

## Appendix 2 – Submission Summary Recommendations Table – Hearing Stream 4

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S4.004	Dom Harris			S4.004	Dom Harris	General comments - urban development	Oppose in part	The last minute, unexplained and inexplicable decision not to include Johnsonville as a area for development and densification in the urban plan is absurd and counter-intuitive. It undermines the broad aspirations of the plan, and this must be reversed to enable common sense development of the region.	Enable densification oin Johnsonville.	No recommendation
S16.075	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.075	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - urban development	Oppose	<p>Council notes the only hierarchical responsibilities given to regional councils under the NPS-UD that must inform and direct the content of district plans are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clause 3.6 – Subclause (2) - Housing bottom lines.</li> <li>2. Clause 3.8 – Subclause (3) - Criteria in the RPS for determining what plan changes will be treated, for the purpose of implementing Policy 8, as adding significantly to development capacity.</li> </ol> <p>The remainder of the NPS-UD provisions that are relevant to regional policy statements and plans are equally applicable to city and district councils – meaning there is no statutory requirement for an RPS to direct how city and district councils are to give effect to all other RPS provisions. When this is taken into account it can be seen much of the RPS Change 1 content in the regional form, design and function chapter attempts to direct city and district councils on how to meet their obligations under the NPS-UD. Such direction is unhelpful, undesirable, and risks conflicting with the Intensification Planning Instruments of the Tier 1 local authorities in the region.</p>	<p>Delete all non-mandatory provisions that are intended to direct city and district councils on how to give effect to the NPS-UD – i.e., only retain provisions in the RPS that give effect to Clause 3.8 Subclause 3 of the NPS-UD – noting Council also seeks amendments to these provisions as requested in this submission.</p> <p>Engage with the technical planning experts within all city and district councils in the region to prepare an appropriately worded variation to RPS Change 1 to give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>	Reject
S16.075	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS18.001	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	FS18.001	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	General comments - urban development	Oppose	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell supported the intent and provisions included in the RPS through Proposed Plan Change 1 to implement the NPS-UD in its submission, and consider the RPS provisions correctly provide direction for further urban development to implement the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD, and meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell do not agree with the submitter that the RPS cannot provide direction to city and district councils on how the NPS-UD should be implemented, from a regional perspective.	Disallow R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell seek for the relief sought by the submitter to delete all nonmandatory provisions that are intended to direct city and district councils on how to give effect to the NPS-UD be disallowed, and seek the intent and provisions in Proposed Plan Change 1 to implement the NPS-UD be retained.	Accept
S16.094	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.094	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - urban development	Support in part	<p>Opposes all references to the Wellington Regional Growth Framework within the RPS, and in particular the suggestion it forms the interim strategic growth direction for the region prior to the development of a Future Development Strategy (FDS) under the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The development of the WRGF was not significantly robust and did not follow the special consultative procedure required for a plan or strategy under the Local Government Act, and it therefore lacks any statutory weight under the RMA as a document prepared under other legislation.</p> <p>References to the WRGF, and the interim legal status, undermines and fails to acknowledge existing growth</p>	<p>Delete all references to, and information from the WRGF throughout proposed RPS Change 1.</p> <p>Replace all references to the WRGF with placeholder references to a Future Development Strategy that has been prepared and published in accordance with the requirements of Subpart 4 of the NPS-UD.</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								strategies prepared by city and district councils in the region under the LGA. They accordingly carry weight under the RMA when preparing and changing plans (s.74(2)(b)(i)).  Notes the statutory weight of a non-statutory document such as the WRGF is not given statutory weight simply via its inclusion in the RPS unless the pre-notification consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 were carried out before RPS Change 1 was publicly notified. Not aware of this mandatory consultation having been carried out.		
<b>S16.094</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS12.009</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	<b>FS12.009</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	General comments - urban development	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of reference to the WRGF within the RPS	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S16.094</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS18.002</b>	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	<b>FS18.002</b>	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	General comments - urban development	Oppose	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell supported the intent of the amendments to the introduction to Chapter 3.9 and sought they be retained as currently written in its submission, and consider the RPS reference to the WRGF is appropriate and necessary to implement the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD, and to meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell do not agree with the submitter that the WRGF was not significantly robust and lacks any statutory weight under the RMA.	Disallow  R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell seek for the relief sought by the submitter to delete all references to, and information from, the WRGF throughout the Proposed RPS Change 1, and the replacement reference to a Future Development Strategy, be disallowed, and seek the provisions in Proposed Plan Change 1 to implement the NPS-UD be retained.	Reject
<b>S17.001</b>	Chelsea Kershaw			<b>S17.001</b>	Chelsea Kershaw	General comments - urban development	Support	Support RPS that helps to deliver more homes without higher transport-related greenhouse gas emissions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S17.006</b>	Chelsea Kershaw			<b>S17.006</b>	Chelsea Kershaw	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Important for all councils to do everything they can to incentivise good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield sprawl.	Retain and strengthen provisions to incentivise good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield sprawl.	Accept
<b>S19.002</b>	Steven Ensslen			<b>S19.002</b>	Steven Ensslen	General comments - urban development	Support	Need to encourage people to use public transport, by improving public transport, by neighbourhood design centred around public transport, and by making transport by car more difficult.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S22.001</b>	Tegan McGowan			<b>S22.001</b>	Tegan McGowan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support councils doing everything to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S24.005</b>	Helen Payn			<b>S24.005</b>	Helen Payn	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. We are in a climate crisis and councils have a very important role in lowering our emissions. Single-family detached houses in greenfield subdivisions should not be the majority of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S25.013</b>	Carterton District Council			<b>S25.013</b>	Carterton District Council	General comments - urban development	Support in part	CDC seeks an objective that specifically provides for urban areas which are not urban environments. This would support Policy 31 in particular.	Add an objective that provides direction for urban areas - those areas that are within urban zones, but not part of 'urban environments'.	Accept in part
<b>S27.001</b>	Peter Ramage			<b>S27.001</b>	Peter Ramage	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support GWRC making policy to influence councils in the Wellington region to not plan to build homes without considering the impact on emissions over the life cycle of those homes. Should not support greenfield single family	Retain and strengthen provisions relating to urban intensification and reducing urban emissions.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								detached houses in places where it is hard to provide public transport, and where most day-to-day tasks will require a car. Decisions on the built environment have impacts for decades. We need to get it right first time. Development needs to be focused in the walkable catchments of places people already want to be, or with convenient public transport to take them to these places.		
<b>S30.020</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.020</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - urban development	Oppose	This chapter needs amendment as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It fails to appropriately give effect to the NPS-UD and to recognise the benefits of urban development.</li> <li>• Objective 22 duplicates other objectives in the RPS.</li> <li>• The objectives and policies create a polycentric urban form with six regionally significant commercial centres, contrary to the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	Amend the chapter to give effect to the NPS-UD, and increase regulatory certainty.	Accept in part
<b>S30.020</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.053</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.053</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - urban development	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S35.002</b>	Oliver Bruce			<b>S35.002</b>	Oliver Bruce	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. It's counterproductive that in this day and age, traffic-inducing greenfield subdivisions of single-family detached houses are still the lion's share of new homes being built. Buildings, streets, roads, parks etc will be there for decades, and how well they're done will profoundly limit (or enable) the people who live there. It's currently easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S37.002</b>	Jennifer Van Beynen			<b>S37.002</b>	Jennifer Van Beynen	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. We are in a climate crisis and councils have a very important role in lowering our emissions. Single-family detached houses in greenfield subdivisions should not be the majority of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions relating to good intensification and reducing urban emission, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S51.001</b>	Khoi Phan			<b>S51.001</b>	Khoi Phan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support councils ensuring that more homes doesn't mean more emissions. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. That is why it's extra important for councils -to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield. Not opposed to greenfield that can pass the test of being founded on high accessibility, not mobility, and whose movement network is very sustainable.	Retain and strengthen provisions relating to intensification rather than greenfield growth.	Accept
<b>S51.005</b>	Khoi Phan			<b>S51.005</b>	Khoi Phan	General comments - urban development	Support	Not stated.	Support councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams boosted and upskilled to become more comfortable and confident at doing density done well by intensification.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S53.001	Ellen Legg			S53.001	Ellen Legg	General comments - urban development	Support	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. We are in a climate crisis and councils have a very important role in lowering our emissions. Single-family detached houses in greenfield subdivisions should not be the majority of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions that encourage good intensification rather than greenfield.	Accept
S56.001	Sam Gilkison			S56.001	Sam Gilkison	General comments - urban development	Oppose	We need to build more homes in places where there is land (Churton Park, Wainuiomarta, Crofton downs). Apartments are good for young adults but they are not good for raising a family. We are in a housing crisis and this will make it much harder to build homes.	Do not progress proposed restrictions on greenfield development.	Reject
S60.003	Grant Buchan			S60.003	Grant Buchan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. We are in a climate crisis and councils have a very important role in lowering our emissions. Single-family detached houses in greenfield subdivisions should not be the majority of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
S61.003	Patrick Morgan			S61.003	Patrick Morgan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support the council ensuring that building more homes doesn't mean more emissions. We are in a climate crisis and councils have a very important role in lowering our emissions. Single-family detached houses in greenfield subdivisions should not be the majority of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
S62.004	Philip Clegg			S62.004	Philip Clegg	General comments - urban development	Oppose	Concerned about references to wrapping 'constraints' around the central government's housing intensification direction and the NPS-UD when regional policy statements are subordinate to primary legislation and national policy statements, and are superior to regional and district plans.	Amend the proposed RPS to remove any and all clauses that seek to "constrain" the intent and direction of NPS-UD.	Reject
S71.002	Parents for Climate Aotearoa			S71.002	Parents for Climate Aotearoa	General comments - urban development	Support	Building homes should not mean increased emissions, especially through urban sprawl and encouraging car dependent suburbs.	Need to maintain and strengthen the links in the RPS between transport and urban development and emissions reduction so that any new transport and urban development projects must show how they will not increase emissions.	Accept
S71.003	Parents for Climate Aotearoa			S71.003	Parents for Climate Aotearoa	General comments - urban development	Support	Creating climate resilient urban areas is win win for everyone now and for future generations.	Include a non-regulatory method to require the Council to invest into upskilling the various teams such as planning, regulatory and consenting to be grounded in the skills and knowledge on how to do intensification well.	Reject
S73.004	Alicia Hall			S73.004	Alicia Hall	General comments - urban development	Support	I support Councils being empowered and upskilled in implementing good policy and decision making around intensification and limiting the development of urban sprawl/car dependent neighbourhoods. Greenfield projects must show how they do not add to or increase emissions and how they can contribute to emissions reductions through good planning. Maintaining and strengthening the links in the	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								RPS between how we live (urban development) and how we move around (transport) and emissions reduction so that all new projects involved in urban development and transport must show how they will not increase emissions.		
<b>S74.004</b>	Finn Hall			<b>S74.004</b>	Finn Hall	General comments - urban development	Support	Our generation will not be as car dependent as my parents so we need you to make good decisions now so it will be easier for us to live and work in the region in the future. Even making it easier to make different choices on how we get to school would be awesome. We need you to put policies in place that prevent urban development creating more emissions in a time where we need to reduce them and create more choices in how we are able to travel around our region.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S75.002</b>	Te Aka Taurira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)			<b>S75.002</b>	Te Aka Taurira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)	General comments - urban development	Support	Support the maintenance and strengthening of the links in the RPS between transport and urban development emissions reduction so that any new transport and urban development projects must show how they will not increase emissions.  Support provisions that set a clear direction that everyone deserves access to good housing.  Support provisions that encourage denser suburbs that are well connected by public transport with reduced dependence on private motor vehicle transport.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S76.002</b>	Gene Clendon			<b>S76.002</b>	Gene Clendon	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support provisions ensuring that more homes do not result in more emissions. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S77.001</b>	James Burgess			<b>S77.001</b>	James Burgess	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Supports the changes proposed to reduce the climate impact of new housing, however need to remove more barriers to more compact, livable developments with better transport choice and lower environmental impact.	No specific relief requested except for additional staff resources and training and enforcement measures to better achieve more compact, liveable developments.	Reject
<b>S82.003</b>	Jonathan Markwick			<b>S82.003</b>	Jonathan Markwick	General comments - urban development	Support	Support allowing more housing to be built where it is most in demand (the inner city and inner suburbs). This will increase housing affordability, livability and transport sustainability.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S89.005</b>	VicLabour			<b>S89.005</b>	VicLabour	General comments - urban development	Support	Support recognition of the lack of housing Wellington has in the modifications to Chapter 3.9, particularly regarding the lack of variety of housing (i.e.: papakāinga). Support ensuring that the housing in Wellington is diverse and built denser, otherwise we will never be able to sustain being the "green" region we desire to be. This does not just apply to Wellington City, but it applies everywhere across the region.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S90.002</b>	Bronwyn Bell			<b>S90.002</b>	Bronwyn Bell	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support provisions ensuring that more homes do not result in more emissions. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils - of all stripes - to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield. Not opposed to greenfield that can pass the test of being founded on high accessibility, not mobility, and whose movement network is very sustainable.	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S92.005</b>	Ruby Miller-Kopelov			<b>S92.005</b>	Ruby Miller-Kopelov	General comments -	Support in part	Support councils ensuring that more homes doesn't mean more emissions. Support well-designed, higher-density housing. Continuing to build traffic-inducing greenfield	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						urban development		subdivisions of single- family detached houses is simply ridiculous. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils - of all stripes - to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.		
<b>S93.005</b>	Isabella Cawthorn			<b>S93.005</b>	Isabella Cawthorn	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support all councils ensuring that more homes doesn't mean more emissions. It's shameful that in this day and age, traffic-inducing greenfield subdivisions of single-family detached houses are still the lion's share of new homes being built. Everyone knows it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. And that's why it's extra important for councils - of all stripes - to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield. I'm not opposed to greenfield that can pass the test of being founded on high accessibility, not mobility, and whose movement network is very sustainable	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
<b>S96.004</b>	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			<b>S96.004</b>	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	General comments - urban development	Oppose	Concerned about references to wrapping 'constraints' around the central government's housing intensification direction and the NPS-UD when regional policy statements are subordinate to primary legislation and national policy statements, and are superior to regional and district plans.	Amend the proposed RPS to remove any and all clauses that seek to "constrain" the intent and direction of NPS-UD.	Reject
<b>S98.001</b>	Teresa Homan			<b>S98.001</b>	Teresa Homan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Supports low rise intensification of housing across the Wellington region and specifically in Upper Hutt. Housing should be on identifiable available urban and rural land not used for production of food. However, recognises a need to limit housing based on population growth and fluctuation.	Add provision(s) which consider the effect that overinflated housing can have on the health and welfare of current and future residents and undue strain on the regions infrastructure.	Accept in part
<b>S98.002</b>	Teresa Homan			<b>S98.002</b>	Teresa Homan	General comments - urban development	Support in part	All public transport needs to be connected and subsidised by central government, regional council and local territorial authorities. There is no need for housing to be concentrated near rail if other forms of public transport are connected such as buses to trains, inner city shuttle services.	Amend provisions to address relief sought.	Accept in part
<b>S98.004</b>	Teresa Homan			<b>S98.004</b>	Teresa Homan	General comments - urban development	Support	Supports affordable housing provisions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S126.004</b>	Templeton Kapiti Limited (TKL)			<b>S126.004</b>	Templeton Kapiti Limited (TKL)	General comments - urban development	Not Stated / Neutral	The TKL Land could implement the Urban Design Amendments.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S129.024</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.024</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Intensification of existing urban areas be prioritised and further consideration be given to the role of enabling infrastructure as lead infrastructure planned for and included in the Future Development Strategies.	Clarify how Objective 22A provides the scope for Policy 55 to define what appropriate urban expansion is and how it will be provided.	Accept in part
<b>S129.024</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<b>FS12.021</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	<b>FS12.021</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	General comments - urban development	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the relief sought.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S131.006</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.006</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - urban development	Not Stated / Neutral	The development of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, and the timeframes provided for their incorporation into the GWRC RPS do not uphold the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga. Ātiawa therefore have fundamental concerns with the process and direction given by the Government requiring this Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1. This means that Ātiawa has had inadequate opportunities and	Ātiawa seeks further reference to mana whenua values, as well as addressing the impact of poor urban design on mana whenua and their relationship with the natural world and to provide for our values and role as mana whenua.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								insufficient time to contribute to the development of the RPS Change 1. This process and the intensification provisions also predjudice the outcomes and potential outcomes of our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement.		
<b>S131.006</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.210</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.210</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - urban development	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept
<b>S131.044</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.044</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Objective 22A seeks growth that both retains the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. Housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs. The tino rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi should be recognised in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. The manaakitanga that iwi, hapū and ahi kā have provided over generations to share their home with Tangata Tiriti needs to be recognised in the way growth is managed. This includes recognising the significant role of Marae as a spiritual and cultural home for our people, a social hub and in civil emergencies. Proactive initiatives are required to ensure that our unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the region.	Amend Objective 22A and underlying policies to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part
<b>S131.044</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.314</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.314</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - urban development	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S135.002</b>	Best Farm Ltd/Hunters Hill Ltd/Lincolnshire Farm Ltd/Stebbings Farmlands Ltd			<b>S135.002</b>	Best Farm Ltd/Hunters Hill Ltd/Lincolnshire Farm Ltd/Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments - urban development	Support	The amendments and new provisions give effect to the NPS-UD 2020 and RM (Enabling Housing Supply & other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 that seeks to increase housing capacity in the urban areas, in particular high density/heights around centres and rapid transport stops to improve housing affordability.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S141.004</b>	Generation Zero Wellington			<b>S141.004</b>	Generation Zero Wellington	General comments - urban development	Support	Housing is another topic which touches on almost every area of our lives and we are currently facing a crisis in; Denser cities allow people to get anywhere they need without the requirement of owning a car and can help the creation of better public transport routes that serve a greater number of people, further decreasing peoples reliance on cars. Similarly, greater density can be used to create a greater supply of houses to ease the pressure on a housing market that is growing more and more inaccessible and thus gives more people the opportunity to live in a home that is stable, warm and affordable. This is just the surface level of the benefits that greater density can bring but it is a tool that has power to reshape the communities that we are living in and address some of the most pressing concerns, it's also a tool that has been severely under-utilised in recent years.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S143.002</b>	Megan Gallagher			<b>S143.002</b>	Megan Gallagher	General comments - urban development	Not Stated / Neutral	If more apartments, townhouses are built with a focus on warmth, community and proximity to amenities people will buy them. Stop encouraging low density greenfield subdivisions in what was once farmers and food production areas.	Amend the provisions to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept
<b>S143.004</b>	Megan Gallagher			<b>S143.004</b>	Megan Gallagher	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support Councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams boosted and upskilled to become more comfortable and confident at doing "density done well" by intensification. This includes supporting co-designed community development for groups wanting to build housing together in non traditional ways.	Amend provisions to address the releif sought in the submission.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S148.009	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.009	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - urban development	Not Stated / Neutral	The provisions for the most part are giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development ("NPSUD"), however the provisions also need to appropriately recognise that in some situations housing developments can be constrained by the "qualifying matters" that are also set out in the NPSUD. This specifically includes areas of land which are subject to designations and the ability to safely and efficiently operate regionally significant infrastructure.	The RPS should also strike a balance in terms of the timing of development so that the provisions do not have the potential to unnecessarily inhibit appropriate development including at the Airport. The Airport is a facilitator of traffic and must take a long term approach to development.	Reject
S151.010	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			S151.010	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Do not support some of the wording of proposed policies relating to regional urban form / peripheral urban development.	Amend provisions to address relief sought in submission.	Accept in part
S152.001	Michelle Ducat			S152.001	Michelle Ducat	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support development rules that ensure any investment in infrastructure will also ensure low/zero emissions, enhances the wellbeing of people and the environment and is climate resilient. All our infrastructure dollars have to be spent wisely to ensure we are giving our communities the best chance to live lives in communities that can thrive. People need homes, but they also need community and community infrastructure that is not centred on private vehicle ownership.	Housing development must be centred on mitigation of emissions, adaptation to climate change, and enhancement of community connection and the environment we depend upon - and centres on the the aspirations of mana whenua.	Accept
S152.003	Michelle Ducat			S152.003	Michelle Ducat	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support councils ensuring more homes do not mean more emissions. It's ridiculous that in this day and age, traffic-inducing greenfield subdivisions of single-family detached houses are still the lion's share of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. That is why it is important for councils - of all stripes - to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
S154.012	Investore Property Limited			S154.012	Investore Property Limited	General comments - urban development	Oppose in part	Seeks that RPS Change 1 is amended to enable an urban form in metropolitan centres that reflects the demand for housing and business use. In Johnsonville, this would reflect significant demand and intensification. The NPS-UD anticipates that there will be a comprehensive review of district plans and regional policy statements to ensure that they enable an urban form that gives effect to the requirements for well-functioning urban environments in the NPS-UD. RPS Change 1 does not reflect this approach. The amendments to the RPS are disparate and are unlikely to achieve the strategic purpose of the NPS-UD, including Policy 1 of the NPS-UD to contribute to well-functioning urban environments.	Amend the RPS Change 1 to address the relief sought in the submission and make any consequential changes.	Accept in part
S155.009	Stride Investment Management Limited			S155.009	Stride Investment Management Limited	General comments - urban development	Oppose in part	Seeks that RPS Change 1 is amended to enable an urban form in metropolitan centres that reflects the demand for housing and business use. In Johnsonville, this would reflect significant demand and intensification.  The NPS-UD anticipates that there will be a comprehensive review of district plans and regional policy statements to ensure that they enable an urban form that gives effect to the requirements for well-functioning urban environments in the NPS-UD. RPS Change 1 does not reflect this approach. The amendments to the RPS are disparate and are unlikely to achieve the strategic purpose of the NPS-UD, including Policy 1 of the NPS-UD to contribute to well-functioning urban environments.	Amend the RPS Change 1 to address the relief sought in the submission and make any consequential changes.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S158.047	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.047	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Urban form and function - Supports PC1 giving effect to the NPS-UD however objectives and policies can be simplified.	Seeks that the related objectives and policies are simplified and are more directive and applicable to the Wellington Region.	Accept in part
S158.048	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.048	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - urban development	Support in part	These changes are requested in line with previous submissions made on the District Council IPI's and Wellington City Council Proposed Plan to achieve regional consistency. Seeks better direction for where high density development should occur and seeks to include prescribed minimum walkable catchments.	Seeks that a defined centres hierarchy is included in line with the National Planning Standards and NPS-UD. Seek to identify Wellington City centre as the City Centre Zone of the region and that additional centres are identified as Metropolitan and Town Centres	Reject
S164.001	Megan Lane			S164.001	Megan Lane	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Support all councils ensuring that more homes don't mean more emissions. Ridiculous that traffic-inducing greenfield subdivisions of single-family detached houses are still the lion's share of new homes being built. There are plenty of reasons why it's easier and more profitable to do traditional car-centric suburban greenfield. It's important for councils to do everything they possibly can to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield. Not opposed to greenfield if it's based on high accessibility, not mobility, with a sustainable movement network.	Retain and strengthen provisions to get good intensification for growth, rather than greenfield.	Accept
S164.006	Megan Lane			S164.006	Megan Lane	General comments - urban development	Support	Support provisions for climate-resilient urban areas.	Provisions should be retained, refined and enhanced.	Accept
S165.031	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.031	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	General comments - urban development	Support in part	We acknowledge that the policy direction in the NPSUD is to provide for urban development; however, this is not to be provided at any cost. The adverse effects of development must be considered in undertaking all council functions and responsibilities, and in achieving the purpose of the Act.	Seek deletion of the directive language in the amended provisions that provide for urban development and expansion. Policies need to be subject to meeting other requirements such as s6 of the RMA.	Reject
S165.031	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - urban development	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept
S166.020	Masterton District Council			S166.020	Masterton District Council	General comments - urban development	Not Stated / Neutral	Objective 22A Need further clarity on how this impacts the Wairarapa District Councils in terms of intensification, and if so - how? The review of the WCDP is proposing to intensify the residential zone (in certain areas).	Clarifications. Further clarity sought on how this will impact Tier 3 councils.	Accept in part
S167.050	Taranaki Whānui			S167.050	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - urban development	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the direction of general comments and make specific comment on subsequent parts below.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.026	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.026	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments -	Support	Development in urban areas and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of	Specify the characteristics of well-functioning urban environments relating to the provision of a variety of	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						urban development		quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga	homes include quality (i.e. healthy), as well as affordability and location.	
<b>S168.026</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.136</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.136</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.Nga mihi nuilan Gun	Not stated	Accept
<b>S168.027</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.027</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Development in urban areas and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga	Strengthen policies and methods that provide for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of tangata whenua with their ancestral land	Accept in part
<b>S168.027</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS6.044</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.044</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - urban development	Support	We support this submission because strengthened policies and methods for the relationship of tangata whenua with their ancestral land will better support these relationships.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S168.027</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.137</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.137</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
<b>S168.028</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.028</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Development in urban areas and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Environmental research explicitly recognises and provides for Mātauranga Māori.	Reject
<b>S168.028</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.138</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.138</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Reject
<b>S168.029</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.029</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - urban development	Support	The decision requested has potential to improve both tangata whenua and wider community outcomes	Provide further opportunities for tangata whenua to build up with iwi their social, cultural, environmental and economic capacity, using Mātauranga Māori; by implementing a kaupapa Māori-based model or framework for urban development that is outcome focused (such as the Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework).	Accept in part
<b>S168.029</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.139</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.139</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
<b>S168.030</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.030</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Development in urban areas and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Policies relating to appropriate urban expansion and development in rural areas are consistent in the issues covered and include a requirement to consider all matters covered in Section 6(e) of the RMA 1991.	Accept in part
<b>S168.030</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.140</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.140</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - urban development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S163.040</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.040</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments -	Oppose	Do not agree that any of the proposed regional form, design and function provisions are freshwater instruments, refer to submission for details of relevant case law.	Delete FW icons	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						urban development				
S163.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS28.036	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.036	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - urban development	Support	HortNZ agree that the Freshwater Planning Process should be limited to freshwater focused provisions only.	Allow	Accept in part
S163.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - urban development	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Accept in part
S163.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.206	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.206	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - urban development	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Accept in part
S163.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.057	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.057	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - urban development	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the ntergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.113	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.113	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - urban development	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Accept in part
S16.088	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.088	Kāpiti Coast District Council	High density development	Oppose	Specifying a minimum building height for high density development is not necessary or helpful to city and district councils in carrying out their functions when giving effect to the MDRS and the requirements of NPS-UD Policies 3 and 4. The proposed height specifications and list of activities that comprise high density development misinterpret NPS-UD requirements and the definition is not required for city and district councils to give effect to the NPS-UD. Council requests the proposed definition be deleted.	Amend as follows: <del>High density development means areas used predominately for commercial, residential and mixed use activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities with a minimum building height of 6 stories.</del>	Reject
S30.0104	Porirua City Council			S30.0104	Porirua City Council	High density development	Support	The definition conflates built form, land use activities and spatial areas, and reads as a zone statement. It does not	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								provide a definition of high-density development with a specificity appropriate for use in regulatory frameworks in RMA plans. Council also objects to the definition requiring that high density development must consist of buildings with a minimum of 6 storeys. This exceeds the requirements of the NPS-UD, is not supported by any urban design evidence, and is more appropriately included in a policy.		
S30.0104	Porirua City Council	FS12.015	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.015	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	High density development	Support	Kāinga Ora agrees that the proposed definition reads as a zone statement, or direction to be provided within provisions, rather than a definition.	Allow	Reject
S30.0104	Porirua City Council	FS25.020	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.020	Peka Peka Farm Limited	High density development	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.0100	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0100	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	High density development	Oppose in part	High density development should not have a 'minimum height of 6 storeys'. It is possible to have high density without 6 storeys. It is not for RPS to direct on matters of national direction and we note the definition is not consistent with UHCC permitted activity standards.	Delete reference to minimum storey requirements.	Accept in part
S115.0121	Hutt City Council			S115.0121	Hutt City Council	High density development	Support in part	The use of the term "minimum building height" is unclear. District plans do occasionally apply minimum building height standards but typically provide a maximum or anticipated building height.	Amend as follows: "Means areas used predominately for <del>commercial, residential and mixed use</del> <b>urban</b> activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities with <del>a minimum</del> <b>an anticipated</b> building height of <b>at least 6 stories.</b> "	Accept in part
S140.0122	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0122	Wellington City Council (WCC)	High density development	Support in part	The height limits go further than the NPS-UD and proposes unnecessary rigidity.	Means areas used predominately for commercial, residential or mixed-use activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities. <del>with a minimum building height of 6 stories.</del>	Reject
S133.066	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.066	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Support	Supports the acknowledgement of specific issues faced by iwi regarding urban development, including lack of variety of housing, inappropriate development effects on mana whenua and how poor-quality urban design can adversely affect cultural practices.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S133.066	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.413	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.413	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S168.0161</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0161</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support acknowledgement that poor quality urban design can adversely affect the cultural practices and wellbeing of tangata whenua and communities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>FS31.090</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.090</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.090</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S167.056</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.056</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Support in part	Cultural visibility and the expression of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā in their areas of interest is important and needs to be articulated throughout the RPS. Current and future urban design practices and urban development need to provide for the cultural visibility, identity, and expression for Taranaki Whānui. Amending Issue 1 will sufficiently lift the culture and identity aspirations of Taranaki Whānui. Taranaki Whānui are Treaty partners through the Port Nicholson Block (Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika) Claims Settlement Act	Amend to: "Poor quality urban design can adversely affect public health, social equity, land values, the cultural practices, <b>visibility, identity,</b> and wellbeing of mana whenua / tangata whenua and communities, the vibrancy of local centres and economies, and the provision of, and access to, civic services. It can also increase the use of non-renewable resources and vehicle emissions in the region."	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								2009 and consider it necessary for NPS-UD objective 5 and policy 9 to be appropriately reflected in RPS1.		
