

TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI KI UTA
UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL
SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT
CHANGE 1

To: Greater Wellington Regional Council
PO Box 11646
Wellington 6011

Email: regionalplan@gw.govt.nz

Submitter:

Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council
HAPAI Puna Ratonga - Service Centre, 879 – 881 Fergusson Drive
Upper Hutt, 5018

Attention: Peter Kelly – Chief Executive
Phone: 04 8855727
Email: peter.kelly@uhcc.govt.nz

Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council make submissions on the Proposed Regional Policy Statement Plan Change 1 in the attached Cover Letter and Detailed Submission - Table 1.

Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council confirms it could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council would like to be heard in support of its submission. If other submitters make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Yenā hae Ngel,

Upper Hutt City Council Submission on Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the Proposed Regional Policy Statement Plan Change 1 (RPSPC1). We appreciate that our feedback on the Draft Plan Change has been considered and some amendments have been made and reflected in RPSPC1.

The Upper Hutt City Council (Council) supports the intent to develop regional provisions to address issues relating to climate change, freshwater management and indigenous biodiversity, in the context of a growing and changing region under significant urban development pressure. However, Council has some key fundamental concerns that require significant amendments to the proposed plan change. Council takes a neutral position on any proposed provisions where a particular opinion or level of support or opposition has not been expressed. Accordingly, the scope of Council's submission relates to the whole of RPSPC1 and seeks any consequential amendments necessary to address our concerns.

This submission is structured to identify the key fundamental concerns in this covering letter with detailed comments on the provisions and the relief sought by Council in the attached Detailed Submission - Table 1. Both parts of our submission must be read together to understand the Council's position on the RPSPC1.

While the RPSPC1 should not shy away from setting aspirations about climate response as a region, it must be designed with a practical and implementable regional policy framework in mind. As notified, RPSPC1 appears to have had little consideration for the practical implementation of national direction and Council is concerned that the proposed provisions will make urban development required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) potentially impossible to deliver, through the wrapping of constraints around housing intensification direction.

Many of the provisions which would be implemented by territorial authorities are impractical, unachievable or unworkable, and there is a disconnect and clear conflict between the proposed provisions and the need to provide urban development for the significant growth projected in the Wellington Region.

Many provisions have also been proposed without:

- sufficient evidence base
- an assessment of whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives
- statutory powers to delegate responsibility to territorial authorities
- an understanding of the significant resource requirements that they will unduly place on territorial authorities
- an understanding of the ability of territorial authorities to implement them

Council is concerned these provisions have been drafted in unnecessary haste and propose a level of change inappropriate when National Policy Statements are in progress, and at a time of significant reform including to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), three waters, and local government. Therefore, it is considered many proposed provisions should be deleted and deferred to a later plan

change, following further assessment, development of the evidence base, an understanding of the impact the proposed provisions will have and their ability to be practically and feasibly implemented.

In addition, some proposals have been developed in advance of the finalisation of higher order documents (such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB)) and allowing for existing proposed changes to District Plans to implement the NPS-UD (such as removal of minimum carparking and enabling of medium and high-density development) to bed in. In particular, Council opposes the inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions at this stage and submits that proposed provisions for indigenous biodiversity should be deleted in their entirety and included in a future plan change once the NPS-IB is gazetted.

As a result of the significant amount of material and the multiple topics in this proposed plan change to consider within a short time frame, Council has not:

- undertaken a complete check of whether detailed relief sought in this submission, could be/are partly or fully addressed by other provisions in RPSPC1
- undertaken a full review of background documents and higher order documents supporting or relating to these provisions
- identified all consequential amendments needed in response to relief sought on specific provisions or that might address our concerns

and, therefore, seeks any other amendments that will address the Council's concerns.

