

Appendix 1 – Accept/Reject Table

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S29.005	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)			S29.005	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General comments - overall	Support in part	Under the existing NPS-FM, mineral and aggregate extraction is prohibited on land deemed to be natural wetlands, the definition of which is very broad. The Government is taking steps to amend this with a revised definition and by introducing a consent pathway for minerals and aggregates.	RPS Change 1 not to be finalized before the release of revised NPS-FM.		Reject	P1S1
S29.005	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS27.002	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.002	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Support	Winstone considers consistency with national direction is required and to achieve this, the RPS should recognise the significance of aggregate extraction for the region.	Allow		Reject	P1S1
S29.005	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS20.268	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.268	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	P1S1
S29.006	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)			S29.006	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	General comments - overall	Support	The NPS Highly Productive Land has recently been released and the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity is to be released later in the year. Both statements recognise the significance of aggregate extraction.	The RPS should be consistent with the existing and upcoming NPS.		Reject	P1S1
S29.006	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS28.001	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.001	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - overall	Support	The submitter seeks that the RPS be consistent with the NPSHPL and forthcoming NPSIB; HortNZ support aligning PC1 to be consistent with national direction.	Allow	Allow amendment to be consistent with national direction	Reject	P1S1
S29.006	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA)	FS20.269	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.269	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	Disallow		Accept	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
								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>S73.001</b>	Alicia Hall			<b>S73.001</b>	Alicia Hall	General comments - overall	Support	As a parent and resident of Pōneke Wellington I fully support the proposed Regional Policy Statement. I support GWRC to make decisions and policies that benefit the wellbeing and health of all communities, all people and to enrich and enhance our biodiversity and environment. Being good ancestors for our tamariki.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
<b>S80.006</b>	Anders Crofoot			<b>S80.006</b>	Anders Crofoot	General comments - overall	Oppose	I wish to support the submission of Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The Wairarapa Federated Farmers submission goes into much greater detail than my submission and I am in broad agreement with it.	Support the submission of Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
<b>S131.001</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.001</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	Support in part	In principle Ātiawa supports the overall intent of the RPS Change 1, to address significant and urgent resource management issues (climate change, indigenous biodiversity, freshwater and urban development). However, there are further amendments required to provide for Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai values and role as mana whenua.	Amend RPS Change 1 to provide for Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai values and role as mana whenua.	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
<b>S131.001</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.002</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.002</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S131.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	Support	Ātiawa supports an integrated approach to resource management. The concept of integrated management aligns with te tirohanga Māori/Māori worldview of understanding te ao Tūroa, the natural world as an interconnected, interdependent whole. These provisions enable mana whenua values and provide for our mātauranga to be applied to resource management.	Retain as notified.	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S131.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.44	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.44	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Rangitāne strongly support the Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (Ātiawa) view that the concept of integrated management aligns with te tirohanga Māori/Māori worldview of understanding te ao Tūroa, the natural world as an interconnected, interdependent whole. Rangitāne agree that these provisions enable mana whenua values and provide for our mātauranga to be applied to resource management.	Allow	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S131.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.206	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.206	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S131.007	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.007	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Mana whenua have an interest in all parts of te ao Tūroa/the natural world. Ātiawa look forward to strengthening our relationship with Greater Wellington Regional Council. Although Ātiawa is pleased that mātauranga Māori is being given its due recognition by Regional Council, Ātiawa stress that mātauranga Māori and other forms of Māori data must be provided the appropriate protections. This includes, Māori data sovereignty, including but not limited to the way Māori data is stored, protected, accessed, shared, used and analysed. Ātiawa support provisions that seek to develop tikanga and kawa to govern Māori data sovereignty, we look forward to developing tikanga and kawa for data sovereignty for mātauranga-a-Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai.	Ātiawa seek a partnership with Greater Wellington Regional Council across all resource management matters, Ātiawa seeks that Regional Council move beyond thinking that limits mana whenua values to 'cultural' or 'spiritual', this philosophy is out-dated and unfairly restricts mana whenua involvement in resource management and decision-making processes.	Accept	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S131.007	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.120	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.120	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this submission point. We believe that mātauranga can and will only be led (and in some instances implemented) by tangata whenua. This is something that GWRC cannot do and must defer responsibility to tangata whenua. Māori Data Sovereignty is also a very crown - tangata whenua relationship driven conversation. It is about protecting our mātauranga from misuse, by the crown and councils. It is vital that GWRC prioritises Māori Data Sovereignty (or as we have referred to it - mana mātauranga a-hapū) to ensure that safe spaces are provided for our whānau, hapū and iwi to participate in mātauranga solutions.	Allow	Accept	FPP and P1S1
S131.007	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.211	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.211	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	General comments - overall	Oppose	1. The NPS-UD is the primary driver for PC1. Expansion of the scope of PC1 to include freshwater, indigenous biodiversity and climate change response is premature and unnecessary. 2. Although Whaitua Implementation Programmes have been developed for three of the five Whaitua, the process has not yet concluded in all Whaitua. Therefore, the proposed PC1 freshwater policies are not fully informed by the outcomes of Whaitua engagement processes. 3. There is a risk that the climate change and indigenous biodiversity provisions will misalign or conflict with national guidance. 4. PC1 is inconsistent with the Zero Carbon Act and New Zealand's wider approach to climate change	Withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those detailed in other submission points.	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS2.40	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.40	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose	The NPS-FM has been in place since August 2020 and implementation should already be well under way. Te Mana o te Wai is not a new concept. These changes are long overdue and the sooner we have a strategic framework in place, the sooner implementation can begin. We need action now for our future generations.	Disallow	Accept	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS19.064	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.064	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - overall	Oppose	Wholesale withdrawal of provisions is not justified by the submitter's stated reasons. Further, the submission may lead to the provisions being retained, but amended in ways that are presently unknown due to the lack of specificity in the submission, which is opposed so as to ensure Wellington Water can have appropriate input in relation to any such amendments.	Disallow		Accept	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS28.002	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.002	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - overall	Support in part	As alternative relief to that expressed in HortNZ's primary submission, HortNZ would support the withdrawal of the freshwater, indigenous biodiversity and climate change for consideration in a future plan change in 2024 (to enable consistency with upcoming NPSIB direction and other relevant national direction).	Allow in part		Reject	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.003	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.003	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS9.001	Wairarapa Water Users Society	FS9.001	Wairarapa Water Users Society	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth in a process separate to the RPS change 1.	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S78.001	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS21.001	Irrigation NZ	FS21.001	Irrigation NZ	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth in a process separate to the RPS change 1.	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S78.005	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited		Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.313	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		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		Reject	P1S1
S78.005	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.005	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	General comments - regulatory policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to the chapter heading and introduction detailed on page 95 of PC1 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified		Accept in part	P1S1
S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that replacing the expression 'indigenous biological diversity' with 'indigenous biodiversity' is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified		Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.326	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.326	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	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.	Reject	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process	
S78.040	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.040	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts, and neither supports nor opposes the following provisions of PC1 that are intended to give effect to the NPS-UD, including: The proposed definitions and amendments to or deletions of the definitions of 'city centre zone', 'complex development opportunities', 'future development strategy', 'high density development', 'hydrological controls', 'key centres', 'marae', 'medium density residential development', 'metropolitan centre zone', 'national grid', 'papakainga', 'regional form', 'regionally significant centres', 'relevant residential zone', 'small scale', 'tier 1 territorial authority', 'tier 1 urban environment', 'urban areas' and 'urban environment'	Retain as notified	Accept in part	P1S1	
S78.040	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.348	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.348	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - definitions	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.	Reject	P1S1
S32.038	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.316	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.316	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - definitions	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	FPP and P1S1	
S90.005	Bronwyn Bell			S90.005	Bronwyn Bell	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Request councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams boosted and upskilled to become more comfortable and confident at doing "density done well" by intensification.	No decision required	P1S1	
S90.006	Bronwyn Bell			S90.006	Bronwyn Bell	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the provisions for uplifting Te Mana o te Wai	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1	
S25.044	Carterton District Council			S25.044	Carterton District Council	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Support	CDC is generally supportive of the non-regulatory methods proposed but notes that there will be financial implications in giving effect to these. CDC would seek practical and financial support from GWRC in implementing these methods.	Retain the policies.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1	
S25.014	Carterton District Council			S25.014	Carterton District Council	General comments - regulatory policies	Oppose	CDC considers that the approach of scattering climate change, indigenous ecosystems and freshwater policies throughout Chapter 4.1 makes the plan very difficult to use.	Re-label policies so that numbering is continuous, or group the CC, FW and IE policies together.	Reject	FPP and P1S1	
S25.014	Carterton District Council	FS13.011	Wellington City Council	FS13.011	Wellington City Council	General comments - regulatory policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Reject	FPP and P1S1	