S167.056	Taranaki Whānui	FS2.83	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.83	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Issue 1: Poor quality urban design	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Issue 1 text proposed by Taranaki Whānui. Rangitāne agree that the matters raised by the submitter can be adverse outcomes of poor urban design.	Allow	Accept
S4.006	Dom Harris			S4.006	Dom Harris	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support in part	Need better planning for transport. Routes must be stood up based on expected volumes before they come on line, not after. Appropriate sequencing between transport and urban planning is required.	Appropriate sequencing between transport and urban planning is required	Reject
S16.076	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.076	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support in part	Clause 2 is outdated as it does not identify the impacts of uncontrolled or uncoordinated development that is now enabled by the MDRS. Subclause (a) in particular regarding development that is poorly located in relation to existing infrastructure should identify the MDRS as a contributing factor to this challenge across the urban areas of Tier 1 city and district councils into the future.	Amend Clause 2 - Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development, as follows: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated, development (including of infrastructure) can adversely affect the region's compact form. <b>Medium density residential development enabled across all urban areas in accordance with the Medium Density Residential Standards by Tier 1 territorial authorities adds to this issue.</b> This can, among other things, result in: a) new development that is poorly located in relation to existing infrastructure (such as roads, public transport, water supply, sewage and stormwater systems)	Reject
S29.001	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)			S29.001	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support	It is essential that access to potential aggregate resources is not shut off. Aggregate extraction is a locationally constrained activity. It can only occur where suitable aggregate resource exists. Council planning must identify where the rock is located and protect those areas from such development and alternative land uses.	Retained as notified, in particular the subclause (b)	Accept in part
S29.001	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS11.007	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.007	Fulton Hogan Limited	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support	As aggregate supplies are locationally constrained, and given their importance to infrastructure and urban construction and development, we agree that aggregate resources should be identified and protected through Council planning processes as part of regional form, design and function.	Allow	Accept in part
S29.001	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS20.001	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.001	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose	Disallow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S128.016	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.016	Horticulture New Zealand	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support in part	It is noted that a focus of Proposed Change 1 is to addressing the lack of urban development capacity and the interface between urban development and freshwater. It would be remiss in our view to not include a productive and sustainable rural environment in planning provisions regarding regional form, design and function. In particular, the RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity. The NPSHPL notes that there needs to be integration in the management of HPL with freshwater management and urban development. The Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) which this RPS acknowledged in their constraints analysis: 1. highly productive land (as Wāhi Toitū) 2. high quality soils (as Wāhi Toiora). The WRGF noted that the Wairarapa and Horowhenua contain important areas of highly productive land (noting the boundary of this work extended into the Horizons region). The amendments sought seek to acknowledge the highly productive land resource as part of these provisions.	Retain with amendments. (c) the loss of rural or open space land, <b>including</b> , valued for its productive, ecological, aesthetic and recreational qualities, including <b>highly productive land and its long-term environmental, social, cultural and economic values.</b>	Reject
S128.016	Horticulture New Zealand	FS30.040	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.040	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support in part	B+LNZ supports the importance of recognising highly productive land. And those provisions relating to urban development should support a productive and sustainable rural environment. B+LNZ seek that this is not limited to HPL as defined by the NPS-HPL but also recognises versatile soils where food production also occurs.	Allow in part	Reject
S162.039	Winstone Aggregates			S162.039	Winstone Aggregates	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Oppose in part	The issues statement in the Chapter Introduction has a single reference to aggregate, but it appears under the heading 'Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development'. Winstone supports recognition of this issue and requests that the Regionally Significant Aggregate Deposits are identified along with the surrounding area as to not sterilise the resource. This includes recognition of the extraction of the resource itself but also activities that go hand in hand with quarrying such as overburden placement which needs to occur as part of the quarrying activity as it is necessary to remove and store the overburden to be able to access the aggregate below. Winstone request that land to be protected as regionally significant mineral deposits and should urgently be identified, mapped and set aside for that purpose in the plan so that the importance of these areas are fully recognised as such (as is anticipated by Method 52 RPS).	Undertake mapping of Regionally Significant Aggregate Deposits to allow for their protection.	Reject
S162.039	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.306	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.306	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
<b>S167.057</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.057</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 2: Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of Issue 2 here and note the reference to the adverse effects on mana whenua.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S4.005</b>	Dom Harris			<b>S4.005</b>	Dom Harris	Issue A: Lack of housing	Support in part	Significant hectareage of land in Wellington has sat vacant for close to a decade. The council should highlight this as a contributing factor and set out powers, actions that will be taken to encourage this land to be unlocked for housing.	Add reference to unlocking empty, unused and earthquake damaged land for housing.	Reject
<b>S133.064</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.064</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Issue A: Lack of housing	Support	Supports the acknowledgement of specific issues faced by iwi regarding urban development, including lack of variety of housing, inappropriate development effects on mana whenua and how poor-quality urban design can adversely affect cultural practices.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S133.064</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.411</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.411</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue A: Lack of housing	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S167.054</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.054</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Issue A: Lack of housing	Support in part	In relation to urban environments, Taranaki Whānui support the direction of this wording on the basis that further opportunities are proffered for their involvement as required by NPS-UD: Policy 9.Taranaki Whānui aspires to provide housing for their own people in their areas of interest.	We note the three issues the NPS-UD requires the RPS to cover:• Providing for a well-functioning and liveable urban environment• Enabling and managing urban intensification • Providing for responsive planning through introducing criteria for "adding significantly to development capacity".Support the direction of this wording on the basis that further opportunities are proffered for their involvement as required by NPS-UD: Policy 9:Local authorities, in taking account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) inrelation to urban environments, must:(a) involve hapū and iwi in the preparation of RMA planning documents and any FDSs by undertaking effective consultation that isearly, meaningful and, as far as practicable, in accordance with tikanga Māori; and(b) when preparing RMA planning documents and FDSs, take into account the values and aspirations of hapū and iwi for urban development; and(c) provide opportunities in appropriate circumstances for Māori involvement in decision-making on resource consents,designations, heritage orders, and water conservation orders, including in relation to sites of significance to Māori and issues of cultural significance; and(d) operate in a way that is consistent with iwi participation legislation.	Accept
<b>S168.0159</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0159</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Issue A: Lack of housing	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the specific reference to Papakāinga, within the context of a lack of variety of housing.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0159</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.088</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.088</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Issue A: Lack of housing	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.Nga mihi nuilan Gun		
<b>S128.015</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.015</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support in part	It is noted that a focus of Proposed Change 1 is to addressing the lack of urban development capacity and the interface between urban development and freshwater.It would be remiss in our view to not include a productive and sustainable rural environment in planning provisions regarding regional form, design and function. In particular, the RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity.The NPSHPL notes that there needs to be integration in the management of HPL with freshwater management and urban development The Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) which this RPS acknowledged in their constraints analysis:1. highly productive land (as Wāhi Toitū)2. high quality soils (as Wāhi Toiora).The WRGF noted that the Wairarapa and Horowhenua contain important areas of highly productive land (noting the boundary of this work extended into the Horizons region).The amendments sought seek to acknowledge the highly productive land resource as part of these provisions.	Amend issue B.Inappropriate and poorly managed urban land use and activities in the Wellington region have damaged, and continue to jeopardise, the natural environment, <b>result in loss, fragmentation or reverse sensitivity effects on highly productive land</b> , degrade ecosystems, particularly aquatic ecosystems, and increased the exposure of communities to the impacts of climate change. This has adversely affected mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Reject
<b>S128.015</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS30.039</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.039</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support in part	B+LNZ supports the importance of recognising highly productive land. And those provisions relating to urban development should support a productive and sustainable rural environment. B+LNZ seek that this is not limited to HPL as defined by the NPS-HPL but also recognises versatile soils where food production also occurs.	Allow in part	Reject
<b>S133.065</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.065</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support	Supports the acknowledgement of specific issues faced by iwi regarding urban development, including lack of variety of housing, inappropriate development effects on mana whenua and how poor-quality urban design can adversely affect cultural practices.	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S133.065</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.412</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.412</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S167.055</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.055</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support in part	In relation to urban environments, Taranaki Whānui support the direction of this wording on the basis that further opportunities are proffered for their involvement as required by NPS-UD: Policy 9.Taranaki Whānui aspires to provide housing for their own people in their areas of interest.	We reference NPS-UD - Policy 9: Local authorities, in taking account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) in relation to urban environments, must:(a) involve hapū and iwi in the preparation of RMA planning documents and any FDSs by undertaking effective consultation that is early, meaningful and, as far as practicable, in accordance with tikanga Māori; and(b) when preparing RMA planning documents and FDSs, take into account the values and aspirations of hapū and iwi for urban development; and(c) provide opportunities in appropriate circumstances for Māori involvement in decision-making on resource consents, designations, heritage orders, and water conservation orders, including in relation to sites of significance to Māori and issues of cultural significance; and(d) operate in a way that is consistent with iwi participation legislation.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0160</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0160</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support acknowledgement of the adverse impact that inappropriate development has had on the relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0160</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.089</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.089</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Issue B: Inappropriate development	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.Nga mihi nullan Gun		
<b>S131.0160</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0160</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Marae	Oppose	Ātiawa seek to include a new definition of marae, drafted by mana whenua. Ātiawa are concerned that in the absence of any definition for marae, some developments may seek to fall under the policy framework for marae where this is not appropriate.	Ātiawa would like to request that mana whenua work together to draft an appropriate definition for marae.	Accept in part
<b>S131.0160</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.281</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.281</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Marae	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S167.0194</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0194</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Marae	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui Note new definition needed.  Taranaki Whānui suggests regional council provide for mana whenua to develop their own definition of marae within each iwi and hapū.	Amend the definition of Marae with input from each iwi and hapū.	Accept in part
<b>S167.0194</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS6.042</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.042</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Marae	Support	We support this submission as the definition of marae should be developed with input from the relevant iwi and hapū.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S16.090</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.090</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Medium density residential development	Oppose	Council notes medium density residential development is a description of the intensity of the use of a site. Medium density residential development can comprise developments less than 3 stories, and there are many examples of this throughout the region. The proposed definition conflicts with	Amend as follows: <del>Medium density residential development</del> Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, and low-rise apartments, and other	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								the definition for medium density housing proposed in Council's IPI. If it considered necessary for the RPS to include a definition for medium density residential development, it is crucial the definition is an umbrella term that does not conflict with the definitions and other provisions proposed within the Intensification Planning Instruments notified within the region. It also appears the proposed height specification within the definition has cross-over with the height limits suggested in the proposed definition for high density development. Council considers it is not necessary or appropriate for the RPS to specify minimum heights for different types of development. Council notes the NPS-UD does not give the regional council the function of specifying what type of development can be considered medium density residential development within the region. Council also notes including and other compatible activities without a qualifier creates uncertainty and opens the interpretation of the proposed definition to debate. Compatible activities will be defined differently within the district plans across the region. Council seeks the definition is deleted to avoid conflict with the IPIs notified by Tier 1 Councils in the region.	<del>compatible residential activities with a minimum building height of 3 stories.</del>	
S31.027	Robert Anker			S31.027	Robert Anker	Medium density residential development	Oppose in part	This definition on page 221 is incorrect in that it states "minimum" whereas it should be "maximum".	Amend the definition to read: Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities with a <b>maximum</b> <del>minimum</del> building height of 3 stories.	Reject
S30.0107	Porirua City Council			S30.0107	Porirua City Council	Medium density residential development	Oppose	The definition conflates built form, land use activities and spatial areas, and reads as a zone statement. It does not provide a definition of medium density development with a specificity appropriate for use in regulatory frameworks in RMA plans. Council also objects to the definition requiring that medium density development must consist of buildings with a minimum of 3 storeys (noting height is actually expressed in terms of maximum height in metres in Schedule 3A(11) rather than the number of storeys). This exceeds the requirements of the MDRS, is not supported by any urban design evidence, and is more appropriately included in a policy.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.	Reject
S30.0107	Porirua City Council	FS12.016	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.016	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Medium density residential development	Support	Kāinga Ora agrees that the proposed definition reads as a zone statement, or direction to be provided within provisions, rather than a definition.	Allow	Reject
S30.0107	Porirua City Council	FS25.023	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.023	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Medium density residential development	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S115.0123	Hutt City Council			S115.0123	Hutt City Council	Medium density residential development	Support in part	The use of the term "minimum building height" is unclear. District plans do occasionally apply minimum building height standards but typically provide a maximum or anticipated building height. In addition, the circumstances where this term is used either make it clear that the development is residential, or there is no policy reason to limit the development to being residential. It should be amended to be consistent with the term "high density development	Amend the term itself (and references): "Medium density residential development" to be renamed to " <b>medium density residential development</b> ". And the definition: "Means areas used predominately for <del>residential</del> <b>urban</b> activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities with a <del>minimum</del> <b>an anticipated</b> building height of <b>at least 3</b>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									stories."And amend the term throughout the RPS when used.	
<b>S140.0124</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.0124</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Medium density residential development	Support in part	The height limits go further than the NPS-UD and proposes unnecessary rigidity.	Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible <b>commercial and mixed-use activities</b> . <del>with a minimum building height of 3 stories.</del>	Accept
S34.0103	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0103	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Medium density residential development	Support in part	Do not support including a minimum height of three stories. It is unclear why this has been included in the definition given MDH can be achieved without developments being three stories, as an example terraced housing may be two stories. MDRS rules also refer to a maximum of three stories. The definition is unhelpful and goes beyond what is required for the RPS.	Amend to delete reference to minimum storey requirements.	Accept
<b>S78.028</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.028</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 40: Sign the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 40 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.028</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.336</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.336</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 40: Sign the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S115.0107</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.0107</b>	Hutt City Council	Method 40: Sign the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S140.0110</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.0110</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 40: Sign the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S167.0160</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0160</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 40: Sign the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.029</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.029</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 41: Integrate public open space	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 41 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.029</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.337</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.337</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 41: Integrate public open space	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.		
<b>S167.0161</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0161</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 41: Integrate public open space	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.030</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.030</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 42: Develop visions for the regionally significant centres	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 42 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.030</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.338</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.338</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 42: Develop visions for the regionally significant centres	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S167.0162</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0162</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 42: Develop visions for the regionally significant centres	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.031</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.031</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 43: Develop principles for retail activities	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 43 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.031</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.339</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.339</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 43: Develop principles for retail activities	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S167.0163</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0163</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 43: Develop principles for retail activities	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.032</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.032</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 44: Analysis of industrial employment locations	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 44 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
<b>S78.032</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.340</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.340</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 44: Analysis of industrial employment locations	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S167.0164</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0164</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 44: Analysis of industrial employment locations	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.033</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.033</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 45: Develop principles for rural-residential use and development	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 45 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.033</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.341</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.341</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 45: Develop principles for rural-residential use and development	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S167.0165</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0165</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 45: Develop principles for rural-residential use and development	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S78.034</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.034</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Not Stated / Neutral	Accept that the amendments to operative Method 46 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Reject
<b>S78.034</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.342</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.342</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S129.042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support	Supports this method and our continued involvement through our participation in the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee.	Retain as notified.	Reject
S147.096	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.096	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support	Necessary to implement the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Reject
S147.096	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.160	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.160	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Accept
S147.096	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.265	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.265	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept
S115.0108	Hutt City Council			S115.0108	Hutt City Council	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Oppose	<p>The term "complex development opportunity" is not adequately defined (see our comment on the definition) and the method is not adequately supported by higher order objectives and policies.</p> <p>We also oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.</p> <p>It is also inappropriate for a method to direct action through the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee which is not a statutory body with responsibilities under the resource management system.</p>	<p>Delete Method 46.</p> <p>If the method is retained, amend Method 46 so that it does not apply to city and district councils and remove reference to the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee.</p>	Accept
S131.0133	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0133	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support in part	Ātiawa seek to ensure that Regional Council and central government partner with mana whenua in the development and implementation of plans and frameworks for each Complex Development Opportunity.	<del>Jointly</del> <b>In partnership with mana whenua and central government agencies</b> , develop and implement plans and a framework for each Complex Development Opportunity <del>with central government agencies.</del> <b>The Regional Council shall enable this partnership with</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									mana whenua through adequate funding and resourcing.	
S131.0133	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.251	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.251	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Reject
S140.0111	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0111	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support	Support as proposed	Retain as notified.	Reject
S165.0110	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.0110	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support in part		Add the words "and engaging with stakeholders and the community" after the words "partner approach"	Reject
		FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S168.0190</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0190</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support in part	The method refers to joint development of implementation plans and frameworks for each Complex Development Opportunity with central government agencies only. Rangitāne o Wairarapa consider that tangata whenua interests should also be represented as part of this process, as Te Tiriti partners.	Include reference to tangata whenua/mana whenua as being included in the development of any joint framework or implementation plans.	Reject
<b>S168.0190</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.121</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.121</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Method 46: Develop complex development opportunities	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nuilan Gun	Not stated	Reject
<b>S78.035</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.035</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 47: Analysis of the range and affordability of housing in the region	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the deletion of operative Method 47 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the deletion.	Delete as notified	Accept
<b>S78.035</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.343</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.343</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 47: Analysis of the range and affordability of housing in the region	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S131.0134</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0134</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 47: Analysis of the range and affordability	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose deletion of Method 47, a regional analysis of housing, including range and affordability is still necessary, and essential to understanding a well-functioning urban environment. It is not clear why Regional Council no longer view Method 47 as an mechanism to provide for improving	Insert amended Method 47: <b>In partnership with mana whenua</b> complete a regional analysis of housing, including range and affordability, and explore with private sector developers innovative housing design	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						of housing in the region		housing range and options, particularly in the interim while a Future Development Strategy is yet to be released.	and/or developments that increase the range of types and affordability in the region.	
<b>S131.0134</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.252</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.252</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 47: Analysis of the range and affordability of housing in the region	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Reject
<b>S167.0166</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0166</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method 47: Analysis of the range and affordability of housing in the region	Support	Deleted method	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S166.081</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.081</b>	Masterton District Council	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support in part	Further clarity sought on some aspects e.g. Policy FW.1	Retain as notified. However: Further clarity is required.	Accept in part
<b>S30.091</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.091</b>	Porirua City Council	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support in part	This method should be amended to recognise that design guides should be produced where necessary, reflecting that there is already regional and national guidance that can be used. Council's PDP takes an enabling approach to papakāinga development and does not require compliance with design guides.	Amend policy as follows:  Prepare <b>where appropriate</b> the following development manuals and design guidance:  (a) Urban design guidance to provide for best practice urban design and amenity outcomes in accordance with Policy 67(a);  (b) Papakāinga design guidance that are underpinned by Kaupapa which is Māori in partnership with Mana Whenua in accordance with Policy 67(f); and  (c) Urban design guidance and development manuals	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									to assist developers in meeting Policy CC.14 and Policy FW.3. Implementation: Wellington Regional Council and city and district councils (via the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee) <b>and in partnership with mana whenua</b>	
<b>S30.091</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.124</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.124</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
<b>S78.022</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.022</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that Proposed Method UD.1 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provision.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S78.022</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.330</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.330</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Reject
<b>S102.080</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.080</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Generally supports the methods to implement for the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S115.097</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.097</b>	Hutt City Council	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.  It is also inappropriate for a method to direct action through the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee which is not a statutory body with responsibilities under the resource management system.	Amend Method UD.1 to remove implementation by city and district councils and remove reference to the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee.	Accept in part
<b>S129.034</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.034</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support in part	Supports the preparation of development manuals and design guidance subject to inclusion of mode choice and the encouragement of intensification in areas that have existing transport infrastructure.  Requests that urban design guidance and development manuals include mode choice and encouragement development in close proximity to existing transport choices.	Amend method to ensure that urban design guidance and development manuals include mode choice and encourage development in close proximity to existing transport choices.	Accept
<b>S129.034</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<b>FS12.024</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	<b>FS12.024</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports non-regulatory urban design guidance, including encouraging development in close proximity to existing public transport. Kāinga Ora considers that this method should also refer to planned public transport.	Allow in part	Accept
<b>S140.099</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.099</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S147.090</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.090</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Necessary to implement the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S147.090	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.154	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.154	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject
S147.090	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.259	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.259	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.</p>	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
S158.036	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.036	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	<p>Support that design guidance is stipulated as a non-statutory method. Seeks that development manuals and design guides should not be a requirement, but only implemented where considered appropriate by District Councils as non-statutory documents.</p>	Amend the method as follows: Prepare the following development manuals and design guidance <b>when considered appropriate by district councils as non-statutory documents:</b> (a) Urban design guidance to provide for best practice urbandesign and amenity outcomes in accordance with Policy 67(a);(b) Papakāinga design guidance that are underpinned by Kaupapa which is Māori in partnership with Mana Whenua in accordance with Policy 67(f); and(c) Urban design guidance and development manuals to assist developers in meeting Policy CC.14 and Policy FW.3.Implementation: Wellington Regional Council and city and district councils (via the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee)	Reject
S158.036	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS6.019	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.019	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	<p>We oppose this part of the submission as some design guides are underpinned by kaupapa Māori and reflects tangata whenua interests in development. It is important an iwi design guide, developed by iwi and Māori should have legal teeth and this should be made clear when the development proposals are lodged as part of the resource consents.</p>	Disallow	Accept
S158.036	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS20.035	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.035	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submission point, development manuals and design guides are an integral part of informing development. In part, such manuals and guide are a mechanism to enable mana whenua to partner with the council to have input into urban development. The relief sought effectively minimises opportunities to include mana whenua in the design and development of urban development.</p>	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S170.074	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.074	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Not Stated / Neutral	No mention of iwi and tangata whenua in these methods and how they impact iwi, hāpu and Māori.	Clarify how these methods will impact iwi, hāpu and Māori.	Accept
S170.074	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.188	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.188	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Accept
S131.0122	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0122	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa note that our approach to growth is grounded in and guided by our mātauranga, thus recognising the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi, applying the enduring wisdom of kaupapa Māori and enhancing the unique identity and culture of this place. Proactive initiatives are required to ensure that our unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the District. The Design Guides are a key mechanism in giving effect to our kaupapa (values), huanga (vision) through our tikanga (approach) as expressed in Whakarongotai o te moana, Whakarongotai o te wā. Ātiawa support working in partnership with Regional</p>	<b>In partnership with mana whenua</b> , prepare the following development manuals and design guidance:(a) Urban design guidance to provide for best practice urban design and amenity outcomes in accordance with Policy 67(a);(b) Papakāinga design guidance that are underpinned by kaupapa <del>which is Māori in partnership with Mana Whenua</del> in accordance with Policy 67(f); and (c) Urban design guidance and development manuals to assist developers in meeting Policy CC.14 and Policy FW.3. <b>Mana whenua are</b>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								Council to prepare papakāinga design guidance. Ātiawa seek that Regional Council provide for this partnership through adequate funding and resourcing. Additionally Ātiawa seek a partnership model for the entirety of Method UD.1. It is appropriate that the council has identified papakāinga as a kaupapa to work in partnership with mana whenua, we are also interested in all urban development that has the potential to impact on our values, as well as giving effect to concepts such as Te Mana o te Wai (Policy FW.3) - which only mana whenua can provide the local context and meaning. Amend subclause (b) for ease of reading.	enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.	
S131.0122	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.239	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.239	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept
S165.0103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.0103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support		Retain	Accept in part
		FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary	Disallow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S167.0149</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0149</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Taranaki Whānui notes the insertion of new Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides. The premise of integrated management outlines the notion to work together. With respect to mana whenua / tangata whenua there is an expectation that this will result in partnership opportunities. At present the new Method UD.1 ring-fences mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement to 'Papakāinga design guidance' at (b). This is insufficient to represent the aspirations Taranaki Whānui has in relation to urban development over our areas of interest.	Amend the policy to read: Prepare the following development manuals and design guidance <b>with mana whenua / tangata where practicable:.....</b>	Accept
<b>S168.0183</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0183</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	The inclusion of provision for dedicated Papakāinga Design Guidance based on Kaupapa Māori and produced in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and linkage to Policy 67(f) is supported.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S168.0183</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.113</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.113</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Method UD.1: Development manuals and design guides	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nuilan Gun	Not stated	Accept
<b>S166.080</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.080</b>	Masterton District Council	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support in part	Tier 3 Councils are not required under the NPS to prepare an FDS.  The Wairarapa Combined District Plan review in line with this.  Need to clarify this is optional for other authorities.	Retain as notified.  However: Need to clarify this is optional for other authorities.	Reject
<b>S78.036</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.036</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that Proposed Method UD.2 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provision.	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S78.036	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.344	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.344	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
S129.009	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.009	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Supports the preparation of a Future Development Strategy for the Wellington Region in accordance with the NPS-UD to enable appropriate growth and timely development of infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S137.056	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.056	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support in part	Amend to explicitly require consideration of the impacts of climate change in the preparation of the Future Development Strategy, to implement Objective CC.1 and Policy 55.	Amend Method UD.2 as below: .... The Future Development Strategy will provide a framework for achieving Well-Functioning Urban Environments in the Wellington Region, including specifying how and where future growth will occur to provide for sufficient capacity to meet future growth needs over the next 30 years, <b>and considering the impacts of climate change.</b>	Accept
S137.056	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.040	Wellington City Council	FS13.040	Wellington City Council	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept
S144.034	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.034	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Important to have a cohesive strategy, eg for climate change mitigation and adaptation, esp to natural hazards	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S170.075	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.075	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Not Stated / Neutral	No mention of iwi and tangata whenua in these methods and how they impact iwi, hāpu and Māori.	Clarify how these methods will impact iwi, hāpu and Māori.	No recommendation
S170.075	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.189	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.189	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-	Not stated	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S115.0109	Hutt City Council			S115.0109	Hutt City Council	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Oppose	This method is redundant as it is already a requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Delete Method	Reject
S131.0135	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0135	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support in part	Ātiawa note the national direction to prepare a Future Development Strategy, however Ātiawa seek reference to hapū and iwi values and aspirations for urban development within Method UD.2 in accordance with the National Policy for Urban Development, subpart 4. The current drafting of Method UD.2 is silent on the role of mana whenua in the development of FDS, this is contrary to the NPS-UD text. Ātiawa have not finalised our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown. This process and the intensification provisions also prejudice the outcomes and potential outcomes of our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement. The development of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, and the timeframes provided for their incorporation into the RPS do not uphold the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga. Ātiawa therefore have fundamental concerns with the process and direction given by the Government requiring this Proposed Plan Change and the proposed Future Development Strategy	Prepare a Future Development Strategy for the Wellington Region in accordance with Subpart 4 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. The Future Development Strategy will set out the high-level vision for accommodating urban growth over the long term, and identifies strategic priorities to inform other development-related decisions, such as:(a) district plan zoning and related plan changes;(b) priority outcomes in long-term plans and infrastructure strategies, including decisions on funding and financing; and(c) priorities and decisions in regional land transport plans. The Future Development Strategy will provide a framework for achieving well-functioning urban environments in the Wellington Region, including specifying how and where future growth will occur to provide for sufficient capacity to meet future growth needs over the next 30 years. <b>The Future Development Strategy must include a clear statement of mana whenua values and aspirations for urban development. The Future Development Strategy shall be prepared in partnership with relevant mana whenua.</b> Additionally, Ātiawa seek that: Provision is made for Ātiawa tino rangatiratanga within the Future Development Strategy process and for a review of the Strategy on the Ātiawa Settlement with the Crown.	Reject
S131.0135	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.253	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.253	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and	Not stated	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S167.0167</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0167</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui to partner in the development of the FDS.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0184</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0184</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa notes that the NPS-UD requires development of the FDS to be informed by (inter alia) "Māori, and in particular tangata whenua, values and aspirations for urban development.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S168.0184</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.114</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.114</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Method UD.2: Future Development Strategy	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S4.007</b>	Dom Harris			<b>S4.007</b>	Dom Harris	Objective 22	Support in part	Quality of housing is an objective, but there don't seem to be no policy or methods that will enforce it. Voluntary or suggested codes have failed and it is clear developers will always cut costs and corners. there must be regulation and enforcement in place to ensure quality and healthy housing	Include policies, methods to enforce/encourage enhanced quality of housing to implement the objective.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S16.077	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.077	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 22	Support in part	The objective proposes to introduce policy-level direction on what well-functioning urban environments are. We consider this level of detail should be deleted from the objective, with the objective retaining a high-level goal.	Amend Objective 22 to delete proposed clauses (a) - (k).	Accept in part
S16.077	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS25.001	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.001	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 22	Support	The submission point is consistent with the relief sought by Peka Peka Farm Ltd and is supported as it seeks to maintain the drafting of the objective at an appropriately high-level.	Allow	Accept in part
S16.077	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS18.003	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	FS18.003	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	Objective 22	Oppose	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell supported the intent of the new Objective 22 and sought for its current wording to be retained as defining well-functioning urban environments is appropriate and necessary to implement the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD, and meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell do not agree with the submitter that the detail contained in clauses (a) - (k) of the new Objective 22 should be deleted.	Disallow  R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell seek for the relief sought by the submitter to delete clauses (a) - (k) of the new Objective 22 to be disallowed, and seek the current wording of Objective 22 to be retained.	Reject
S30.022	Porirua City Council			S30.022	Porirua City Council	Objective 22	Oppose	Objective 22 as amended by Proposed Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD, and largely just repeats requirements listed elsewhere in the RPS. In part, this is because it will result in a polycentric urban form rather than an urban form where intensification is located in areas which are best served by public transport and services. For example, Wellington City Centre clearly benefits from the greatest range of public transport than all other centres in the Wellington Region. The language in the Objective also needs to be consistent with the terminology used in the National Planning Standards which have been, or are being, implemented within the District Plans. To use different terminology is confusing and unnecessary and will result in potentially different interpretations and implementation. The objective lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation. As it is drafted, it unnecessarily duplicates other objectives within the RPS which need to be considered alongside it. For instance, clause (e) is superfluous, as those objectives in the RPS need to be given effect to irrespective. Similarly clause (f) is addressed through the climate change objectives and policies. Terminology in the RPS also needs to be consistent with Waka Kotahi's One Network Framework (ONF) which has hierarchy for "movement" and "place" and Network Operating Frameworks (NOF).	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcome sought is, and/or reword as follows: <b>The Wellington regional form:</b> <b>A. Is compact, well designed and has good accessibility between housing, employment opportunities, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including:</b> <b>1. A network and hierarchy of commercial centres which support the primacy of the Wellington city centre followed by:</b> <b>i. Metropolitan Centres, ii. Town Centres, iii. Local Centres; and</b> <b>iv. Neighbourhood Centres; iii. Local Centres; and</b> <b>iv. Neighbourhood Centres; 2. A Regional urban form that is integrated with existing and planned transport network; 3. Commercial and industrial activities distributed in appropriate locations and in a way that supports the commercial centres hierarchy identified in A.1 above; 4. More people living in, and more business and community services located in, areas that are in or near a commercial centre and/or well-served by public transport; 5. Urban built environments that meet the health and wellbeing needs of people.</b> <b>B. Supports the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that contribute to improved housing affordability and business activity, including:</b> <b>1. A variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type and location, of different households. 2. Sufficient housing and business development capacity in the short and medium term as identified in Table 9A to RPS Objective 22A. 3. A range of buildings and sites in appropriate locations that provide opportunities for commercial and industrial activities in a way that achieves the commercial centres hierarchy identified in A.1 above and maintains the primacy of the Wellington city centre. C. Optimises the efficient use of existing infrastructure.</b>	Accept in part
S30.022	Porirua City Council	FS12.012	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.012	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Objective 22	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with its primary submission.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S30.022	Porirua City Council	FS25.055	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.055	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 22	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
S32.007	Director-General of Conservation			S32.007	Director-General of Conservation	Objective 22	Support	This objective provides useful regional context for what constitutes well-functioning urban environments. In particular, recognition of the need to protect freshwater and meet other objectives relating to land, freshwater, coast and indigenous biodiversity is appropriate in terms of higher order documents and integrated management.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S32.007	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.285	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.285	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S34.089	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.089	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 22	Oppose in part	Council is concerned that this objective goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD, and what an RPS can specify the districts should do to give effect to NPS-UD.	Amend objective to address concerns by deleting sub clauses a-k and allowing district plans flexibility to respond to local characteristics and issues.	Reject
S79.016	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.016	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 22	Support in part	The objective is not clear as to how it applies to development not intended to be managed by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS UD).SWDC had previously requested direction to be able to consider these matters, but not its direct application for all of them.It is noted that the residential, commercial and mixed use zones of all district are considered 'urban areas' in the definitions included for this plan change. Urban development, the point of the Objective, would include development in those zones or of that type in the SWDC jurisdiction.Competitive land marketsThe policy appears to attempt to implement 3.8 of the NPS UD. The NPS UD specifically identifies those areas for which it is to which it is to apply. South Wairarapa District is not one of those areas.It is of concern that any and all urban development that meets the characteristics set out in (a) to (k) is required to be enabled.For small Councils with critical infrastructure issues and not required to provide urban land under the NPS UD in the same way. The proposed amendments will more likely lead to poor outcomes where planned development may be precluded in favour of unplanned development with significant long term infrastructure effects. This could be considered counter-intuitive given that some of the settlements in the SWDC jurisdiction are some of the highest housing costs in New Zealand, including Greytown which was recently identified as the second most behind only Queenstown.Our preference is that a more nuanced policy is provided that allows Council to better provide for	Amend Objective 22 as follows:Urban development, including housing <b>and infrastructure in tier 1, 2 and 3 urban authorities is enabled where it</b> demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments, which:(a) Are compact and well designed; and(b) Provide for sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of current and future generations; and(c) Improve the overall health, well-being and quality of life of the people of the region; and(d) Prioritise the protection and enhancement of the quality and quantity of freshwater; and(e) <del>Achieve</del> the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity can be met; and(f) Support the transition to a low- emission and climate-resilient region; and(g) Provide for a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and(h) Enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and(j) <b>Provide for commercial and industrial development in appropriate locations, including employment close to where people live; and(i)</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								development and where planned development is not undermined. Please provide an assessment of the costs and benefits on SWDC of applying the NPS UD in a manner over and above its statutory purpose. This should include affordability of rates for new and upgraded infrastructure and the cost of unanticipated development that meets the objective. It is unclear why the whole objective must go through the Freshwater Planning process.	<b>Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and(k)</b> Are well connected through multi-modal (private vehicles, public transport, walking, micromobility and cycling) transport networks that provide for good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open space. <b>For other territorial authorities, urban development, including housing and infrastructure are provided for where (a) to (i) and(k) are met and where it is identified as part of long term growth planning documents adopted by that Council.</b> [End of amendments to Objective 22] Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought. And; Separate out matters in the objective that are required to go through the Freshwater Planning Process from those that need not.	
<b>579.016</b>	South Wairarapa District Council	<b>FS14.021</b>	Masterton District Council	<b>FS14.021</b>	Masterton District Council	Objective 22	Support in part	Agree with: The objective is not clear as to how it applies to development not intended to be managed by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS UD). SWDC had previously requested direction to be able to consider these matters, but not its direct application for all of them. It is noted that the residential, commercial and mixed use zones of all districts are considered 'urban areas' in the definitions included for this plan change. Urban development, the point of the Objective, would include development in those zones or of that type in the SWDC jurisdiction. Competitive land markets: The policy appears to attempt to implement 3.8 of the NPS UD. The NPS UD specifically identifies those areas for which it is to apply. South Wairarapa District is not one of those areas. It is of concern that any and all urban development that meets the characteristics set out in (a) to (k) is required to be enabled. For small Councils with critical infrastructure issues and not required to provide urban land under the NPS UD in the same way. The proposed amendments will more likely lead to poor outcomes where planned development may be precluded in favour of unplanned development with significant long term infrastructure effects. This could be considered counter-intuitive given that some of the settlements in the SWDC jurisdiction are some of the highest housing costs in New Zealand, including Greytown which was recently identified as the second most behind only Queenstown. Our preference is that a more nuanced policy is provided that allows Council to better provide for development and where planned development is not undermined. Please provide an assessment of the costs and benefits on SWDC of applying the NPS UD in a manner over and above its statutory purpose. This should include affordability of rates for new and upgraded infrastructure and the cost of unanticipated development that meets the objective. It is unclear why the whole objective must go through the Freshwater Planning process.	Not stated: Agree with the relief sought: Amend Objective 22 as follows: Urban development, including housing and infrastructure in tier 1, 2 and 3 urban authorities is enabled where it demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments, which: (a) Are compact and well designed; and (b) Provide for sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of current and future generations; and (c) Improve the overall health, well-being and quality of life of the people of the region; and (d) Prioritise the protection and enhancement of the quality and quantity of freshwater; and (e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity can be met; and (f) Support the transition to a low-emission and climate-resilient region; and (g) Provide for a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and (h) Enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and ) Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and (j) Provide for commercial and industrial development in appropriate locations, including employment close to where people live; and i) Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and (k) Are well connected through multi-modal (private vehicles, public transport, walking, micromobility and cycling) transport networks that provide for good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open space. For other territorial authorities, urban development, including housing and infrastructure are provided for where (a)	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									to (i) and (k) are met and where it is identified as part of long term growth planning documents adopted by that Council. [End of amendments to Objective 22] Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought. And; Separate out matters in the objective that are required to go through the Freshwater Planning Process from those that need not.	
<b>S100.012</b>	Meridian Energy Limited			<b>S100.012</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 22	Support	Support clause (f) of Objective 22. The transition to a low-emission economy is essential of New Zealand is to achieve its climate change goals.	Retain Objective 22 as amended by RPS Change #1 and, in particular, proposed clause (f).	Accept in part
<b>S102.075</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.075</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 22	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S113.011</b>	Wellington Water			<b>S113.011</b>	Wellington Water	Objective 22	Oppose	The clause restates the RPS and is superfluous	Delete clause (e) <del>(e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and</del>	Accept
<b>S115.025</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.025</b>	Hutt City Council	Objective 22	Support	No reasons provided	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S118.013</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>S118.013</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 seeks to enable urban development where it "demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which" and then lists a range of matters. Each matter is linked with an 'and' thereby creating a requirement that urban development achieves each of the listed matters before the objective would consider the urban development to be enabled. Policy 1 of the NPS-UD defines a 'well-functioning urban environment'. If the objective is seeking to define a well-functioning urban environment then the definition of the NPS-UD should be the starting point. The policy has the effect of adding 11 additional aspects that would need to be addressed to consider a proposal to be a well-functioning urban environment. This is inconsistent with the intent of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.	Amend Objective 22 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the 'and' following each listed matter;</li> <li>Be based on the definition of 'well-functioning urban environment' as defined in Policy 1 of the NPS-UD;</li> <li>and</li> <li>Remove superfluous matters that are otherwise addressed by the RPS or NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	Reject
<b>S119.003</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited			<b>S119.003</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 seeks to enable urban development where it "demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which" and then lists a range of matters. Each matter is linked with an 'and' thereby creating a requirement that urban development achieves each of the listed matters before the objective would consider the urban development to be enabled. Policy 1 of the NPS-UD defines a 'well-functioning urban environment'. If the objective is seeking to define a well-functioning urban environment then the definition of the NPS-UD should be the starting point. The policy has the effect of adding 11 additional aspects that would need to be addressed to consider a proposal to be a well-functioning urban environment. This is inconsistent with the intent of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.	Amend Objective 22 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the 'and' following each listed matter;</li> <li>Be based on the definition of 'well-functioning urban environment' as defined in Policy 1 of the NPS-UD;</li> <li>and</li> <li>Remove superfluous matters that are otherwise addressed by the RPS or NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	Reject
<b>S120.003</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand			<b>S120.003</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 seeks to enable urban development where it "demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which" and then lists a range of matters. Each matter is linked with an 'and' thereby creating a requirement that urban development achieves each of the listed matters before the objective would consider the urban development to be enabled. Policy 1 of	Amend Objective 22 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the 'and' following each listed matter;</li> <li>Be based on the definition of 'well-functioning urban environment' as defined in Policy 1 of the NPS-UD;</li> <li>and</li> <li>Remove superfluous matters that are otherwise addressed by the RPS or NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								the NPS-UD defines a 'well-functioning urban environment'. If the objective is seeking to define a well-functioning urban environment then the definition of the NPS-UD should be the starting point. The policy has the effect of adding 11 additional aspects that would need to be addressed to consider a proposal to be a well-functioning urban environment. This is inconsistent with the intent of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.		