The Council considers that significant amendments to the proposed plan change are necessary, and these can be grouped in the following broad themes:

1. the inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions ahead of the gazettal of the NPS-IB
2. the use of negative rather than neutral language in issues statements
3. the use of regulatory methods instead on non-regulatory methods
4. some non-regulatory policies and methods appear to signal or require regulatory actions
5. some explanatory text is currently written in such a way that it reads like a policy
6. some objectives appear to be written in language more appropriate to a policy and some policies appear to be more suited to being objectives
7. requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or to extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct
8. use of directive and overly restrictive verbs / terms in objectives and policies
9. the lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for some proposals
10. lack of forethought on the scale at which provisions apply
11. inadequacy of the section 32 assessment
12. the addition of arbitrary and unjustified timing of district plan requirements
13. relation and implementation to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HL)
14. reliance on Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) and future plans/strategies

Summary and decision sought

Council remains concerned that there are fundamental issues with the proposed provisions that require significant revision or deletion to ensure the proposal is legally robust and practical to implement.

These include:

- Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) acting ultra vires, in directing territorial authorities to carry out some of the functions of regional council without the statutory powers to do so
- a lack of evidentiary, legislative or higher order document support for many of the provisions proposed
- a lack of understanding of the role of territorial authorities performs under section 31 of the RMA and their ability to resource and implement the provisions as proposed
- lack of policy direction and the requirement to identify arbitrary thresholds that don't accommodate for location and typological differences
- language, which is excessively restrictive and, in some cases, inappropriate
- the unrealistic and unachievable timescales within which territorial authorities are expected to implement plan changes to give effect to the proposed provisions

Council seeks that GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of the proposed provisions and amend the RPSPC1 to address these concerns, including specific relief sought on individual provisions, included in Table 1 at Enclosure 1. Council also seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought and for some provisions to be deleted and / or deferred to a later plan change following further assessment.

As Te Tumu Whakarae | Chief Executive of Upper Hutt City Council, I am concerned based on Council's recent experience, that GWRC has learnt nothing from the protracted court case in Whiteman's Valley where the regional council's zeal and aspirations of what they believed constituted a wetland, ran counter to their own published guidelines and was not rooted in legislation or legal definition. I am disappointed to see the extent of problematic and impractical provisions in RPSPC1 reach this point in the process – it is critical that this plan change is amended to remove the problematic provisions identified in the Council's submission.

Ha rui te mihi



Peter Kelly

Te Tumu Whakarae | Chief Executive

Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta | Upper Hutt City Council

Enclosure 1: UHCC Submission Proposed RPS Plan Change 1 – Detailed Submission - Table 1

Upper Hutt City Council Detailed Submission (Table 1) on Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region

As noted in the covering letter, the Council supports the general intent of the proposed provisions in the context of a growing and changing region. However, Council has some key fundamental concerns that need to be addressed by amendments to RPSPC1.

This submission is structured to identify the key fundamental concerns, and then identify detailed comments on specific provisions as well as the relief sought in relation to those provisions. Both the covering letter and this attachment must be read together to understand the Council's position on the RPSPC1.

Council takes a neutral position on proposed provisions where a particular opinion and / or level of support or opposition has not been expressed. Accordingly, Council's scope of submission relates to the whole of RPSPC1.

As noted in the cover letter, Council has not:

- undertaken a complete check of whether detailed relief sought in this submission, could be/are partly or fully addressed by other provisions in RPSPC1
- undertaken a full review of background documents and higher order documents supporting or relating to these provisions
- identified all consequential amendments needed in response to relief sought on specific provisions or that might address our concerns

and so, seeks any other amendments that will address the relief sought.

Council only addresses each objective, policy and method as it first appears in the proposed plan change, but comments and relief sought apply everywhere the inter-related provisions appear.

General Comments

Council considers that many of the provisions in the plan are impractical, unachievable and unworkable and do not recognise the significant growth projected for the Wellington Region, and that some of the proposed provisions would benefit from a delayed timetable to support further assessment.