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S25.014	Carterton District Council	FS3.015	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.015	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - regulatory policies	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point - better consistency is needed.	Allow	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S17.007	Chelsea Kershaw			S17.007	Chelsea Kershaw	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams to be upskilled in climate change policy and density-done-well by intensification.	No decision required	P1S1
S142.006	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)			S142.006	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)	General comments - overall	Support	Highly supportive of efforts to align provisions in the Regional Policy Statement with climate and mode shift commitments made by national, regional and local authorities, often in non-statutory documents.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	P1S1
S136.001	DairyNZ			S136.001	DairyNZ	General comments - overall	Oppose	Recent direction from the High Court to Otago Regional Council, on the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement indicates the scope for use of the streamlined freshwater planning process is narrower than GWRC appears to consider. Further, concerned at the significant lack of robust analysis in the s32 analysis of PC1 to the RPS, particularly in relation to climate change, freshwater and biodiversity under PC1, including a lack of assessment of the economic and social costs to primary production, rural communities and the regional economy, and a lack of assessment given to the costs and benefits of waiting for further national direction in these areas. Considers a more efficient and effective process would be to postpone these changes to the RPS with the scheduled full review of the RPS in 2024 to better align with the NRP Plan Changes (1, 2 and 3), to allow for a more robust assessment of the proposed provisions and to provide for further national direction in these areas, to enable a better-informed assessment of GWRC's role in addressing these issues.	Reduce scope to changes needed to address the NPS-UD and urban climate change related issues only. Postpone all other changes (freshwater, biodiversity, climate change) until at least the scheduled full review of the RPS and Regional Plan in 2024.	Reject	FPP

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S136.001	DairyNZ	FS2.5	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.5	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose	The NPS-FM has been in place since August 2020 and implementation should already be well under way. Te Mana o te Wai is not a new concept. Likewise, local government is already required to have regard to the National Climate Adaptation Plan and Emissions Reduction Plan. These changes are long overdue and the sooner we have a strategic framework in place to address these issues, the sooner implementation can begin. Rangitāne is concerned at the inertia in addressing climate change. We need action now for our future generations.	Disallow		Accept	FPP
S136.001	DairyNZ	FS27.003	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.003	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Support	Winstone agrees that preempting the direction of national policy documents is inappropriate and that it is more appropriate to address various National Policy Statements in 2023 when they have been finalised. Winstone also considers that use of the Freshwater Planning Process is far too broad and that the scope of this should be significantly narrowed.	Allow		Reject	FPP
S136.001	DairyNZ	FS28.003	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.003	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - overall	Support in part	As alternative relief to that expressed in HortNZ's primary submission, HortNZ would withdrawal of the freshwater, indigenous biodiversity and climate change for consideration in a future plan change in 2024 (to enable consistency with upcoming NPSIB direction and other relevant national direction).	Allow in part		Reject	FPP
S136.001	DairyNZ	FS9.003	Wairarapa Water Users Society	FS9.003	Wairarapa Water Users Society	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth in a process separate to the RPS change 1.	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Reject	FPP
S136.001	DairyNZ	FS21.003	Irrigation NZ	FS21.003	Irrigation NZ	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth in a process separate to the RPS change 1.	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Reject	FPP
S32.021	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.299	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.299	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 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		No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S32.021	Director-General of Conservation			S32.021	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	The proposed changes appropriately respond to climate change and national direction.	Retain as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.		Accept in part	FPP and P1S1



Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S32.034	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.312	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.312	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	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	FPP and P1S1
S32.034	Director-General of Conservation			S32.034	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Support	The proposed changes appropriately and usefully allocate responsibilities for biodiversity and freshwater.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S32.035	Director-General of Conservation			S32.035	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Support	The proposed changes appropriately respond to climate change and national direction.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S32.035	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.313	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.313	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - non-regulatory 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 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	FPP and P1S1
S32.036	Director-General of Conservation			S32.036	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - regulatory methods	Support	The proposed changes appropriately revise the methods to support proposed changes to objectives and policies, including changes supported in this submission.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S32.036	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.314	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.314	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - regulatory methods	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	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S32.038	Director-General of Conservation			S32.038	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - definitions	Support in part	The proposed definitions generally appropriately reflect national direction and/or support changes to objectives, policies and methods.	Retain as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S53.004	Ellen Legg			S53.004	Ellen Legg	General comments - overall	Support	Not stated.	Council planning, consent, and regulatory teams should be up skilled so they have greater ability to create density done well.	No decision required	P1S1
S74.001	Finn Hall			S74.001	Finn Hall	General comments - overall	Support	Kia ora, My name is Finn and I am 13 years old. I have lived in the Wellington Region since I was 3 years old. I am writing on behalf of my siblings, Tara (7) and Brodie (11) and myself. We support the Regional Policy Statement.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S114.008	Fulton Hogan Ltd			S114.008	Fulton Hogan Ltd	General comments - overall	Support in part	It is critical that Regional Policy Statements (RPS) recognise and provide for the extraction of aggregate resources, as these contribute to the construction and maintenance of cost effective building, roads and housing. The importance of aggregate supply has been recognised in recent national policy direction such as the proposed draft of the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F), and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). It is important that this support flows through the planning document hierarchy.	Retain as notified	Reject	P1S1
S114.008	Fulton Hogan Ltd	FS27.001	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.001	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Support	Winstone Aggregates ('Winstone') agrees that aggregate extraction and supply is critical to the construction and maintenance of housing and infrastructure. Winstone also seeks specific support for this in the RPS and planning document hierarchy	Allow	Reject	P1S1
S76.004	Gene Clendon			S76.004	Gene Clendon	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the provisions for uplifting Te Mana o te Wai.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S141.008	Generation Zero Wellington			S141.008	Generation Zero Wellington	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the direction and vision that is enabled through these changes to the Regional Policy Statement, we see the need for this tool as a way to point the Wellington region along a path that supports greater climate, housing and environmental justice.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	P1S1
S60.005	Grant Buchan			S60.005	Grant Buchan	General comments - overall	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	No decision required	P1S1
S94.015	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.015	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - consideration policies	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S94.016	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.016	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S94.017	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.017	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S94.018	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.018	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - regulatory methods	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S94.019	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.019	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - non-regulatory methods	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	Accept in part FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S94.020	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.020	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S94.022	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.022	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - definitions	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S115.0116	Hutt City Council			S115.0116	Hutt City Council	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support in part	No reasons given	Consequential amendments to reflect relief sought on related provisions.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S115.0118	Hutt City Council			S115.0118	Hutt City Council	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	No reasons given	Consequential amendments to definitions, deleted definitions, and new definitions as appropriate for our other requested relief.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S139.002	Ian Gunn			S139.002	Ian Gunn	General comments - overall	Support	Progress has been made to truly create a co governance structure in resource management. An iwi point of view will add a new dimension and advance resource management in the Wairarapa due to their holistic approach and feelings for the whenua and awa.	Retain as notified.	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S139.002	Ian Gunn	FS2.124	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.124	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	We endorse the submitters support for the provisions. We believe mātauranga driven and te ao Māori inclusive solutions are what our whenua and awa need to be resilient to current and future challenges, including climate change. We need to do the best we can now for our mokopuna to come.	Allow	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S37.004	Jennifer Van Beynen			S37.004	Jennifer Van Beynen	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	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.		No decision required	P1S1
S158.043	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.043	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the intent of PC1, in general, seeks better clarity within the objectives and policies so that they are measureable and provide direction as to how the objectives or policy can be achieved.	Seeks better clarity within the objectives and policies so that they are measureable and provide direction as to how the objectives or policy can be achieved. Amendments sought and required across all of PC1.		No decision required	P1S1
S158.043	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS13.002	Wellington City Council	FS13.002	Wellington City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow		No decision required	P1S1
S158.043	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS3.002	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.002	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - overall	Support	Waka Kotahi agrees that better clarity is needed on how the objectives and policies will be achieved.	Allow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be allowed and seeks to be involved in the development of any amendments.	No decision required	P1S1
S158.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - overall	Support in part	Giving effect to higher order documents - notes that PC1 includes provisions to give effect to the NPS-FM and provisions related to indigenous biodiversity, in anticipation of a new National Policy Statement on Indigenous Whilist supports this, it is noted that the NPSFM is most likely subject to change through the exposure draft and that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) is yet to be gazetted. Both of these higher order documents will trigger and require the GWRC to make changes to the RPS to align with these higher order documents. In some instances, PC1 seeks requirements on landowners beyond the current NPS-FM that is considered to be more onerous and restrictive.	Seeks that amendments to PC1 are made to align and does not go beyond what is required under the NPS-FM and NPS-IB (once gazetted).		No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S158.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS10.026	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.026	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	General comments - overall	Support	The Fuel Companies agree PC1 needs to be amended to align with and ensure it does not go beyond what is required under the NPS-FM (including the 8 Dec 22 amendments) and the NPS-IB (once gazetted).	Allow	Allow the submission. The Fuel Companies seek to be involved in the development of any amendments.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S158.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS24.022	Powerco Limited	FS24.022	Powerco Limited		Support	Powerco agrees PC1 needs to be amended to align with and ensure it does not go beyond what is required under the NPS-FM (including the 8 Dec 22 amendments) and the NPS-IB (once gazetted).	Allow	Allow the submission. Powerco seeks to be involved in the development of any amendments.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S158.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS3.003	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.003	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)		Support	Waka Kotahi agree that amendments should be aligned with national direction.	Allow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be allowed and seeks to be involved in the development of any amendments.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S16.0101	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0101	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Consequential relief: Many consequential amendments will be required across RPS provisions to give effect to the relief sought in this submission. Although these provisions and amendments are generally not specifically identified in the submission, Council requests all consequential amendments are made	All necessary consequential amendments are made to the RPS to give effect to the relief sought in its submission		No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S16.096	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.096	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	All methods where we oppose city and district councils being responsible for delivery of policies: Consequential amendments, additions, and deletions are necessary to all methods relevant to our submission.	Amend all methods in accordance with Council's submission, and in accordance with section 31 of the RMA, and relevant higher-level statutory planning documents		No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S16.099	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.099	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Consequential amendments: Many consequential amendments will be required across RPS provisions to give effect to the relief sought in this submission. Although these provisions and amendments are generally not specifically identified in the submission, Council requests all consequential amendments are made.	All necessary consequential amendments are made to the RPS to give effect to the relief sought in its submission.		No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S85.004	Lachlan Patterson			S85.004	Lachlan Patterson	General comments - overall	Support	Strongly support the provisions incorporating Te Mana o te Wai, supporting the Blue Belt, and supporting climate resilient urban areas.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S85.005	Lachlan Patterson			S85.005	Lachlan Patterson	General comments - overall	Support	Strongly support the provisions strengthening protection and enhancement of our biodiversity, given the significant biodiversity crisis we are also faced with.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S63.001	Mary Beth Taylor			S63.001	Mary Beth Taylor	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the Proposed Change 1 to the RPS for Wellington Region in its entirety	Retain as notified, with some suggested amendments.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S63.011	Mary Beth Taylor			S63.011	Mary Beth Taylor	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Work with Ministry of Education and NZQA to include Environmental Studies at all levels of schooling with standards for assessment on the qualifications framework .	Reject	P1S1
S63.015	Mary Beth Taylor			S63.015	Mary Beth Taylor	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Change the building code to make rain water collection and storage tanks, meters for reticulated water, storm water for toilet flushing, on site renewable energy generation or community generation, and triple glazing in certain areas, and WOF for all septic systems in rural areas.	Reject	P1S1
S63.016	Mary Beth Taylor			S63.016	Mary Beth Taylor	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Local councils should create a new committee for Water Strategy in order to more easily draft policy at the local level.	Reject	P1S1
S164.004	Megan Lane			S164.004	Megan Lane	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Support councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams boosted and upskilled to become more comfortable and confident at doing "density done well".	No decision required	P1S1
S153.001	Meta Beyers			S153.001	Meta Beyers	General comments - overall	Support	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. "Behaviour change" can't do anything meaningful when the entire landscape is pushing against it. Future development and growth should make it possible for people to change their car dependency and live a productive, well-connected life.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	P1S1
S152.006	Michelle Ducat			S152.006	Michelle Ducat	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Councils' planning, regulatory and consenting teams be boosted and upskilled to become more comfortable and confident at doing "density done well" by intensification.	No decision required	P1S1
S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Historical evidence indicates in several instances that Muaūpoko iwi has strong ancestral and historical connections to Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Muaūpoko's traditional rohe includes Te Whanganui-a-Tara on the Kāhui Māngai site which represents the area over which Muaūpoko exercises kaitiakitanga for the purposes of the RMA.	Acknowledge Muaūpoko connection with TeWhanganui-a-Tara throughout the RPS in any relevant provisions or introductory text.	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS2.138	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.138	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Support the request to include Te Mana o te Wai expressions from other iwi.	Allow	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS2.139	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.139	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the request by Muaūpoko for acknowledgement of their connection with TeWhanganui-a-Tara throughout the RPS in any relevant provisions or introductory text.	Allow	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.046	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.046	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	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	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S133.001	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.054	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.054	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S133.003	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.003	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	There are several grammatical and sentence structure errors throughout the plan change. Requests that GWRC undertake a general sense and grammar check throughout the plan to ensure amendments are robust and reflect the intent of changes.	A general grammar and sense check is undertaken to reflect the intent and produce desired outcomes from Plan Change 1.		Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S133.003	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.059	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.059	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	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.	Reject	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S133.003	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.350	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.350	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	Disallow the whole submission	Reject	FPP and P1S1



Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process	
S133.076	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.076	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Our whakapapa described above indicates several instances that Muaūpoko iwi have strong ancestral and historical connections to Te Whanganui-a-Tara. At the highest level the Māori name for Wellington is named for one of our key eponymous ancestors. Muaūpoko traditional rohe on the Kāhui Māngai site: <a href="https://www.tkm.govt.nz/iwi/muaupoko/#">https://www.tkm.govt.nz/iwi/muaupoko/#</a> As stated above: This rohe map represents the area over which Muaūpoko exercises kaitiakitanga for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991. The GWRC Regional Policy Statement (RPS) definitions include: Kaitiakitanga: as defined in the Resource management Act. The exercise of guardianship by tangata whenua of an area in accordance with tikanga Māori in relation to natural and physical resources. It includes the ethic of stewardship. Tangata whenua: Māori with ancestral claims to a particular area of land and resources. Literally translated as "people of the land." Iwi are tangata whenua of a particular rohe, whole all Māori are tangata whenua of Aotearoa. Given the rohe map and historical evidence indicates Muaūpoko rohe extends over the Wellington region and is stated as the area which Muaūpoko exercises kaitiakitanga over for the purposes of the RMA, Muaūpoko connection with the land and waters in Te-Whanganui-a-Tara should be recognised and provided for in the Regional Policy Statement. Muaūpoko were not consulted under Clause 3(1)(d), 1st Schedule of the RMA 1991 in the preparation of the proposed plan change. This clause states: 1. During the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority concerned shall consult the tangata whenua of the area who may be so affected, through iwi authorities; and Amendments to Plan Change 1 are therefore requested that appropriately provide for matters affecting Muaūpoko.	Amend the RPS to appropriately recognise Muaūpoko connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara throughout the policy statement. Consider a future plan change which includes formal recognition of Muaūpoko as mana whenua, with connections within the Wellington Region, including in the Tangata Whenua chapter	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1	
S133.076	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS2.75	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.75	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Rangitāne support Muaūpoko seeking to have the RPS amended as submitted and support the request to consider a future plan change to include appropriate recognition as proposed.	Allow	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1	
S133.076	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.071	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.071	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	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	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S133.076	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.423	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.423	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation	FPP and P1S1
S127.004	Neo Leaf Global			S127.004	Neo Leaf Global	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Major concerns both about the extent of provisions linked to Freshwater and, additionally, lack of appeal rights as a consequence. Particularly with infrastructure service provision including capital works, operation, maintenance and renewal, many activities intersect with freshwater.	The complete document be reviewed via expert solicitation to justify the Freshwater linkages and practical implications.		Reject	FPP
S151.001	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			S151.001	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	General comments - overall	Support	Strongly support Greater Wellington's proposals to change to its Regional Policy Statement ('Change 1') which would, among other things, implement directions required by the Government's National Policy Statements on Urban Development and Freshwater Management.	Not stated.		Accept in part	P1S1
S151.014	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			S151.014	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	General comments - overall	Support	The case for a change to the way we live in our cities, and the need for new transport and land use policies, is supported by a considerable amount of international evidence that we are familiar with, in the academic research literature (e.g. Creutzig et al., 2018; Javaid, Creutzig, & Bamberg, 2020; Lee & Lee, 2020).	Not stated.		Accept in part	P1S1
S35.004	Oliver Bruce			S35.004	Oliver Bruce	General comments - overall	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.		No decision required	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S67.001	Pareraho Forest Trust			S67.001	Pareraho Forest Trust	General comments - overall	Support	We need to make changes now to shape the future of our towns and cities to ensure goals around improving the health of our streams and oceans, our protection of biodiversity and our transition to low-carbon lifestyles are achieved. This must mean focusing future housing intensification around our railway lines, and getting that intensification right, including with the provision of quality water infrastructure, community and green spaces, and access to nature. We must give greater statutory weighting to climate change mitigation and adaptation opportunities.	Retain RPS Pland Change 1 in its entirety.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S106.001	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.001	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Support	Support integrated management approach of the region's natural and built environment guided by Te Ao Māori.	Not Stated.	Accept	P1S1
S106.002	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.002	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Plan Change 1 is complicated, unworkable; and, will put unreasonable demands and high cost pressures on landowners. Furthermore, freshwater provisions have been extended beyond what they should be, serving to prevent important consultation to clarify what will happen on the ground. There are also matters of process, and gaps in the content, that undermine an integrated management approach, and that therefore desperately need to be addressed.	Not stated.	No decision required	P1S1
S106.004	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.004	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inadequate consultation and input with stakeholders in the apiculture industry. No apicultural representative was included in the Farming Reference Group. This can undermine an integrated management approach.	Need to rectifythe lack of consultation with the apiculture industry.	No decision required	P1S1
S61.005	Patrick Morgan			S61.005	Patrick Morgan	General comments - overall	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.	No decision required	P1S1
S30.0120	Peka Peka Farm Limited			FS25.038	Peka Peka Farm Limited		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	FPP and P1S1
S118.019	Peka Peka Farm Limited			S118.019	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support in part	Supports the overall intent to appropriately address matters relating to climate change, facilitating mode shift and active transport modes, sustainable urban development, and freshwater management. Has some concerns about the scope and effect of PC1, issues relating to clarity of drafting, along with ensuring that PC1 appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD. Concerned that PC1 should be the best and most appropriate resource management response to the issues being addressed, that PC1 appropriately gives effect to national direction, does not unduly duplicate national direction and does not confuse jurisdictional boundaries. The direction of the RPS needs to be clear so that it is not subject to interpretation. Considers that a number of objectives and policies do not achieve these aims.	Amend objectives and policies to address the releif sought in the submission.	Accept	P1S1
S118.019	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS2.19	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.19	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support in part	Rangitāne agree the direction of the RPS needs to be clear so that it is not subject to interpretation. While we generally support the proposed amendments which relate to urban development, we agree with the submitter that further changes should be made to strengthen and clarify the objectives, policies and methods.	Allow in part	Accept	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process	
S118.020	Peka Peka Farm Limited			S118.020	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Notes that the leadership role of Greater Wellington in facilitating some of the outcomes sought by PC1, including in its investment in and operation of existing and new public transport infrastructure and services. Both the planning framework and these investments need to be designed and implemented in a manner that supports and does not preclude otherwise appropriate development opportunities.	Not stated.	Accept	P1S1	
S27.005	Peter Ramage			S27.005	Peter Ramage	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	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	No decision required	P1S1	
S62.003	Philip Clegg			S62.003	Philip Clegg	General comments - definitions	Support in part	I strongly recommend that GWRC consider moving the definitions to the start of the RPS. The definitions contain critical information that materially affects how the RPS will be applied. For instance, people will assume the natural and ordinary meaning of "restoration" will apply, unless they have seen the definition.	Move the definitions section to the front end of the RPS.	Accept	P1S1	
S30.0114	Porirua City Council			S30.0114	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Poor drafting of provisions and a lack of supporting evaluation makes it difficult to assess what many provisions will mean for Council. RPS provisions, including definitions, are not drafted with sufficient rigour and clarity so that they can efficiently and effectively be implemented in regulatory frameworks, namely district and regional plans. These provisions should not require high levels of interpretation, and there is a risk of inconsistent or incoherent implementation across the region as currently drafted. They must also be drafted using the National Planning Standards so that they can meaningfully be implemented by territorial authorities who have implemented the National Planning Standards within their district plans.	Council considers that the provisions need a major overhaul and redrafting.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1	
S30.0114	Porirua City Council	FS25.031	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.031	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1	
S30.0114	Porirua City Council	FS3.005	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.005	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - overall	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point and seek further clarity in the provisions to ensure alignment with the regulatory frameworks and National Planning Standards.	Allow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be allowed and would like to be involved in any redrafting.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0115	Porirua City Council			S30.0115	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	We have generally been unable to undertake redrafting as part of our submission due to the scale of redrafting required and the limited time available. In some cases, we are unclear as to the policy intent and in those circumstances, we have not been able to request any changes until we fully understand that intent. The exception is Objective 22, Policy 30 and Policy 31 of which we have requested redrafted versions.	We request that GWRC immediately commence a variation to Proposed Change 1, and meaningfully engage and work with the territorial authorities on the redrafting of the provisions. Doing so will avoid litigation through appeals and subsequent plan and consent processes.	Reject	FPP and P1S1	
S30.0115	Porirua City Council	FS25.032	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.032	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	Reject	FPP and P1S1	