S124.002	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			S124.002	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Objective 22	Support	KiwiRail supports Objective 22(c) to 'improve the overall health, well-being and quality of life of people in the region'. This objective is appropriate to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD and to recognise that providing for the health and well-being of our communities relies on having appropriate planning provisions in place, such as controls on development near the rail corridor. Providing for wellbeing of our communities also relies on having the necessary infrastructure in place to support urban development.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S125.003	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			S125.003	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Objective 22	Support	Consistent with the intent and requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S128.017	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.017	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective 22	Support in part	The RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity. The highly productive land resource need to be acknowledged and reiterated in the text. A more explicit reference to highly productive land is warranted.  It is not clear that this is currently provided for within the 'significant values and features' identified within the RPS. Strategic management of highly productive land is critical.	(e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land ( <b>particularly highly productive land and reserve sensitivity</b> ), freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and	Accept in part
S128.017	Horticulture New Zealand	FS30.041	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.041	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22	Support in part	B+LNZ supports that highly productive land should be protected for food production and from reverse sensitivity. B+LNZ seek versatile soils used for food production are also recognised and provided for in recognition of their value to food production.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S129.046	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.046	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Objective 22	Support	Supports the direction that development should only occur where it can demonstrate that the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environments are provided.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.040	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.040	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 subclauses (a), (b), (c), (i) and (j)Ātiawa seeks growth that both retains the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. Housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs. The tino rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi should be recognised in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. The manaakitanga that iwi, hapū and ahi kā have provided over generations to share their home with Tangata Tiriti needs to be recognised in the way growth is managed. This includes recognising the significant role of Marae as a spiritual and cultural home for our people, a social hub and in civil emergencies. Proactive initiatives are required to ensure that our unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the region	Specific amendments are proposed in relation to underlying policies.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S131.040	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.310	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.310	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept in part
S131.041	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.041	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Support	Objective 22 (d)Ātiawa are concerned that development will be enabled prior to infrastructure being established. The provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure and the design of urban form is foundational to the delivery of housing and intensification. When grounded in and guided by the mātauranga of mana whenua the results enhance the unique identity and culture of this place. If done poorly, housing and intensification can have enduring negative impacts on the relationship of Ātiawa with our lands and waters.	Objective 22 (d)Ātiawa position is that Regional Council must ensure that infrastructure is established prior to housing development to ensure this objective is met.	Accept in part
S131.041	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.311	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.311	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S131.042</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.042</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Support	Objective 22 (f) and (k)Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided. We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change including managed retreat and increased restrictions on development in high prone flood areas. In line with this, we also support the identification of future new town centres that are removed from flood and liquefaction risk. We support development centred around public transport hubs and walkable catchments. However, the scale of that development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of freshwater, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Objective 22 (f) and (k) Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.042</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.312</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.312</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S131.043</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.043</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Support	Objective 22 subclause (g) and (h) Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided. We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change including managed retreat and increased restrictions on development in high prone flood areas. In line with this, we also support the identification of future new town centres that are removed from flood and liquefaction risk.	Objective 22 subclause (g) and (h) Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.043</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.313</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.313</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S132.004	Toka Tu Ake EQC			S132.004	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Objective 22	Support in part	It is important that urban development is enabled in areas which are at minimal risk from natural hazards, and that development is appropriately resilient to both current and future risks from natural hazards, accounting for the effects of climate change.	Add:1) minimise the exposure of residents to natural hazards, and account for future natural hazard risk increased by the effects of climate change	Accept in part
S132.004	Toka Tu Ake EQC	FS12.017	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.017	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Objective 22	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Consistent with its primary submission, Kāinga Ora considers that Objective 22 operates as a 'plan within a plan'. Natural hazards provisions are provided within separate, more comprehensive sections of the RPS.	Disallow	Reject
S133.067	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.067	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Objective 22	Support	Supports the amendments to this clause to support the ability for Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S133.067	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.414	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.414	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation
S134.006	Powerco Limited			S134.006	Powerco Limited	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 appropriately recognises the development of infrastructure as key to achieving well-functioning urban environments and the intent is supported. Clause (e), however, is unnecessary as places additional weight on the objectives of the RPS relating to air, land, freshwater, coast and biodiversity, giving them additional weight for urban	Retain the intent of Objective 22, but delete clause (e) as follows: "Urban development, including housing and infrastructure, is enabled where it demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which: ... (e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and ..."	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								development proposals over and above other RPS objectives that are not listed.		
S137.029	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.029	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Objective 22	Support in part	This objective is drafted more in the style of a policy rather than an outcome. Amendment to the chapeau is required to address this.	Amend Objective 22 as follows: Urban development, including housing and infrastructure, is enabled where it demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which:	Accept in part
S140.027	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.027	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 22	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 22	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	amend subclause: (e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and <b>indigenous and valued introduced biodiversity</b>	Reject
S147.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.141	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.141	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.111	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.111	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 22	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.  Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.  Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.216	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.216	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S148.050</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.050</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 22	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks that the RPS appropriately recognises that in some situations housing developments can be appropriately constrained by the "qualifying matters" that are also set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and recognised in sections 77I and 77O of the RMA. WIAL also considers that it would be appropriate for this objective to be clear in that it does not apply to regionally significant infrastructure, and rather it is referring to infrastructure (3 Waters, roading) which supports housing developments.	Amend the objective as follows: Urban development, including housing and <b>its associated infrastructure... (L) Protects regionally significant infrastructure and its ability to operate safely and effectively.</b> [Note: end of amendments] Otherwise delete the objective	Accept in part
<b>S154.013</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.013</b>	Investore Property Limited	Objective 22	Support in part	Support the transition to a low-emission region set out in Objective 22. However, Objective 22(j) does not set out clear direction on what is 'appropriate' and 'close to where people live' could be used to support development in a wide range of locations.	Amend the provision to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part
<b>S155.010</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.010</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Objective 22	Support in part	Support the transition to a low-emission region set out in Objective 22. However, Objective 22(j) does not set out clear direction on what is 'appropriate' and 'close to where people live' could be used to support development in a wide range of locations.	Amend the provision to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part
<b>S157.008</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			<b>S157.008</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Objective 22	Support in part	Objective 22 appropriately recognises the development of infrastructure as key to achieving well-functioning urban environments as well as the need to provide for commercial and industrial development in appropriate locations. Clause (e), however, is unnecessary as places additional weight on the objectives of the RPS relating to air, land, freshwater, coast and biodiversity, giving them additional weight for urban development proposals over and above other RPS objectives that are not listed.	Retain the intent of Objective 22, but delete clause (e) as follows: <del>(e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and</del>	Accept
<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objective 22	Oppose in part	Objective 22 is considered a 'plan within a plan' in that the sub-points within the objective refer to climate change resilience and freshwater management, when these issues are provided within separate, more comprehensive chapters. In addition, the associated policies link climate change and freshwater management appropriately to the objective.	Amend Objective 22 as follows: Urban development, including housing and infrastructure, is enabled where it demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which: (a) Are compact and well designed; and (b) Provide for sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of current and future generations; and (c) Improve the overall health, well-being and quality of life of the people of the region. ; and (d) Prioritise the protection and enhancement of the quality and quantity of freshwater; and (e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and (f) Support the transition to a low-emission and climate-resilient region; and (g) Provide for a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and (h) Enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and (i) Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and (j) Provide for commercial and industrial development in appropriate locations, including employment close to where people live;	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									and(k) Are well connected through multi-modal (private vehicles, public transport, walking, micro-mobility and cycling) transport networks that provide for good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open space. A compact...	
<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS10.024</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	<b>FS10.024</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Objective 22	Support	Agree with the submitter that many of the sub-points within the objective are unnecessary and create the potential for confusion given these issues are addressed in separate, more comprehensive chapters.	Allow the submission and amend Objective 22 as sought.	Reject
<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS19.020</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.020</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 22	Oppose	The submission's approach fails to implement the NPS-FM	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS24.020</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS24.020</b>	Powerco Limited	Objective 22	Support	Agree with the submitter that many of the sub-points within the objective are unnecessary and create the potential for confusion given these issues are addressed in separate, more comprehensive chapters.	Allow the submission and amend Objective 22 as sought.	Reject
<b>S158.037</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS20.036</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.036</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22	Oppose	Ātiawa strongly oppose the relief sought. Objective 22 as notified sets out all the components of well-functioning urban environments, to accept the relief sought would result in a continuation of the status quo (i.e. inappropriate subdivision, use and development and degradation of te taiao). This is unacceptable to Ātiawa, it is also contrary to NPS-UD, but also NPS-FM and the draft NPS-IB. Well-functioning urban environment requires an all-encompassing, integrated approach to resource management. Additionally, relief sought to delete (h) referencing mana whenua values is unconstitutional and offensive to Ātiawa. Not only are our values and the role of mana whenua provided for through the RMA and national direction (NPS-UD, NPS-FM and draft NPS-IB), but our partnership with regional council is enacted through Te Tiriti o Waitangi.	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S166.019</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.019</b>	Masterton District Council	Objective 22	Support	The review of the WCDP will reflect this objective through areas of intensification - allowing for higher density and mixed use development.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S167.058</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.058</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 22	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the intent and direction of Objective 22 including the provision at (h) to enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga. We support the intention to direct 'planning decisions relating to urban environments'. Taranaki Whānui understand from GWRC officers that the specific urban development provisions that reflect NPS-UD Objective 5 and Policy 9 are provided by Policies UD1 and UD2. What is lacking in these provisions is specific reference to respective Treaty relationships with mana whenua partners across the region. This is a concern for Taranaki Whānui as treaty partners and in relation to the proposed provisions.	Objective 22 to be re-drafted in a way that reflects Treaty relationships in planning decisions relating to urban environments.	Reject
<b>S168.0162</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0162</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Objective 22	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the expansion of the clause specifically relating to supporting the ability for Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms to refer to	Amend subclause (g) of the policy to include "quality" in terms of the variety of homes that are provided for, as follows: (g) Provide for a variety of homes that meet the needs,	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								'providing for tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga'.	in terms of <b>quality</b> , type, price, and location, of different households;	
<b>S168.0162</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.091</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.091</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Objective 22	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.Nga mihi nuilan Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S16.078</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.078</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 22B	Support	The general intent of the objective is supported.	Retain	Reject
<b>S30.023</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.023</b>	Porirua City Council	Objective 22B	Oppose	As drafted, it is unclear what this objective means. The objective lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation. It is unclear what sort of development should be 'strategically planned', or what 'strategically planned' means in this context. The objective should describe what the end result looks like; strategic planning is likely the method to achieve that outcome, not the outcome itself.The second half of the objective refers to the need to consider other objectives and policies in the RPS which is unnecessary if the RPS is read a whole as required. Further, it is unclear how use of the term 'effectively' relates to more specific direction in these policies i.e. where effects are to be avoided. The direction of 'effectively managed' is at odds with protecting significant values and features.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcome sought is. Provide a definition of 'strategically planned'.	Accept in part
<b>S30.023</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.056</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.056</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 22B	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S32.008</b>	Director-General of Conservation			<b>S32.008</b>	Director-General of Conservation	Objective 22B	Support	This objective supports a strategic approach to development. In particular, recognition of the need to manage impacts on significant values and features is appropriate in terms of higher order documents and integrated management.	Retain as notified.	Reject
<b>S32.008</b>	Director-General of Conservation	<b>FS30.286</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.286</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22B	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S34.098</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.098</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 22B	Support in part	Council supports the intent of this objective, insofar as the key fundamental issues within the RPS are addressed	See comments on provisions relating to the inclusion of NPS- IB provisions, throughout this submission. Clarify how NPS-HPL relates to this objective and how it is proposed to be implemented.	Reject
<b>S79.017</b>	South Wairarapa District Council			<b>S79.017</b>	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 22B	Oppose	The objective is so broad that it is meaningless. Further, the type of development in the rural area is that is most often not strategic in nature. The purpose of this objective is unclear, particularly when viewed against the relevant policies, and methods which are largely non-regulatory and related to water attenuation, other parts of the RPS which are already adequately covered, or thinking about matters in the future. GWRC needs to clearly identify what it is seeking to manage and why. This objective does not and can not meet any requirement of s.32 of the RMA.	Delete objective 22B And; Consult with rural communities to develop a more comprehensive, strategic and meaningful set of objectives and policies for the rural environment and introduce them by way of variation to this plan change.	Accept in part
<b>S102.076</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.076</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 22B	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Reject
<b>S115.026</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.026</b>	Hutt City Council	Objective 22B	Oppose	This objective is unclear, particularly in relation to what it means to be "strategically planned". As the objective primarily supports non-regulatory methods and consideration policies, the objective seems unnecessary.	Delete new Objective 22B	Accept
<b>S118.014</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>S118.014</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 22B	Oppose in part	The objective lacks clarity as to what is meant by 'strategically planned'.	Delete Objective 22B or insert new definition for 'strategically planned'.	Accept
<b>S125.005</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			<b>S125.005</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Objective 22B	Support	Consistent with the intent and requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Reject
<b>S128.018</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.018</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective 22B	Support in part	The RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity. The highly productive land resource need to be acknowledged and reiterated in the text. A more explicit reference to highly productive land is warranted.  It is not clear that this is currently provided for within the 'significant values and features' identified within the RPS. Strategic management of highly productive land is critical.	Amend Objective 22B  Development in the Wellington Region's rural area is strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features identified in this RPS and <b>highly productive land</b> are managed effectively.	Reject
<b>S128.018</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS11.008</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	<b>FS11.008</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	Objective 22B	Support	Highly productive land and primary production activities which occur on that land (which includemore than just food production), should be protected from urban encroachment. Urban and ruralresidential development can sterilise land for aggregate extraction and result in reversesensitivity effects.	Allow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								The submission is supported in so far as it requests greater clarity on what the 'significant values and features' are.		
S128.018	Horticulture New Zealand	FS30.042	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.042	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22B	Support in part	B+LNZ supports that highly productive land should be protected for food production and from reverse sensitivity. B+LNZ seek versatile soils used for food production are also recognised and provided for in recognition of their value to food production.	Allow in part	Reject
S128.018	Horticulture New Zealand	FS9.0010	Wairarapa Water Users Society	FS9.0010	Wairarapa Water Users Society	Objective 22B	Support in part	Support for the need to highlight the value of highly productive land but needs to link that with access to water	Not stated Development in the Wellington Region's rural area is strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features identified in this RPS and highly productive land are managed effectively. This includes appropriate access to fresh water to enable the value of HPL class to be realised.	Reject
S128.018	Horticulture New Zealand	FS21.0010	Irrigation NZ	FS21.0010	Irrigation NZ	Objective 22B	Support in part	Support for the need to highlight the value of highly productive land but needs to link that with access to water	Not stated Development in the Wellington Region's rural area is strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features identified in this RPS and highly productive land are managed effectively. This includes appropriate access to fresh water to enable the value of HPL class to be realised.	Reject
S131.045	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.045	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22B	Support in part	Ātiawa support the rural area being strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features managed effectively. Ātiawa has an enduring whakapapa relationship with the natural and physical environment. Our values, kaupapa and taonga are our enduring platform. Our vision is for our people to be able to live their lives in the rohe of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai in harmony with te taiao. This means we need to ensure the sustainable use of taonga and te taiao and that there are minimal impacts to our taonga and community through decision-making around development. Managing the effects of water supply systems, stormwater and wastewater disposal services and transport infrastructure on our cultural values is critical. We support a proactive approach to responding to climate change including managed retreat and increased restrictions on development in high prone flood areas. In line with this, we also support the identification of future new town centres that are removed from flood and liquefaction risk. Water is a taonga that must have its mana and wairua protected and enhanced. Ātiawa support the move away from the use of hard structures to provide storm and flood protection. Ātiawa seek specific reference to mana whenua values in Objective 22B to ensure they are managed effectively in the rural area in regards to development. The Trust seek deletion of the word identified as it is not appropriate or necessary to provide an extensive list of mana whenua values in the RPS.	Amend as follows: Objective 22B Development in the Wellington Region's rural area is strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features, <b>including mana whenua values</b> identified in this RPS are managed effectively.	Reject
S131.045	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.63	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.63	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Objective 22B	Support	Rangitāne supports the vision Ātiawa expresses for its people to be able to live their lives in their rohe in harmony with te taiao. The proposed amendment to the Objective is also supported.	Allow	Reject
S131.045	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.315	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.315	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22B	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-	Not stated	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S134.007</b>	Powerco Limited			<b>S134.007</b>	Powerco Limited	Objective 22B	Support	Objective 22B appropriately recognises the need for strategic planning of development in rural areas and is supported.	Retain as notified.	Reject
<b>S140.028</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.028</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 22B	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Reject
<b>S147.048</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.048</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 22B	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM	Retain as notified	Reject
<b>S147.048</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.112</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.112</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 22B	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.  Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.  Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S147.048</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.217</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.217</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22B	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 22B	Oppose	This proposed new objective relating to development in rural areas does not fit in this chapter which is focused on urban areas; and as currently structured is uncertain in its intent and application. If the intent is to manage rural residential development then the objective should be reworded to reflect this. See submission for more details.	That Objective 22B be deleted OR Insert a clause in Objective 22 to the following or similar effect: <b>provide for rural residential development in appropriate locations</b> Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.085</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.085</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 22B	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Reject
<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.207</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.207</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 22B	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Reject
<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS29.058</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.058</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 22B	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Reject
<b>S163.041</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.114</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.114</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 22B	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S167.059</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.059</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 22B	Oppose in part	Taranaki Whānui raised an issue around protections for potential future coastal marine permits and would like to work further in partnership on this objective.	Work in partnership with Taranaki Whānui to amend this objective.	No recommendation
<b>S102.093</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.093</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Papakāinga	Oppose	The reason for the removal of "Papakāinga" is entirely unclear. In the absence of a good reason, the definition should be reinstated and should include reference to residential accommodation, communal buildings and facilities	Oppose the removal of "Papakāinga". Amend the "Papakāinga" definition following further consultation with iwi, hapu and Māori landowners to include reference to residential accommodation, communal	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								for iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners who whakapapa to the area. Consultation with iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners should be undertaken.	buildings and facilities for iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners who whakapapa to the area.	
<b>S102.093</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	<b>FS6.005</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.005</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Papakāinga	Support	We support this submission because there should be a definition of papakāinga with the Regional Policy Statement and this should be developed alongside mana whenua/ tangata whenua.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S131.0161</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0161</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Papakāinga	Oppose	Ātiawa seek to include a new definition of papakāinga, drafted by mana whenua. Ātiawa are concerned that in the absence of any definition for marae, some developments may seek to fall under the policy framework for papakāinga where this is not appropriate.	Papakāinga means housing and any ancillary activities (including social, cultural, educational, recreational, and commercial activities) for mana whenua on their ancestral land.	Accept in part
<b>S131.0161</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS6.009</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.009</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Papakāinga	Support	We support this submission because a new definition for papakāinga is needed and it will need to be developed with each relevant iwi and hapū.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S131.0161</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.282</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.282</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Papakāinga	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S167.0195</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0195</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Papakāinga	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui note new definition needed.  Taranaki Whānui suggests regional council provide for mana whenua to develop their own definition of marae within each iwi and hapū.	Amend the definition of Papakaainga with input from each iwi and hapū.	Accept in part
<b>S167.0195</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS6.043</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	<b>FS6.043</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	Papakāinga	Support	We support this submission because a new definition for papakāinga is needed and it will need to be developed with each relevant iwi and hapū	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
			Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Ngāti Toa Rangatira					
<b>S11.018</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			<b>S11.018</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	Not stated.	Amend Explanation as follows: "...The centres identified are of significance to the region's form for <b>environmental wellbeing and indigenous biodiversity</b> , economic development, transport movement..."	Reject
<b>S16.084</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.084</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose	While Council supports enhancing the viability and vibrancy of all centres, the reasons for changes to the terminology in this policy are unclear. In particular, Council notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>new terms such as "locally significant centres" do not appear to correlate with terms in the national planning standards</li> <li>it is unclear why Ōtaki and Waikanae are included in a list of "locally significant centres" but not Raumati Beach and Paraparaumu Beach which are also classified as "town centres" in the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021</li> <li>it is unclear whether Ōtaki is intended to mean the town centre known as Ōtaki Main Street, or the town centre known as Ōtaki Rail, or both.</li> <li>in the absence of any justification to the contrary, it is inappropriate and unnecessary for the RPS to get to the level of detail specifying any particular centres as being "locally significant".</li> </ul>	Delete the list of locally significant centres.	Reject
<b>S25.032</b>	Carterton District Council			<b>S25.032</b>	Carterton District Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	CDC supports this policy and recognition of Carterton as a locally significant centre.	Retain this policy.	Accept in part
<b>S30.051</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.051</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose	This policy needs to align with national planning standard zones rather than introducing new terms. The RPS should give better guidance on how the NPS-UD should be implemented in a Wellington region context. The notified policy will result in a polycentric urban form rather than an urban form where intensification is located in areas which are best served by public transport and services. Wellington city centre is the primary centre in the Wellington region and is to continue to be the main focus for a wide range of commercial activity, community activities, cultural activities, visitor accommodation, as well as high density residential activity. The other key centres also provide significant business, retailing and community services, as well as residential opportunities. The requested amendments to this policy do not limit territorial authorities from identifying additional centres of local significance within their district plan.	Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives, and/or reword policy as follows: <p>Policy 30: <del>Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres</del> <b>Wellington regional form – commercial centres hierarchy</b>– district plans</p> <p><b>District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or other methods that identify and manage subdivision, use and development in the centres listed below in a way that recognises and maintains the viability and vibrancy of:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The regionally significant Wellington city centre;</b></li> <li><b>2. The sub-regional metropolitan centres at:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Upper Hutt</b></li> <li><b>b. Lower Hutt</b></li> <li><b>c. Porirua</b></li> <li><b>d. Paraparaumu</b></li> <li><b>e. Masterton</b></li> </ol> </li> <li><b>3. The locally significant town centres at:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Petone</b></li> <li><b>b. Kilbirnie</b></li> <li><b>c. Johnsonville</b></li> <li><b>d. Ōtaki</b></li> <li><b>e. Waikanae</b></li> <li><b>f. Featherston</b></li> <li><b>g. Greytown</b></li> <li><b>h. Featherston</b></li> <li><b>i. Carterton</b></li> <li><b>j. Martinborough</b></li> </ol> </li> <li><b>4. Other local and neighbourhood centres that provide for the daily and weekly needs of their residential catchments.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Explanation</b> Policy 30 identifies the</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>hierarchy of regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region. These centres are of significance to achieving a well-functioning urban environment for Wellington and a compact regional form, including by ensuring that urban intensification occurs in a coherent and consistent manner across the region. By identifying these centres and in enabling their planned purpose and role in the urban environment and wider region, Policy 30 is intended to help achieve a regional form that deliver other outcomes identified in the RPS. This includes, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, ensuring an equitable access to commercial and community services, economic development, and land use-transport integration. They also support the economic, social and cultural well-being of communities. District Plans are required to identify these centres and include provisions that enable them to achieve their planned purpose and role. Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of these centres is important to encourage investment and development that supports an increased range and diversity of activities. It is also important for their prosperity and resilience in the face of social and economic change. Wellington city centre is the primary centre in the Wellington region and is to continue to be the main focus for a wide range commercial activity, community activities, cultural activities, visitor accommodation, as well as high density residential activity. The other key centres also provide significant business, retailing and community services, as well as residential opportunities. This policy does not limit territorial authorities from identifying additional centres of local significance within the district plan.</p>	
S30.051	Porirua City Council	FS12.014	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.014	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the RPS should give better guidance on how the NPS-UD should be implemented across the Wellington region. Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with its primary submission.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S30.051	Porirua City Council	FS25.084	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.084	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S31.021	Robert Anker			S31.021	Robert Anker	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy 30 identifies the hierarchy of regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region. Policy 30 does not identify any hierarchy. This is unclear.	Amend the Explanation to read: Explanation Policy 30 identifies <del>the hierarchy of</del> regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region for.....	Reject
S34.090	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.090	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	Council supports the intent to support vitality and vibrancy of the range of centres in the region	Retain policy as notified.	Accept in part
S62.020	Philip Clegg			S62.020	Philip Clegg	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Hierarchy is defined as a system in which people or things are put at various levels or ranks according to their importance. Policy 30 does not identify a hierarchy.	Amend as follows: Policy 30 identifies <del>the hierarchy of</del> regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region for which district plans must maintain and enhance...	Reject
S78.012	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.012	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 30 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.012	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.320	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.320	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
S96.016	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.016	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally	Not Stated / Neutral	Hierarchy is defined as a system in which people or things are put at various levels or ranks according to their importance. Policy 30 does not identify a hierarchy.	Amend as follows: Policy 30 identifies <del>the hierarchy of</del> regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region for which district plans must maintain and enhance...	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and locally significant centres - district plans				
<b>S115.051</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.051</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	We support removing references that could be construed as references to national planning standards zones. the current policy in the operative RPS also uses terms in a way that are inconsistent with the national planning standards.However, we do not support the concept of "locally significant centres". If centres are not of regional significance, then they should not be addressed by the Regional Policy Statement.The amendments also continue the unnecessary distinction of "sub-regional" and "suburban" centres in the operative RPS. While this distinction is made in the list of centres, the policy direction does not reflect this difference and does not accurately reflect differences in the size, scale, and role of centres.We request that all centres other than the Wellington City Centre be listed as "other regionally significant centres". District plans can then set out the hierarchy and role of centres a district. We support both the Lower Hutt city centre and the Petone commercial area continuing to be identified as having regional significance.	Amend Policy 30 as follows:"Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally significant centres - district plansDistrict plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of:1. The <del>regionally significant central business district</del> <b>main centre of the region, the central business area of Wellington City</b> ;2. Other regionally significant centres:(i) Lower Hutt;(ii) <b>Petone</b> ;(iii) and other centres outside the City of Lower Hutt as appropriate]3. <del>the locally significant centres of: [list of centres]</del> ExplanationPolicy 30 identifies the hierarchy of regionally and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region for which district plans must maintain and enhance their vibrancy and vitality. The centres identified are of significance to the region's form for economic development, transport movement, civic or community investment. Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of these centres is important in order to encourage investment and development that supports an increased range and diversity of activities. It is also important for their prosperity and resilience in the face of social and economic change. The regional central business district area of Wellington City is the major centre the main centre in the Wellington region; the other key centres also provide significant business, retailing commercial and community services. This policy does not limit territorial authorities from identifying additional centres of local or sub-regional significance within the district plan."(Our submission is neutral on which centres outside the Hutt City Council area are included, other than the Wellington City centre)	Reject
<b>S131.075</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.075</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided.We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.075</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.345</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.345</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						centres - district plans		recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S133.068</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.068</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Supports the strengthening of these policies to give effect to the NPSUD 2020.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S133.068</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.415</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.415</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S140.052	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.052	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	Johnsonville and Kilbirnie should be considered 'other regionally significant centres' as it helps align with the metropolitan centre zone application approach of the WCC PDP. It recognises that the role in growth, economic contribution, access to transport and range of services of Johnsonville and Kilbirnie is aligned with the regional centres, rather than the local centres they had been grouped with.	Amend policy as following: Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of regional central business district in the Wellington city and the: 1. the regionally significant central business district of Wellington City; 2. other regionally significant centres: (i) Upper Hutt city centre; (ii) Lower Hutt city centre; (iii) Porirua city centre; (iv) Paraparaumu town centre; (v) Masterton town centre; and the (vi) <b>Metropolitan centres of Johnsonville and Kilbirnie.</b> 3. the locally significant (suburban) centres in: (i) Petone; (ii) Kilbirnie; and (iii) Johnsonville; (iv) Ōtaki; (v) Waikanae; (vi) Featherston; (vii) Greytown (viii) Carterton; and (ix) Martinborough...	Accept in part
S140.052	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS16.001	Stride Investment Management Limited	FS16.001	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Stride agrees that Johnsonville should be identified as a regionally significant centre, which would align with the approach taken in the Proposed Wellington City District Plan. This would recognise that Johnsonville Shopping Centre is a hub of retail activity which supports the economic and social wellbeing of the Wellington community.	Allow	Accept in part
S140.052	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS1.001	Investore Property Limited	FS1.001	Investore Property Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Investore agrees that Johnsonville should be identified as a regionally significant centre, which would align with the approach taken in the Proposed Wellington City District Plan. This would recognise that the Johnsonville Centre is a hub of retail and commercial activity which supports the economic and social wellbeing of the Wellington community.	Allow	Accept in part
S154.001	Investore Property Limited			S154.001	Investore Property Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally	Oppose in part	Opposes the removal of Johnsonville from the definition of sub-regional centres and seeks Johnsonville Town Centre be recognised as a sub-regional centre. Under the Operative RPS, Johnsonville is currently appropriately recognised as both a suburban area of regional significance and a sub-regional centre. Johnsonville centre includes regionally and sub-regionally significant facilities and businesses. Johnsonville	Amend the RPS to include Johnsonville Town Centre as a sub-regional centre and any consequential changes to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						significant centres - district plans		also has a number of significant community and recreational facilities that serve the sub-region. Consider the change will not give effect to the NPS-UD.		
<b>S154.014</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.014</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 30 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject
<b>S155.001</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.001</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose in part	Opposes the removal of Johnsonville from the definition of sub-regional centres and seeks Johnsonville Town Centre be recognised as a sub-regional centre.  Under the Operative RPS, Johnsonville is currently appropriately recognised as both a suburban area of regional significance and a sub-regional centre. Johnsonville centre includes regionally and sub-regionally significant facilities and businesses. Johnsonville also has a number of significant community and recreational facilities that serve the sub-region.  Consider the change will not give effect to the NPS-UD.	Amend the RPS to include Johnsonville Town Centre as a sub-regional centre and any consequential changes to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part
<b>S155.011</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.011</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 30 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject
<b>S158.026</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.026</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support in part	Seeks a regionally consistent approach in the hierarchy of centres and therefore seeks amendments to the policy to align with those submissions (of IPI Plan Changes) and the national planning standards.	Amend the policy as follows:  District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities, <b>including high density residential living</b> that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of:  1. the regionally significant <del>central business district of Wellington City</del> <b>centre</b> ; 2. <del>other regionally significant centres</del> <b>The Metropolitan Centres of:</b> <b>(i) Johnsonville</b> <b>(ii) Kilbirnie</b> (iii) Upper Hutt <b>Centre</b> (iv) Lower Hutt <b>Centre</b> <b>(v) Petone</b> (vi) Porirua (vii) Paraparaumu (viii) Masterton  3. The <b>Town Centres</b> <del>locally significant centres of:</del>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>(i) Kilbirnie;  (ii) Mirimar;  (iii) Newtown;  (iv) Tawa;  (v) Petone;  (vi) Naenae  (vii) Waterloo  (viii) Mana;  <del>(ix) Johnsonville</del>  (x) Ōtaki(Township);  (xi) Ōtaki (Main Road);  (xii) Paraparaumu Beach;  (xiii) Raumati Town  (xiv) Waikanae;  (xv) Featherston;  (xvi) Greytown  (xvii) Carterton; and  (xviii) Martinborough</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Policy 30 identifies the hierarchy of regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region <del>for which district plans must maintain and enhance their vibrancy and vitality.</del> The centres identified are of significance to the Wellington region <del>to achieve a wellfunctioning urban environment and compact form that provides many employment opportunities, is well-served by public transport and has a high demand for housing and business activities for economic development, transport movement, civic or community investment.</del> Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of these centres is important in order to encourage investment and development that supports an increased range and diversity of activities. <b>Development and intensification of these areas will achieve a regional form that will contribute to meeting the objectives and policies of the RPS associated with climate change and land-use and transportation integration.</b> <del>It is also important for their prosperity and resilience in the face of social and economic change.</del> Wellington City centre <del>The regional central business district</del> is the major centre in the Wellington region; the other key centres also provide significant business, retailing and community services. This policy does not limit territorial authorities from identifying additional centres of local significance within the district plan</p>	
S158.026	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS16.005	Stride Investment Management Limited	FS16.005	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant	Support	<p>Johnsonville should also be identified as a metropolitan centre which is consistent with the National Planning Standards, Proposed Wellington City Plan and its sub-regional status.</p> <p>Stride also supports other submission points which seek consequential amendments to the RPS to reflect Johnsonville being recognised as a Metropolitan Centre.</p>	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						centres - district plans				
<b>S158.026</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS13.024</b>	Wellington City Council	<b>FS13.024</b>	Wellington City Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S158.026</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS3.030</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.030</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a regionally consistent approach in the hierarchy of centres and consistency with the national planning standards.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S158.026</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS1.005</b>	Investore Property Limited	<b>FS1.005</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Johnsonville should also be identified as a metropolitan centre which is consistent with the National Planning Standards, Proposed Wellington City District Plan and its sub-regional status.  Investore also supports other submission points which seek consequential amendments to the RPS to reflect Johnsonville being recognised as a Metropolitan Centre.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S166.032</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.032</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	This is being looked at in Wairarapa Combined District Plan review.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S167.091</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.091</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 30.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0163</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0163</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the amendment of the policy to reflect the NPS-UD terminology.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans				
<b>S168.0163</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.092</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.092</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres - district plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S16.085</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.085</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	The proposed policy is out of step with the NPS-UD and conflicts with the Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI) notified by Council.  The policy wording attempts to interpret the requirements of the NPS-UD but appears to insert GWRC's understanding of heights and densities for medium and high density development via new requirements and unwarranted new definitions. This is neither necessary nor useful to city and district councils that have notified their Intensification Planning Instruments. Combined with the proposed new definitions for medium density residential development and high density development (which we also oppose), the result is a policy that interferes and conflicts with Council's IPI, and likely the IPIs of other Tier 1 city and district councils in the region.  Also see our specific concerns regarding proposed defined terms in our submission below which are also relevant to Policy 31.	Either:  Amend to ensure consistency with the wording of the NPS-UD and to ensure wording does not conflict with the Intensification Planning Instruments that have been notified by Tier 1 city and district councils.  OR  Delete Policy 31 entirely and work with the technical planning experts from Tier 1 city and district councils on appropriate policy wording to be notified as a variation to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject
<b>S25.033</b>	Carterton District Council			<b>S25.033</b>	Carterton District Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building	Support	CDC supports this policy. The approach outlined in (c) is appropriate in the Carterton context and will be reflected in the draft Wairarapa Combined District Plan	Retain this policy	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						heights and density - district plans				
S30.052	Porirua City Council			S30.052	Porirua City Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	The amendments to this policy just duplicate the requirements of the NPS-UD and do not add value in the context of the Wellington Region. It should be rewritten in line with relief sought in relation to Policy 30 to give regional guidance on the implementation of the NPS-UD.	Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives, and/or reword policy as follows:  <del>Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - Wellington regional form – urban intensification – district plans</del>  <b>District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or other methods that identify and enable urban intensification, including building heights and built form density, in a way that:</b>  <b>1. For Wellington city centre: Realises as much development capacity as possible to maximise the benefits of intensification in this regionally significant centre;</b>  <b>2. For Metropolitan centres identified in Policy 30: Reflect demand for housing and business activity in these locations, but at a minimum, building heights of at least 6 storeys;</b>  <b>3. Within and adjacent to locally significant town centres identified in Policy 30 and other centres: Reflect the purpose of these centres and their planned level of commercial activities and community services; and</b>  <b>4. Provide for building heights of at least 6 storeys in areas that are within a walkable catchment of the edge of the Wellington city centre, or the edge of a Metropolitan centre identified in Policy 30, or an existing or planned rapid transit stop as identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan.</b>  <b>5. For any other territorial authority not identified as a tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for greater building height and density where:</b>  <b>a. there is good access to existing and planned active and public transport to a range of commercial activities and community services; and/or</b>  <b>b. there is relative demand for housing and business use in that location.</b>  <b>Explanation</b>  <b>Policy 31 directs the identification of areas suitable for intensification across the Wellington urban environment and wider region, and the level of intensification in these areas. In so doing it gives effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on</b>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									Urban Development 2020 in way that ensures that Wellington has a well-functioning urban environment and compact regional form. Policy 31 also enables greater building height and densities to be provided for in non-tier 1 territorial authorities which includes Masterton being a tier 3 territorial authority as well as Carterton and South Wairarapa. Providing for this development is consistent with Policy 5 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.  Include definitions for 'rapid transit stop' and 'walkable catchment'.	