The Council considers that fundamental amendments to the RPSPC1 are necessary, and these can be grouped in the following broad themes:

1. inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions prior to the gazettal of the NPS-IB
2. the use of negative rather than neutral language in issues statements
3. the use of regulatory methods instead on non-regulatory methods
4. some non-regulatory policies and methods appear to signal or require regulatory actions
5. some explanatory text is currently written in such a way that it reads like a policy

6. some objectives appear to be written in language more appropriate to a policy and some policies appear to be more suited to being objectives
7. requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or to extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct
8. use of directive and overly restrictive verbs / terms in objectives and policies
9. the lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for some provisions
10. lack of forethought on the scale at which provisions apply
11. inadequacy of Section 32 Assessment
12. the addition of timing of district plan requirements
13. relation and implementation to the NPS-HL
14. reliance on WRGF and future plans/strategies

1. Changing Indigenous Biodiversity Provisions prior to the gazettal of the NPS-IB

As expressed in feedback on the draft RPSPC1, Council maintains the view that it is premature and incongruous to amend/include indigenous biodiversity provisions in RPSPC1, in advance of the NPS-IB that provides national direction being gazetted. Council is concerned that amending the provisions now will be inconsistent with national direction and require rework. Therefore, comprehensive changes should not be made until after the NPS-IB is gazetted.

Council is particularly opposed to the indigenous biodiversity provisions that require territorial authorities to include provisions in district plans by June 2025. These arbitrary deadlines are unachievable alongside other work programmes and given RMA Schedule 1 process requirements. It is also noted that the NPS-IB is likely to include different assessment requirements which territorial authorities will have to give effect to, and that the NPS-IB implementation timeframes are eight years after commencement for general provisions and five years for significant natural areas.

Council opposes the inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions at this stage and submits that proposed provisions for indigenous biodiversity should be deleted in their entirety and included in a future plan change once the NPS-IB is gazetted. Should the provisions be retained, Council seeks specific relief as identified in Table 1 below.

2. Use of negative rather than neutral language in issue statements

Council is concerned the issues are worded in strong negative language in the absence of any evidence, that Council is aware of, to support this negatively framed position, and these set a negative presumption and tone for the proposed cascading provisions. Council requests the issues are amended to be written in neutral language with a balanced approach to the issue. An example of this, the first new overarching resource management issues for the region (adverse impacts on natural environments and communities) does not address the fundamental issue of urban growth and the provision of housing

generally but focusses only on negative impacts of urban development on environmental values and features. The issue statements set the tone of the RPS and as drafted they give the impression of only poor outcomes being possible, in a growing region.

3. Use of regulatory methods instead of non-regulatory methods

Many proposed provisions seek to impose regulatory methods, to be included in city and district plans and via resource consents, in preference to other more appropriate non-regulatory methods available. The proposed regulatory methods are cumbersome, costly and likely to be ineffective in resolving the identified issues and don't appear to be sufficiently evidenced or an appropriate RMA tool supported by higher order documents within the Section 32 Assessment.

It would be more appropriate and effective in many circumstances to develop non-regulatory guidance jointly with Local Authorities and have this used as a means of compliance to address effects management on a site-by-site basis. Councils could then determine individually, based on local circumstances, the best way to implement this guidance, which may include some district plan provisions. This could also be supported by guidance and / or civil engineering standards.

Council submits that some provisions more appropriately sit in the non-regulatory space and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

4. Non-regulatory policies and methods

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.

5. Drafting/language hierarchy between objectives, policies and explanatory text

Council has identified that some explanatory text reads like a policy and there are policies that read like objectives and objectives that read like policies.

It is concerning that some of the explanatory text appears to be directing an action that should be contained within the policy itself. Explanatory text should only ever be an aide to interpreting a provision.

Council seeks that this is addressed and identifies relief sought in Table 1 below.

6. Requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or that extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct

Council has significant concerns that many of the proposed provisions attempt to require city and district councils to carry out some of the functions of regional councils or require Council to address resource management issues in its district plan that are beyond its statutory functions, powers and duties under the RMA. GWRC is not able to legitimately direct these outcomes. Council considers these provisions ultra vires.