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S30.0118	Porirua City Council			S30.0118	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Proposed Change 1 introduces new requirements where there is no capacity or capability in terms of what is required. Examples of these include whole of life carbon assessment and the requirement for territorial authorities to assess the potential discharge of contaminants against desired attribute states of water. Not to mention the fact that contaminant limits are yet to be set through a plan change to the Natural Resource Plan. Even if this capacity and capability existed, there is a lack of policy direction on some concepts, for example the offsetting of greenhouse gas emissions.	Significant guidance and implementation support would be needed before some provisions can be implemented.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0118	Porirua City Council	FS25.035	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.035	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0120	Porirua City Council			S30.0120	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	In addition to the relief sought as set out in our submission, as outlined above Council considers that the best course of action would be to withdraw much of Proposed Change 1, or otherwise work with councils on a variation to significantly amend most of its contents.	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S30.0121	Porirua City Council			S30.0121	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	The drafting of many provisions shows a failure to understand the role of the RPS in an RMA framework, and failure to properly identify a range of tools and levers outside of RMA plans that are needed to deliver the outcomes set out in the objectives. For example, Proposed Change 1 contains some very ambitious objectives, such as a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from 2019 levels, and net-zero emissions by 2050. However, the policies in the RPS cannot and will not achieve these objectives. For example, there are insufficient levers at a regional/local level to reduce emissions from the existing vehicle fleet to the extent needed to meet these goals. Further, district plans can only address future use, development and subdivision and cannot require change to existing use or development.	The objectives collectively need to be reviewed to ensure they are both achievable and realistic.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0121	Porirua City Council	FS25.039	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.039	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0122	Porirua City Council			S30.0122	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Council considers that there is a lack of an evidence base to support the approach taken to most topics in Proposed Change 1. The Section 32 evaluation report does not adequately assess the approach, nor assess costs and benefits.	Not stated	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S30.0122	Porirua City Council	FS25.040	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.040	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	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S30.0123	Porirua City Council			S30.0123	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.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S30.0123	Porirua City Council	FS25.041	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.041	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0119	Porirua City Council			S30.0119	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Proposed Change 1 will require that all councils in the region undertake significant plan reviews by 30 June 2025 at a time where there are a number of other nationally-driven requirements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upcoming plan changes that will be required by the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Soils, and the Regional Future Development Strategy; and</li> <li>• Government led reform of the resource management system, three waters reform, and the local government review. For Porirua City Council this will be on top of our existing full District Plan Review which is in the middle of its hearings stage.</li> </ul>	Council seeks that more thought be given to how these various overlapping processes align, and the implications of a significant change to regional policy at this time.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S30.0119	Porirua City Council	FS25.036	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.036	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S168.001	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.001	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Rangitāne o Wairarapa notes that many of the provisions as notified contain inconsistencies in grammatical tense and structure.	In some instances we have suggested wording to rectify this, but we ask that a comprehensive editorial review of the full plan change is undertaken to resolve these errors and inconsistencies.	Accept	FPP and P1S1
S168.001	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.002	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.002	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	General comments - overall	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	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S130.001	Renters United			S130.001	Renters United	General comments - overall	Support	Renters United is proud to support the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region ("the RPS"). We believe that the RPS supports our vision for an Aotearoa where everyone has access to a stable, warm, affordable home and where everyone can meaningfully enforce their human right to a decent home.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S130.002	Renters United			S130.002	Renters United	General comments - overall	Support	The proposed changes set a clear direction that everyone deserves access to good housing. If we want to leave neighbourhoods that last generations we need to ensure that they don't contribute to an unsustainable climate. Renters live in poorer quality housing, don't benefit from rising land values, and find it hard to see a future where they have the option of renting a home that is stable, warm and affordable. The lack of good housing is a major contributor to the stress that renters face. A good home is beyond what's inside its four walls. A good home has plenty of local amenities, shared green spaces, and is well connected to other areas of the city.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	P1S1
S130.004	Renters United			S130.004	Renters United	General comments - overall	Support	Support the use of plain language in all areas of government, including local bodies like regional councils. Active participation is a core pillar of democracy and with more renters working longer hours or multiple jobs, they need to be able to easily read and understand changes to regulations that have implications for them, so they can provide their input and ensure that their voice is heard.	Ensure the provisions use plain language.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S165.032	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.032	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	General comments - regulatory policies	Support	Supports the chapter Introduction and table of contents.	Retain.	Accept in part	P1S1
S165.032	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 - regulatory 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	FPP

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S165.150	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			S165.150	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	General comments - overall	Oppose	Forest & Bird notes there is no jurisdiction under the RMA for many provisions currently marked with a freshwater symbol to undergo the freshwater planning process. Forest & Bird considers that GWRC has not correctly applied the High Court decision Otago Regional Council v Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated [2022] NZHC 1777 (Otago Regional Council v Forest & Bird) when identifying provisions to include in the freshwater planning process. Examples of chapters and provisions which do not qualify for the freshwater planning process include, but are not limited to: • Climate change provisions e.g. Chapter 3.1A. • Natural hazard provisions e.g. Objective 20. • Urban design provisions e.g. Objective 22, Policy 31. • Provisions concerning wetlands in the coastal marine area (the NPSFM only applies to "natural inland wetlands"). • General indigenous biodiversity provisions e.g. Policies 23-24. • The methods that give effect to the above provisions While these provisions have some connection to freshwater or the concept of Te Mana o te Wai, the link is tenuous. They do not fall squarely within the jurisdiction of the freshwater planning process as outlined by the High Court (or supported by the policy intent of the freshwater planning process): a) They have not been designed to "regulate activities in the catchment or receiving environment, because of their effect on the quality or quantity of freshwater". The prime examples are the provisions addressing climate change – a phenomenon with indiscriminate effects; b) Some provisions affect or relate directly to seawater which is clearly outside the jurisdiction of the freshwater planning process Many of these provisions require expertise beyond freshwater quality and quantity such as marine biology, coastal systems, climate science, urban planning, terrestrial ecology, and air quality. They risk frustrating the expedition of the process for developing a National Objectives Framework. The National Objectives Framework is long overdue, and should not be delayed by matters which have some link to freshwater, but are essentially peripheral i.e. urban development. These provisions are also subject to separate policy direction such as the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement or the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. They are not only required to be dealt with under the standard Schedule 1 process, but are more appropriately dealt with in this separate arena.	Forest & Bird accordingly seeks that only those provisions coming within the ambit expressed by the High Court above go through the freshwater planning process.	Reject	FPP
S165.150	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 - overall	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	FPP
S72.001	Rozalie Brown			S72.001	Rozalie Brown	General comments - overall	Support in part	There is a need to show the interconnections between central government, regional government and the local bodies and various pieces of legislation.	The inclusion of a flow chart to show the weaving of the harakiki with the following acts and plans included: *SPA (strategic planning act), *CAA (Climate adaption act), *NBA (Natural Build Environment act), *NAP (Natural adaption	Reject	FPP and P1S1



Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
									plan), *EDAP (energy descent action plan).		
S72.002	Rozalie Brown			S72.002	Rozalie Brown	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The removal of the word "resource" is to future proof Change 1 when RMA is fully replaced by NBA.	Remove the word "resource"	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S96.001	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.001	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	General comments - definitions	Support in part	I strongly recommend that GWRC consider moving the definitions to the start of the RPS. The definitions contain critical information that materially affects how the RPS will be applied. For instance, people will assume the natural and ordinary meaning of "restoration" will apply, unless they have seen the definition.	Move the definitions section to the front end of the RPS.	Accept	P1S1
S167.002	Taranaki Whānui			S167.002	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - overall	Support in part	We [the submitter] note the focus of RPS Change 1 is to implement and support the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD), and to start the implementation of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM). RPS Change 1 also addresses issues related to climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and high natural character. We [the submitter] support the general policy direction of integrated management including the expectation that mana whenua / tangata whenua will be at the decision-making table. What is unclear is how this will be implemented, and we make a number of specific comments in this submission to specifically address these.	Details of decision sought in submission points.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S167.003	Taranaki Whānui			S167.003	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	We [the submitter] note the future changes of the RPS in the form of RPS2 that will approach review of the tangata whenua chapter. We signal our aspiration to be involved and engaged in that process.	Taranaki Whānui want to be involved in any future review of the RPS tangata whenua chapter.	No recommendation	P1S1
S167.0193	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0193	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	Insert a new definition <b>Mahinga kai</b> (Wording adopted from Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao): <b>Mahinga kai is described as: Our kaitiaki relationship with water is through mahinga kai. Mahinga kai are the places where we practice our cultural harvest. Mahinga kai are the taonga species; plants, birds, fish, and animals that we provide for as kaitiaki. Mahinga kai are the activities which we undertake as kaitiaki. Mahinga kai activities enable us to maintain and transfer kaitiaki knowledge between generations. Mahinga kai supports cultural wellbeing through manaaki tangata; the provision of kai to our guests. Mahinga kai enables us to assess the wellbeing of water and all that it supports; including people</b>	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S167.0196	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0196	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	Definition needed here as used widely throughout the RPS. Something that speaks to equality of voice, goals for equity, and power-sharing.	Accept in part	P1S1
S75.004	Te Aka Tauira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)			S75.004	Te Aka Tauira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)	General comments - overall	Support	Generally supports the proposed change and is fully in support of work to ensure Wellington is protected for future generations, to ensure students have access to warm and liveable housing and a city that is liveable and thriving.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S75.005	Te Aka Tauira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)			S75.005	Te Aka Tauira - Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA)	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	VUWSA supports the use of plain language in all areas of government, including local bodies like regional councils. Active participation is a core pillar of democracy and with more students working longer hours or multiple jobs to meet rising living costs, they need to be able to easily read and understand changes to regulations that have implications for them, so they can provide their input and ensure that their voice is heard. In the future, it would be great to see these documents become more accessible to the communities they serve through plain language or the inclusion of documents such as a summary and overview information sheet. Not only does this benefit those who are time-poor, but also those whose first language is not English	Ensure the provisions use plain language or include documents such as a summary and overview information sheet.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S34.0114	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0114	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Oppose in part	There are several non-regulatory policies and methods that appear to require a future short-to-medium term regulatory response and so cannot be truly non-regulatory.	Council submits that these actions need to be redrafted, to make them legitimately non regulatory actions and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below. Alternatively, some of these actions may need to be reclassified as regulatory with further Section 32 assessment, and Council is likely to have further comment if this occurs.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S34.0119	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0119	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Timing of District Plan Requirements: District plan changes are difficult and costly to resource and develop, and the need to progress in a logical sequence based on individual Councils resources. Given the difficulties recent national direction timeframes for plan changes has caused, Council does not want to see this repeated by the RPSPC1.	Council submits that arbitrary timeframes should be removed from provisions in the RPSPC1 and identifies the specific provisions to which relief is sought in Table 1 below.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S170.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Support	Objective 11 could be worded to express a stronger behavioral direction to say: the quantity of waste disposed of is reduced to ultimately remove our reliance on landfills.	Objective 11 could be worded to express a stronger behavioral direction to say: the quantity of waste disposed of is reduced to ultimately remove our reliance on landfills.	Reject	P1S1
S170.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS2.91	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.91	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support	Rangitāne support the proposed strengthening of the wording of the Objective by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.128	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.128	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.018	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.018	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Support in part	Objective 29A It is encouraging to see an objective that is aiming to increase the resilience of the land. The policies to implement this objective seems to be limited to forest cover and extent. Was there any deliberation of using District Plan and land use controls to strengthen the tools that are available to us increasing land resilience, not just a regional policy. Another consideration is the negative impacts of development on the decrease of resilience, how does the RPS address that?	Objective 29A It is encouraging to see an objective that is aiming to increase the resilience of the land. The policies to implement this objective seems to be limited to forest cover and extent. Was there any deliberation of using District Plan and land use controls to strengthen the tools that are available to us increasing land resilience, not just a regional policy. Another consideration is the negative impacts of development on the decrease of resilience, how does the RPS address that?	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.018	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.132	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.132	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.019	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.019	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Objective 31 The wording of Objective 31 can be strengthened to mean: the demand for mineral resources is met from resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand - in an appropriate way we can reduce its footprint. The Objective should not encourage further mining, and the wording could somewhat contain the need of mining and its footprint. This objective should not read to encourage mining activities further.	Objective 31 The wording of Objective 31 can be strengthened to mean: the demand for mineral resources is met from resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand - in an appropriate way we can reduce its footprint. The Objective should not encourage further mining, and the wording could somewhat contain the need of mining and its footprint. This objective should not read to encourage mining activities further.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.019	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.133	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.133	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.046	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.046	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Historic Heritage Policy 21 and Policy 22: We are unsure whether Policy 21 and 22 make a distinguished note between the historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) identification and mapping and protection. They should be separated - or the policy 21 and 22 to be worded to ensure that distinguishing features are identified and comes across in the paragraph.	Distinguish between the historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) identification and mapping and protection. Seperate or ensure that distinguishing features are identified.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.046	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.160	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.160	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.056	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.056	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy 49 Recognising and providing for matters of significance to tangata whenua - consideration It is confusing mana whenua roles and values are recognised in this particular policy and given consideration for a resource consent, however in other parts of the RPS we do not see them. Policy 49 has connections to Policy IE.3 and all taonga will need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework; it is confusing why the plan picks out a regime of giving effect to mana whenua values and roles particularly managing indigenous biodiversity but not other parts of the Plan. Policy 49, in a way, explains it to extend the policy intention to fresh and coastal waters in the clause (b) and the exercise of kaitiakitanga in the clause (a) however this comes through as fragmented. The word 'recognised' can be strengthened, we suggest removing this wording and leave it with providing for.	Require mana whenua roles and vlaues to be given consideration in consent applications. All taonga need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework. Replace the word 'recognised' with stronger policy direction. We suggest removing this wording and leave it with providing for.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.056	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.170	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.170	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.057	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.057	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy 48 Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi provides a generic explanation what the applicants need to provide and what the consideration would be from the perspective of resource consent issuer. Deed of Settlement Acts should be clause (c) and any other evidence that are provided such as, Cultural Impact Assessments and iwi environmental management plans.	Clause (c) should refer to Deed of Settlement Acts. Other relief sought unclear without the context of the relevant provision (see notes below).	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.057	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.171	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.171	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.077	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.077	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - regulatory policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy 6 recognises the significance of Porirua Harbour. This could be further discussed.	Discuss in more detail the significance of Porirua Harbour.	Reject	P1S1



Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.077	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.191	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.191	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - regulatory policies	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.078	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.078	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Not Stated / Neutral	4.2 Regulatory Policies - matters to be considered Explanations for Policy 48 (Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi) and Policy 49 (Recognising and providing for matters of significance to tangata whenua) have been removed. These are beneficial explanations which provide greater context for policies. These explanations discuss how Māori values and sites of significance should be considered. If these explanations are going to be put somewhere else there should be guidance on where to find them.	Reinstate explanations for Policy 48 (Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi) and Policy 49 (Recognising and providing for matters of significance to tangata whenua). If these explanations are going to be put somewhere else there should be guidance on where to find them.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.078	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.192	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.192	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - consideration policies	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S170.081	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.081	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	It is confusing mana whenua roles and values are recognised in this particular policy and given consideration for a resource consent, however in other parts of the RPS we do not see them. Policy 49 has connections to Policy IE.3 and all taonga will need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework; it is confusing why the plan picks out a regime of giving effect to mana whenua values and roles particularly managing indigenous biodiversity but not other parts of the Plan.	There should be a framework for giving effect to mana whenua roles and values for all topcis, not just indigenous biodiversity.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S170.081	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.195	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.195	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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-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.	Not stated	Reject	P1S1
S102.096	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.096	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	General comments - definitions	Support in part	'Ancestral land' is not defined and should be defined in the definitions chapter to avoid ambiguity in regards to individual's interpretation of ancestral lands and their extent.	Insert definition for 'Ancestral Land'.	Reject	P1S1
S98.005	Teresa Homan			S98.005	Teresa Homan	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Support	All district plans need to identify natural taonga and heritage sights examples peat swamps, native trees, forest, birds, native fish.	Amend provisions to address the relief sought in the submission.	Reject	FPP and P1S1
S95.001	Tony Chad			S95.001	Tony Chad	General comments - overall	Support	Supports the Proposed Change 1 to the RPS for Wellington Region in its entirety	Retain as notified, with some suggested amendments.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S95.010	Tony Chad			S95.010	Tony Chad	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Work with Ministry of Education and NZQA to include Environmental Studies at all levels of schooling with standards for assessment on the qualifications framework .	Reject	P1S1
S95.012	Tony Chad			S95.012	Tony Chad	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Local councils should create a new committee for Water Strategy in order to more easily draft policy at the local level.	Reject	P1S1
S95.015	Tony Chad			S95.015	Tony Chad	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated.	Change the building code to make rain water collection and storage tanks, meters for reticulated water, storm water for toilet flushing, on site renewable energy generation or community generation, and triple glazing in certain areas, and WOF for all septic systems in rural areas.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process	
S84.001	Tony Randle			S84.001	Tony Randle	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region is both complex and difficult to understand.	Requests additional time to consider proposed changes.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1	
S89.009	VicLabour			S89.009	VicLabour	General comments - overall	Support	Support the overall proposed Regional Policy Statement changes and supports direction in the space of climate, urban development, and freshwater to ensure that we are heading towards being a climate-friendly and low-emissions city, alongside genuinely abiding by our Te Tiriti obligations.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1	
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - overall	Oppose	Concerns that Plan Change 1 to the RPS includes climate change provisions which have been notified in advance of amendments to the RMA which do not come into effect until 30 November 2022; and that it includes biodiversity provisions which seek to pre-empt the upcoming National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). Freshwater issues were to be addressed comprehensively as part of the full RPS review scheduled for 2024.	RPS Change One should not include provisions relating to climate change, biodiversity and water. The scope of RPS Change One should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Any other matters should be subject to proper review in the scheduled full review of the Regional Policy Statement in 2024; and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024.	Reject	P1S1	
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS2.27	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.27	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose	The NPS-FM has been in place since August 2020 and implementation should already be well under way. Te Mana o te Wai is not a new concept. Councils are already required to have regard to the National Climate Adaptation Plan and Emissions Reduction Plan. These changes are long overdue and the sooner we have a strategic framework in place, the sooner implementation can begin. We need action now for our future generations. Rangitāne believe amending the RPS to reflect the requirements of the NPS-UD and NPS-FW is urgent and should not be postponed. It is not appropriate to amend the RPS to reflect the NPS-UD in isolation because of the interconnectedness of social, cultural, environmental and economic aspects. The process should reflect an integrated resource management approach consistent with Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori. Rangitāne support the inclusion of issues, objectives, policies and methods that address lack of mana whenua involvement in decision making, climate change, freshwater and biodiversity.	Disallow	Accept	P1S1	
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.030	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.030	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - overall	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept	P1S1
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.057	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.057	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - overall	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	P1S1	