S30.052	Porirua City Council	FS25.085	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.085	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S30.053	Porirua City Council			S30.053	Porirua City Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	The policy should be amended to provide clear direction on how a territorial authority is to determine a walkable catchment, so that there is a consistent regional approach.  The RPS should also either include a definition of a rapid transit stop, or the policy should provide clear direction as to how a rapid transit stop is determined.	Include definitions for 'rapid transit stop' and 'walkable catchment'.	Accept in part
S30.053	Porirua City Council	FS25.086	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.086	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S31.022	Robert Anker			S31.022	Robert Anker	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	Policy 31 is an unnecessary inclusion that has the potential to cause confusion. NPS-UD clearly specifies how Local Authority District Plans are to be amended to give effect to the NPS and Policy 31 is attempting to insert another layer of bureaucracy in the process. As such Policy 31 adds nothing but the potential for confusion as to whether the Regional Policy Statement or the National Policy Statement prevails.	Delete Policy 31 from RPS	Reject
S34.091	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.091	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	Council considers this policy is unnecessary and may cause confusion, as clause (b) does not seem consistent with MDRS requirements.  Council notes that the NPS-UD provides all the criteria necessary for adjustments to district plans as a matter of national direction and this is not required to be repeated, inaccurately, in the RPSPC1.	Delete entirely or refer to 'enabling a range of building heights and density to give effect to the NPS' only without specific sub clause a) and b).	Reject
S62.021	Philip Clegg			S62.021	Philip Clegg	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of	Oppose	Policy 31 is an unnecessary inclusion that has the potential to cause confusion. The NPS-UD clearly specifies how Local Authority District Plans are to be amended to give effect to	Delete Policy 31 from the RPS.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						building heights and density - district plans		the NPS and Policy 31 just inserts another layer of bureaucracy in the process without really adding any value.		
<b>S78.013</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.013</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 31 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S78.013</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.321</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.321</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept in part
<b>S79.037</b>	South Wairarapa District Council			<b>S79.037</b>	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support in part	Support the enabling of greater densities and height for transport oriented growth nodes in (c), including Featherston.	Retain (c) as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S89.006</b>	VicLabour			<b>S89.006</b>	VicLabour	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support in part	Support Policy 31 mentioning the enabling of a range of building heights and density, but urge considering whether this language or structure in the policy will suffice in creating a good enough "dense housing" mandate. Notes that Policy 31(c) may cover this.	Amend Policy 31 to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part
<b>S96.017</b>	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			<b>S96.017</b>	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	Policy 31 is an unnecessary inclusion that has the potential to cause confusion. The NPS-UD clearly specifies how Local Authority District Plans are to be amended to give effect to the NPS and Policy 31 just inserts another layer of bureaucracy in the process without really adding any value.	Delete Policy 31 from the RPS.	Reject
<b>S115.052</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.052</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	The operative policy is redundant, and we support it being removed. However, the replacement policy simply repeats the direction of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, without providing any additional direction or regional context.	Delete Policy 31 as proposed. Delete proposed replacement Policy 31.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S124.006	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			S124.006	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support in part	<p>KiwiRail broadly supports Policy 31 as notified, but considers that further amendments are required to ensure consistency with the NPS-UD and the Resource Management (EnablingHousing Supply) Amendment Act 2021.</p> <p>Where urban development is enabled in new areas and at a higher density near lawfully established activities, like transport corridors, there is a need to ensure reverse sensitivity effects do not constrain the safe and efficient operation of transport networks. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply) Amendment Act 2021 recognises a nuanced approach to urban development where a qualifying matter applies. Amendments are also necessary to recognise qualifying matters at the RPS level to ensure the district planning framework appropriately gives effect to the higher order planning documents.</p>	<p>Amend the policy as.</p> <p>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that identify and enable a range of different building heights and density within urban areas where it contributes to maintaining, establishing or improving the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments, <b>except where qualifying matters reduce building height and/or density of urban form</b>, including as a minimum:</p>	Reject
S131.076	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.076	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	<p>Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided.</p> <p>We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.076	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.346	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.346	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S133.069	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.069	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Supports the strengthening of these policies to give effect to the NPSUD 2020.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S133.069	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.416	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.416	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation
S137.031	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.031	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						building heights and density - district plans				
<b>S140.053</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.053</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Support provided that the definitions of 'high density development' and 'medium density residential development' are amended as outlined below in the definition. With the current definitions the policy is too prescriptive and does not meet the intent of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified provided the definitions of 'high density development' and 'medium density residential development' are amended.	Accept in part
<b>S147.060</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.060</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S147.060</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.124</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.124</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject
<b>S147.060</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.229</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.229</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	<p>Disallow</p> <p>That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007</p>	Reject
<b>S154.008</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.008</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose in part	Considers the proposed amendment to Policy 31 is not sufficient to give effect to the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 31 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S155.006	Stride Investment Management Limited			S155.006	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose in part	Considers the proposed amendment to Policy 31 is not sufficient to give effect to the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 31 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part
S158.027	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.027	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support in part	Seeks a regionally consistent approach in the hierarchy of centres and therefore seeks amendments to the policy to align with those submissions (of IPI Plan Changes) and the national planning standards. Also considers that the policy as notified does not add any additional value than what is stated within the NPS-UD and therefore seeks better direction for where high density development should occur and within prescribed minimum walkable catchments.	<p>Amend Policy 31 as follows:</p> <p>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that identify and enable a range of different building heights and <b>intensification density</b> within urban areas where it contributes to maintaining, establishing or improving the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments, including as a minimum:</p> <p>(a) For any tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for high density development within:</p> <p><b>i. As much capacity development capacity as possible to maximise the benefits of intensification within the Wellington City Centre and at least a 15-20 minute / 1200m-1600m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone;</b></p> <p><b>ii. Building heights of at least 6 storeys and density of urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use within the Metropolitan Zones and at least 10-15min/800m-1200m walkable catchment from the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and from existing and planned rapid transit stops;</b></p> <p><b>iii. Within and adjacent to the town centres, building heights of at least 6 storeys and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services and at least a 5-10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from the edge of the Town Centre Zones.</b></p> <p><del>(i) City centre zones and metropolitan centre zones; and</del></p> <p><del>(ii) any other locations, where there is with good access to:</del></p> <p><del>1. existing and planned rapid transit;</del></p> <p><del>2. edge of city centre zones and metropolitan centre zones; and/or</del></p> <p><del>3. areas with a range of commercial activities and community services.</del></p> <p>(b) For any tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>medium density residential development within any relevant residential zone.</p> <p>(c) For any other territorial authority not identified as a tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for greater building height and density where:</p> <p>(i) there is good access to existing and planned active and public transport to a range of commercial activities and community services; and/or</p> <p>(ii) there is relative demand for housing and business use in that location.</p>	
<b>S158.027</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.017</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.017</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Oppose	We oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity for the sake of development and at the expense of Taiao; it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S158.027</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS16.006</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	<b>FS16.006</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Stride considers PC 1 does not adequately give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD and supports providing better direction for where intensification can occur, for example, by amending Policy 31.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S158.027</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS3.031</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.031</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a regionally consistent approach in the hierarchy of centres and consistency with the national planning standards.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S158.027</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS1.006</b>	Investore Property Limited	<b>FS1.006</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Investore considers PC 1 does not adequately give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD and supports providing better direction for where intensification can occur, for example, by amending Policy 31.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S166.033</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.033</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	This is being looked at in Wairarapa Combined District Plan review - areas for intensification being provided.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S167.092</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.092</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 31: Identifying	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui understands the need for intensification. We want to ensure protection of mana whenua sites and	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans		areas of significance and are keen to work with council on this.		
<b>S170.040</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.040</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>This policy does not mention the role of intensification and greenfield development interaction, and this may not recognise the land development trends and nuances that every city in the Greater Wellington region is going through. In Porirua, Porirua PDP Future Urban Zone (FUZ) suggested large areas of greenfield development including central government fast track greenfield development projects such as, the Plimmerton Farms. This means Porirua will gear up for quite a number of housing projects, supplied with greenfield development as well as giving effect to Government's NPS-UD requirements of intensification and densification.</p> <p>This policy is not clear where the intensification is expected to be covered by brownfield development and whether greenfield development is considered as part of intensification. This will have repercussions for the environment.</p> <p>It is unclear that Policy UD.1 Enabling intensification - district plans is kept separately as the policy intention could have been included in Policy 31.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S170.040</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.154</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.154</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
<b>S168.0164</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0164</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support expansion and amendment of the policy to reflect the NPS-UD provisions which relate to identifying areas for intensification and providing options for non-tier 1 Councils.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0164</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.093</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.093</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 31: Identifying and enabling a range of building heights and density - district plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S25.034</b>	Carterton District Council			<b>S25.034</b>	Carterton District Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	CDC supports the approach in this policy, of ensuring that industrial land is protected for industrial use.  The draft Wairarapa Combined District Plan is consistent with this policy.	Retain this policy.	Accept in part
<b>S30.054</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.054</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy 32: Identifying	Support in part	Council generally supports this policy as industrial activities are an important part of our local economy and they can be	Amend policy as follows:	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans		compromised by inappropriate use, development and subdivision.  Delete comma as it does not make sense grammatically.	District plans should shall include policies, rules and/or methods that identify and protect key industrial-based employment locations where they contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments by:  (a) Recognising the importance of industrial based activities and the employment opportunities they provide.  (b) Identifying specific locations and applying zoning suitable for accommodating industrial activities and their reasonable needs and effects including supporting or ancillary activities.  (c) Identifying a range of land sizes and locations suitable for different industrial activities, and their operational needs including land-extensive activities,  (d) Managing the establishment of non-industrial activities, in industrial zones, by avoiding activities likely to result in reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities, or likely to result in an inefficient use of industrial zoned land or infrastructure.	
<b>S30.054</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.087</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.087</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
<b>S31.023</b>	Robert Anker			<b>S31.023</b>	Robert Anker	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	Policy 32 is regurgitating clear direction that is contained in NPS-UD and as such is redundant and should be removed.	Delete Policy 32 from the RPS	Reject
<b>S34.092</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.092</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support in part	It is beyond the legislative ability of GWRC to direct or require district plans to protect some types of industrial development. Council notes that this policy is quite directive given the use of 'shall; and 'protect' and questions the role of the RPS to direct this	Amend policy to delete sub clauses b) and d) and not amend 'should' to "shall".	Reject
<b>S62.022</b>	Philip Clegg			<b>S62.022</b>	Philip Clegg	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	Policy 32 repeats clear direction that is contained in NPS-UD. It is unnecessary and should be removed.	Delete Policy 32 from the RPS	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S78.014	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.014	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 32 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.014	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.322	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.322	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept in part
S79.038	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.038	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	There could be improved clarity for matters such as quarries being 'industrial' and critical for growth and therefore included as part of this policy.	Improve clarity over which activities is intended to be covered by the policy.	Reject
S83.004	CentrePort Limited			S83.004	CentrePort Limited	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	There is a need for clear provision and protection of industrial employment locations such as port areas and freight distribution hubs.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S83.004	CentrePort Limited	FS10.001	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.001	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	There is a need to provide for industrial activities in appropriate locations and to protect those industrial activities from encroachment by sensitive activities and associated reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow the submission and retain Policy 32 as notified.	Accept
S96.018	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.018	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	Policy 32 repeats clear direction that is contained in NPS-UD. It is unnecessary and should be removed.	Delete Policy 32 from the RPS	Reject
S115.053	Hutt City Council			S115.053	Hutt City Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						locations - district plans				
<b>S131.077</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.077</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	<p>Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided.</p> <p>We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.077</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.347</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.347</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept
<b>S133.070</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.070</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment	Support	Supports the strengthening of these policies to give effect to the NPSUD 2020.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						locations - district plans				
S133.070	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.417	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.417	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation
S137.032	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.032	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	Reject
S137.032	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.025	Wellington City Council	FS13.025	Wellington City Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S140.054	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.054	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.061	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.061	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.061	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.125	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.125	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject
S147.061	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.230	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.230	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	<p>Disallow</p> <p>That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007</p>	Reject
S158.028	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.028	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	Supports the amendments to Policy 32.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S166.034	Masterton District Council			S166.034	Masterton District Council	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-	Support	Zones being reviewed as part of Wairarapa Combined District Plan review.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						based employment locations - district plans				
<b>S167.093</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.093</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui want to ensure protection of mana whenua sites and areas of significance and are keen to work with council on this.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0165</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0165</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the strengthening and expanding of the policy to require Council's to identify and protect key industrial-based employment locations.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0165</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.094</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.094</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations - district plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
<b>S34.039</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.039</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related	Support in part	Integration between transport and land use is important to ensure that growth is supported by infrastructure. The RLTP is appropriate place for this to be.  Support insofar as it only relates to the RLTP and that it can be used to support advocacy for funding.	Retain provision as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan				
<b>S115.054</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.054</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Support as proposed	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S129.015</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.015</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support in part	Supports well-functioning urban environments and the reduction of transport related greenhouse gas emissions.	Requests to be involved in the future drafting of Policy 33 to ensure the policy appropriately aligns with direction from Central Government.	Reject
<b>S131.078</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.078</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	<p>Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. We support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided.</p> <p>We also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept
<b>S131.078</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.348</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.348</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-</p>	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan		<p>management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environemental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
<b>S133.071</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.071</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Supports the strengthening of these policies to give effect to the NPSUD 2020.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S133.071</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.418</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.418</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan		perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S137.033</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.033</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	Reject
<b>S140.055</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.055</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S147.062	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.062	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.062	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.126	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.126	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject
S147.062	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.231	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.231	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	<p>Disallow</p> <p>That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007</p>	Reject
S154.009	Investore Property Limited			S154.009	Investore Property Limited	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 33 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan				
<b>S155.007</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.007</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 33 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject
<b>S162.035</b>	Winstone Aggregates			<b>S162.035</b>	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Not Stated / Neutral	Winstone supports the intent of this Policy in that it aims to provide well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gases. Winstone consider that a clearer link be provided between this policy and Objective 30, so seek amendment to better recognise that the demand for mineral resources is met with the resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand. Quarrying aggregate that is located near the product use point reduces transport cost and emissions is a key factor in enabling development within the region.	further amend Policy 33 and the accompanying explanation to provide for the benefits of use of local quarrying/local aggregate supply as an ingredient in well-functioning urban environments and reduction in transportation emissions in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan	Reject
<b>S162.035</b>	Winstone Aggregates	<b>FS11.013</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	<b>FS11.013</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Support the intent of the policy to create well-functioning urban environments. However, it should also be recognised that a well-functioning urban environment requires a locally available source of aggregate, often located in a rural environment, to support construction activities and reduce transport related costs and greenhouse gas emissions	Allow	Reject
<b>S162.035</b>	Winstone Aggregates	<b>FS20.303</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.303</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga</p>	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan		(including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.  On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
<b>S165.059</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.059</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support in part	There is a mismatch between what this policy seeks (a reduction of transport emissions) and Objective CC.3, which seeks a reduction of 35% of 2019 transport emissions by 2030)	Amend to ensure that the reduction sought under Policy 33 reflects the requirements of Objective CC.3.	Reject
<b>S165.059</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept
<b>S166.035</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.035</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban	Not Stated / Neutral	No reason given for this submission point	Include District Plans which will allow for local infrastructure to support the Policy.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan				
<b>S167.094</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.094</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 33.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0166</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0166</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	The direction that the Regional Land Transport Plan contain objectives and policies supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in carbon emissions from transport is supported.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0166</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.095</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.095</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions - Regional Land Transport Plan	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S10.005	Transpower New Zealand Limited			S10.005	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of (a)(ii)(8) "Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8", noting the importance of protecting regionally significant infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects and that the NPS-UD 3.32(1)(c) and RMA Section 771(e) identify any "matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure" as a 'qualifying matter'.	Retain Policy 55(a)(ii)(8).	Accept
S10.005	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS26.084	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.084	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Transpower: supports the inclusion of(a) (ii) (8) (protecting RSI from reverse sensitivity effects).	Not stated	Accept
S16.040	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.040	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	<p>Whilst Council supports the intent of the policy, noting direction on the consideration of appropriate urban expansion in the RPS is required by the NPS-UD. However, Council has concerns regarding the specific drafting set out below.</p> <p>1. Consideration versus having particular regard. These verbs have different meanings, and we request the use of these verbs is consistent to present clear direction on the application of the policy to decision makers. Council request the verb chosen for this policy gives effect to the NPS-UD, that being particular regard being given.</p> <p>2. Clause (a)(ii)1 directs applying the direction of avoidance of inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29. We note RPS change 1 proposes changes to Policy 29 that conflict with this. Council supports the avoidance of inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from significant natural hazards, whilst mitigation should be the focus for areas subject to less risk.</p> <p>3. As the policy is to assist in the consideration of potential areas for urban expansion, Council considers it is necessary for the criteria to include the consideration of housing need in the relevant area. This should refer to the latest HBA findings but should also refer to the impacts of the implementation of the MDRS across all urban areas where the impact of this on housing capacity is known. Council notes there is no support for urban expansion in under the NPS-UD where there is no evidence demonstrating the need for additional urban land to meet housing needs.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 55 as follows:</p> <p>Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion – <del>consideration</del></p> <p>When considering an application for a <del>resource consent, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan</del> for urban development beyond the region’s urban areas (as at August 2022) <b>that would provide for significant development capacity, that is not otherwise enabled in the district plan or is not in sequence with planned land release</b>, particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>a) the <del>urban</del> proposed <b>urban</b> development contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment, including:</p> <p>i the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area and infrastructure, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors;</p> <p>ii the location, design and layout of the proposed development <del>shall apply</del> incorporates the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS, including:</p> <p>1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from significant natural hazards and the mitigation of other natural hazards <del>as required by Policy 29;</del></p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>4. Council considers reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established activities needs to be included. This is not limited to the consideration of protecting regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>5. Clause (b) is too broad and needs to be amended to be specific to a relevant Future Development Strategy for the area, and in the absence of one it needs to refer to those growth strategies that have been prepared appropriately and are supported by a robust evidence base. It is also important that such growth strategies have been prepared in accordance with the consultation requirements of the Local Government Act. Council notes the WRGF does not meet any of these requirements. Council has addressed concerns with the proposed inclusion of the WRGF in the RPS elsewhere in this submission, but Council also requests amendments to this clause to ensure it is fit for purpose and does not unduly prejudice local decision making and community aspirations for future urban growth.</p> <p>6. Clause (c) needs to be specific on the status of a structure plan and who has prepared it. As currently worded, anyone could prepare a structure plan for a proposed area for urban expansion and it would have weight under the policy. Council considers a structure plan under the policy needs to be prepared either in consultation with the relevant city or district council, or by the relevant city or district council in consultation with the regional council and other relevant stakeholders including iwi.</p> <p>7. Clause (d) – We note this is not consistent with NPS-UD Policy 8 as it refers to any urban development rather than plan changes. This has the effect of undermining or significantly reducing the importance of the other matters outlined in the policy. Council considers the policy needs to present a holistic list of matters that need to be applied when considering new areas for urban expansion via plan changes. The NPS-UD requirements mean the consideration of areas for potential urban expansion needs to consider other important factors such as the ability and timing of the availability of infrastructure, and the need for housing in particular locations. Clause (d) undermines a holistic approach to this consideration process, and we request it be deleted and replaced with wording in the beginning of the policy that aligns with the requirements of Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>8. Explanation – Council consider explanations should not accompany policies as they have no legal status under the RMA, but can often attempt to make up for poor policy drafting by including information that should be included in the policy itself. Council notes the explanation contains inaccuracies including attempting to give legal weight to the WRGF. As pointed out elsewhere in this submission, the WRGF was not prepared in accordance with the principles of consultation under the Local Government Act and it has no</p>	<p>2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23,;</p> <p>3. Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25;</p> <p>4. Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22,;</p> <p>5. Integrating Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42;</p> <p>6. Providing for climate resilience and supporting a low or zero carbon contributing towards an efficient transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17,;</p> <p>7. Recognising and providing for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua;</p> <p>8. Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8; and</p> <p>b) the urban development is consistent with any a published Future Development Strategy, or the city or district Council's regional or local strategic growth strategy or plan and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district or region, should the a Future Development Strategy be yet to be released published; and</p> <p>c) a structure plan has been prepared <b>in consultation with the relevant city or district council, or by the relevant city or district council in consultation with the regional council, iwi and other relevant stakeholders;</b> and/or</p> <p>d) Any urban development that would provide for significant development capacity, regardless of if the development was out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies.</p> <p><b>d) The proposed development will provide housing in a part of the city or district that is identified in the latest Housing and Business Capacity Assessment as having a shortfall in plan-enabled housing capacity; and</b></p> <p><b>e) The proposed development will not result in reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities or activities provided for in the district plan on adjacent land.</b></p> <p>Explanation</p>	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>legal status under the RMA. Council requests the explanation be deleted entirely.</p> <p>9. Council is surprised not to see reference to natural wetlands in the policy. If this is an oversight, we request this be corrected.</p> <p>10. Council notes the requirements of the NZCPS regarding development that affects coastal natural character is not referred to. If this is an oversight, Council request the policy is amended to include relevant consideration of the NZCPS requirements.</p>	<p><del>Policy 55 gives direction to the matters that must be considered in any proposal that will result in urban development occurring beyond the region's existing urban areas. This includes ensuring that the qualities and characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment are provided for through clause (a), which includes recognising values or resources identified elsewhere in the RPS.</del></p> <p><del>Clause (d) requires consideration of any proposal that would add significantly to development capacity, regardless of whether it is out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies. This clause gives effect to Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. Clause (d) should be considered in conjunction with Policy UD.3.</del></p> <p><del>Clause (b) requires consideration to be given to the consistency of the development with the Future Development Strategy which will look to deliver well-functioning urban environments through a regional spatial plan. To provide for the interim period where the Future Development Strategy is in development, clause (b) also requires consideration to be given to the consistency with any regional strategic growth and/or development framework which is currently the Wellington Regional Growth Framework.</del></p> <p><del>Clause (c) requires consideration to be given to whether a structure plan has been provided. A structure plan is a framework to guide the development or redevelopment of an area by defining the future development and land use patterns, areas of open space, the layout and nature of infrastructure (including transportation links), and other key features and constraints that influence how the effects of development are to be managed.</del></p>	
<b>S16.040</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS25.002</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.002</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	The submission seeks to reorganise the structure of the policy, including by deleting matter (d) and incorporating the intent of matter (d) into the introduction of the policy. By doing so, the submission requires consideration of out of sequence development or urban development opportunities not otherwise identified in a growth strategy, to be assessed for consistency with a growth strategy at point (b) of the policy as suggested by the submission. This is inconsistent both internally within the policy and with the NPSUD.	<p>Disallow in part</p> <p>Oppose in part in relation to the submission on matter (d)</p>	Reject
<b>S16.040</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS18.004</b>	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	<b>FS18.004</b>	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell supported the intent of the Policy 55 and sought for its current wording to be retained (with a minor amendment sought to the Explanation) as providing for appropriate urban expansion is appropriate and necessary to implement the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD, and meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell do not agree with the submitter the range of amendments including additional wording and the deletion of parts of the policy, and the Explanation, are appropriate or	<p>Disallow</p> <p>R P Mansell; A J Mansell, &amp; M R Mansell seek for the relief sought by the submitter to amend Policy 55 by adding to and deleting parts of the policy, and the Explanation, be disallowed, and seek the current intent of Policy 55 to be retained, with the minor amendment sought to the Explanation as per their submission.</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								necessary. These amendments to not retain the intent of Policy 55, which the submitter indicated they supported.		
S16.040	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS28.070	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.070	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support consideration of reverse sensitivity effects	Allow in part  Allow amendment to include (e) relating to reverse sensitivity	Reject
S25.041	Carterton District Council			S25.041	Carterton District Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	CDC supports the amendments to this policy.	Retain the policy.	Accept in part
S30.072	Porirua City Council			S30.072	Porirua City Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	<p>The policy lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation, contains unnecessary duplication, and does not align with objectives. Issues of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a)(ii) repeats policies, an RPS and all its objectives and policies should be read as a whole, unless a specific objective or policy has primacy. There is also a risk in this approach of listing policies that certain policies are omitted.</li> <li>• In regard to (d) this goes beyond the scope of policy 8 of the NPS-UD which only applies to plan changes. Given this matter is also covered in proposed Policy UD.3, it would be better to cross-reference to policy 55 from UD.3.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives, and/or reword policy as follows:</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at March 2009/August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>(a) the urban <del>proposed development is the most appropriate option to achieve Objective 22</del> contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment, including:</p> <p>(i) the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors;</p> <p>(ii) the location, design and layout of the proposed development shall <b>achieve the objectives and policies of the RPS</b> <del>apply the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS</del>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29,</del></li> <li>2. <del>Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23,</del></li> <li>3. <del>Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25,</del></li> <li>4. <del>Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22,</del></li> <li>5. <del>Integrates Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42,</del></li> <li>6. <del>Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17.</del></li> <li>7. <del>Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua,</del></li> <li>8. <del>Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as</del></li> </ol>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>identified by Policy 8; and</p> <p>(b) the urban development is consistent with <del>any</del> <b>the Wellington Region</b> Future Development Strategy, or the regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development <del>should</del> <b>will</b> occur in that district or region, <del>should</del> <b>if</b> the Future Development Strategy <b>has not been notified under section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002</b> <del>be yet to be released;</del> and/or</p> <p>(c) a structure plan has been prepared.; and/or</p> <p>(d) <del>Any</del><b>The</b> urban development <del>that</del> would provide for significant development capacity, regardless of if the development was out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies.</p> <p><b>Explanation</b></p> <p>Policy 55 gives direction to the matters that must be considered in any proposal that will result in urban development occurring beyond the region's existing urban areas. This includes ensuring that the qualities and characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment are provided for through clause (a), <del>which includes recognising values or resources identified elsewhere in the RPS.</del></p>	
<b>S30.072</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.105</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.105</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S30.072</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS26.064</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.064</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>Porirua CC seeks extensive amendments, including deletion of (ii) (8) protection of RSI.</p> <p>Meridian considers retention of clause (ii) (8) is essential to give effect to the higher order policy instruments which recognise and provide renewable electricity generation (including by protecting it from adverse reverse sensitivity effects associated with urban expansion).</p>	<p>Disallow in part</p> <p>Disallow in part by retaining clause (ii) (8).</p>	Accept
<b>S34.013</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.013</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>Council is concerned with some of the drafting of this policy and its application in relation to the definition of urban areas, which is zone based and does not recognise some of the zones of Upper Hutt, such as the Special Activity Zones, as well as the Settlements Zone, which is identified in the NPS-HPL as an urban zone. In this respect there seems to be a disconnect between this policy and the WRGF.</p> <p>It is unclear what "appropriate" means in the context of this policy and consider that the original policy wording title identifies more articulately, the outcome wished to be achieved.</p>	<p>Delete or amend to be consistent with the NPS-UD definition of a well-functioning urban environment, define 'urban development' and 'planned urban area' and read:</p> <p><del>"Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion</del>  <b>Maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable urban form regional form – consideration</b></p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>The policy seems to be being used to define “a well-functioning urban environment” which is already defined in the NPS-UD and does not take account of locational differences across the region. It is unclear how the extent of the ‘urban development’ is defined e.g. the extent of the existing built urban environment or by zoning as at August 2022.</p> <p>This policy, along with other provisions within RPSPC1 will make it very difficult for greenfield development to be achieved, when it is necessary to meet our housing needs.</p> <p>Clause a) and a)i) seems to take a provision in section 3.8 of the NPS that applies to out of sequence developments. This does not take account of future planned long-term development and does not allow Council to address capacity issues.</p> <p>Clause a)ii)1) refers to Policy 29, which is now proposed to read “manage” and not “avoid inappropriate” development and so there should be consistency between the two provisions.</p> <p>Clause a)ii)6) refers to policies that Council is seeking to be deleted or amended.</p> <p>Clause b) could apply to any document in the absence of the Future Development Strategy being released. It should be recognised that a future document should not be relied upon as is unknown what implications such a document would have. However, any future document that is incorporated through a future plan change should be sufficiently evidenced and supported or jointly developed by all local authorities.</p> <p>Clause c) it is unclear who is developing the structure plan and how. This needs to be collaborative and approved through a relevant process in order to be given any weight in decision making. A future plan change to incorporate this document should be undertaken at a later stage.</p> <p>Clause d) Council does not consider that Policy 8 of the NPS-UD intended that out of sequence or unanticipated development should be given regard to when considering an application for resource consent, since Policy 8 only appears to refer to plan changes. It is also unclear what is meant by significant / what thresholds or locations apply.</p> <p>Council also notes that there are interrelated factors that play a part in urban development including infrastructure delivery and funding (through mechanisms such as Long Term Plans and external funding programmes), that are not sufficiently financed and operate on different funding cycles.</p>	<p>given to whether:</p> <p>a) .....</p> <p>i. the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors;</p> <p>ii. the location, design</p> <p>....including</p> <p>1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards <del>as required by Policy 29,</del></p> <p>2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; <del>as identified by Policy 23, .....</del></p> <p>6. Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network <del>consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17. ....</del></p> <p><del>b) the proposed urban development is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the Council’s regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district or region, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; and/or</del></p> <p>c) a structure plan has been prepared <b>and approved by the wellington regional local authorities;</b> and/or</p> <p>d) Any urban development</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>....</p> <p>Clause (b) requires consideration... Future Development Strategy is in development, clause (b) also requires consideration to be given to the consistency with any regional strategic growth and/or development framework which is <b>prepared and approved by the Wellington Region local authorities is currently the Wellington Regional Growth Framework.</b></p> <p>....Clause (d) requires consideration of any proposals that would add.....”</p>	
S115.075	Hutt City Council			S115.075	Hutt City Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate	Support in part	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						urban expansion - consideration				
<b>S118.015</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>S118.015</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Policy 55 extensively adds to the definition of a 'well-functioning urban environment', particularly through matter (ii). Matter (ii) cross-references to other topic areas of the RPS that are otherwise relevant considerations and do not need to be included here.	Amend Policy 55 as follows:  "When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:  (a) The urban development contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment, including: (i) the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors; (ii) the location, design and layout of the proposed development shall apply the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS, including: 1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29, 2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23, 3. Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25, 4. Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22, 5. Integrates Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42, 6. Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC.17, 7. Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua, 8. Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8; and ---"	Reject
<b>S119.004</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited			<b>S119.004</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Policy 55 extensively adds to the definition of a well-functioning urban environment, particularly through matter (ii). Matter (ii) cross-references to other topic areas of the RPS that are otherwise relevant considerations and do not need to be included here.	Amend the policy to recognise the particular development requirements of certain development types, such as retirement villages, and by making the following changes: "When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:  (a) The urban development contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment., including: (i) the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors; (ii) the location, design and layout of the proposed development shall apply the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS, including: 1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29, 2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23, 3. Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25, 4. Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22, 5. Integrates Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42, 6. Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17. 7. Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua, 8. Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8; and ...."	
<b>S120.004</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	<b>S120.004</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	<b>S120.004</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Policy 55 extensively adds to the definition of a well-functioning urban environment, particularly through matter (ii). Matter (ii) cross-references to other topic areas of the RPS that are otherwise relevant considerations and do not need to be included here.	Amend Policy 55 as follows:  "When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:  (a) The urban development contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment, including: (i) the urban development will be well connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors; (ii) the location, design and layout of the proposed development shall apply the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS, including: 1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29, 2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23, 3. Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25, 4. Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22, 5. Integrates Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42, 6. Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17. 7. Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua, 8. Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8; and ...."	Reject
<b>S124.009</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			<b>S124.009</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	KiwiRail supports the amendment to Policy 55 which recognises the value of regionally significant infrastructure and the contribution of such infrastructure to a well-functioning urban environment. The reference to Policy 8 which expressly recognises the importance of protecting regional significant infrastructure from incompatible subdivision, use and development is supported.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S124.009</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	<b>FS3.043</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	<b>FS3.043</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point, as the policy recognises the value of regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
			Agency (Waka Kotahi)		Agency (Waka Kotahi)	urban expansion - consideration				
<b>S125.004</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			<b>S125.004</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Consistent with the intent and requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S125.007</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			<b>S125.007</b>	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Accurately reflect the proposed new wording of clause (b)	Amend the explanation for Policy 55 (second sentence in paragraph two) to read: <i>"To provide for the interim period where the Future Development Strategy is in development, clause (b) also requires consideration to be given to the consistency with any regional strategic growth and/or development framework which is currently the Wellington Regional Growth framework, or any local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where or how future urban development should occur in a District."</i>	Accept in part
<b>S128.048</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.048</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	New urban development beyond the region's urban areas should consider highly productive land, which is recognised elsewhere in the (operative) RPS.	New subclause to be added under Policy 55(a)(ii) <b>9. Protecting highly productive land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b>	Reject
<b>S129.025</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.025</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Supports the integration of land use and transport infrastructure as a means of providing good environmental outcomes and supporting the efficient use of infrastructure. Supports urban expansion occurring as anticipated by strategic planning or zoning within district plans. However, seeks the prioritising of intensification of existing areas first. Out of sequence or out of zone urban expansion can result in the inefficient use of, and has adverse effects on, infrastructure.	Add explanation to note that urban expansion occurring as anticipated by strategic planning or zoning within district plans should be prioritised. Out of sequence or out of zone urban expansion can result in the inefficient use of, and has adverse effects on, infrastructure.	Accept
<b>S129.025</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<b>FS12.022</b>	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	<b>FS12.022</b>	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the relief sought.	Allow	Accept
<b>S131.099</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.099</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Ātiawa note that Section 6 of the RMA states that in "achieving the purpose of this Act, ...shall recognise and provide for ... (e) the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga"  Policy 55 does not adequately recognise and provide to these matters.	Amend as follows:  7. Recognises and provides for values, <b>sites and areas</b> of significance <b>and other taonga</b> to mana whenua / tangata whenua,  Retain remainder of policy as drafted	Accept in part
<b>S131.099</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.369</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.369</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
<b>S132.010</b>	Toka Tu Ake EQC			<b>S132.010</b>	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Appropriate urban expansion and intensification should be zoned for areas which are at minimal risk from natural hazards, including predicted increase in risk from climate change. The RPS could assist in regulating how urban expansion progresses by providing policies on where it is appropriate.	Strengthen, require urbandevelopment and intensification to be zoned outside of areas at high risk of natural hazards, or areas which will become high risk due to the impacts of climate change. As with Policy 29, guidance on what constitutes high risk should be provided.	Reject
<b>S137.034</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.034</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	Reject
<b>S137.038</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.038</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Add 'improving' into clause (a) for consistency with Policy 31.	Amend clause (a) to read:  (a) the urban proposed development is the most appropriate option to achieve Objective 22 contributes to establishing, <b>improving</b> or maintaining the qualities <b>and characteristics</b> of a well-functioning urban environment, including:	Reject
<b>S137.039</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.039</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Amendment of the wording of clause (a)(ii)(1) is required to amend an error, in that the notified version uses the language from an older version of Policy 29.	Amend subclause (a)(ii)(1) to read:  (ii) the location, design and layout of the proposed development <del>shall apply</del> <b>applies</b> the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this <b>Regional Policy Statement RPS, including by:</b>  1. <del>Avoiding inappropriate</del> <b>Managing</b> subdivision, use	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									and development in accordance with the risk areas at from natural hazards as required by Policy 29;	
S137.040	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.040	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, including fixing references to policy numbers.  Ensure reference to 'low and zero-carbon multi modal transport' is consistent with other provisions.	Amend subclause (a)(ii)(6) to read:  6. Providing for climate resilience and supporting a low <del>and</del> zero-carbon <b>multi modal</b> transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.9 <del>10</del> and CC14 <del>7</del> ;	Accept
S137.040	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.028	Wellington City Council	FS13.028	Wellington City Council	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept
S137.040	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS3.044	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.044	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the amendments proposed for further clarity in the submission point.	Allow	Accept
S137.041	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.041	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, including fixing references to policy numbers.	Amend clause (d) to read:  (d) <del>the Any</del> urban development <del>that</del> would provide for significant development capacity <b>as outlined in Policy UD.3</b> , regardless of if the development was out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies.	Reject
S137.042	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.042	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are also required to align with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. NPS-HPL Policy 2 requires that the identification and management of highly productive land is undertaken in an integrated way, considering interactions with freshwater and urban development.	Insert a new subclause (a)(ii)(9) to read: <b>9. Protecting highly productive land for use in land-based primary production consistent with Policies 56 and 59; and</b>	Reject
S137.042	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS23.007	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.007	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	While Transpower does not oppose the intent of the policy addition to give effect to the NPS-HPL, it questions the appropriateness of giving effect to the NPS through Plan Change 1 as opposed to a comprehensive plan change that considers the entire context of the RPS and is accompanied by a s32 evaluation.	Disallow	Accept
S137.042	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS23.0010	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.0010	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	While Transpower does not oppose the intent of the policy addition to give effect to the NPS-HPL, it questions the appropriateness of giving effect to the NPS through Plan Change 1 as opposed to a comprehensive plan change that considers the entire context of the RPS and is accompanied by a s32 evaluation.	Disallow	Accept
S137.042	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS28.071	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.071	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Support the need to recognise HPL in this policy, subject to Policies 56 and 59 being consistent with the NPSHPL	Allow to the extent that it is consistent with the NPSHPL	Reject
S137.043	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.043	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are also required to align with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. NPS-HPL Policy 2 requires that the identification and management of highly productive land is undertaken in an integrated way, considering interactions with freshwater and urban development.	Insert a new sentence in the Explanation section  Explanation  ...Clause (a) also aligns with direction from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<b>2022 to protect highly productive land for use in land-based primary production.</b>	
<b>S137.043</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	<b>FS28.072</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.072</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Support inclusion of HPL in clause (a) of this policy	Allow	Reject
<b>S140.076</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.076</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S144.030</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			<b>S144.030</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Change "appropriate" to "well-functioning", and change "expansion" to "growth", as to many readings "expansion" implies spatial (sprawling) growth, which is to be discouraged.	Amend the policy	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	WIAL submits that in considering urban development particular regard should also be had to whether it is compatible with and does not adversely affect or constrain the ability to operate existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Amend the policy to include (or with similar effect): <b>avoids adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure.</b>	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS23.011</b>	Transpower New Zealand Limited	<b>FS23.011</b>	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Notwithstanding the clarification sought in its original submission, Transpower supports the recognition within the policy for regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS10.027</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	<b>FS10.027</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	The Fuel Companies support the amendment sought to Policy 55 to ensure particular regard is had to whether urban development is compatible with and does not adversely affect or constrain the ability to operate existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow the submission and amend Policy 55 as sought by WIAL.	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS24.023</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS24.023</b>	Powerco Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Powerco supports the amendment sought to Policy 55 to ensure particular regard is had to whether urban development is compatible with and does not adversely affect or constrain the ability to operate existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow the submission and amend Policy 55 as sought by WIAL.	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS3.045</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.045</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point as-future reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure should be avoided.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S148.051</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS26.065</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.065</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	WIAL submits that in considering urban development particular regard should also be had to whether it is compatible with and does not adversely affect or constrain the ability to operate existing regionally significant infrastructure.  The submission seeks amendment to include the following (or	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								with similar effect):  'avoids adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure.'  Meridian agrees that the RPS needs to consistently protect established regionally significant infrastructure from the adverse effects of urban expansion, including adverse reverse sensitivity effects.		