Council opposes the provisions and seeks that the RPS is reviewed and amended to more appropriately and accurately reflect the powers, functions and duties of the regional, district and city councils.

Whilst Council acknowledges the benefits of nature-based solutions and recognises it as a tool to address adverse effects, many would fall outside of the control of district and city councils, particularly as there is no legislative basis to support this. In enabling solutions such as rain gardens, as a possible means of compliance, it should also be recognised that many of these options may involve a long-term maintenance burden on councils, for which the implications are not clearly identified, understood, funded or justified.

Council seeks relief to specific provisions to address concerns as identified in Table 1 below.

7. Inappropriate use of verbs in objectives and policies

The RPSPC1 includes significant changes to the verbs in many objectives and policies. There has been a distinct move from using terms such as “promoting” “maintaining” and having “particular regard to” to more direct verbs including “avoid”, “protecting and enhancing” and “ensuring and requiring”. In some provisions this is entirely appropriate but in other provisions this is excessively restrictive and will prevent efficient or effective development of planned urban areas, including the delivery of key infrastructure.

The Section 32 report notes that the regional council has made some amendments in response to previous feedback on the draft change requesting consistency of verbs to ensure their legal meaning fits with the intent of the RMA and relevant higher order documents, as well as consistent and appropriate use of the terms: “iwi” and “mana whenua”.

Council considers that the changes proposed post the exposure draft do not go far enough in addressing these concerns. Further, the Section 32 Assessment does not adequately support the position taken.

Of particular concern is the use of the term ‘avoid’, particularly in policies such as Policy 32. It is not considered appropriate for regional plans to direct the avoidance such activities in district plans, or for territorial authorities to require only the avoidance of effects under section 31 (1)(b) and is not consistent with the purpose of the RMA under section 5 - to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.

Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

8. Lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for provisions, and policies which duplicate national direction

Many of the proposed provisions do not appear to be adequately supported within the Section 32 Assessment by robust evidence, including any existing legislation or higher-level strategic planning document such as a national policy statement. This is particularly evident for the proposed climate change and indigenous biodiversity provisions.

Council submits that a full legal and planning review is undertaken to address these inconsistencies and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

9. Lack of consideration of scale of provisions

Council considers there is a lack of forethought and clarity on the scale at which many of the provisions are intended to apply. This places a resource burden on territorial authorities, to first identify what threshold should be applied where, and then to develop provisions relating to those thresholds. The requirements and evidence base to develop the thresholds require significant effort and resourcing, which Council is not in a position to undertake, and in some cases, thresholds may not be an appropriate mechanism to address effects.

Council contends that GWRC should further consider the practicalities associated with threshold-based provisions, to determine if this is the most appropriate method to achieve an objective or policy or develop guidance jointly with territorial authorities to support the development of provisions and decision-making process. Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

10. Inadequacy of Section 32 Assessment

Council is concerned that the Section 32 assessment is not sufficiently evidenced and does not fully evaluate whether many of the regulatory provisions are practical / can be achieved and are the best method of achieving the outcomes sought. These provisions should be deleted and considered in a later plan change. In particular, Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

11. Timing of District Plan Requirements

Council strongly opposes arbitrary timeframes being imposed on our district plan programme by some provisions of the RPSPC1, particularly where there is no support for this in higher order documents or where higher order documents enable a longer timeframe. 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.

12. Relation and implementation of the NPS-HL

Whilst Council acknowledges and recognises that the NPS-HPL was gazetted following the notification of the RPSPC1, it is currently unclear how the RPSPC1 relates to the NPS-HPL and Council queries how the NPS-HPL is intended to be included/implemented within the RPSPC1.

Council considers it is inappropriate for the NPS-HPL to be included during the submission process and seeks a robust timeline for implementation, where the NPS-HPL is included in a future plan change.