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS28.004	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.004	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - overall	Support in part	As alternative relief to that expressed in HortNZ's primary submission, HortNZ would withdrawal of the freshwater, indigenous biodiversity and climate change for consideration in a future plan change in 2024 (to enable consistency with upcoming NPSIB direction and other relevant national direction).	Allow in part		Reject	P1S1
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.0100	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.0100	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Reject	P1S1
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS9.007	Wairarapa Water Users Society	FS9.007	Wairarapa Water Users Society	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Reject	P1S1
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS21.007	Irrigation NZ	FS21.007	Irrigation NZ	General comments - overall	Support	The removal of the provisions related to Climate Change, Biodiversity and Fresh Water and only addressing the provisions to give effect to the NPS-UD will allow the other topics to be consulted on in more depth	Not stated	Only retain elements in the RPS change 1 that give effect to the NPS-UD	Accept	P1S1
S163.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.003	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.003	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - overall	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	P1S1
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	Disagree that the proposed amendments to Chapter 3 should be treated as "freshwater" instruments: instead their intention and application is as 'integrative' provisions, as per recent case law (see submission for more detail).	Delete FW icons		Reject	FPP
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS28.005	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.005	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	HortNZ support a review of the appropriate provisions which should be subject to the freshwater planning process.	Allow in part	Allow amendment to ensure only freshwater provisions are subject to the freshwater planning process	Reject	FPP
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.032	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.032	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - Chapter 3	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept	FPP

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.154	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.154	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - Chapter 3	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept	FPP
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.005	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.005	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - Chapter 3	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	FPP
S163.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.061	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.061	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - Chapter 3	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	FPP
S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review	That all amendments to Appendix 3 be deleted		Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.046	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.046	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - definitions	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1
S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.168	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.168	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - definitions	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.019	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.019	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - definitions	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	FPP and P1S1
S163.0106	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.075	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.075	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - definitions	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	FPP and P1S1
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - regulatory policies	Oppose	The proposed amendments to regulatory policies would more properly be considered in the full review of the RPS scheduled in 2024. Additional reasons are as set out in respect of the objectives for each topic.	That the proposed amendments to Chapter 4.1 be deleted		Reject	P1S1
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS19.057	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.057	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - regulatory policies	Oppose	The provisions provide useful guidance for regional implementation of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept	P1S1
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.086	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.086	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - regulatory policies	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept	P1S1
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.208	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.208	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - regulatory policies	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.059	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.059	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - regulatory policies	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	P1S1
S163.042	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.115	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.115	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - regulatory policies	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	P1S1
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	The proposed amendments to regulatory policies would more properly be considered in the full review of the RPS scheduled in 2024. Additional reasons are as set out in respect of the objectives for each topic.	That the proposed amendments to Chapter 4.2 be deleted		Reject	FPP and P1S1
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS19.052	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.052	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	The provisions provide useful guidance for regional implementation of the RMA	Disallow		Accept	FPP and P1S1
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.105	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.105	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - consideration policies	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept	FPP and P1S1
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.227	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.227	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - consideration policies	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept	FPP and P1S1



Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process	
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.078	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.078	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - consideration policies	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	FPP and P1S1	
S163.062	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.134	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.134	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - consideration policies	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	FPP and P1S1	
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Oppose	Defer to full review of the RPS in 2024	Delete all amendments	Reject	FPP and P1S1	
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS19.053	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.053	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - non-regulatory policies	Oppose	The provisions provide useful guidance for regional implementation of the RMA	Disallow	Accept	FPP and P1S1	
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - non-regulatory policies	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	Disallow whole submission	Accept	FPP and P1S1
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.244	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.244	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - non-regulatory policies	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	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept	FPP and P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.095	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.095	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - non-regulatory policies	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	FPP and P1S1
S163.079	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.151	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.151	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - non-regulatory policies	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	FPP and P1S1
S140.0118	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0118	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Oppose in part	NA	Consequential amendments to reflect relief sought on related provisions.	No decision required	FPP and P1S1
S148.001	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.001	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	It is appropriate that the RPS continues to recognise the importance of the Airport in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities. Functional, technical, operational and safety related constraints often influence the location of important infrastructure, such as airports. In the case of Wellington Airport, given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance.	Not stated.	Accept	P1S1
S148.010	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.010	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - overall	Support in part	The Proposal contains a number of provisions that have been notified as either using (the usual) Part One Schedule 1 process, or as part of a Freshwater Planning Process ("FPP"). Provisions which are subject to the FPP are annotated throughout the proposal documentation with the reference "FW". This has recently been tested in the Otago region in the High Court. In this case, the Otago Regional Council publicly notified the entirety of its Proposed RPS as a freshwater planning instrument. This was challenged by Forest and Bird and in its judgement (Otago Regional Council v Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated [2022] NZHC 1777) dated 22 July 2022, the High Court declared that the Council's determination that the whole of the Proposed RPS is a freshwater planning instrument was wrong. The High Court then instructed the Council to satisfy itself as to which parts of the proposed regional policy statement qualify are part of a freshwater planning instrument because they relate directly to the maintenance or enhancement of freshwater quality or quantity. The Otago Regional Council has recently re-notified the freshwater components of its RPS and these are notably now very narrow in terms of the provisions which are being subject to the FPP. A number of the provisions within the RPS have been identified as progressing through the FPP. For the majority of these provisions, the relationship between freshwater and the provision is	Not stated.	Reject	FPP