<b>S151.017</b>	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			<b>S151.017</b>	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 55 of Objective CC.6 would now have wording that is weaker, from a climate mitigation viewpoint, than before. To date the wording has been put in terms of maintaining a compact and sustainable regional form, but this is now proposed to be abandoned in favour of expansion that is 'appropriate',  See this move away from a goal of compact urban sustainability as highly undesirable and contradictory to the Council's broader stated intentions. 'Appropriate urban expansion' is ambiguous and could mean almost anything. In the absence of clear countervailing planning goals, and with development pressures in such areas that seem oblivious to the desirability of constraining urban form to support climate change mitigation and contain infrastructure costs (Adams & Chapman, 2016), the proposed Policy 55 would exacerbate rather than address several important problems identified in Chapter 3.9, particularly "A lack of integration between land use and the region's transportation network can create patterns of development that increase the need for travel, the length of journeys and reliance on private motor vehicles".	Amend Policy 55 with wording that unequivocally supports intensifying urban development within the contiguous urban form of the region, implicitly supporting the vision of the 15-minute city with its focus on local active and public transport, containing infrastructure costs, and significantly reducing GHG emissions below the path they would take otherwise.  We would recommend not revising Policy 55, but retaining the current wording [of the operative RPS].	Accept in part
<b>S154.005</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.005</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 55 fails to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban environments.	Amend Policy 55 to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support well functioning urban environments.	Accept in part
<b>S155.004</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.004</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 55 fails to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban environments.	Amend Policy 55 to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support well functioning urban environments.	Accept in part
<b>S162.016</b>	Winstone Aggregates			<b>S162.016</b>	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose in part	The amendments to this policy fail to recognise the importance of protecting regionally significant quarries/mineral/aggregate resource as provided in Policy 60 and Objective 30 RPS.	new subclause under (a) <b>9. Protecting Regionally Significant Mineral/Aggregate Resources from inappropriate development.</b>	Accept in part
<b>S162.016</b>	Winstone Aggregates	<b>FS7.027</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.027</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	The amendment sought is not a requirement of the RMA.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S162.016</b>	Winstone Aggregates	<b>FS11.022</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	<b>FS11.022</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 55: Providing for	Support	The amendments to the policy 55 fail to recognise the importance of protecting regionally significant	Allow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						appropriate urban expansion - consideration		quarries/mineral/aggregate resources as provided for in policy 60 and objective 30 in the operative RPS. Reverse sensitivity effects and the sterilisation of the aggregate resource by urban development is a significant issue for the quarrying industry. Poorly planned urban development can lead to local sources of aggregate being unavailable as a construction resource, impacting the cost of housing and infrastructure construction. Therefore, we agree with and support relief that protects regionally significant mineral and aggregate resources from inappropriate development.		
<b>S162.016</b>	Winstone Aggregates	<b>FS20.284</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.284</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Reject
<b>S165.077</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.077</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	<p>The policy is poorly drafted. There is an inconsistency with the requirement to "have particular regard to" a later requirement that the Council "shall apply". The direction is either to have particular regard to the RPS provisions requiring protection of values or to apply those provisions.</p> <p>The matters under Policy 55(a)(ii) should to be applied not had particular regard to.</p>	Amend Policy 55 to ensure that the requirements in Policy 55(a)(ii) are required to be applied, not matters to which particular regard has to be had. Make consequential amendments to explanation.	Accept in part
<b>S165.077</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these</p>	Disallow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S170.061	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.061	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Policy 55 Establishing and maintaining well-functioning urban environments - consideration</p> <p>In clause 7, suggest delete the word 'recognise 'and just keep the provide for to strengthen the intention.</p>	<p>[Note. the policy title quoted in this submission point does not align with the RPS Change1 documents, but the Decision Requested seem to be correctly referenced]</p> <p>Amend clause 7:</p> <p>7. Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua,</p>	Accept
S170.061	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.175	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.175	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S167.0117	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0117	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 55.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.0172	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0172	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support in part	Recognition and provision for values of significance to tangata whenua is supported; however, subclause (a)(ii)(7) should be expanded to provide for the matters set out in s.6 of RMA.  The same issues affect both urban expansion and rural development, therefore this policy and Policy 56 should be amended to be consistent and to address the same matters.	Amend subclause (a)(ii)(7) of the policy to recognise and provide for the matters in Section 6(e) and 6(g) of the RMA, rather than 'values of significance' to tangata whenua.  Amend as necessary, together with Policy 56, to ensure consistency between the two policies.	Accept in part
S168.0172	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.102	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.102	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
S16.041	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.041	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose	Council notes the policy attempts to place legal weight on the WRGF under the RMA, which Council has expressed opposition to elsewhere in this submission. This is opposed and deletion to the WRGF is sought from Policy 56.  Council also notes the policy duplicates one of the many matters addressed in Policy 55. This is unnecessary and creates policy overlap and the potential for conflict between the policies. Council seeks amendments to address these concerns. Council's requested amendments will ensure that in the case of proposed new urban development the matters contained in Policy 55 will be addressed.	Amend Policy 56 as follows:  d) <b>in the case of proposed new urban development</b> , the proposal is consistent with <b>Policy 55</b> <del>any Future Development Strategy, or the city or district regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity.</del> Explanation Policy 56 recognises the tension that exists between urban and rural development on the fringe of urban areas and seeks to manage this tension such that well-functioning urban environments and urban areas are established and maintained.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S16.041	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS18.005	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	FS18.005	R P Mansell, A J Mansell & M R Mansell	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell supported the intent of Policy 56 and sought for its current wording to be retained as managing development in rural areas is appropriate and necessary to implement the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD, and meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell do not agree with the submitter that Policy 56 attempts to place legal weight on the WRGF, and that reference to the WRGF in Clause d) need to be deleted.	Disallow  R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell seek for the relief sought by the submitter to delete reference to the WRGF from Clause d) of Policy 56 be disallowed, and seek the current intent of Policy 56 to be retained.	Reject
S29.002	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)			S29.002	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Given quarrying is included in the definition of Primary Production in the National Planning Standards. It is very important because even more so than other primary production activities, aggregate is a locationally constrained resource, as discussed above. For this reason, it is important that access to potential aggregate resources is not shut off by other development and alternative land uses or reverse sensitivity.  Due to its weight and volume, aggregate is very expensive to transport which reinforces the case for council planning to identify where the rock is located and protect those areas from other uses. Quarries need to be able to operate in close proximity to urban populations because transport is the big cost in each truckload of delivered aggregate, rock or sand.	Retain as notified, in particular the subclause (a)	Accept in part
S29.002	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS11.023	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.023	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Aggregate supplies are locationally constrained and the quarrying activity cannot occur at another location. Also, quarries need to be able to operate in close proximity to urban areas where development is occurring to minimise transport costs and subsequent development costs. Therefore, it is important that the policy provides direction that land in close proximity to urban areas is not sterilised through urban development. We support relief which protects primary production activities and recognises reverse sensitivity effects as an issue for existing primary production activities. Policy 56 refers to 'primary production', however, there is no definition of primary production in either the operative or proposed RPS. To support policy interpretation the National Planning Standards definition for 'Primary Production' should be included in the pRPS.	Allow	Accept
S29.002	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS20.265	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.265	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.  Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.  On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to	Disallow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
<b>S30.073</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.073</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Amend to address minor typographical error.	Amend policy:  When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:  (a) the proposal 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 and reverse sensitivity issues for existing production activities, including extraction and distribution of aggregate minerals;  (b) the proposal will reduce aesthetic and open space values in rural areas  between and around settlements;  (c) the proposal's location, design or density will minimise demand for non- renewable energy resources; and  (d) the proposal is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or  (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity.	Accept
<b>S30.073</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.106</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.106</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
<b>S34.014</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.014</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose in part	Regard should be given to local growth strategies in the absence of an FDS, not regional strategies for which the impact of provisions at a district level are unclear and unknown. It is inappropriate to rely on a document that does not exist and only existing documents available at the time of policy development should be relied upon.	Amend to read:  "When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:  ... (d) the proposal is consistent with <del>any Future</del>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<del>Development Strategy, or the city or district regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development., should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity."</del>	
<b>S78.015</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.015</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 56 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S78.015</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.323</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.323</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S79.047</b>	South Wairarapa District Council			<b>S79.047</b>	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	The policy is supported, but puts too much weight on (a) over (d). This is reflected in the recently gazetted National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Soils (NPS - HPS). While SWDC seeks amendment here, we do not seek that the NPS HPS is implemented in its entirety in this process, it is particularly relevant to this policy and for growth in our district.	Amend Policy 56 as follows: When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at March 2009 August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether: (a) the proposal 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 <b>excluding land identified in (d)</b> and reverse sensitivity issues for existing production activities, including extraction and distribution of aggregate minerals; (b) the proposal will reduce aesthetic and open space values in rural areas between and around settlements; (c) the proposals location, design or density will minimise demand for nonrenewable energy resources; and (d) the proposal is consistent with <b>any Future Development Strategy</b> , or the <del>city or district</del> <b>regional or local</b> strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development, should the <b>Future Development Strategy be yet to be released</b> ; or (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity. Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought	Reject
<b>S115.076</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.076</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 56: Managing development	Support in part	Support in relation to changes, variations, and reviews of district plans. However, for territorial authority land use and subdivision consents, this level of assessment is likely to be	Amend Policy 56 insofar as it applies to resource consents, so that it only applies to regional resource consents.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						in the rural areas - consideration		redundant given the more detailed objectives, policies, and assessment criteria that would be included in rural zone and subdivision chapters.		
<b>S118.016</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>S118.016</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	<p>Policy 56 lists a range of considerations for the management of development in rural areas. Matter (a) relates to impacts on productive land. This matter may well have been overtaken by the introduction of the NPS on Highly Productive Soils and could be removed pending GWRC giving effect to the NPS.</p> <p>Matter (d) requires consideration of the consistency of a development with a Future Development Strategy or other growth strategy and is reflective of Policy 55 above. Matter (e) notes that in the absence of such a strategy consideration is required of the pressure development may put on existing services and infrastructure.</p> <p>While the policy mirrors Policy 55 in terms of reflecting consideration of growth strategies, it does not similarly reflect Policy 55 in considering 'out of sequence' development. Either the policy is intending to duplicate the matters in Policy 55 with respect to growth management in which case it should mirror all relevant aspects, or matters (d) and (e) should be removed and Policy 55 and UD.3 should be relied upon.</p>	Amend Policy 56 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-considering whether matter (a) remains necessary as currently worded given the introduction of the NPS on Highly Productive Soils;</li> </ul> Remove duplication, or ensure consistency, between policies 55, 56 and UD.3	Accept in part
<b>S118.016</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS28.073</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.073</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support alignment with the NPSHPL, but generally consider that (a) should remain a policy consideration. The roles and focus of 55, 56 and UD.3 could be clarified to ensure consistency with the NPSHPL.	Allow in part	Accept in part
<b>S119.005</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited			<b>S119.005</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	<p>Policy 56 lists a range of considerations for the management of development in rural areas. Matter (a) relates to impacts on productive land. This matter may well have been overtaken by the introduction of the NPS on Highly Productive Soils and could be removed pending GWRC giving effect to the NPS.</p> <p>Matter (d) requires consideration of the consistency of a development with a Future Development Strategy or other growth strategy and is reflective of Policy 55 above. Matter (e) notes that in the absence of such a strategy consideration is required of the pressure development may put on existing services and infrastructure.</p> <p>While the policy mirrors Policy 55 in terms of reflecting consideration of growth strategies, it does not similarly reflect Policy 55 in considering 'out of sequence' development. Either the policy is intending to duplicate the matters in Policy 55 with respect to growth management in which case it should mirror all relevant aspects, or matters (d) and (e) should be removed and Policy 55 and UD.3 should be relied upon.</p>	Amend Policy 56 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-considering whether matter (a) remains necessary as currently worded given the introduction of the NPS on Highly Productive Soils;</li> <li>Remove duplication, or ensure consistency, between policies 55, 56 and UD.3.</li> </ul>	Accept in part
<b>S120.005</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand			<b>S120.005</b>	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural	Support in part	Policy 56 lists a range of considerations for the management of development in rural areas. Matter (a) relates to impacts on productive land. This matter may well have been overtaken by the introduction of the NPS on Highly	Amend Policy 56 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-considering whether matter (a) remains necessary as currently worded given the introduction of the NPS</li> </ul>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						areas - consideration		<p>Productive Soils and could be removed pending GWRC giving effect to the NPS.</p> <p>Matter (d) requires consideration of the consistency of a development with a Future Development Strategy or other growth strategy and is reflective of Policy 55 above. Matter (e) notes that in the absence of such a strategy consideration is required of the pressure development may put on existing services and infrastructure.</p> <p>While the policy mirrors Policy 55 in terms of reflecting consideration of growth strategies, it does not similarly reflect Policy 55 in considering 'out of sequence' development. Either the policy is intending to duplicate the matters in Policy 55 with respect to growth management in which case it should mirror all relevant aspects, or matters (d) and (e) should be removed and Policy 55 and UD.3 should be relied upon.</p>	<p>on Highly Productive Soils;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove duplication, or ensure consistency, between policies 55, 56 and UD.3.</li> </ul>	
S120.005	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	FS28.074	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.074	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support alignment with the NPSHPL, but generally consider that (a) should remain a policy consideration. The roles and focus of 55, 56 and UD.3 could be clarified to ensure consistency with the NPSHPL.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S124.010	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			S124.010	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	KiwiRail supports the intent of Policy 56 to provide a framework that manages development in rural areas in accordance with sound resource management principles. A further amendment is proposed to expressly recognise and provide for the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects as one of those principles, as this is a critical resource management issue that must be managed when providing for growth of urban activities near lawfully established transport corridors.	<p>[Note: stated "Seek amendment" in original submission]</p> <p>New subclause.(f) the proposal will result in reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept in part
S124.010	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS28.075	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.075	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support reverse sensitivity as an important consideration, noting that it is currently noted in clause (a)	<p>Allow in part</p> <p>Allow relief to the extent that reverse sensitivity is comprehensively addressed in the policy</p>	Accept in part
S124.010	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS3.046	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.046	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point as-future reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure should be avoided.	Allow	Accept in part
S124.010	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS26.066	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.066	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	<p>KiwiRail requests insertion of a new clause to protect against reverse sensitivity: : (f) the proposal will result in reverse sensitivity effects'.</p> <p>The context discussed in the submission is transport but Meridian considers the principle is equally applicable to all regionally significant infrastructure. Meridian considers the requested relief could be refined to refer to 'lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure'.</p>	Allow in part by amending the requested relief to refer to 'lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure'.	Reject
S125.006	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			S125.006	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural	Support	Objective 22B is to be implemented through Policy FW.7 (Water attenuation and retention - non-regulatory) and Policy 56 (Managing development in rural areas - consideration). The submitters generally support the proposed new Objective	The submitters seek the intent of the proposed new Objective 22B and the implementation of this objective through Policy 56 to be retained as currently written.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						areas - consideration		22B and the implementation of this objective through Policy 56, and consider they are consistent with the intent and requirements of the NPS-UD.		
S125.008	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			S125.008	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	The amendments provide for the interim period where the Future Development Strategy is in development and recognises the tension that exists between urban and rural development on the fringe of urban areas.	Retained as notified.	Accept in part
S128.049	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.049	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Support retaining the considerations in (a), however the policy could be more specific as to the type of development is trying to capture. The explanation to the policy previously stated that it relates to urban development and rural residential development, this clarity has been removed.  Interest in ensuring that primary production activities are appropriately provided for (and enabled) in the rural environment; this is important for meeting national direction around highly productive land and also emissions reduction.  The policy intent in the Section 32 evaluation report indicates the focus of this policy is on urban development.	Provide clarity as to what this policy applies to by adding a sentence to the main body:  <b>This policy applies to urban development and rural residential development.</b>  OR if the policy remains more general in application, amend to add  Retain the main body and add a new subclause: <b>(x) The use of highly productive land for food production is enabled.</b>	Accept in part
S129.026	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.026	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Supports the direction of Policy 56 where it manages development in rural areas. Dispersed development is at odds with the MDRS direction to centralise development and intensify our urban centres. Supports the inclusion of more direction that intensification is prioritised ahead of greenfield developments and development of rural areas. If development is to occur in rural areas, then the provision of mode choice options should be required.	Amend the provisions to address the relief sought in the submission. Supports the inclusion of more direction that intensification is prioritised ahead of greenfield developments and development of rural areas. If development is to occur in rural areas, then the provision of mode choice options should be required.	Accept in part
S136.018	DairyNZ			S136.018	DairyNZ	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Update Policy to be in line with National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land.	Amend Policy 56 to be consistent with National Direction.	Reject
S136.018	DairyNZ	FS28.076	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.076	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	HortNZ support aligning Policy 56 with the NPS HPL	Allow relief	Reject
S137.044	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.044	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to align with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.  The addition of cultural values is to incorporate feedback received on the draft RPS Change 1.	Amend clause (b) to read:  (b) the proposal will reduce aesthetic, <b>cultural</b> and open space values in rural areas between and around settlements;	Accept
S137.045	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.045	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to align with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.  The addition of cultural values is to incorporate feedback received on the draft RPS Change 1.	Insert new clause (c) <b>(c) the proposal will lead to subdivision, rezoning to urban or rural lifestyle, use or development of highly productive land not otherwise provided for by exceptions in clauses 3.6, 3.8, 3.9 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022;</b>	Reject
S137.045	Greater Wellington	FS28.077	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.077	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development	Support in part	HortNZ support alignment with the NPSHPL, however consider that the drafting proposed could be clearer. In	Allow in part, subject to amendment to ensure the drafting is clear and gives effect to the NPSHPL.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
	Regional Council (GWRC)					in the rural areas - consideration		addition, the NPSHPL has more direct requirements than the 'particular regard shall be given to' direction in the chapeau.		
<b>S137.046</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.046</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to align with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.  The addition of cultural values is to incorporate feedback received on the draft RPS Change 1.	Insert a sentence in the Explanation section: <b>In addition to direction in Policy 59, Policy 56 aligns with direction from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 to protect highly productive land for use in land-based primary production.</b>	Reject
<b>S137.046</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	<b>FS28.078</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.078</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support amendment to align with the NPSHPL, this explanation should be included only to the extent that any edits to the policy are made consistent with the NPSHPL.	Allow in part  Allow to the extent that amendments to Policy 56 are made to align with NPSHPL	Reject
<b>S140.077</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.077</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	This policy is confusing, in that it gives particular regard to matters that the RPS presumably wants to happen, and matters the RPS presumably doesn't want to happen, without a clear statement about which state it prefers. The policy should be worded to consistently refer to the outcomes the RPS wants.	Amend with this text, or similar:  (a) the proposal will result in a loss of <b>retain the</b> productive capability of the rural area, including <b>minimising</b> cumulative impacts that would reduce the potential for food and other primary production and reverse sensitivity issues for existing production activities, including extraction and distribution of aggregate minerals; (b) the proposal will reduce <b>retain or enhance</b> aesthetic and open space values in rural areas between and around settlements; (c) the proposal's location, design or density will minimise demand for non-renewable energy resources; and (d) the proposal is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the city or district regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will not increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity.	Accept
<b>S140.077</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	<b>FS28.079</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.079</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ support re-framing the policy to focus on what is outcome is sought provided this is consistent with the NPSHPL	Allow in part  Allow relief to the extent that it is consistent with the NPSHPL	Accept
<b>S166.038</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.038</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	The contents of this policy is being considered as part of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan review.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S170.062</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.062</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural	Not Stated / Neutral	Mana Whenua and iwi have land in rural areas that was returned through the Deed of Settlement Acts. Policy 56 consideration needs to include the execution of Tino Rangatiratanga on this land and to be able to allow the land aspirations of iwi and Māori is accounted for.	Consideration needs to include the execution of Tino Rangatiratanga on land that was returned through the Deed of Settlement Acts and provide for the land aspirations of iwi and Māori.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						areas - consideration				
S170.062	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.176	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.176	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Reject
S131.0100	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0100	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>As it is drafted the policy does not provide for an assessment of the potential impacts of development in rural areas on the natural environment. While Ātiawa recognise that rural areas should maintain their productive nature, it is also realistic to expect development to occur in rural areas, particularly on the fringe of urban settlements. Therefore, Ātiawa seek additional considerations to be included in this policy.</p>	<p>Include new subclauses:</p> <p><b>(f) the proposal will adversely impact on mana whenua values, including the relationship with traditions, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga;</b></p> <p><b>(g) the proposal is resilient to climate change</b></p> <p><b>(h) integrates Te Mana o te Wai consistent with Policy 42</b></p> <p><b>(i) protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats</b></p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<b>with significant biodiversity values as identified in Policy 23</b>	
<b>S131.0100</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.215</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.215</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S167.0118</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0118</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui request amendment to be made.	Insert a new clause: <b>(x) the proposal will affect cultural values in rural areas between and around settlements.</b>	Reject
<b>S168.0173</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0173</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Provisions partially amended to reflect suggested amendments (Amend Policy 56, 2 May Hui). Recommended amendment to consider whether the proposal is resilient to climate change and provides for adaption in accordance with CC adaptation policies of the RPS has not been included in the amendment.	Include a requirement for consideration of whether the proposal is climate change resilient and provides for adaptation in accordance with the relevant climate change policies;	Accept in part
<b>S168.0173</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.103</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.103</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						areas - consideration		submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
<b>S168.0174</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0174</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Clause (a) combines issues that should be addressed separately as they relate to quite separate matters (i.e. loss of productive land, reverse sensitivity issues).	Address the issue of loss of production land and reverse sensitivity as two separate matters, rather than as part of the same clause, as they are not necessarily related;	Accept
<b>S168.0174</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS28.080</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.080</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	HortNZ supports amendments that improve the policy, provided these two considerations remain	Allow in part  Allow relief - provided both issues are sufficiently addressed in the policy	Accept
<b>S168.0174</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.104</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.104</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gunn		
<b>S168.0175</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0175</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Reference to 'aesthetic' values in clause (b) is inappropriately narrow and should be replaced by reference to 'amenity' values, which would cover a broader range of relevant values.	Amend the policy to:  Replace reference to 'aesthetic' values with a broader reference to 'amenity' values;	Accept
<b>S168.0175</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.105</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.105</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.	Not stated	Accept
<b>S168.0176</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0176</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa notes that the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Land has now been published. The policy should be reviewed to ensure that it is consistent with and gives effect to this National Policy Statement.	Review the policy to ensure it is consistent with and gives effect to the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Land.	Accept
<b>S168.0176</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS28.081</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.081</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	HortNZ support changes required to align with the NPS HPL	Allow relief	Accept
<b>S168.0176</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.106</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.106</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
<b>S168.0177</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0177</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support in part	The explanatory note for Policy 56 does not appear to relate to the policy and causes confusion.	Amend the explanatory text to better reflect the matters covered by Policy 56 and ensure consistency with the explanation for Policy 55.	Accept
<b>S168.0177</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS28.082</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.082</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	HortNZ support amendments to align the explanation with the content of Policy 56.	Allow relief	Accept
<b>S168.0177</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.107</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.107</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.074	Porirua City Council	FS25.107	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.107	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 56: Managing development in the rural areas - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S16.042	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.042	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	Although Council supports the principle of improved alignment between resource management decisions and the Regional Land Transport Plan, it is unclear how this would be delivered through the policy particularly as the explanation supporting the policy appears to conflict with the policy itself. The explanation states the policy is relevant to the consideration of proposals that affect land transport outcomes. We note the policy requires more than this and does not contain any thresholds for when the policy would need to be applied or given effect to in district plans.	Delete Policy 57 or amend so it:1. applies only to the consideration of proposals that affect land transport outcomes (that are within the powers of city and district councils); and2. Provides clear thresholds for when the policy would need to be applied or given effect to in district plans (limited to the powers city and district councils have).	Reject
S25.042	Carterton District Council			S25.042	Carterton District Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	<p>CDC supports integrated development in the Eastern Growth corridor – Hutt to Masterton. However, CDC does not consider that this policy in its proposed form is appropriate in Carterton. The public transport network in the Wairarapa is limited, and as a predominantly rural area, there are practical limits to the way in which public transport can be utilised. While active modes can be encouraged, and the rail network provides a linkage to other towns on the Wairarapa line, the heavy emphasis on public transport networks is not appropriate in the Wairarapa context.</p> <p>CDC is concerned that the policy requires that land use and transport planning is integrated for new development and would instead support the policy seeking ‘particular regard’ be given to these matters in Carterton.</p> <p>Requiring this for consent applications for land use and development is also onerous and has the potential to create a significant burden in preparation and processing of consents for relatively small developments. Softening the wording will allow some discretion in when this policy should be considered.</p>	<p>Amend the policy as follows:</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or development, <del>require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way</del> <b>which have particular regard to the way in which land use and transport planning is integrated within the Wellington Region, so that it:</b></p> <p>(a) supports a safe, reliable, inclusive and efficient transport network;</p> <p>(b) supports connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity;</p> <p>(c) minimises private vehicle travel and trip <b>length, where practical, while supporting</b> mode shift to public transport or active modes and support the move towards low and zero-carbon modes;</p> <p>(d) encourages an increase in the amount of travel made by public transport and active modes;</p> <p>(e) provides for well-connected, safe and accessible multi modal transport networks, <b>where practical, while recognising that</b> the timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where the provision of public transport may not be efficient or practical;</p> <p>(f) supports and enables the growth corridors in the Wellington Region, including:</p> <p>(i) Western Growth Corridor – Tawa to Levin;</p> <p>(ii) Eastern Growth Corridor – Hutt to Masterton;</p> <p>(iii) (iii) Let’s Get Wellington Moving Growth Corridor.</p>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.074	Porirua City Council			S30.074	Porirua City Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	<p>Council opposes proposed amendments to policy 57 and seek they are deleted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear how the requirement to 'require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way' relates to resource consents or notices of requirement. The regulatory policies will be implemented in district plans through methods such as zoning, district wide provisions and distribution of land use management frameworks. These methods better achieve the objectives of the RPS and higher order planning instruments, such as the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• The policy duplicates the regulatory policies in other chapters of the RPS including Chapter 4.1 and as such represents an unnecessary regulatory burden.</li> <li>• The explanation to the policy states that it is intended for considering proposals that affect land transport outcomes, but the policy is drafted in a way that it extends beyond this. It also contains no thresholds for development types and scale to be considered. For example, would it apply to a dormer window that breaches a height in relation to boundary standard in a district plan.</li> <li>• Clarity or policy direction is needed on what is meant by an 'inclusive transport network'.</li> <li>• It is unrealistic to require resource management plans and consents to minimise private vehicle use. The tools and methods for achieving this, such as congestion charging, lie outside of the resource management system.</li> <li>• References or a map needed to identify the Western Growth Corridor, Eastern Growth Corridor, and Let's Get Wellington Moving Growth Corridor.</li> </ul>	Delete proposed amendments to policy.	Reject
S34.015	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.015	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	<p>Many of these matters are outside the control of district and city councils and so this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>This policy applies no threshold and means that even small developments or applications for alterations or a change of use to a building would be captured by this rule, placing undue burden on Council and developments.</p> <p>Clause b) is too onerous for resource consents. Particular examples are new tourism related activities in rural areas accommodation or experiences and will stymie comprehensive development opportunities that grow over time.</p> <p>d) is duplicating c)</p> <p>Under clause e) low carbon modes should be defined. Council is also concerned that the provision of public transport is not a function of the district plan and relies on services being provided by other organisations / agencies.</p>	<p>Define low carbon modes amend to read:</p> <p>"When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or development, require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way which:</p> <p>....(b) <del>supports connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity;</del></p> <p><del>(c) minimises private vehicle travel and trip length while supporting mode shift to public transport or active modes and support the move towards low and zero-carbon modes;</del></p> <p><del>(d) encourages an increase in the amount of travel made by public transport and active modes;</del></p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									(e) <del>provides for</del> <b>consider where practicable enabling a</b> well-connected, safe and accessible multi modal transport networks while recognising that the timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where the provision of public transport may not be efficient or practical;  ... Explanation:  ....Policy 57 lists matters that need to be <del>given particular regard when considering</del> <b>considered for all</b> proposals that affect land transport outcomes. It seeks to align with the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and support decarbonising the transport system in the Wellington Region”	
<b>S79.048</b>	South Wairarapa District Council			<b>S79.048</b>	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	CDC supports integrated development in the Eastern Growth corridor – Hutt to Masterton. However, SWDC does not consider that this policy in its proposed form is appropriate in the district outside of Featherston and potentially the proposed Woodside growth area. The public transport network in the Wairarapa is limited, and as a predominantly rural area, there are practical limits to the way in which public transport can be utilised. While active modes can be encouraged, and the rail network provides a linkage to other towns on the Wairarapa line, the heavy emphasis on public transport networks is not appropriate in the Wairarapa context. SWDC is concerned that the policy requires that land use and transport planning is integrated for new development and would instead support the policy seeking ‘particular regard’ be given to these matters in Carterton. Requiring this for consent applications for land use and development is also onerous and has the potential to create a significant burden in preparation and processing of consents for relatively small developments. Softening the wording will allow some discretion in when this policy should be considered.	Amend the policy as follows:  When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or development, <del>require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way which have particular regard to the way in which land use and transport planning is integrated within the Wellington Region, so that it:</del>  (a) supports a safe, reliable, inclusive and efficient transport network;  (b) supports connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity;  (c) minimises private vehicle travel and trip <b>length, where practical, while supporting</b> mode shift to public transport or active modes and support the move towards low and zero-carbon modes;  (d) encourages an increase in the amount of travel made by public transport and active modes;  (e) provides for well-connected, safe and accessible multi modal transport networks, <b>where practical, while recognising that the</b> timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where the provision of public transport may not be efficient or practical;  (f) supports and enables the growth corridors in the Wellington Region, including:  (i) Western Growth Corridor – Tawa to Levin;  (ii) Eastern Growth Corridor – Hutt to Masterton;  (iii) Let’s Get Wellington Moving Growth Corridor.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND;  Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought	
<b>S115.077</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.077</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	While we support direction on this issue to inform decisions on district plans, this type of analysis should be complete at plan-making stage and it is redundant and infeasible to reconsider the issue from scratch for each resource consent.	Amend Policy 57 so that it does not apply to resource consents.	Reject
<b>S124.011</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			<b>S124.011</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	KiwiRail supports the intent of Policy 57 but considers that express recognition is needed for the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects which must be carefully managed when providing for land use and transport integration.  KiwiRail considers express recognition of reverse sensitivity effects is necessary to ensure development near transport corridors can co-exist in an appropriate way. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply) Amendment Act also expressly recognises and provides a nuanced approach to development where qualifying matters apply (including for example the provision of nationally or regionally significant infrastructure).	<i>[Note: stated "Seek amendment" in original submission] New subclause.</i>  iii. Let's Get Wellington Moving Growth Corridor; <b>and(g) avoids the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on the safe and efficient operation of transport corridors.</b>	Accept in part
<b>S124.011</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	<b>FS12.0010</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	<b>FS12.0010</b>	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought in relation to reverse sensitivity effects and considers that effects from the operation of transport corridors should first be mitigated at the source. Kāinga Ora considers that a policy requiring decision makers to consider 'avoiding the potential' for reverse sensitivity effects is ambiguous, overly directive, and places undue responsibility on the receiving environment to mitigate adverse effects.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S124.011</b>	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	<b>FS3.047</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.047</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point as-future reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure should be avoided.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S129.011</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.011</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	Supports Policy 57(e) to prioritise the integration of land use and transportation. Transport choices and proximity to multimodal choices enables well-functioning urban areas and needs to be considered early.  However notes that lower order documents could interpret an inconsistency between Policy 57 and 58.	Seeks clarification regarding the inconsistency between Policy 57 and Policy 58.	Reject
<b>S133.062</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.062</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Supports these policies surrounding effective management and measures for climate change and climate change effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S133.062</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.409</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.409</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S140.078</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.078</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	Applying this requirement to resource consents will result in unnecessary bureaucracy. This policy is about integrated land use and transport planning, which is best done through a plan change, or where a new notice of requirement is applied overtop. Integration is best achieved through plan provisions, not RPS consideration at individual consent level.	Amend with this text, or similar: When considering <del>an application for a resource consent</del> , notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, <del>for subdivision, use or development</del> , require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is <b>to be</b> integrated in a way which: ...	Reject
<b>S144.005</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			<b>S144.005</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Combatting sprawl is key to reducing GHG emissions across all sectors.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S148.052</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.052</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	WIAL generally supports the intent of this policy, however this should be directed at the district level (to influence zoning decisions for example) rather than requiring applicant for a resource consent (for example) to have to demonstrate consistency with all of the matters set out in (a) – (f).	This policy should be amended so that it is directed at a higher level rather than as a consideration for each and every resource consent application.  Otherwise delete the amendments to the Policy.	Reject
<b>S163.077</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.077</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	This policy should only apply within urban areas or within proposed areas for urban expansion. Land users in remote rural areas with limited options for transportation and movement of people and goods, should not be required to commit to needless costs and delays in assessing alternatives in resource consent applications - for little or no environmental benefit	That the amendments to Policy 56 be amended to the following or similar effect:  When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or development for land within urban areas or <b>within</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									proposed areas for urban expansion, Delete the FW icon	
S163.077	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.120	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.120	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	No recommendation
S163.077	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.242	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.242	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	No recommendation
S163.077	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.093	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.093	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.  Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept
S163.077	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.149	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.149	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support		Retain	Accept in part
S165.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other	Disallow	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
	Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)					- consideration		matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
<b>S166.039</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.039</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Public transport in the Masterton District and throughout the Wairarapa is significantly limited in comparison to the Hutt, Wellington, and Porirua regions. We are interested in further clarity on the extent that land use can be integrated with transport.	Clarifications.  Further clarity requested on how this policy can be implemented in the Wairarapa.	Reject
<b>S131.0101</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0101</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Ātiawa supports the overall intent of Policy 57. Ātiawa wants to ensure that maximising modal shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes does not exacerbate existing inequalities. That is, ensuring accessibility for all capabilities – those who cannot easily walk or cycle, ensuring equity for Māori, and those with care-giving responsibilities. For example it is reported that low-income people in some areas consider it essential to own a car, because they have no other way to do what they need to get done in their lives. Work and other activities are not close enough to walk to; the cycling networks are not safe enough; and public transport is neither frequent nor direct for people who do not work in the central city and live close to train lines or rapid bus routes. Ātiawa seeks that the Regional Council actively partner with mana whenua and other parts of the community who are most impacted by the proposed policy to provide the greatest benefit to all.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.0101</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.216</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.216</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.  This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.  3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal  3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal  Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S167.0119</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0119</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	Lower-decile areas (including Māori) have been historically disadvantaged by the public transport system. Focus needs to be on equity.	Insert a new clause: <b>(x) supports an equitable transport network</b>	Accept in part
<b>S168.0146</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0146</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the list of matters that are required to be given particular regard when considering proposed development that may affect land transport outcomes. However, Clause (e) should be amended to ensure that public transport provision is sequenced such that the 'period of time where public transport is not efficient and / or practical' is minimised to the extent possible.	Amend Clause (e) to reflect a requirement to minimise any period where servicing of subdivision or development by public transport is likely to be inefficient or impractical, as far as practicable.	Reject
<b>S168.0146</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.075</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.075</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.  Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S168.0178	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0178	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the content and intent of this policy.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.0178	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.108	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.108	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
S116.002	Doctors for Active, Safe Transport (DAST)			S116.002	Doctors for Active, Safe Transport (DAST)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	Proposals for "maximising mode shift" should be required to robustly assess options. Our experience from Riverlink was that motorised transport was subject to detailed evaluation or impacts on flow and safety. Assessment of active modes was cursory and qualitative only. Proposals for "maximising mode shift" should also consider the impact on the wider network. In Riverlink, improvements for motorised transport claimed benefits from decreased congestion, but did not assess worsening congestion elsewhere on the road network. Likewise, active transport improvements were proposed independently of, and disconnected from, the cycle network outside of the project designation.	Amend Policies CC.9, policy EIW.1 and Policy 57 to require a robust quantitative assessment of mode shift options and consideration of impacts on the wider network.	Reject
S116.004	Doctors for Active, Safe Transport (DAST)			S116.004	Doctors for Active, Safe Transport (DAST)	Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation - consideration	Support in part	In high- and middle-income countries physical inactivity has become the fourth leading risk factor for premature mortality. Policies designed to effect a population-level modal shift to more active modes of work commuting present major opportunities for public health improvement. Mode shift has all been agreed in policy statements by councils for some years. It is a clear requirement of the Government Policy Statement. However, it's still not happening. We are saddened - and your people's health has suffered as a result - that the development of cycling infrastructure remains subject to piecemeal planning and disconnected networks with variable levels of service. This is also about much more	Require health assessments of transport under policy CC.9, policy EIW.1 and policy 57. The heart of transport planning must be to facilitate and promote rapid modal shift.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								than capital works projects. This requires leadership - looking at this evidence and making our cities and roads the best they can be for everyone - not just motorists. We need to - urgently - reduce our dependence on private motor vehicles - they are the key driver of congestion, they are bad for our fragile environment, and they are bad for our health. This plan does little more than advance the status quo.		
S10.006	Transpower New Zealand Limited			S10.006	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	Transpower considers that it is important to provide policy direction to enable the infrastructure to support the urban development. The RPS would benefit from policy supporting the regionally significant infrastructure that is required to support urban development. Transpower considers that this would be best achieved by amending Policy 7 as requested elsewhere in this submission.	Retain Policy 58, but amend Policy 7 to provide direction supporting the regionally significant infrastructure that is required to support urban development.	Reject
S16.043	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.043	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	<p>Council supports the inclusion of clause (a) that requires new urban development to be carried out in a way that requires the development, funding, implantation and operation of infrastructure is provided for.</p> <p>However, Council notes that decisions on resource consents and changes, variations or reviews of district plans cannot require that low or zero carbon, multi modal and public transport infrastructure, is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring. Council therefore opposes clause (b) and seek it be deleted.</p>	Amend Policy 58 as follows: <del>(b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi-modal and public transport infrastructure, is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring.</del>	Reject
S25.043	Carterton District Council			S25.043	Carterton District Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	<p>CDC supports the requirement to ensure that new development can be supported by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>However, the application of this policy is potentially very broad, in that it applies to all new urban development (presumably of any scale and including infill development). Clause (b) is structured in a way that implies that new development must provide low or zero carbon, multi-modal and public transport infrastructure. CDC requests amendments to clause (b) to delete these references, as they obfuscate this policy, and other policies already encourage a range of transport infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>[Note: No changes are shown in 'amendment as follows' section. Changes requested are described in 'reasons' section. Somewhat unclear how amendments would be reflected as it would change structure of provision (b)]</b></p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan for subdivision, use or development, require all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that:</p> <p>(a) the development, funding, implementation and operation of infrastructure serving the area in question is provided for; and</p> <p>(b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi modal and public transport infrastructure, is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring.</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.075	Porirua City Council			S30.075	Porirua City Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose	The policy lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation. It is unclear how this policy would be applied to many consents, especially brownfield or infill development. For instance, an applicant has no control over the operation of infrastructure, including public transport. This entire policy is more appropriately managed under development agreements and the development contributions policy made under the LGA.	Delete policy, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.	Reject
S30.075	Porirua City Council	FS25.108	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.108	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.096	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.096	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose in part	Many of these matters are outside the legislative control and authority of district and city councils and so this cannot be achieved. It is inappropriate for these to be directed by the RPS.	Amend policy by deleting all references to 'require'.	Accept
S49.007	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited			S49.007	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	Infrastructure is critical to a successful urban development, and this is recognised in the policy. In particular, the requirement in the policy to be sequenced so that infrastructure is provided before development, is supported. The explanation that this includes three waters infrastructure and transport infrastructure that would be necessary to support the development should be widened to include all aspects of regionally significant infrastructure needed to support the development, rather than solely highlighting only two of a myriad of necessary infrastructure matters.	Amend as follows: <i>Policy 58 requires development to be sequenced such that infrastructure that is necessary to service the development will be provided before the development occurs. This includes both all regionally significant three waters infrastructure and transport infrastructure that would be necessary to support the development.</i>	Reject
S78.016	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.016	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 58 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.016	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.324	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.324	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S79.049	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.049	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	Critical to ensure that environmental infrastructural objectives are met and ensures community affordability.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S113.044	Wellington Water			S113.044	Wellington Water	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	Clause (b) should be amended to support public health outcomes	Amend clause (b) as follows:  (b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi modal, <del>and</del> public transport infrastructure <b>and Te Mana o te Wai infrastructure</b> , is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring.	Reject
S115.078	Hutt City Council			S115.078	Hutt City Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	While we support direction on this issue to inform decisions on district plans, this type of analysis should be complete at plan-making stage and it is redundant and infeasible to reconsider the issue from scratch for each resource consent.  There may be resource consents for developments not anticipated in their zone for which this type of assessment will be relevant. However, district plans that themselves implement this policy will have sufficient direction without needing to go up to the Regional Policy Statement as well.	Amend Policy 58 so that it does not apply to resource consents.	Reject
S118.017	Peka Peka Farm Limited			S118.017	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 58 is not consistent with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD relating to being responsive to proposals that would bring about significant development capacity. It is not always possible to achieve all of the matters listed in Policy 58.  The policy is internally inconsistent with proposed Policy 57(e) of the RPS which recognises that the timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where public transport may not be practical.	Delete Policy 58 or amend the policy to achieve consistency with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.	Reject
S119.006	Summerset Group Holdings Limited			S119.006	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 58 is not consistent with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD relating to being responsive to proposals that would bring about significant development capacity. It is not always possible to achieve all of the matters listed in Policy 58.  The policy is internally inconsistent with proposed Policy 57(e) of the RPS which recognises that the timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where public transport may not be practical.	Delete Policy 58, or amend the policy to achieve consistency with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.	Reject
S120.006	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand			S120.006	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy 58 is not consistent with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD relating to being responsive to proposals that would bring about significant development capacity. It is not always possible to achieve all of the matters listed in Policy 58.  The policy is internally inconsistent with proposed Policy 57(e) of the RPS which recognises that the timing and	Delete Policy 58, or amend the policy to achieve consistency with Objective 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where public transport may not be practical.		
S129.028	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.028	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	Supports Policy 58 as it promotes integrated transport, land use planning and multi-modal transport, but considers further clarification is required	Seek clarification of how Policy 58 will be implemented.	No recommendation
S129.028	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS14.032	Masterton District Council	FS14.032	Masterton District Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	Agree with Waka Kotahi that it is important to have integrated transport, land use planning and multi-modal transport But agree, further clarification is required with how the Policy is to be implemented.	Not stated  Agree with Waka Kotahi re: Seeking clarification on how Policy 58 will be implemented.	No recommendation
S134.018	Powerco Limited			S134.018	Powerco Limited	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose	<p>Interpretation of Policy 58 is that the requirement for new development to be sequenced in a way that ensures the availability of infrastructure prior to development occurring will apply in relation to electricity and gas distribution networks, which fall within the RMA definition of 'infrastructure'. This is supported as infrastructure capacity and security of supply are significant resource management issues. Intensification, urbanisation and population growth continually place demands on energy resources, in particular electricity. While investing considerable resources in forward planning to meet future demand, the layout and delivery of the network is significantly influenced by the scale and pattern of development that results from individual subdivision and development proposals. In some situations, significant infrastructure upgrades may be required to meet the demand for electricity created by new development.</p> <p>The explanation to the policy suggests that the policy will apply just to three waters infrastructure and transport infrastructure. While case law is clear that it is the objectives and policies of a planning document, rather than explanatory statements, that hold statutory weight, and does not support the wording of the explanatory statement and seeks that it be amended to avoid any suggestion that it may narrow the scope of the policy.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, also seeks to amend the wording of Policy 58 to clearly acknowledge the need to coordinate the provision of energy infrastructure with urban development.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 58 and the explanatory statement to clarify that the policy applies to all infrastructure needed to support new urban development, not just three waters and transport infrastructure. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines:</p> <p>“When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan for subdivision, use or development, require all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that:</p> <p>(a) the development, funding, implementation and operation of infrastructure serving the area in question is provided for; and</p> <p>(b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi modal, <del>and</del> public transport infrastructure, <b>energy and telecommunications infrastructure</b> is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring.</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Explanation Policy 58 requires development to be sequenced such that infrastructure that is necessary to service the development will be provided before the development occurs. This includes <del>both</del> three waters infrastructure, <del>and</del> transport infrastructure, <b>energy and telecommunications infrastructure</b> that would be necessary to support the development.”</p>	Reject
S137.035	Greater Wellington			S137.035	Greater Wellington	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
	Regional Council (GWRC)				Regional Council (GWRC)	development and operation of infrastructure - consideration		areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	<b>policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	
<b>S140.079</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.079</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	It is unrealistic to stop all urban development until all public transport and multi-modal transport are available to serve it. Public transport, cycleways and other transport infrastructure in existing urban areas will usually be the responsibility of councils. Development should not be stopped while this is being built. For example, some high density developments along the Let's Get Wellington Moving Mass Rapid Transit corridor should be allowed while the MRT is being designed, consented and constructed. Also the policy confuses all "subdivision, use or development" and "new urban development", and the list of transport infrastructure options "low or zero carbon", "multi modal", and "public transport" overlap.	Amend with this text, or similar: When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan, for <b>new urban development</b> , subdivision, use or development, <b>give particular regard to its layout, location and sequencing so</b> require all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that:  (a) the development, funding, implementation and operation of infrastructure serving the area in question is provided for; and <b>(b) the development is integrated with planned or constructed transport infrastructure for low or zero carbon modes and public transport.</b> <del>(b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi modal and public transport infrastructure, is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring.</del>	Accept in part
<b>S148.053</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.053</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose	WIAL submits that this policy sets an unduly onerous threshold in that it requires all new urban development to ensure it has all the infrastructure required to serve such development, including that low or zero carbon and public transportation infrastructure is available prior to the development occurring. While it is not clear if this policy would apply to a development within the Airport area, WIAL submits that it would be inappropriate to hold up such a project if for example, there are issues with the public transportation network, which is beyond its control.	<b>Include a clear definition of urban development in the RPS.</b>  Delete this policy.	Reject
<b>S148.053</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS8.025</b>	Guardians of the Bays Inc	<b>FS8.025</b>	Guardians of the Bays Inc	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Oppose	Wellington Airport which is a major traffic generator should always be considering the public transport network and how to enhance its connection to it. We support Policy 58: Coordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure -relating to Wellington Airport and its developments	Disallow	Accept in part
<b>S166.040</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.040</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Very important to have the necessary infrastructure there for any new subdivision and/or development. Difficult to sequence.	Policy is too specific. Should be broader to encourage a range of infrastructure.	Reject
<b>S170.063</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.063</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development	Not Stated / Neutral	The part of the Policy 58 that says 'ensure all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that...' seems to belong to the 'responsive planning' section of the RPS. Co-ordinating land use with	Move 'ensure all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that...' to the 'responsive planning' section of the RPS.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and operation of infrastructure - consideration		development and operation of infrastructure is not just about transport as specified in clause (b).	The provision should ensure that co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure is not just about transport as specified in clause (b).	
<b>S170.063</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.177</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.177</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Reject
<b>S131.0102</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0102</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa supports the overall intent of policy -that all new urban development, including supporting infrastructure occurs in a sequenced and planned manner. Although Ātiawa recognises this is administratively challenging for regional and district council to coordinate, it is important that councils actively work together to achieve well-functioning urban development.</p> <p>Where infrastructure is available, it should be assessed to measure if the current infrastructure can handle additional</p>	Amend to require that development occurs on the basis of infrastructure provided.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>capacity (i.e. wastewater and stormwater network that is already at capacity).</p> <p>Ātiawa oppose development being enabled on the basis of programmed infrastructure.</p>		
<b>S131.0102</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.217</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.217</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S167.0120</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0120</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 58.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0179</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0179</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 58: Co-ordinating land use with development and operation	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the content and intent of this policy.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						of infrastructure - consideration				
<b>S168.0179</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.109</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.109</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 58: Coordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S16.083</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.083</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	Council opposes references to the WRGF and the attempt to give the document legal weight under the RMA as we express elsewhere in our submission. We seek deletion of such references from Policy 67 (and from throughout the plan change).  We also oppose the inclusion and use of proposed definitions for high density development and medium density residential development. As expressed elsewhere in our submission, these definitions are not consistent with the NPS-UD and conflict with the Intensification Planning Instrument notified by Council.	Amend Policy 67 as follows:  (a) implementing the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and any urban design guidance that provides for best practice urban design and amenity outcomes, including for high density development and medium density residential development;  (e) implementing the actions in the Future Development Strategy, or the regional and local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in the region; and	Reject
<b>S30.088</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.088</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	This policy does not make sense. It is a non-regulatory policy that requires a regulatory response.	Delete policy, or amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.088	Porirua City Council	FS25.121	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.121	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S34.097	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.097	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	Council is concerned that the proposed non-regulatory method, appears to rely on a future regulatory process under clause (e). In addition, it is inappropriate to rely on future plans and strategies where the content of these is unknown. References to an undeveloped strategy are ultra vires.	Amend policy to provide clarity on where this should apply and include non-regulatory methods that could achieve an outcome rather than a regulatory approach and remove all references to the yet to be developed Future Development Strategy.	Reject
S78.020	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.020	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Policy 67 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.020	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.328	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.328	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Reject
S102.079	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.079	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities	Support	Generally supports the non-regulatory policies in the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory				
<b>S115.090</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.090</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Amend Policy 67 to make it clear it does not apply to city and district councils.	Reject
<b>S128.054</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.054</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support in part	Policy 67 previously includes (g) safeguarding the productive capability of the rural area. A mention of highly productive land is valid in terms of establishing urban environments.	Add a new subclause: <b>(g) recognising the values of highly productive land, including long-term for food production</b>	Accept in part
<b>S128.054</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS11.025</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	<b>FS11.025</b>	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	The value of highly productive land, primary production activities on this land, and their protection from urban encroachment and urban sprawl should be recognised when establishing the qualities and characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S129.029</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.029</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban	Support	Supports the direction to implement the actions in the Future Development Strategy which describes where and how future urban development should occur. Well-functioning urban communities are reliant on transport choice to enable communities to operate at a scale that reduces VKT and lowers emissions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						environments - non-regulatory				
S133.075	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.075	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support in part	Supports these policies, however, requests amendment to ensure Muaūpoko is specifically recognised.	Specific recognition of Muaūpokoas having connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara and interest in these policies.	Reject
S133.075	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.422	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.422	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation
S137.037	Greater Wellington			S137.037	Greater Wellington	Policy 67: Establishing and	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this</b>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
	Regional Council (GWRC)				Regional Council (GWRC)	maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory		areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	<b>policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	
<b>S137.055</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.055</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity.  Add 'improve' into heading and wording for consistency with Policy 31.	Amend Policy 67 as shown below:  Policy 67: Establishing, <b>improving</b> and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory  To establish, <b>improve</b> and maintain and enhance the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments	Accept in part
<b>S140.091</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.091</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	Support provided that the definitions of 'high density development' and 'medium density residential development' is amended as outlined below in the definition. With the current definitions the policy is too prescriptive and does not meet the intent of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified provided the definitions of 'high density development' and 'medium density residential development' are amended.	Accept in part
<b>S147.082</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.082</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S147.082</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.146</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.146</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.  Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.	Disallow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						functioning urban environments - non-regulatory		Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
<b>S147.082</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.251</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.251</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow  That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S154.007</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.007</b>	Investore Property Limited	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose in part	Policy 67 fails to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban environments.	Amend Policy 67 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject
<b>S155.005</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.005</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose in part	Policy 67 fails to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban environments.	Amend Policy 67 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Reject
<b>S158.031</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.031</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban	Support	Supports the wording in this policy identifying urban design guidance as non-regulatory.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						environments - non-regulatory				
<b>S165.091</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.091</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support		Retain	Accept in part
<b>S165.091</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S131.0116</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0116</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	Ātiawa approach to growth is grounded in and guided by our mātauranga, thus recognising the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi, applying the enduring wisdom of kaupapa Māori and enhancing the unique identity and culture of this place. Proactive initiatives are required to ensure that our unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the region. The Design Guides are a key mechanism in giving effect to our kaupapa (values), huanga (vision) through our tikanga (approach) as expressed in Whakarongotai o te moana, Whakarongotai o te wā.	Amend as follows:  (a) implementing the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and any urban design guidance that provides for best practice urban design and amenity outcomes, including <b>mātauranga Māori</b> and for high density development and medium density residential development;	Accept
<b>S131.0116</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.232</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.232</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.  This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						- non-regulatory		<p>interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
<b>S167.0134</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0134</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	<p>Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 67.</p> <p>We note subclause (d) and (f) and are keen to work in partnership with council on this.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0181</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0181</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support in part	<p>It is noted that this policy covers a range of matters, potentially not all of which non-regulatory - see clause d in particular.</p> <p>The inclusion of subclause (f) relating to partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to develop papakāinga design guidelines that are underpinned by Kaupapa Māori is supported. However, the clause only needs to refer to partnering (as this is the same as working together).</p> <p>The amendment of subclause (d) to substitute "encouraging" with "providing for" and the inserted reference to meeting "cultural" needs along with social and economic needs is supported.</p> <p>The explanation provided for Policy 67 does not address the range of matters covered in the policy. The Explanation should be expanded.</p>	<p>Amend clause (f) of the policy to read:</p> <p><del>"work together</del> and partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to prepare papakāinga design guidelines that are underpinned by kaupapa Māori."</p> <p>Provide a more comprehensive explanation of the policy.</p>	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S168.0181	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS6.045	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.045	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	We support this submission because the suggested amendments use stronger language than that proposed in the policy statement. These suggested amendments also discuss making reference to partnership more consistent, rather than referring to it as just working together.	Allow	Accept
S168.0181	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.111	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.111	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments - non-regulatory	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
S170.042	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.042		Policy CC.3	Support in part	Policy CC.3 Environmental integration in urban development - district plans The policy intention is supported however, the policy wording 'ensure' is not strong enough directing district plans to integrate environment in urban development. This policy could give stronger direction to District Councils that the policy is implemented in rules and standards.	Amend the word 'ensure' to provide stronger direction to District Councils.	Accept in part
S170.042		FS29.156		FS29.156	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy CC:3	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.  This submission goes to great length to define where and how	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>		
S16.079	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.079	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	<p>The proposed policy supports the proposed papakāinga provisions included in the Council's IPI. An amendment is sought to qualify that in the case of tangata whenua only, they must demonstrate an ancestral connection to their land. This amendment would make the policy consistent with the proposed papakāinga provisions notified by Council in its IPI that were developed in partnership with mana whenua. Council understands similar provisions have been notified in the IPIs of at least one other Tier 1 council in the region.</p>	Amend policy UD.1 as follows:  Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land – district plans  District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that provide for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua with their <b>ancestral land, <del>and</del></b> tangata whenua <b>where it can be demonstrated that there is a whakapapa or ancestral connection to the land and the land will remain in Māori ownership, and the land will remain in Māori ownership with their ancestral land, by:</b>  (a) ...	Reject
S16.079	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS6.001	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.001	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of	Support	<p>We support this submission because the suggested amendments are consistent with the KCDC papakāinga provisions, which we have worked in partnership with tangata whenua and council.</p>	Allow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans				
S16.079	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS20.053	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.053	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>While Ātiawa acknowledge the work Kāpiti Coast District Council has done with the ĀRT collective in regards to their own provisions for papakāinga. The amendments cannot be transferred to the regional policy statement without additional changes, specifically expanded the definition of papakāinga to include ancestral lands (meaning "</p> <p>Ancestral Land means land where mana whenua/tangata whenua have an undisturbed collective whakapapa relationship."). Without these changes we do not support the proposed amendment by Kāpiti Coast District. Ātiawa recognise the scope of further submission must be limited to those matters raised in submissions. No new material may be brought up in further submissions. Therefore, limiting the scope of our comments.</p>	Disallow	Accept
S30.055	Porirua City Council			S30.055	Porirua City Council	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Oppose	<p>Council supports this policy in principle, the Proposed Porirua District Plan seeks to enable papakāinga developments, introduces a Māori Purpose Zone for Hongoeka, and generally better enables the use and development of ancestral lands.</p> <p>There needs to be a definition in the RPS of what constitutes ancestral land, to provide clarity as to what land exactly this policy applies to considering how land owned by both mana whenua and maata waka should be treated.</p> <p>In regard to (a) if this clause is intended to apply to land that is not ancestral, then this clause does not flow from the chapeau of the policy. It needs to be another clause to this policy i.e.  (a) ancestral land  (b) general land owned by Māori</p>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives, and/or reword policy as follows:</p> <p>District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that provide for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land, by:</p> <p><del>(a) enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their Tino Rangatiratanga; and</del></p> <p>(b) recognising that marae and papakāinga are a Taonga and making appropriate provision for them; and</p> <p>(c) recognising the historical, contemporary, cultural, and social importance of papakāinga; and</p> <p>(d) if appropriate, identifying a Māori Purpose Zone; and</p> <p>(e) recognising Te Ao Māori and enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise Kaitiakitanga <b>and their Tino Rangatiratanga</b>; and</p> <p>(f) providing for the development of land owned by mana whenua / tangata whenua.</p>	Reject
S30.055	Porirua City Council	FS25.088	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.088	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans				
<b>S34.093</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.093</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	Support provisions that enable Māori to express their culture and traditions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S102.077</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.077</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	Generally supports the regulatory policies in the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter. Provision UD.1(f) should provide for the development of land owned by Māori landowners, whether its whenua under General land or Māori Freehold land.	Amend Policy UD.1 clause (f) as follows:  (f) providing for the development of land owned by mana whenua / tangata whenua <b>and Māori landowners.</b>	Reject
<b>S102.097</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.097</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	Believes there is a need for the Regional Council to clarify who will identify a Māori Purpose Zone, if it is appropriate within the districts. Considers that it is appropriate that iwi, hapū and Māori landowners identify a Māori Purpose Zone in their respective rohe.	clarify who will identify a Māori Purpose Zone if deemed appropriate	Reject
<b>S115.055</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.055</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing	Support in part	While we support the general intent of this policy it is unclear which situations the policy is intended to apply to. At minimum the policy should set out whether it applies only to Māori freehold land, or whether any general land in Maori ownership is included, and which mana whenua groups should be covered.	Amend Policy UD.1 to clarify which situations the policy applies to.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans				
S131.079	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.079	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa position is that papakāinga should be provided for, not just recognised.</p> <p>Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori.</p> <p>Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. This includes the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of iwi, hapū and whānau.</p>	Amend as follows:  (c) <del>recognising</del> <b>providing for</b> the historical, contemporary, cultural, and social importance of papakāinga; and [Retain remainder of policy as drafted.]	Reject
S131.079	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS6.008	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.008	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	We support this submission as these suggested amendments would better support papakāinga development.	Allow	Reject
S131.079	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.349	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.349	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p>	Not stated	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal  Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S133.072</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.072</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	Supports these policies, however, requests amendment to ensure Muaūpoko is specifically recognised.	Specific recognition of Muaūpokoas having connection to Te-Whanganuia-Tara and interest in these policies.	No recommendation
<b>S133.072</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS6.070</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.070</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow  We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	No recommendation
<b>S133.072</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.419</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.419</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						land - district plans		Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S140.056</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.056</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	While we support the general intent of this policy it is unclear which situations the policy is intended to apply to. At minimum the policy should set out whether it applies only to Māori freehold land, or whether any general land in Māori ownership is included, and which mana whenua groups should be covered.	Amend Policy UD.1 to clarify which situations the policy applies to.	Accept in part
<b>S167.095</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.095</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	Taranaki Whānui notes this is a new policy focussed on providing for the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land. Taranaki Whānui supports the policy to direct that district plans must provide for the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land and provides the minimum requirements in doing so. Enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise Tino Rangatiratanga may be achieved through District Councils working in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua during the plan review, change or variation process. Taranaki Whānui notes that Papakāinga is specifically referenced in the policy and are required to be provided for, which is consistent with Policy 1(a)(ii) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Clause (d) provides the ability for identifying a Māori Purpose Zone, having the same	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								meaning as the National Planning Standards. By way of background Taranaki Whānui has submitted on the Wellington City Council Proposed District Plan that is currently silent on Papakāinga definitions.		
<b>S170.087</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.087</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Policy UD.3 Marae and papakāinga - consideration</p> <p>The consideration of this policy should apply to all tangata whenua sites of significance and other land that has been given back/ returned to iwi. Some of these lands that are returned to Tangata Whenua, iwi would have a raft of different values associated to the whenua and the values will be dynamic -can change over time. Urban Development provisions need to recognise these values and that recognise they will play out differently in different sites.</p> <p>Marae and Papakāinga should not be negatively impacted in the face of intensification and densification proposals, and this could be addressed when considering resource consent applications. This may need to extend to other taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where iwi still practice cultural matāuranga.</p>	<p>This policy should apply to all tangata whenua sites of significance and other land that has been given back/ returned to iwi.</p> <p>Urban Development provisions need to recognise these values, that they can change over time and that recognise they will play out differently in different sites.</p> <p>Marae and Papakāinga should not be negatively impacted in the face of intensification and densification proposals, and this could be addressed when considering resource consent applications.</p> <p>This may need to extend to other taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where iwi still practice cultural matāuranga.</p>	Accept in part
<b>S170.087</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.201</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.201</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
<b>S168.0167</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0167</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this broad overarching policy, in conjunction with a more specific policy containing matters for consideration. The requirement to acknowledge the importance of papakāinga and marae, use of Māori Purpose Zones, and providing for development of Māori owned land is supported. However, we request that an explicit reference to Mātauranga Māori is included in the policy.	Amend subclause (e) of the policy to include specific reference to "Mātauranga Māori":  (e) recognising Te Ao Māori <b>and Mātauranga Māori</b> , and enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise Kaitiakitanga;	Accept
<b>S168.0167</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.096</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.096</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
<b>S170.058</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.058</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy UD.3 Marae and papakāinga - consideration  The consideration of this policy should apply to all tangata whenua sites of significance and other land that has been given back/ returned to iwi. Some of these lands that are returned to Tangata Whenua, iwi would have a raft of different values associated to the whenua and the values will be dynamic -can change over time. Urban Development provisions need to recognise these values and that recognise they will play out differently in different sites.	This policy should apply to all tangata whenua sites of significance and other land that has been given back/ returned to iwi.  Urban Development provisions need to recognise these values, that they can change over time and that recognise they will play out differently in different sites.  Marae and Papakāinga should not be negatively	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						whenua with their ancestral land - district plans		Marae and Papakāinga should not be negatively impacted in the face of intensification and densification proposals, and this could be addressed when considering resource consent applications. This may need to extend to other taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where iwi still practice cultural matāuranga.	impacted in the face of intensification and densification proposals, and this could be addressed when considering resource consent applications.  This may need to extend to other taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where iwi still practice cultural matāuranga.	