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
								reasonably clear, however in some instances it is not. In accordance with the Ministry for the Environment's guidance which provides a high level overview of the FPP, it is understood that it was essentially established so as to allow expedited regional plan changes to give effect to the NPSFM, or otherwise relate to freshwater. It is therefore not clear how provisions such as those which more broadly relate to climate change, urban environments, all biodiversity and natural hazards should be progressed through the FPP. WIAL submits that such provisions are either not related to freshwater resources at all or relate to matters which may have some interaction or interplay with freshwater resources but are focussed on outcomes that are much broader.			
<b>S148.059</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.059</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	WIAL notes that not all of the provisions which have been earmarked for the freshwater planning process are directly related to the maintenance or enhancement of freshwater quality or quantity.	Ensure only those provisions which relate to the maintenance or enhancement of freshwater quality or quantity are subject to the fast-track freshwater planning process.	Accept in part	FPP
<b>S113.032</b>	Wellington Water			<b>S113.032</b>	Wellington Water	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Table 15 in Appendix 1 of the RPS and Schedule H of the pNRP are inconsistent.	Update Table 15 of RPS Appendix 1 (Rivers and lakes with significant amenity and recreational values) to align with Schedule H of the pNRP.	Reject	P1S1
<b>S162.001</b>	Winstone Aggregates			<b>S162.001</b>	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	The proposed changes to the indigenous biodiversity provisions are entirely unworkable for aggregate extraction. Offsetting and compensation are important tools in the effects management hierarchy and restricting their use will result in unintended consequences, particularly for developments that provide the potential for significant ecological gains overall, via offsetting. These do not appear to have attempted to provide any recognition for the Exposure Draft of the NPS-FW (update) and draft NPS-IB both containing amendments that provide more viable pathways for mineral extraction. Requests that the RPS via PPC1 contains an updated policy framework and clear policy directives that provide and support an appropriate enabling consenting pathway for aggregate extraction and associated quarrying activities such as overburden placement in a similar to that of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. It is considered that this approach would better give effect to the recognition and management of aggregate extraction activities as set out in the NPS-FW (including the anticipated 2022 update) and draft NPS-IB. The Natural Resources Plan (NRP) includes a policy framework that specifically recognise the criticality of significant mineral and aggregate resources for the Wellington Region (including Objectives 9 and 11 of the NRP). However, the RPS does not currently provide consistent direction recognising the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of the utilisation of mineral and aggregates resources or the protection of land containing significant aggregate resources. The plan provides very little guidance as to how local authorities plans should manage conflicting considerations where mineral and aggregate resources are involved, and so a framework recognising the benefits of mineral and aggregate resources is important.	Amend the RPS to provide recognition and protection for significant mineral resources in a way that is consistent with the policy framework in the NRP and consistent with the NPS-FW (update) and NPS-IB when those documents are confirmed. Seek to work further with GWRC to accurately and appropriately reflect the NRP policy direction in the RPS.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S162.001	Winstone Aggregates	FS3.004	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.004	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - overall	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the use of offsetting and compensation as appropriate and consistent with the NPS FM and NPS IB when confirmed	Allow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be allowed as it is important to be able to use offsetting and compensation as appropriate to mitigate effects. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved in the development of amendments to address this issue.	Reject	P1S1
S162.001	Winstone Aggregates	FS7.019	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.019	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - overall	Oppose	It is not clear what the, if any, environmental benefits of the utilisation of mineral and aggregates resources are. Provision of a clear consenting pathway for this extractive industry is not a requirement of the RMA and should be addressed using the appropriate RMA process as laid out in the legislation and higher order planning instruments.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission point	Accept	P1S1
S162.001	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	P1S1
S162.001	Winstone Aggregates	FS2.24	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.24	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Rangitāne acknowledge the importance of mineral and aggregate extraction to allow (appropriately designed and located) development. However, offsetting and compensation provisions should represent a last resort after all efforts have been made to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental impacts on indigenous biodiversity (and freshwater) from such activities. Offsetting and compensation are referred to as important tools in the effects management hierarchy, which reflect a 'business as usual' or 'the way we have always done it' approach to effects management. Rangitāne does not support any promotion of these measures in the effects management hierarchy above the duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate environmental impacts.	Disallow in part		Reject	P1S1
S162.002	Winstone Aggregates			S162.002	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Concerned that Plan Change 1 seeks to address issues such as housing supply and infrastructure pressures, as a result of the NPS-UD but that the provisions of the Plan Change will decrease our access and ability to supply the aggregate required to address these problems. In the absence of policy recognition of the fundamental importance of mineral extraction and clean fill activities and contribution these materials make to construction and development, it will be difficult for housing and industry providers to meet the	Specific provision is made for aggregate and clean filling in PC1 to recognise the vital importance of these activities that underpin growth sought by the NPS-UD and provide Regional direction as to how the conflicts between NPS-FW		Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
								region's needs at a reasonable cost and for reducing waste to landfill.	and NPS-IB matters must be balanced.		
S162.002	Winstone Aggregates	FS2.25	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.25	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Rangitāne acknowledge the importance of mineral and aggregate extraction to allow (appropriately designed and located) development and growth. Rangitāne are concerned that any policy recognition of mineral extraction and restoration reflects an effects management hierarchy that prioritises avoidance, remedying and mitigation of environmental effects above offsetting and compensation.	Disallow in part	Accept	P1S1
S162.002	Winstone Aggregates	FS7.020	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.020	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	We are concerned at the uncertainty of the provisions being requested. As above, this should be addressed using due process.	Disallow	Disallow submission point	Accept P1S1
S162.002	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.270	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.270	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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 P1S1	
S162.003	Winstone Aggregates			S162.003	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	The Plan Change introduces a number of new policies aimed at implementing the NPS-FM, which in fact do not properly give effect to the NPS-FM and PC1 does not appear to have amended/added new definitions to implement the NPS-FM. In particular it appears that the RPS does not implement section 3.22 of the NPS-FM, which relates to natural inland wetlands and which every Regional Council needs to 'give effect to' in their regional plan. The RPS should therefore provide consistent direction to what is required by the NPS-FM, and implemented in the Natural Resources Plan (NRP).	Requests that: • The RPS amendments are updated to accurately reflect the direction sought by the NPS-FM, • The NPS-FM is given effect to in the NRP • New definitions are inserted into the RPS that reflect and are consistent with the NPS-FM definitions and the expected NPS-FM Update (due for release in December 2022).	Reject	P1S1
S162.003	Winstone Aggregates	FS2.26	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.26	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Support in part	Rangitāne agrees that the RPS Change 1 should be consistent with the direction of the NPS-FM, and any amendments to the NPS will need to be reflected in the RPS in due course.	Allow in part	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary recommendation	Process
S162.003	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.271	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.271	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	P1S1
S162.004	Winstone Aggregates			S162.004	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Concerned with the breadth of the Plan Change content that is subject to the Freshwater Planning Process (FPP), rather than the Schedule 1 process. The FPP process provides limited scope for future public input, and a large number of provisions are subject to the FPP where freshwater is not the primary issue, and is instead peripheral or only one of several issues to which the provision relates. Very concerned with this approach and considers that it is an inappropriate use of the FPP process.	Requests that the scope of the FPP versus Schedule 1 processes is reviewed and that only those provisions where freshwater is the primary issue are subject to the FPP.	Reject	FPP
S162.004	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.272	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.272	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	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	FPP
S2.001	Zara Wills			S2.001	Zara Wills	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Regional Council will be taking a step backwards to what the Kainga Ora / Government are wanting to achieve and do. Regional council should not restrict any existing identified greenfield development. Outside of these areas yes, but not existing identified greenfield or where there is a need for it.	Allow greenfield development where it has already been identified or where there is a need for it.	Reject	P1S1

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary recommendation	Process
S2.002	Zara Wills			S2.002	Zara Wills	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	As a resident of Wainuiomata North, I would like the Regional City Council to allow Wainuiomata North to be further developed. Wainuiomata North is the only greenfield area left that has been identified for development in the Lower Hutt area. This area is also included in the Regional growth framework. Properties have already been purchased by developers waiting for HCC to allow/rezone residential development. The regional council will be the reason for not allowing more housing when we have a housing crisis.	Exclude Wainuiomata North, and other greenfield areas identified in the Wellington Regional Growth Framework, from any new restrictions that would stop or make it very difficult to develop the area for residential housing.		Reject	P1S1
S2.002	Zara Wills	FS3.001	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.001	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Not stated	Should this be considered Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to assess accessibility to active and public transport, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issues.	Reject	P1S1