<b>S170.058</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.172</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.172</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land - district plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S30.076</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.076</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	This policy provides no value beyond s6(e) RMA, in fact “have particular regard” is a lower regulatory bar than “recognise and provide for”. The RPS needs to provide direction at a regional level and not repeat requirements in the RMA. The explanation to the policy actually provides a level of regional guidance and direction and should be considered for inclusion within the policy.	Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.076	Porirua City Council	FS25.109	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.109	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S34.094	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.094	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Support provisions that enable Māori to express their culture and traditions.	Retain provision as notified. Consider amendment to read:  "Policy UD.2 supports Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms in land use and development. This includes recognising taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places to where mana whenua/ tangata still practice mātauranga in accordance with Mātauranga Māori"  Consider the role of urban Māori and how they are presented within the objective and policy.	Accept in part
S34.094	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS6.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	We support these suggested amendments as it uses stronger language to support the use of mātauranga Māori in recognising sites of significance to mana whenua/ tangata whenua.	Allow	Accept in part
S102.078	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.078	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Generally supports the policies that need to be considered in the 'Regional form, design and function' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S115.079	Hutt City Council			S115.079	Hutt City Council	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support in part	While we support direction on this issue to inform decisions on district plans, this type of analysis should be complete at plan-making stage and it is redundant and infeasible to reconsider the issue from scratch for each resource consent. District plans that implement this policy will have adequate triggers for when more detailed assessment is required.	Amend Policy UD.2 so that it does not apply to resource consents.	Reject
S133.073	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.073	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support in part	Supports these policies, however, requests amendment to ensure Muaūpoko is specifically recognised.	Specific recognition of Muaūpokoas having connection to Te-Whanganuia-Tara and interest in these policies.	Reject
S133.073	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.420	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.420	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S140.080</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.080</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S147.072</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.072</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S147.072</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.136</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.136</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.  Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.  Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S147.072</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.241</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.241</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary	Disallow  That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S148.054	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.054	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose in part	WIAL is concerned that there may be some practical limitations to the ability to implement this policy, and for this reason there is uncertainty around it. It also does not make grammatical sense as currently drafted.	Amend this policy and explanation to clarify how it will be implemented as follows:  <b>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change of a district plan for use or development, regard shall be had to whether there is any opportunity to support Maori in being able to express their culture and tradition through the proposal. This includes recognising taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where mana whenua / tangata whenua still practice mātauranga.</b>	Reject
S148.054	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS6.012	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.012	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	We oppose this submission because the requested amendments use weak language and disadvantage Tangata Whenua interests in the RPS by doing so.	Disallow	Accept
S163.078	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.078	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	This is a very open-ended provision, including and especially in relation to resource consent applications.	That Policy UD.2 be deleted.  Delete the FW icon.	Reject
S163.078	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept
S163.078	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.243	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.243	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept
S163.078	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.094	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.094	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>		
<b>S163.078</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.150</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.150</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
<b>S166.061</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.061</b>	Masterton District Council	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	<p>Intent of this policy has been considered as part of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan review.</p> <p>MDC is allowing for it as a permitted activity in appropriate zones.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.0103</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.0103</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Ātiawa supports Policy UD.2.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S131.0103</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.218</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.218</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like</p>	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S167.0121</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0121</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui supports the principle of this new policy.	We seek further clarification/amendment that protects against proposed developments on land surrounding marae/urupā and other sites.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0168</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0168</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support in part	Specific direction to territorial authorities is supported; however Rangitāne o Wairarapa seek that the policy wording is strengthened and a reference included to adopting Kaupapa Māori based models or frameworks that provide an opportunity for tangata whenua to help build iwi social, cultural, environmental and economic capacity, and to express their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Amend the policy as follows:  When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change of a district plan for use or development, particular regard shall be given <del>the ability</del> to enable Māori to express their culture and traditions in land use and development, by as a minimum, providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; <b>and by providing opportunities for a Kaupapa Māori outcomes-based framework to be applied to future urban development"</b> , or wording that provides similar relief.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0168</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.097</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.097</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S16.082	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.082	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	<p>Council opposes clause (a)(iii) as it goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and the RMA by preventing city and district councils from applying urban zones other than those where the Medium Density Residential Standards would be applied.</p> <p>Council notes it is not the role of the RPS to determine whether significant development capacity could be realised through other zoning, such as mixed-use zones and other centre zones. Council also notes that neither the RMA or the NPS-UD gives a regional council the power to direct district plan content to the level of the specific zones that must be applied through plan changes.</p> <p>Council sees no resource management reason for (or benefit to be gained from) this regulatory direction, and we consider that the suggested limitation on how housing may be provided for via zoning is not appropriate or useful for an RPS to specify. We consider the directive approach proposed may not be vires the RMA.</p>	Delete clause (a)(iii).	Reject
S16.082	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS25.003	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.003	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	The submission rightly identifies that other appropriate urban zones may be applicable and should not be restricted	Allow	Reject
S30.077	Porirua City Council			S30.077	Porirua City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	<p>Council opposes this policy and seeks is be amended for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unclear when the policy would apply i.e. what is meant by a change of a district plan for a development. Reference to 'plan changes' would be more consistent with Policy 8 of the RMA.</li> <li>The location, design and layout of a development is something that is likely to be unknown until the time of subdivision or land use consent. A district plan provides the framework for guiding these factors.</li> <li>Policy guidance is needed to help determine when a plan change area is considered to be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area.</li> <li>It is inappropriate and arbitrary to limit zoning options to High density residential or Medium density residential. The most appropriate zoning for an area will be determined by a range of natural and physical factors relevant to a specific location.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives; and/or reword as follows:</p> <p>Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to <del>developments</del> <b>plan changes</b> that provide for significant development capacity – consideration</p> <p>When considering a change of a district plan for <del>a</del> <b>an unanticipated or out of sequence development</b> in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether <del>the following criteria is met:</del></p> <p>(a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:</p> <p>(ii) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well- functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</p> <p>(iii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</p> <p>(iv) for housing will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>development,</p> <p>(b) the proposal makes a <del>significant</del> contribution to <b>providing significant development capacity</b> meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage identified in monitoring for:</p> <p>(i) a variety of housing that meets the regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the particular type, size, or format,  (ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or  (iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, and  (iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</p> <p>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal's contribution:</p> <p>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,  (ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner,  (iii) is likely to be taken up, and  (iv) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term,</p> <p>(d) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term.</p>	
<b>S30.077</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.110</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.110</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S34.095</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.095</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	Clarify that this policy relates to urban development outside of existing urban areas.	Amend policy to clarify that this relates to urban development only including the following amendments:  "\"When considering a change of a district plan for an <b>urban</b> development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met: ...\""	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S78.017	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.017	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that Proposed Policy UD.3 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provision.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.017	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.325	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.325	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept in part
S115.080	Hutt City Council			S115.080	Hutt City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	We support this direction to meet the requirements of clause 3.8(3) of the NPS-UD. However, the criteria could be improved and made more consistent with the goals of the NPS-UD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To better provide for non-residential development,</li> <li>• To recognise there may be limitations in monitoring and this should not preclude applicants from providing the assessment instead,</li> <li>• To avoid unnecessary assessment which is not necessary to determine if a proposal provides for significant development capacity,</li> <li>• To provide a standard for infrastructure provision that recognises that infrastructure capacity cannot always cleanly be assigned and limited to specific areas, and</li> <li>• To improve clarity</li> </ul>	Amend Policy UD.3 as follows:  “Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity – consideration  When considering a change of a district plan for a development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met:  (a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:  (i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,  (ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors  (iii) <b>where it provides</b> for housing <b>the proposal</b> will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development,  (b) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage <b>otherwise</b> identified <del>in monitoring</del> for:  (i) a variety of housing that meets <del>the</del> a regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the a particular type, size, or format, or (ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, <del>and</del> or</p> <p>(iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</p> <p>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal's contribution:</p> <p>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</p> <p>(ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner, and</p> <p>(iii) is likely to be taken up, <del>and</del></p> <p><del>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term,</del></p> <p>(d) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, <b>taking into account that the capacity provided by existing or committed infrastructure may already be needed for and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for,</b> other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short- medium term.</p> <p>..." (See also our requested relief on definitions used in this policy)</p>	
<b>S118.018</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>S118.018</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	<p>Policy UD.3 lists a range of criteria which must be given particular regard when considering developments that provide for significant development capacity.</p> <p>Matter (a)(i) references the "characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment" as identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22. These matters have been addressed above.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by matter (c)(iv) of the policy and this matter should be clarified or deleted.</p>	<p>Amend Policy UB.3 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Make consequential amendments that reflect the relief sought in respect of Objective 22 and Policy 55; or</li> <li>· Deleting the words "identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22" from Policy UD.3(a)(i);</li> <li>· Remove reference to 'high density' and 'medium density' zoning; and</li> <li>· Delete or clarify matter (c)(iv).</li> </ul>	Accept in part
<b>S119.007</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited			<b>S119.007</b>	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	<p>Policy UD.3 lists a range of criteria which must be given particular regard when considering developments that provide for significant development capacity.</p> <p>Matter (a)(i) references the "characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment" as identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22. These matters have been addressed above.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by matter (c)(iv) of the policy and this matter should be clarified or deleted.</p>	<p>Amend Policy UD.3 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make consequential amendments that reflect the relief sought in respect of Objective 22 and Policy 55 outlined above; or</li> <li>• Deleting the words "identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22" from Policy UD.3(a)(i);</li> <li>• Delete or clarify matter (c)(iv).</li> </ul>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S120.007	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand			S120.007	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	<p>Policy UD.3 lists a range of criteria which must be given particular regard when considering developments that provide for significant development capacity.</p> <p>Matter (a)(i) references the "characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment" as identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22. These matters have been addressed above.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by matter (c)(iv) of the policy and this matter should be clarified or deleted.</p>	<p>Amend Policy UD.3 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make consequential amendments that reflect the relief sought in respect of Objective 22 and Policy 55 outlined above; or</li> <li>• Deleting the words "identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22" from Policy UD.3(a)(i);</li> <li>• Delete or clarify matter (c)(iv).</li> </ul>	Accept in part
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	<p>KiwiRail broadly supports the intent of Policy UD.3 to provide significant development capacity, but this needs to be carefully managed to ensure that any effects at the interface of conflicting land uses, including reverse sensitivity effects, are appropriately managed. This is critical to recognise and provide for well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the direction in the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>New subclause under (a)</p> <p>(a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:.....iv. <b>minimises land use conflicts as far as practicable, including avoiding the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</b></p>	Accept in part
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS11.024	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.024	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	<p>Minimising land use conflict and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects should be a key consideration of any proposed urban expansion. Land sterilisation and reverse sensitivity are key issues for the quarrying industry.</p>	Allow	Accept in part
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS12.011	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.011	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, particularly in relation to "avoiding the potential for reverse sensitivity effects" and consider that UD.3(a)(i) and the assessment in relation to the 'well-functioning urban environment' has broad coverage of issues with respect to future plan changes providing for development capacity.</p>	Disallow	Reject
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS10.028	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.028	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	<p>Agree that significant development capacity needs to be managed to ensure that any effects at the interface of conflicting land uses, including reverse sensitivity effects, are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Allow the submission and amend Policy UD.3 as sought, to require minimisation of land use conflicts and avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept in part
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS24.024	Powerco Limited	FS24.024	Powerco Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	<p>Agree that significant development capacity needs to be managed to ensure that any effects at the interface of conflicting land uses, including reverse sensitivity effects, are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Allow the submission and amend Policy UD.3 as sought, to require minimisation of land use conflicts and avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS28.083	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.083	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	HortNZ support consideration of reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow relief	Accept in part
S124.012	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS3.048	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.048	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point as-future reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure should be avoided.	Allow	Accept in part
S129.027	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.027	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Supports the general intent, but considers that this policy needs to prioritise the intensification of existing urban areas rather than enabling greenfield developments for significant development capacity.  Seek that the wording is amended to clarify that intensification of existing urban areas ahead of greenfield developments is prioritised and responsive planning should occur where intensification is not available:	Amend Policy UD.3 as follows:  Responsive planning to developments that provide for a <b>within the existing urban environment is priorities ahead of greenfield developments when significant development capacity is considered</b> — <del>consideration</del>	Accept in part
S129.027	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS12.023	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.023	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the relief sought, accepting that intensification within existing urban areas should be a priority.	Allow	Accept in part
S133.074	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.074	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Supports these policies, however, requests amendment to ensure Muaūpoko is specifically recognised.	Specific recognition of Muaūpokoas having connection to Te-Whanganuia-Tara and interest in these policies.	Reject
S133.074	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.421	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.421	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S137.036</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.036</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	The qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments articulated in Objective 22 applies to all urban areas in the Wellington Region. A sentence to this effect in the relevant policy explanations will assist with clarity.	Add a sentence to the Explanation section <b>Well-functioning urban environments, as referred to in this policy and articulated in Objective 22, apply to all urban areas in the Wellington Region.</b>	Reject
<b>S137.036</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	<b>FS13.029</b>	Wellington City Council	<b>FS13.029</b>	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Reject
<b>S137.048</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.048</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Amend Policy UD.3 as shown below:  Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to <b>unanticipated or out-of-sequence</b> developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Reject
<b>S137.048</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	<b>FS13.030</b>	Wellington City Council	<b>FS13.030</b>	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						that provide for significant development capacity - consideration				
S137.049	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.049	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Add 'improving' into clause (a)(i) for consistency with Policy 31.	Amend clause (a)(i) to read:  (a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:  (i) contributes to establishing, <b>improving</b> or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22;	Reject
S137.049	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.031	Wellington City Council	FS13.031	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.		Reject
S137.050	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.050	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Amend clause (c)(ii) to read:  (ii) <b>is likely to</b> <del>will</del> be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner, <b>and earlier than the anticipated urban development</b> ;	Accept in part
S137.050	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.032	Wellington City Council	FS13.032	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept in part
S137.051	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.051	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Delete clause (c)(iii)	Accept
S137.051	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.033	Wellington City Council	FS13.033	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						capacity - consideration				
S137.052	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.052	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Amend clause (c)(iv) to read:  (iviii) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide <b>development uptake</b> up-take in the short to medium term;	Reject
S137.052	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.034	Wellington City Council	FS13.034	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Reject
S137.053	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.053	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Amend clause (d) to read:  (d) <b>the</b> required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term.	Accept
S137.053	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.035	Wellington City Council	FS13.035	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept
S137.054	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.054	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability, consistency and clarity, and reduce duplication.  Policy UD.3 is necessary to ensure a pathway for out-of-sequence development is available, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020. Amendments are suggested to make the policy intent clearer.	Amend policy to read:  When considering a change of a district plan for a development, <b>to determine whether it provides significant development capacity</b> in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether <b>all of</b> the following criteria <del>is</del> <b>are</b> met:	Accept in part
S137.054	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS13.036	Wellington City Council	FS13.036	Wellington City Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S140.081	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.081	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	<p>We support this direction to meet the requirements of clause 3.8(3) of the NPS-UD. However, the criteria could be improved and made more consistent with the goals of the NPS-UD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To better provide for non-residential development,</li> <li>• To recognise there may be limitations in monitoring and this should not preclude applicants from providing the assessment instead,</li> <li>• To avoid unnecessary assessment which is not necessary to determine if a proposal provides for significant development capacity,</li> <li>• To provide a standard for infrastructure provision that recognises that infrastructure capacity cannot always cleanly be assigned and limited to specific areas, and</li> <li>• To improve clarity</li> </ul>	<p>Clarify and refine wording of policy; and <b>Amend</b> Policy UD.3 as follows:</p> <p>“Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity – consideration</p> <p>When considering a change of a district plan for a development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met:</p> <p>(a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:</p> <p>(i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</p> <p>(ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors</p> <p><del>(iii) where it provides for housing the proposal will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development, (iii) enables medium or high density housing as part of a Centre(s) and/or Mixed Use zoning, or within walking distance of a Centre(s) and/or Mixed Use zoning</del></p> <p>(b) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage <b>otherwise</b> identified in <del>monitoring</del> for:</p> <p>(i) a variety of housing that meets <del>the</del> a regional, district, or local <del>shortages-shortage</del> of housing in relation to <del>the</del> a particular type, size, or format, or (ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</p> <p>(ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</p> <p>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, <del>and-or</del></p> <p>(iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</p> <p>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal’s contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal’s contribution:</p> <p>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand</p>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject	
									<p>or the identified shortfall,</p> <p>(ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner, and</p> <p>(iii) is likely to be taken up, and</p> <p>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term,</p> <p>(d) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, taking into account that the capacity provided by existing or committed infrastructure may already be needed for <del>and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for,</del> other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short- medium term.</p> <p>..."</p> <p>(See also our requested relief on definitions used in this policy)</p>		
<b>S147.073</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.073</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	
<b>S147.073</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.137</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.137</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject	
<b>S147.073</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.242</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.242</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before	<p>Disallow</p> <p>That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007</p>	Reject	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S148.055	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.055	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks that the RPS appropriately recognises that in some situations housing developments can be appropriately constrained by the "qualifying matters" that are also set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and recognised in sections 77I and 77 of the RMA.	Amend the policy to include (or with similar effect):  <b>(a) (iv) avoids adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the operation and safety of regionally significant infrastructure.</b>	Accept in part
S154.010	Investore Property Limited			S154.010	Investore Property Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy UD.3 will not give effect to the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy UD.3 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part
S155.012	Stride Investment Management Limited			S155.012	Stride Investment Management Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	Policy UD.3 will not give effect to the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy UD.3 to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept in part
S158.002	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.002	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Consequential to submission point 1, seek that Policy UD.3 within Chapter 4.2 is retained and amended as sought by this submission and relocated to Chapter 4.1.	Retain Policy UD.3 as amended within the relief sought in this submission and relocate to Chapter 4.1.	Reject
S158.029	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.029	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	Supports Policy UD.3 but seeks additions to strengthen unanticipated or out of sequence developments.  Seeks that the policy also includes the need to prioritise intensification within existing urban environments prior to considering urban expansion via greenfield development.	Amend Policy UD.3 as follows:  When considering a change of a district plan for a development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met:  a) The development is not inconsistent with the Council's strategic outcomes as set out in any Future Development Strategy, or development framework / strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur, should the Future Development Strategy not yet be released. This includes the prioritisation of intensification of existing urban areas.  b) the location, design and layout of the proposal:	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>i. contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</p> <p>ii. well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</p> <p>ii. is well connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors and/or have access to existing or planned rapid transit stops; and / or</p> <p>iii. provides for resilience to the effects of climate change and support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>iv. for housing will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development,</p> <p>c) The development would add significantly to meeting a demonstrated need or shortfall for housing or business floor space, as the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage identified in monitoring for:</p> <p>i. a variety of housing that meets the regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the particular type, size, or format a variety of homes that meet the needs of different households in terms of type, configuration, price, and/or location;</p> <p>ii. a variety of homes that enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms;</p> <p>iii. business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</p> <p>iv. community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, and</p> <p>v. the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</p> <p>d) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal's contribution:</p> <p>i. is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</p> <p>ii. will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner,</p> <p>iii. is likely to be taken up, and</p> <p>iv. will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term,</p> <p>ii. will likely be realised in a manner earlier than the anticipated land release sequence; and /or</p> <p>iii. supports, and limits as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and</p>	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									development markets.  e) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term.	
S158.029	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS25.004	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.004	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	The inclusion of matter (a) is opposed as it is unclear how the prioritisation of intensification can be meaningfully achieved or measured	Disallow	Accept in part
S165.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support in part	The matters under Policy 55(a)(ii) should to be applied not had particular regard to.	Amend Policy UD.2 to ensure that the requirements in Policy 55(a)(ii) are required to be applied, not matters to which particular regard has to be had.	Accept in part
S165.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S131.0104	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0104	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	While Ātiawa is supportive of providing for urban development in a strategic and sequenced way, in accordance with mana whenua values, Ātiawa is concerned that responsiveness planning conflicts with the principles of a well-functioning urban development, in particular coordinating and planning for development (including supporting infrastructure).  In addition, Ātiawa seek that mana whenua values are recognised and provided for during responsiveness planning for developments under Policy UD.3.	Include new subclause: <b>(e) the proposal shall recognise and provide for mana whenua values, including their culture, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</b>	Accept in part
S131.0104	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.219	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.219	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration		<p>of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
<b>S167.0122</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0122</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	We note the new policy provides for responsive planning as required by the NPS-UD by introducing criteria for considering developments that add significantly to development capacity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0169</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0169</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of cultural and health facilities in Clause (b)(iii) and assessing a proposal's contribution to affordable housing in Clause (b)(iv).	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0169</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.098</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.098</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						that provide for significant development capacity - consideration		is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi- Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.092	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira			S170.092	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity - consideration	Oppose in part	The responsive planning section does not refer to three waters and stormwater. This has been mentioned generally in the clause (d) referring that required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposals. This does not say anything about whether it can be provided at all effectively or efficiently.	Not stated.	Accept in part
<b>S78.039</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.039</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that AERs 1 to 7 for Objective 22 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S78.039</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.347</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.347</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
<b>S128.062</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.062</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	As elsewhere, urban development needs to be carefully planned to protective the values of highly productive land.	Amend paragraph 5 in Table 14 (p. 204)  5. Urban expansion is carefully planned including occurring in locations and ways that are well connected, support the protection of freshwater ecosystems, <b>retain highly productive land</b> and improve resilience to the effects of climate change	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S158.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	Consequential to the changes sought to Objective 22, seeks changes to the anticipated environmental results.	Amend anticipated environmental results as follows:  1. District plans:  (a) contain policies, rules and/or other methods that encourage a range of land use activities to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of Wellington City Centre, the Metropolitan Centres and the Town Centres <del>the regionally and locally significant centres, including the regional central business district;</del>  <del>and(b) identify and contain policies and methods to enable a range of building heights and density, including high and medium density development.</del>  <b>(c) identify and enable urban intensification, including building heights and built form density:</b>  <b>i. As much capacity development capacity as possible to maximise the benefits of intensification within the Wellington City Centre and within at least a 15-20 minute / 1200m-1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone;</b>  <b>ii. Building heights of at least 6 storeys and density of urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use within the Metropolitan Zones and at least 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and from existing and planned rapid transit stops;</b>  <b>iii. Within and adjacent to the town centres, building heights of at least 6 storeys and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services and at least within a 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from the edge of the Town Centre Zones.</b>	Reject
S158.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS6.018	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.018	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Oppose	We oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity for the sake of development and at the expense of Taiao; it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment.	Disallow	Accept
S158.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS17.036	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")	FS17.036	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Oppose in part	WIAL opposes the relief sought to the extent that it is not clear where the "town centres" are located and the extent to which these may / may not be located within WIAL's Obstacle Limitation Surface designation or the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary for Wellington International Airport.	Disallow	Accept
S158.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS3.061	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.061	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Regional form, design and function Anticipated	Support in part	Waka Kotahi support the intent of the submission point, that changes should be made to line up with other changes sought to objective 22.	Not stated Waka Kotahi seek that the anticipated environmental results are consistent with any changes to objective 22.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
						environmental results				
S131.0157	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0157	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	There is no AER related to (h) Enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and	Add the following AER:  <b>Mana whenua unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the region.</b>  <b>Mana whenua live on and are sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori.</b>  <b>Development provides for the economic and social security of mana whenua.</b>  <b>Rāhui and other tikanga Māori tools are implemented when communities fail to selfregulate behaviour and use to the detriment of the environment or sustainability of resources.</b>  <b>The valuation of the environment is in terms of how it sustains and supports life to thrive, rather than in terms of financial value.</b>  <b>The qualities of the environment that restore, cleanse and heal wairua are protected and enhanced where possible.</b>  <b>Critical habitats such as riparian and fish spawning habitat are protected and restored.</b>  <b>Ecological connectivity is maintained and protected.</b>	Accept in part
S131.0157	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.71	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.71	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the AERs proposed by Ātiawa.	Allow	Accept in part
S131.0157	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.277	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.277	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.  This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.  3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal  3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
<b>S167.0190</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.0190</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Regional form, design and function Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Support in partnership (resourcing/funding) with mana whenua.  Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the process to establish the AERs.  What input has come from mana whenua?  Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that AERs need to be developed and monitored in partnership with mana whenua and include mātauranga Māori. (State of Environment Reports).	Amend anticipated environmental results in partnership with mana whenua	Reject
<b>S163.039</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.039</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	The National Planning Standards direct that Regional Policy Statements should include a chapter on urban form and development. Consistent with this direction, the existing chapter introduction and the proposed amendments to it (to give effect to the NPS for Urban Development) are all clearly directed to urban areas.	That the Chapter 3.9 title be amended to read <del>Regional</del> <b>Urban form, design and function OR Urban form and development</b>	Reject
<b>S163.039</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS28.035</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.035</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	The proposed amendments add clarity to the focus of the provisions	Allow	Reject
<b>S163.039</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.083</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.083</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept
<b>S163.039</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.205</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.205</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S163.039	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.056	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.056	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated	Accept
S163.039	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.112	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.112	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S11.025	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.025	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Not Stated / Neutral	In 30 years most of the baby boomers will be gone and people are having less or no children. Are these projections still correct.	Review projections on page 78.	Reject
S16.095	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.095	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Supports the reference to the importance of design guides in achieving well-functioning urban environments. Also supports the recognition that sporadic, uncontrolled and uncoordinated development can result in adverse effects on mana whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Not stated.	Accept in part
S25.012	Carterton District Council			S25.012	Carterton District Council	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	The chapter introduction refers extensively to urban environments, as defined in the NPS-UD. However there is no mention of other urban areas that do not meet the definition of urban environments - for example, Carterton. Some introductory text that recognises other urban areas would be useful.	Add some introductory text that recognises 'urban areas', not just 'urbanenvironments', and describes their role in the regional form, design andfunction of the Wellington region.	Accept
S30.021	Porirua City Council			S30.021	Porirua City Council	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	<p>Long introductory statements unnecessarily lengthen a plan which is not consistent with best practice plan making. It is also not necessary to replicate matters covered in section 32 reports.</p> <p>Further, the RPS should use terms that are consistent with the NPS-UD and the national planning standards. For example, regionally significant centres is not a term used in either and should be changed.</p>	<p>Amend introduction to shorten and use language consistent with national direction, and/or reword as follows:</p> <p>Regional form is about the physical arrangement within and between urban and rural communities. Good urban design seeks to ensure that the design of buildings, places, spaces, and networks work well for mana whenua / tangata whenua and communities, and are environmentally responsive.</p> <p>The concept of well-functioning urban environments was introduced in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. There are a number of</p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>characteristics and qualities that contribute to forming a well-functioning urban environment. Well-functioning urban environments enhances the quality of life for residents as it is easier to get around, allows for a greater supply and choice of housing close to where people work or to public transport, and provide vibrant, safe, and cohesive centres that <b>are well connected by public and active transport, and which also</b> enhance business activity. <b>This network of centres support urban intensification.</b> Well-functioning urban environments enable communities and businesses to be more resilient to the effects of climate change, and the uptake of zero and low-carbon emission modes is supported throughout the region. Well-functioning urban environments have compact urban form and are well-designed and planned through the use of spatial and development strategies and use of design guidance. Well-functioning urban environments are low impact, incorporating water sensitive urban design and managing the effects on other regionally significant values and features as identified in this RPS.</p> <p>Central Wellington city contains the central business district for the region <b>and represents the primary regional centre where community, cultural, business and entertainment activities, as well as residential activities are focused.</b> Its continued viability, vibrancy and accessibility are important to the whole region. There are also a other <b>sub</b>-regionally significant centres that are an important part of the region's form. These centres are significant areas of transport movement and civic and community <del>investment</del> <b>investment activities.</b> They also have the potential to support new development and increase the range and diversity of activities. Good quality high and medium density housing in and around these centres, and existing and planned rapid transit stops, would provide increased housing choice and affordability. Further medium and high density development must be enabled within the fast-growing districts of the Region, being those identified in the National Policy Statement for Urban Development as tier 1 territorial authorities. If this development occurs, it will further improve housing affordability. <del>Encouraging</del> <b>Enabling the</b> use and development of existing centres of business activity can also lead to social and economic benefits, <b>and is necessary to achieving well- functioning urban environments.</b> Additional local employment <b>and educational opportunities around in</b> these centres <del>could</del> also provide people with greater choice about where they work <b>and obtain skills training.</b> The design of urban and rural communities/smaller centres, the region's industrial business areas, the port, the airport, the road and public transport network, and the region's open space network are fundamental to well-functioning urban environments and regional form.</p>	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>The Wellington Regional Growth Framework provides a <b>non-statutory</b> spatial plan that has been developed by local government, central government, and iwi partners in the Wellington- Horowhenua region. It sets out the key issues identified for urban growth and development and provides a 30-year spatial plan that sets a long-term vision for changes and urban development in the Wellington Region.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The region is facing <b>population change and</b> growth pressure. Based on the May 2022 Wellington Regional Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA), the Greater Wellington urban environment is expected to grow by around 195,000 people by 2051. As of May 2022, district plans within the Greater Wellington region, does not provide sufficient development capacity for the long term with a shortfall of more than 25,000 dwellings.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>National direction provided through the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 supports increased supply of affordable housing. However, high levels of development without suitable <del>constraints</del> <b>management</b> risks undermining other characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment. <del>We There</del> is a need to recognise and provide for other regionally significant values and features, including managing freshwater, indigenous biodiversity, values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua and management of the coastal environment. Most of the region, including its existing urban areas, has significant exposure to multiple natural hazards, and there is continuing demand to build in coastal and/or natural hazard-prone areas. <del>Development pressure can reduce transport efficiency and limit the ability of all centres to provide community services and employment. Medium and high density d</del>Development that is enabled through national direction has the potential to result in poor urban design outcomes, in the absence of sufficient design guidance.</p>	
<b>S30.021</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.054</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.054</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S49.001</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited			<b>S49.001</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	The existing infrastructure examples provided is too limited, and should align with the RPS definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as proposed in RPS PC1.	Amend the introduction to Chapter 3.9 as follows:  2. Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated development Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated, development (including of infrastructure) can adversely affect the region's compact form. This can, among other things, result in: (a) new development that is poorly located in relation to existing infrastructure (such as <b>telecommunications networks</b> , roads, public transport, water supply,	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									sewage and stormwater systems) and is costly or otherwise difficult to service	
<b>S49.001</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	<b>FS24.037</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS24.037</b>	Powerco Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Powerco agrees the existing infrastructure examples provided are too limited and should align with the RPS definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure.	Allow Allow the submission and amend the introductory text to Chapter 3.9 Regional form, design and function to provide broader recognition of all RSI including gas and electricity distribution networks.	Accept in part
<b>S63.003</b>	Mary Beth Taylor			<b>S63.003</b>	Mary Beth Taylor	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Finite planet with finite resources = finite growth. Te Awa Kairangi is exhibiting symptoms of having reached its limit for extraction. This would logically mean that growth and development should be curtailed until the health of the awa is restored.	Include mention of 'Limits to Growth'	Reject
<b>S78.006</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			<b>S78.006</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that amendments to Chapter 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function as summarised in the table on pages 75 and 76 of PC1 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Not stated.	Accept in part
<b>S78.006</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	<b>FS20.314</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.314</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept in part
<b>S95.002</b>	Tony Chad			<b>S95.002</b>	Tony Chad	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Finite planet with finite resources = finite growth. Te Awa Kairangi is exhibiting symptoms of having reached its limit for extraction. This would logically mean that growth and development should be curtailed until the health of the awa is restored.	Include mention of 'Limits to Growth'	Reject
<b>S102.074</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.074</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Generally supports the inclusion of the 'Chapter Introductions' for the Regional form, design and function.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S113.008</b>	Wellington Water			<b>S113.008</b>	Wellington Water	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	It is unclear how Te Mana o te Wai and three waters infrastructure interacts with the 'well-functioning urban environments'. This issue runs throughout this chapter.	Amend paragraph on page 76:  Well-functioning urban environments enable communities and businesses to be more resilient to the effects of climate change, and the uptake of zero and low-carbon emission modes is supported throughout the region. Well-functioning urban environments have compact urban form and are well-designed and planned through the use of spatial and development strategies and use of design guidance. Well-functioning urban environments are low impact, <b>support Te Mana o te Wai</b> , incorporating water sensitive urban design, and managing the effects on other regionally significant values and features as identified in this RPS.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S113.009	Wellington Water			S113.009	Wellington Water	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	Given the upcoming investments that three waters infrastructure providers are considering in relation to both growth and water quality improvement, additional clarity would be helpful.  The chapter also fails to recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and its benefits.	Amend paragraph on page 79  Medium and high-density development that is enabled through national direction has the potential to result in poor urban design outcomes, in the absence of sufficient design guidance. <b>Effective regionally significant infrastructure is necessary for a well functioning urban environment.</b>	Accept in part
S113.010	Wellington Water			S113.010	Wellington Water	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	The chapter also fails to recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and its benefits. Potential interactions include: Stormwater flooding Stormwater quality Wastewater contamination Efficient use of water.	Include an additional issues on page 80:  <b>AA Inadequate infrastructureThere is a lack of supporting infrastructure to enable the development of sufficient housing and the provision of quality urban environments.</b>	Accept in part
S115.024	Hutt City Council			S115.024	Hutt City Council	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	This introduction is very long and does not add to understanding the objectives and policies relating to regional form, design, and function.	Reduce the length of the introduction and ensure it provides sufficient guidance for RPS users about the objectives and policies relating to regional form, design and function.	Accept
S125.002	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			S125.002	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Support well-function urban environments consistent with the NPS-UD.  Includes reference to the Western Growth Corridor - Tawa to Levin (included in the Wellington Regional Growth Framework).	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S128.013	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.013	Horticulture New Zealand	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	It is noted that a focus of Proposed Change 1 is to addressing the lack of urban development capacity and the interface between urban development and freshwater.  It would be remiss in our view to not include a productive and sustainable rural environment in planning provisions regarding regional form, design and function. In particular, the RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity.  The NPSHPL notes that there needs to be integration in the management of HPL with freshwater management and urban development The Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) which this RPS acknowledged in their constraints analysis: 1. highly productive land (as Wāhi Toitū) 2. high quality soils (as Wāhi Toiora).  The WRGF noted that the Wairarapa and Horowhenua contain important areas of highly productive land (noting the boundary of this work extended into the Horizons region).  The amendments sought seek to acknowledge the highly productive land resource as part of these provisions.	Add a paragraph in chapter introduction <b>The region also includes highly productive land, a finite resource which has long-term values for land-based primary production, including for food security.</b>	Accept in part
S128.013	Horticulture New Zealand	FS2.11	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.11	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Rangitāne consider loss of soil fertility and the relationship to food security is an issue that should be identified, but has concerns about the sustainability of many current forms of land based primary production.	Allow in part	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S128.013	Horticulture New Zealand	FS9.009	Wairarapa Water Users Society	FS9.009	Wairarapa Water Users Society	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Recognition of the value to the community of highly productive land that allows food production	Not stated Add "The region also includes highly productive land, a finite resource which has long-term values for land-based primary production, including for food security."	Accept in part
S128.013	Horticulture New Zealand	FS21.009	Irrigation NZ	FS21.009	Irrigation NZ	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Recognition of the value to the community of highly productive land that allows food production	Not stated Add "The region also includes highly productive land, a finite resource which has long-term values for land-based primary production, including for food security."	Accept in part
S128.014	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.014	Horticulture New Zealand	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	<p>It is noted that a focus of Proposed Change 1 is to addressing the lack of urban development capacity and the interface between urban development and freshwater.</p> <p>It would be remiss in our view to not include a productive and sustainable rural environment in planning provisions regarding regional form, design and function. In particular, the RPS should protect highly productive land for food production and from reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>The NPSHPL notes that there needs to be integration in the management of HPL with freshwater management and urban development The Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) which this RPS acknowledged in their constraints analysis:  1. highly productive land (as Wāhi Toitū)  2. high quality soils (as Wāhi Toiora).</p> <p>The WRGF noted that the Wairarapa and Horowhenua contain important areas of highly productive land (noting the boundary of this work extended into the Horizons region).</p> <p>The amendments sought seek to acknowledge the highly productive land resource as part of these provisions.</p>	Amend, paragraph 9 (p. 79)  We need to recognise and provide for other regionally significant values and features, including managing freshwater, indigenous biodiversity, <b>highly productive land</b> , values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua and management of the coastal environment.	Accept in part
S128.014	Horticulture New Zealand	FS11.005	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.005	Fulton Hogan Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	<p>Fulton Hogan is supportive of the inclusion of the term 'highly productive land' as a regionally design and function. However, we note that the use of highly productive land is not limited to food production and in reality, there are factors other than soil properties that influence whether land has productive value. This is recognised through the NPS-HPL by providing a consenting pathway for quarries on highly productive land. Aggregates are a vital, if under recognised component of everyday life. Without them there would be none of the infrastructure on which modern society relies.</p> <p>Transportation is often the single most important factor in determining the delivered price of aggregates highlighting the importance of establishing and protecting local sources of aggregate. Often the aggregate resources required are physically available but access to them may become constrained by, amongst other matters:</p> <p>a) A lack of appropriate importance being placed on them by the local planning framework,</p> <p>b) Land use planning provisions that either fail to appropriately facilitate extraction opportunities or are overtly inhospitable to extraction activities,</p>	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								c) Establishment of incompatible land use activities on or adjacent to resources. Consequently, it is vital that aggregates are specifically recognised as a regionally significant value and feature, similar to highly productive land, within the introductory text and throughout the pRPS.		
<b>S128.014</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS30.038</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.038</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	B+LNZ supports the importance of recognising highly productive land. And those provisions relating to urban development should support a productive and sustainable rural environment. B+LNZ seek that this is not limited to HPL as defined by the NPS-HPL but also recognises versatile soils where food production also occurs.	Allow in part	Accept in part
<b>S131.038</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.038</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Ātiawa seek reference to mana whenua and our values in reference to the concept of a well-functioning urban environment, in accordance with the NPS-UF.	Amend to: The concept of well-functioning urban environments was introduced in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. There are a number of characteristics and qualities that contribute to forming a well-functioning urban environment. Well-functioning urban environments enhance the quality of life for residents as it is easier to get around, allows for a greater supply and choice of housing close to where people work or to public transport, and provide vibrant, safe, and cohesive centres that enhance business activity and <b>enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms</b> . Well-functioning urban environments enable communities and businesses to be more resilient to the effects of climate change, and the uptake of zero and low-carbon emission modes is supported throughout the region. Well-functioning urban environments have compact urban form and are well-designed and planned through the use of spatial and development strategies and use of design guidance. Well-functioning urban environments are low impact, incorporating water sensitive urban design and managing the effects on other regionally significant values and features as identified in this RPS.	Accept
<b>S131.038</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS2.62</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.62</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Introductory text proposed by Ātiawa.	Allow	Accept
<b>S131.038</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.309</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.309</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.  There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.  This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to	Not stated	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
<b>S133.063</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.063</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Supports the acknowledgement of home ownership and access to affordable housing being exacerbated for Māori, however, requests specific mention of Muaūpoko.	Amend to include specific reference of Muaūpoko.	Reject
<b>S133.063</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.410</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.410</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner</p>	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
<b>S140.026</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.026</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Confusing introduction with unclear direction.	Clarify and refine introduction.	Accept
<b>S147.046</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.046</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM	Retain as notified	Accept in part
<b>S147.046</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.110</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.110</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	Reject
<b>S147.046</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.215</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.215</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S154.011</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.011</b>	Investore Property Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Chapter 3.9 introduction to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept
<b>S155.008</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.008</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose in part	The proposed changes will not give effect the NPS-UD.	Amend Chapter 3.9 introduction to give effect to the NPS-UD to recognise that intensification is to be focused around major centres and rapid transit nodes, to support the efficient use of infrastructure and create well-functioning and sustainable urban environments.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S158.012	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.012	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks that chapter focuses on the regional form, design and function of the urban and rural environments. The proposed amendments and inclusions in the chapter create a 'plan within a plan' setting, for example, Objective 22 requires 11 matters to be met for enabling an urban development.</p> <p>Amendments are sought to the proposed amendments for simplification and implementation. The RPS should be read as a whole, and there is no need to include all matters that is covered across the various chapters of the RPS into one objective. The focus should be on enabling urban development, form and function, including housing and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Amend the chapter introduction as follows:</p> <p>Regional form is about the physical arrangement within and between urban and rural communities. Good urban design seeks to ensure that the design of buildings, places, spaces, and networks work well for mana whenua / tangata whenua and communities, and are environmentally responsive.</p> <p><b>Well-functioning urban environments</b></p> <p>The concept of well-functioning urban environments was introduced in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. There are a number of characteristics and qualities that contribute to forming a well-functioning urban environment. Well-functioning urban environments enhance the quality of life for residents as it is easier to get around, allow for a greater supply and choice of housing close to where people work or to public transport, town centres are and provide vibrant, safe, and cohesive centres that enhance business activity. Well-functioning urban environments enable communities and businesses to be more resilient to the effects of climate change, and the uptake of zero and low-carbon emission modes is supported throughout the region. Well-functioning urban environments have compact urban form and are well-designed and planned through the use of spatial and development strategies and use of design guidance. Well-functioning urban environments are low impact, incorporating water sensitive urban design and managing the effects on other regionally significant values and features as identified in this RPS.</p> <p><b>Commercial Centres</b></p> <p>The Central Wellington city contains the central business district for the <b>whole</b> region. Its continued viability, vibrancy and accessibility are important to the whole region. There are also <del>other regionally significant centres that are</del> <b>metropolitan centres that are</b> an important part of the region's form and <b>centres distribution</b>. These centres are significant areas of transport movement and civic and community investment. They also <del>have the potential to</del> support new development and increase the range and diversity of activities <b>across the region</b>. Good quality high and medium density housing in and around these centres, and existing and planned rapid transit stops, would provide increased housing choice and affordability. Further medium and high density development must be enabled within the fast-growing districts of the Region, being those identified in the National Policy Statement for Urban Development as tier 1 territorial authorities. If this development occurs, it will further improve housing affordability <b>and provide for additional housing choice across the</b></p>	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p><b>region.</b></p> <p>Encouraging use and development of existing centres of business activity can also lead to social and economic benefits. Additional local employment around these centres <del>could also</del> <b>can</b> provide people with greater choice about where they work <b>and live in the region.</b> The design of urban and rural communities/smaller centres, the region's industrial business areas, the port, the airport, the road and public transport network, and the region's open space network are fundamental to well-functioning urban environments and a regional form.</p> <p><b>Regional growth and urban development</b></p> <p>The Wellington Regional Growth Framework<sup>3</sup> provides a spatial plan that has been developed by local government, central government, and iwi partners in the Wellington Horowhenua region. It sets out the key issues identified for urban growth and development and provides a 30-year spatial plan that sets a long-term vision for changes and urban development in the Wellington Region.</p> <p>The region has a strong corridor pattern, yet is generally compact. The Wellington Regional Growth Framework identifies the three key growth corridors within the Wellington Region being the western, eastern and Let's Get Wellington Moving growth corridors. Two additional potential west-east corridors are identified. The corridors are shown in Figure 3 below.</p> <p>This corridor pattern is a strength for the region. It reinforces local centres, supports passenger transport, reduces energy use and makes services more accessible.</p> <p><del>{Image}</del> <b>Figure 3: Wellington Regional Growth Framework</b></p> <p>The region is facing growth pressure. Based on the May 2022 Wellington Regional Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA), the Greater Wellington urban environment is expected to grow by around 195,000 people by 2051. As of May 2022, district plans within the Greater Wellington region, does not provide sufficient development capacity for the long term with a shortfall of more than 25,000 dwellings.</p> <p>In more and more areas of the region, housing is unaffordable for many people. Across the region the average rent per week increased by 24 percent between 2018 and 2021 and the average house price increased by 46 percent between 2018 and 2021. The ratio of house values to annual average household income has been steadily increasing as house prices have risen without equivalent rises in incomes. For</p>	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
									<p>instance, the ratio for Wellington City as at March 2021 was 6.75. Home ownership and access to affordable housing issues are exacerbated for Māori; 43 percent of Māori living in the Wellington region were living in owner occupied dwellings compared to 55 percent of the overall population<sup>6</sup>.</p> <p>National direction provided through the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 supports increased supply of housing <b>that includes a range of housing typologies and sizes to assist in meeting the housing needs of the region.</b> <del>affordable housing.</del> <b>Both legislative documents direct urban intensification and development in around the urban environments, centres and existing and planned rapid transit stops, subject that there are no qualifying matters limiting development.</b></p> <p><del>However, high levels of development without suitable constraints risks undermining other characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment. We need to recognise and provide for other regionally significant values and features, including managing freshwater, indigenous biodiversity, values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua and management of the coastal environment. Most of the region, including its existing urban areas, has significant exposure to multiple natural hazards, and there is continuing demand to build in coastal and/or natural hazard-prone areas.</del></p> <p>Medium and high-density development that is enabled through national direction has the potential to <b>be reduced by Councils' identifying qualifying matters in their District Plan that will result in less enabled development capacity and growth across the region</b> <del>result in poor urban design outcomes, in the absence of sufficient design guidance.</del> Development pressure can reduce transport efficiency and limit the ability of all centres to provide community services and employment.</p> <p><b>Regionally significant issues</b> The regionally significant issues and the issues of significance to the Wellington region's <b>territorial authorities and iwi</b> authorities for regional form, design and function are: <b>A. 1. Lack of housing supply and choice</b></p> <p>The Wellington Region lacks sufficient, affordable, and quality (including healthy) housing supply and choice to meet current demand, the needs of projected population growth and the changing needs of our diverse communities. There is a lack of variety of housing types and sizes across the region, including</p>	

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>papakāinga and medium and high density residential living in and around centres and existing and planned transit nodes. All of which impacts housing affordability in the region. Housing affordability has declined significantly over the last decade, causing severe financial difficulty for many lower income households, leaving some with insufficient income to provide for their basic needs and well-being. There is a lack of supporting infrastructure to enable the development of sufficient housing and the provision of quality urban environments. 2. Lack of infrastructure There is a lack of supporting infrastructure and sufficient infrastructure to enable the development of housing and provision of quality urban environments. Enabling housing requires infrastructure, both physical and social infrastructure to support well functioning urban environments. Physical infrastructure includes roading and three waters infrastructure. Social infrastructure includes community facilities and services, and open spaces. Territorial Authorities, network utility operators and infrastructure providers are encouraged to continue providing the additional infrastructure needed to meet the needs of current and future communities. B. 3. Inappropriate land use, activities and development</p> <p>Inappropriate and poorly managed urban land use and activities in <b>parts of</b> the Wellington region have damaged, and continue to jeopardise, the natural environment, degrade ecosystems, particularly aquatic ecosystems, and increased the exposure of communities to the impacts of climate change. This has adversely affected mana whenua/ tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. <b>This has also led to poor quality urban environments. Clear direction is needed to where land-use and development is appropriate and where it is not appropriate. 1. Poor quality urban design</b> Poor quality urban design can adversely affect public health, social equity, land values, the cultural practices and wellbeing of mana whenua / tangata whenua and communities, the vibrancy of local centres and economies, and the provision of, and access to, civic services. It can also increase the use of non-renewable resources and vehicle emissions in the region.</p> <p><b>4. Out of sequence development</b> Out of sequence Sporadic, uncontrolled and/or uncoordinated, development (including of infrastructure) can adversely affect the region's compact form and function. This can, among other things, result in:</p> <p>a) new development that is poorly located in relation to existing infrastructure (such as roads, public transport, water supply, sewage and stormwater systems) and is costly or otherwise difficult to service</p> <p>(b) development in locations that restrict access to the significant physical resource in the region - such as</p>		

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>aggregate</p> <p>(c) the loss of rural or open space land valued for its productive, ecological, aesthetic and recreational qualities</p> <p>(d) insufficient population densities to support public transport and other public services</p> <p>(e) development in locations that undermine existing centres and industrial employment areas</p> <p>(f) loss of vitality and/or viability in the region's central business district and other centres of regional significance</p> <p>(g) displacement of industrial employment activities from established industrial areas</p> <p>(h) adverse effects on the management, use and operation of infrastructure from incompatible land uses under, over, on or adjacent.</p> <p>(i) adverse effects on mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</p> <p><b>5. Lack of Integration of land use and transportation</b> A lack of integration between land use and the region's transportation network can create patterns of development that increase the need for travel, the length of journeys and reliance on private motor vehicles, resulting in:</p> <p>(a) increased emissions to air from a variety of pollutants, including greenhouse gases</p> <p>(b) increased use of energy and reliance on non-renewable resources</p> <p>(c) reduced opportunities for alternate means of travel (such as walking and cycling), increased community severance, and increased costs associated with upgrading roads</p> <p>(d) increased road congestion leading to restricted movement of goods and services to, from and within the region, and compromising the efficient and safe operation of the transport network</p> <p>(e) inefficient use of existing infrastructure (including transport orientated infrastructure).</p>		
<b>S158.012</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS20.034</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.034</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the relief sought to the extent that it is inconsistent with our original submission. In particular, Ātiawa oppose the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora which seek to minimise the intent of other national direction (particularly, NPS-FM and NPS-IB). Recent case law sets out that the NPS-UD and NPS-FW must be read together and reconciled under regional policy statements. Therefore, any amendments that seek to minimise the NPS-FM must be disallowed.</p> <p>Additionally, Ātiawa strongly oppose the amendment where it seeks to delete reference to mana whenua values. This is inappropriate and offensive to Ātiawa. Not only are our values and the role of mana whenua provided for through the RMA and national direction (NPS-UD, NPS-FM and draft NPS-IB), but our partnership with regional council is enacted through Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S162.041	Winstone Aggregates			S162.041	Winstone Aggregates	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Winstone note that this chapter and section references all of the aspects of building, growth and construction apart from the supply of the material and where that comes from. Winstone also seeks amendments to Issue 2 in the Introduction to specifically recognise the need to locally supply aggregate in order to minimise the cost of housing and infrastructure development.	Retain the text recognising that development in locations that restrict access to aggregate resource is a significant issue for the region.  Winstone seeks amendments to the Chapter Introduction to include reference to aggregates, providing a link to Objective 30 of the RPS and to make provision for the need to locally supply aggregate in order to minimise the cost of housing and road production.	Accept in part
S162.041	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.006	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.006	Fulton Hogan Limited	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Quarrying activities can only be located where the resource naturally occurs. This, coupled with the significant contribution transportation has to the cost of aggregate means that local aggregate supplies are required to minimise construction costs. Locally available aggregate supplies are therefore a significant issue for the construction and development in the region and should be recognised in the introductory text.	Allow	Accept in part
S162.041	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.308	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.308	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.	Disallow	Reject
S167.051	Taranaki Whānui			S167.051	Taranaki Whānui	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Cultural visibility and the expression of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā in their areas of interest is important and needs to be articulated throughout the RPS.	Insert a sentence in paragraph 2 (p.76)  <b>Well-functioning urban environments provide for the cultural visibility of mana whenua / tangata whenua to be incorporated, integrated, and expressed through design guides and opportunities.</b>	Accept
S167.051	Taranaki Whānui	FS2.81	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.81	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the introductory text proposed by Taranaki Whānui. Rangitāne agree that cultural visibility in urban form is important.	Allow	Accept
S167.051	Taranaki Whānui	FS6.028	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	FS6.028	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	Regional form, design and function	Support	We support this submission because it supports the visibility of mana whenua / tangata whenua throughout the design of our rohe. This will support awareness of our presence.	Allow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
			Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Ngāti Toa Rangatira	introductory text				
<b>S167.052</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.052</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Cultural visibility and the expression of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā in their areas of interest is important and needs to be articulated throughout the RPS.	Amend paragraph in page 78:  The region is facing growth pressure. <b>It is important to recognise the history of impact and effects from growth and urban development on mana whenua / tangata whenua throughout the Greater Wellington region.</b> Based on the May 2022 Wellington Regional Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA),.....	Accept in part
<b>S167.052</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS2.82</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.82</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the introductory text proposed by Taranaki Whānui. These impacts should be highlighted and acknowledged.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S167.053</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.053</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui are Treaty partners through the Port Nicholson Block (Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika) Claims Settlement Act 2009 and consider it necessary for NPS-UD objective 5 and policy 9 to be appropriately reflected in RPS1. Links to Method UD1 about urban design guidance	Amend the second paragraph (p.79) to reflect objective 5 and policy 9 of the NPS-UD that (objective 5) planning decisions relating to urban environments, and FDSs, take into account the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and (policy 9) provisions in relation to urban environments.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0158</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.0158</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa notes that the Introduction appropriately identifies that home ownership and access to affordable housing is exacerbated for Māori (lower ownership rates than national average). The Introduction includes reference to recognising and providing for regionally significant values and features, which includes values of significance to tangata whenua.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
<b>S168.0158</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.087</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.087</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S162.042	Winstone Aggregates			S162.042	Winstone Aggregates	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Support in part	Winstone also notes that the chapters lists issues of significance to the Wellington region's iwi authorities, and queries whether this should refer to local and iwi authorities.	Clarify if the listed issues are for iwi authorities only, or if they are also for local authorities.	Reject
S162.042	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.309	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.309	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Regional form, design and function introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.	Disallow	Accept
S115.0125	Hutt City Council			S115.0125	Hutt City Council	Regionally significant centres	Support	Support the amendments to the definition as proposed.	Amend the definition as proposed.	Accept
S30.0111	Porirua City Council			S30.0111	Porirua City Council	Tier 1 territorial authority	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion and replacement with the definition of Tier 1 territorial authority under s2 of the RMA. The reason is that the RMA is the primary piece of legislation and the definition applies broader than just the NPS- UD.	Delete definition and replace it with the definition under s2 of the RMA	Accept
S30.0111	Porirua City Council	FS25.028	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.028	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Tier 1 territorial authority	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S34.0109	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0109	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Tier 1 territorial authority	Not Stated / Neutral	Tier 1 authorities - words missing in the note.	Amend definition to fix errors.	Accept
S158.042	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.042	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Urban areas	Support in part	Seeks that the definition is amended to include open space zones.	Amend the definition as follows:  The region's urban areas include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <b>open space zones</b> and industrial zones <b>identified in the District Plans of the Wellington Region.</b> <del>city, Porirua city, Lower Hutt city, Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.</del>	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S30.0113	Porirua City Council			S30.0113	Porirua City Council	Urban areas	Support in part	Definition wording should align with National Planning Standards.	Amend definition as follows:  The region's urban areas include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <b>sport and open space zones</b> , and industrial zones identified in the Wellington	Reject
S30.0111	Porirua City Council	FS25.030	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.030	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Urban areas	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S115.0126	Hutt City Council			S115.0126	Hutt City Council	Urban areas	Support in part	Support but seek amendment to be consistent with the term used for our district plan: the City of Lower Hutt District Plan.	Instead of amending to " <del>Lower Hutt city</del> ", amend as " <b>City of Lower Hutt-city</b> ".	Accept
S140.0127	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0127	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Urban areas	Support in part	To be consistent with the wording and intent of the NPSUD 2020.	Urban areas  The region's urban areas (as at February 2009) include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <del>and</del> industrial zones <b>and Future Development Areas</b> identified in the Wellington city, Porirua city, <b>Lower Hutt city</b> , Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.	Reject
S158.040	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.040	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	City centre zone	Oppose in part	Seeks that the definition is amended to reflect the centres hierarchy proposed within Policy 30, recognising Wellington City as the only City Centre within the context of the RPS.	Amend the definition as follows:  <del>Has the same meaning as in Standard 8 of the National Planning Standards: Areas used predominantly for a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. In the context of the Wellington Region, the City Centre Zone is that of Wellington City.</del> The zone is the main centre for the district or region.	Reject
S16.086	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.086	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Complex development opportunities	Oppose	Council notes the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee has no statutory authority under the RMA. We consider it is inappropriate for a regional policy statement to include provisions that refer to committees and government agencies to jointly develop and implement plans and a framework for development opportunities.	Delete proposed definition for complex development opportunities and associated references throughout the plan change including Method 46.	Accept
S30.0103	Porirua City Council			S30.0103	Porirua City Council	Complex development opportunities	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks that it be deleted:  • It relies on a committee rather than a statutory plan, Future Development Strategy or other planning instrument for identification of relevant land areas.  • It is drafted as a policy rather than a definition and requires a level of assessment and judgement inappropriate for a definition.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.	Accept
S30.0103	Porirua City Council	FS25.019	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.019	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Complex development opportunities	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S115.0119	Hutt City Council			S115.0119	Hutt City Council	Complex development opportunities	Oppose	It is inappropriate for a definition to outsource the meaning of a definition to a third party, in this case the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee, particularly regarding decisions to be made by that third party in future.	Delete definition. (Note our other relief would delete all uses of this term in the RPS in any case).	Accept
S16.087	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.087	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Future Development Strategy	Oppose	All Tier 1 local authorities have a requirement to prepare a FDS in accordance with Subpart 4 of the NPS-UD. All Tier 1 city and district councils in the region are authorised to prepare a FDS in accordance with the NPS-UD. On this basis	Amend as follows:  Future Development Strategy	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								the proposed definition is incorrect and should simply refer to subpart 4 of the NPS-UD.	Means any Future Development Strategy prepared <b>and published for the Wellington Regional</b> in accordance with Subpart 4 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.	
<b>S30.0123</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.0123</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Council opposes all "consideration" policies since they often duplicate or conflict with "regulatory" policies, and represent regulatory overreach without sufficient s32 evaluation or other evidence. We consider that they will create unnecessary regulatory costs due to the way they are drafted. They assume a level of knowledge and expertise on a range of matters generally not available to consent authorities, and in some cases represent a transfer of s31 functions to territorial authorities.	Not stated.	Accept in part
<b>FS25.041</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>FS25.041</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - consideration policies	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S140.002</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.002</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	The title of the regulatory policies as 'consideration' policies set out in chapter 4.2 creates confusion for their statutory weighting and should be amended.	Amend the wording of the title of the regulatory policies as outlined in Chapter 4.2 from 'Consideration' to 'Give particular regard'.	Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Considers that all of the policies in Chapter 4.2 have been worded to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria). Seek that all policies directing matters of consideration for resource consent are deleted from the regional policy statement in full.	That Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full. OR In the alternative that this relief is not granted, seek that the policies are reworded to state the intended outcome such that regional and district plans giving effect to the regional policy statement are suitably informed of the desired outcomes to address identified resource management issues.	Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.013</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.013</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS3.032</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.032</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	WK supports submission in part and also seeks clarification as to the intent and implementation of this policy.	Not stated	Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS20.031</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.031</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Ātiawa strongly oppose the submission point, it would be inappropriate to delete Chapter 4.2, the chapter contains important strategic policy direction to plan users on how te taiao must be managed, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA, national policy and other statutory direction.	Disallow	Reject
<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Considers that a number of policies have been worded within the chapter to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria).	Seek that Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full, however seeks that Policy UD.3 is retained with amendments and relocated to Chapter 4.1.	Reject
<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.014</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.014</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana	Disallow	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.		
S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose in part	Submission in reference to Chapter Introduction and Table of Contents Chapter 4.2. The introduction (above the table) incorrectly states the weight to be given to the chapter's policies when changing or varying regional and district plans. Those plans must give effect to the RPS, not have particular regard to the RPS' provisions.	This section contains the policies that need to be given particular regard, where relevant, when assessing and deciding on resource consents or notices of requirement. <b>The policies must be given effect to</b> when changing, or varying district or regional plans. Within this section, policies are presented in numeric order, although the summary table below lists the policy titles by topic headings.	Accept in part
S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept in part
S124.015	KiwiRail Holdings Limited			S124.015	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	General comments - definitions	Support in part	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a definition for "well-functioning urban environments" which is consistent with the NPS-UD.	New definition of "well- functioning urban environments" <b>Well-functioning urban environment has the meaning in Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</b>	Accept
S124.015	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS11.027	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.027	Fulton Hogan Limited	General comments - definitions	Support	A definition for 'well-functioning urban environment' consistent with the NPS-UD may assist with minimising conflict between urban environments and activities such as quarrying.	Allow	Accept
S124.015	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS3.052	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.052	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - definitions	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the inclusion of a definition for well-function urban environments that is aligned with the NPS-UD	Allow	Accept
S168.008	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.008	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	It is Rangitāne o Wairarapa's view that the plan change goes further than this, and proposes a number of policies which, in title at least, seek to manage land use and development as it impacts on freshwater in 'urban' environments.No definition of 'urban development' has been proposed, leaving this term open to interpretation as to what constitutes 'urban development', and what doesn't.	Add a definition of 'urban development'.	Reject
S168.008	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.022	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.022	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - definitions	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will	Not stated	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
<b>S128.063</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.063</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - definitions	Support in part	Amend the existing RPS definition, to be more consistent with the NPS for Highly Productive Land 2022, and the WRGF, to capture Land use classes 1-3.	Amend as follows:Highly protective agricultural land is Class I and, II and III land in the land use capability classes of the New Zealand Land Resources Inventory. Also trigger consequential amendment to Policy 59	Reject
<b>S137.047</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			<b>S137.047</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	General comments - definitions	Support in part	A new definition is required to support submission points on Policies 55 and 56 until maps of highly productive land are operative in the RPS. The proposed submission aligns with NPS-HPL 2022 clause 3.5(7).	Insert new definition as shown below: <b>Highly Productive Land</b> Until highly productive land is mapped and operative in this Regional Policy Statement, highly productive land refers to land that, as of 17 October 2022:• Is zoned general rural or rural production and is Land Use Capability 1, 2, or 3 land; and• Is not identified for future urban development or subject to a Council initiated or adopted notified plan change to rezone it to urban or rural lifestyle.	Reject
<b>S137.047</b>	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	<b>FS28.092</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.092</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - definitions	Support	HortNZ support amendments to align with the NPSHPL	Allow	Reject
<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council		Porirua City Council	<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Clear and concise definitions are critical to assist in interpretation and implementation of the RPS.	Add any further definitions for any terms that are unclear and where a definition would assist in interpretation and implementation, including any relevant terms proposed to be introduced in response to submissions.	Accept in part
<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.132</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.132</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - definitions	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S19.001</b>	Steven Ensslen			<b>S19.001</b>	Steven Ensslen	General comments - overall	Support	Strongly supports increasing density. There is a clear need to reduce the number of single family detached homes being built.	Retain provisions seeking to increase density.	Accept
<b>S31.033</b>	Robert Anker			<b>S31.033</b>	Robert Anker	General comments - overall	Oppose	The submitter referred to Clause 44 of Preamble to the Proposed Regional Policy Statement. Council order paper (p.10) (18 August 2022)  This clause clearly states that it is the deliberate intention of GWRC to use the RPS to create a change in the directives contained in NPS-UD by wrapping constraints around housing intensification direction. In doing so GWRC is acting Ultra Vires and is once again following the path for which it was severely admonished by the Environment Court in that it is making regulation by fiat. All Councillors have made themselves a party to this intention and are jointly and	Amend the document to remove any and all clauses that seek to implement the intention stated above which is contrary to the intent and direction contained in NPS-UD.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>severally responsible for it.</p> <p>The community is increasingly troubled by the council's apparent belief that it has the right, power and mandate to regulate matters more properly the domain of central government, and to ignore limits imposed by central government where the council disagrees.</p> <p>It is not the place of the GWRC to be the self-appointed arbiter in deciding which parts of Government policy contained in a NPS it will choose to fully implement. Local government's role is to implement what central government has mandated, not to go beyond and create regional inconsistencies.</p>		
<b>S31.035</b>	Robert Anker			<b>S31.035</b>	Robert Anker	General comments - overall	Oppose	<p>Page 15, The focus of RPS Change 1 is to implement and support the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD),</p> <p>Another statement of support and again the intention to constrain makes this disingenuous.</p>	Require GWRC to be consistent and not pose contradictory statements in the document.	Reject
<b>S106.005</b>	Patricia (Dr) Laing			<b>S106.005</b>	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>The NPS-UD has implications for beekeeping. In the Upper Hutt City Council area the titles in some new developments limit the number of beehives that property owners can host. On the other hand, some commercial beekeepers have arrangements with UHCC to place high numbers of hives on Council land adjoining new developments which raises a question about whether this could be regarded as "boundary stacking".</p>	Landowners' usage rights relating to beekeeping need clarification.	No recommendation
<b>S151.012</b>	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			<b>S151.012</b>	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	General comments - overall	Support in part	<p>Strongly support that "Change 1" will significantly influence the shape of the region's cities and towns through encouraging urban intensification that will lead to lower emissions infrastructure and new, compact housing development around travel corridors.</p>	Amend provisions to ensure that new development around travel corridors should consider a mix of uses (rather than simply housing) where possible and viable, to further support the creation of walkable neighbourhood environments that support wellbeing through equitable access to essential infrastructure and amenities, including green spaces.	Accept
<b>S151.012</b>	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	<b>FS13.001</b>	Wellington City Council	<b>FS13.001</b>	Wellington City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.</p>	Allow	Accept
<b>S154.002</b>	Investore Property Limited			<b>S154.002</b>	Investore Property Limited	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	<p>Council is required to amend the RPS to give effect to the NPS-UD and specifically the objectives and policies applying to tier 1 urban environments.</p> <p>Specifically, the requirements to amend its RPS to enable building heights and urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use in metropolitan centre zones under Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>However, the changes proposed under RPS Change 1 are not consistent with the recognition of metropolitan centre zones in the NPS-UD, which make it difficult for the Council to then implement Policy 3. The RPS may fail to give effect to the NPS-UD in this regard.</p> <p>Amendments are not supported as they fail to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban</p>	Amend RPS to give effect to the NPS-UD to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								<p>environments.</p> <p>Seeks that RPS Change 1 is amended to enable an urban form in metropolitan centres that reflects the demand for housing and business use. In Johnsonville, this would reflect significant demand and intensification.</p> <p>The amendments to the RPS are disparate and are unlikely to achieve the strategic purpose of the NPS-UD, including Policy 1 of the NPS-UD to contribute to well-functioning urban environments.</p>		
<b>S155.002</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited			<b>S155.002</b>	Stride Investment Management Limited	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	<p>Council is required to amend the RPS to give effect to the NPS-UD and specifically the objectives and policies applying to tier 1 urban environments.</p> <p>Specifically, the requirements to amend its RPS to enable building heights and urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use in metropolitan centre zones under Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>However, the changes proposed under RPS Change 1 are not consistent with the recognition of metropolitan centre zones in the NPS-UD, which make it difficult for the Council to then implement Policy 3. The RPS may fail to give effect to the NPS-UD in this regard.</p> <p>Amendments are not supported as they fail to recognise that the NPS-UD seeks to focus intensification around centres and rapid transport nodes, to ensure efficient use of infrastructure, and to enable more sustainable urban environments.</p> <p>Seeks that RPS Change 1 is amended to enable an urban form in metropolitan centres that reflects the demand for housing and business use. In Johnsonville, this would reflect significant demand and intensification.</p> <p>The amendments to the RPS are disparate and are unlikely to achieve the strategic purpose of the NPS-UD, including Policy 1 of the NPS-UD to contribute to well-functioning urban environments.</p>	Amend RPS to give effect to the NPS-UD to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part
<b>S11.023</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			<b>S11.023</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	General comments - overall	Support in part	<p>Can we remove all the words information, promote, support and encourage to an action. We have been doing this for years and now is time for action. Still too passive. My local Council have been ignoring your information, promotion, support and encouragement to date. The document is far too passive.</p>	Use stronger language throughout the document: Replace "information", "promote", "support" and "encourage" with "implement" or "incentivize" (or better word), Replace "consideration" with "essential". Replace "non-regulatory" with "regulatory".	Accept in part
<b>S16.097</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.097</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Support in part	<p>Objectives : Many objectives are not drafted clearly with regard to what outcome is sought, and some do not appear to be achievable within the scope of a regional policy statement.</p>	Ensure all objectives are specific, state what is to be achieved where and when, clearly relate to (or state) an issue, and can be determined through implementation and monitoring whether the objectives have been met. Delete all objectives that are not achievable within the scope of a regional policy statement (with respect to legal justification, and the effectiveness and efficiency in light of alternative methods outside of the regional policy statement).	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
S16.0100	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0100	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inappropriate use of verbs within objectives and policies: There are a number of examples throughout RPS Change 1 that proposes the use of verbs within objectives and policies that do not align with the RMA or relevant higher-level statutory planning documents. Council submits that the use of the correct verb in each instance is of critical importance due to their specific meaning and requirements for implementation that have been determined through case law. Council has not identified all instances of the use of inappropriate verbs, but this submission requests all verbs are reviewed and replaced where appropriate.	All verbs used in objectives and policies are reviewed and replaced with the appropriate verb in accordance with the RMA and relevant higher-level statutory planning documents.	Accept in part
S16.0102	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0102	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Use of 'and/or' throughout RPS Change 1: We note the use of and/or generally means a choice can be made. This is an issue across RPS Change 1 where it appears there is uncertainty as to whether there should be a choice or not. We request all instances of 'and / or' are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	All instances of and/or are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	Accept in part
S16.0103	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0103	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Plan-wide provisions that are based on the misconception that district plan content, decision making on resource consents or notices of requirement by the Council are not limited by legislation: There are many examples in the plan change where there is a misconception that a district plan can require certain actions or require specific changes in behaviour. There are many free-market factors that district plans cannot regulate, and therefore should be pursued by the regional council via non-regulatory methods. Examples include but are not limited to: • Emission of greenhouse gases. • Transportation mode choice. • Restoration and enhancement activities. Nature based solutions	Delete all district plan requirements where the proposed methods (including the consideration of RPS policies, district plan making, resource consents, and notices of requirement) attempt to regulate free-market activities and behaviours of individuals that are not clearly supported by the RMA or a higher-level statutory planning document.	Accept in part
S16.0104	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0104	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Explanations to objectives and policies: There are many examples where explanations to objectives and policies either contain information that is unnecessary, or content that should be included in the relevant objective or policy itself. Explanations can provide useful context in some situations, but as they have no legal status under the RMA they should be used sparingly and appropriately.	Review and amend all explanations to objectives and policies to: a. Delete those that are unnecessary; and b) Delete text that should have been included in the relevant objective or policy	Accept in part
S16.0106	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0106	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or an evidence base that supports and justifies the proposed provisions: We have been unable to find an evidence base supporting and justifying a number of provisions in the plan change. The section 32 evaluation does not assist us in understanding the resource management basis or evidence base for many of the proposed provisions - particularly where a regulatory method is proposed.	Delete all provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or a robust evidence base that supports and justifies their inclusion in a regional policy statement.	Accept in part
S30.0116	Porirua City Council			S30.0116	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The real value of regional policy statements is to provide policy direction that either does not exist at a national level or exists at a national level but needs to be articulated at a regional level. Council is concerned about the many provisions in Proposed Change 1 that either duplicate or are inconsistent with matters now comprehensively addressed by national direction. In some instances, they duplicate national direction without giving specific guidance in a Wellington Region context.	Greater alignment with National Direction	Accept in part
S30.0116	Porirua City Council	FS25.033	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.033	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific	Allow	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
								relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Council has concerns over jurisdictional issues, particularly in relation to the discharge of contaminants to air, land and water; and the management of fresh waterbodies. We consider that various provisions are ultra vires in terms of our respective functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA. Further, territorial authorities do not have the capacity or capability to undertake these functions. Many of the provisions as required would require a transfer of powers from regional councils to territorial authorities.	Query in relation to s30 and s31 functions, RMA, 1991	Accept in part
<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.034</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.034</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S30.0120</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.038</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.038</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
<b>S34.0111</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0111</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Council has not: • undertaken a complete check of whether detailed relief sought in this submission, could be/are partly or fully addressed by other provisions in RPS PC1 • undertaken a full review of background documents and higher order documents supporting or relating to these provisions • identified all consequential amendments needed in response to relief sought on specific provisions or that might address our concerns	Seeks any and all other amendments that will address the relief sought.	Accept in part
<b>S34.0115</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0115</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or that extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct: Council has significant concerns that many of the proposed provisions attempt to require city and district councils to carry out some of the functions of regional councils or require Council to address resource management issues in its district plan that are beyond its statutory functions, powers and duties under the RMA. GWRC is not able to legitimately direct these outcomes. Council considers these provisions ultra vires.	Council opposes the provisions and seeks that the RPS is reviewed and amended to more appropriately and accurately reflect the powers, functions and duties of the regional, district and city councils.	Accept in part
<b>S34.0116</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0116</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for provisions, and policies which duplicate national direction: Many of the proposed provisions do not appear to be adequately supported within the Section 32 Assessment by robust evidence, including any existing legislation or higher-level strategic planning document such as a national policy statement. This is particularly evident for the proposed climate change and indigenous biodiversity provisions.	Council submits that a full legal and planning review is undertaken to address these inconsistencies and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.	Accept in part
<b>S34.0117</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0117</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of consideration of scale of provisions: The requirements and evidence base to develop the thresholds require significant effort and resourcing, which Council is not in a position to undertake, and in some cases, thresholds may not be an appropriate mechanism to address effects	Council contends that GWRC should further consider the practicalities associated with threshold-based provisions, to determine if this is the most appropriate method to achieve an objective or policy or develop guidance jointly with territorial authorities to support the development of provisions and decision-making process. Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Accept/reject
<b>S34.0118</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0118</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inadequacy of Section 32 Assessment: Council is concerned that the Section 32 assessment is not sufficiently evidenced and does not fully evaluate whether many of the regulatory provisions are practical / can be achieved and are the best method of achieving the outcomes sought.	These provisions should be deleted and considered in a later plan change.	Accept in part
<b>S34.0120</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0120</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Council considers that there are fundamental issues with the proposed provisions that require significant revision or deletion to ensure the RPSPC1 is legally robust and practical to implement. Thus, Council seeks that GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of the proposed provisions and amend the RPSPC1 to address these concerns, including detailed submission points on individual provisions included in Table 1.	Council also seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought.	Accept in part
<b>S100.029</b>	Meridian Energy Limited			<b>S100.029</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Tables 1A, 3, 4, 6 (a) and 9. Some amendments may be necessary where changes are made to the titles of policies and methods.	Amend the titles of the policies and methods referred to in Tables 1A, 3, 4, 6(a) and 9 where necessary to reflect any amendments made as a result of the foregoing submission points 1 to 28.	Accept in part
<b>S82.005</b>	Jonathan Markwick			<b>S82.005</b>	Jonathan Markwick	General comments - regulatory policies	Support	Support all policies and changes that encourage or enable high density housing in the city centre and inner suburbs	Retain as notified.	Accept in part