13. Reliance on the WRGF and future plans/strategies

Council is concerned there appears to be an over-reliance on the WRGF and future plans and strategies which may be implemented within the Wellington Region. Beyond the fact that many of these provisions attempt to give legal status to a document that has no statutory weight under the Act (i.e., WRGF), Council considers that a future document should not be relied upon as it is unknown what implications such a document, and any future political changes would have. Any future document incorporated or referenced within the RPS through a future plan change should be sufficiently evidenced and supported or jointly developed by all local authorities. Reference to these documents e.g. the Future Development Strategy should be deleted from all regulatory policies.

Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.

Summary

Council considers that there are fundamental issues with the proposed provisions that require significant revision or deletion to ensure the RPSPC1 is legally robust and practical to implement. Thus, Council seeks that GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of the proposed provisions and amend the RPSPC1 to address these concerns, including detailed submission points on individual provisions included in Table 1. Council also seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought.

How to read this submission

There are two parts to the Council's submission. This submission is structured to identify the key fundamental concerns in the covering letter and is supported by more detailed comments on the provisions and the relief sought by Council in Table 1. Both parts of our submission must be read together to fully understand the Council's position on the RPSPC1.

Column one of Table 1 identifies the proposed changes to the specific provisions that are being submitted on. Column two identifies Council’s position on the proposed changes, whilst Columns three and four provide reasoning / comments and the relief / amendments sought.

Table 1 – Detailed Submission Table

Table 1: Submission points on individual provisions

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
Chapter 3: Resource management issues, objectives and summary of policies and methods to achieve the objectives in the Regional Policy Statement			
<p><u>Proposed overarching issue statements</u></p> <p>The overarching resource management issues for the Wellington Region are:</p> <p><u>1. Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities</u></p> <p><u>Inappropriate and poorly managed use and development of the environment, including both urban and rural activities, have damaged and continue to impact the natural environment, increase greenhouse gas emissions, destroying ecosystems, degrading water, adversely impacting the relationship between mana whenua and the taiao, and leaving communities and nature increasingly exposed to the impacts of climate change.</u></p> <p><u>2. Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity</u></p> <p><u>Population growth is putting pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity. To meet the needs of current and future populations, development will place additional pressure on the natural and built environments.</u></p> <p><u>3. Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>The three proposed issue statements are negatively worded, and this sets the tone for the rest of the plan change. As a result, the proposed provisions do not appear to support or acknowledge the population growth that is forecast and subsequent development that is necessary/enabled for the Wellington Region.</p> <p>For issue one, whilst Council recognises that adverse</p>	<p>Amend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include more neutral language and address balance between environmental protection and enabling the significant development necessary to accommodate forecast growth in for the region. source and reference more relevant and up to date evidence base and data to support statements and review and amend provisions based on this evidence complete and provide further explanation for

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Mana whenua / tangata whenua values, Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori have not been given sufficient weight in decision-making, including from governance level through to the implementation. As a result, mana whenua / tangata whenua values have not been adequately provided for in resource management, causing disconnection between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the environment.</u></p>		<p>environmental effects need to be managed, this appears to insinuate that the listed effects are attributable solely to poorly managed land use and development activities when other external factors have also played an important part, for example, funding availability to comprehensively address mode shift and transport related emissions or to deliver networked biodiversity projects.</p> <p>In following links in the Section 32 report to technical reports supporting the provisions, it appears as if some of the evidence base relies on state of the environment monitoring reports</p>	<p>issue two and include more detail on the problems that this pressure is causing, that the proposed provisions are seeking to address, including providing the framework for possible infrastructure growth/delivery provisions within the RPS</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>that are now over ten years old, and so responses via proposed provisions to issues that were identified some time ago may no longer be relevant or appropriate.</p> <p>Fundamentally, issue one appears to state that growth within the region is an inherently negative outcome which is contrary to the intention and direction of the NPS-UD. Council notes that well managed and integrated growth and infrastructure can be and is good for the region – socially and economically and environmentally.</p> <p>Issue two appears to be incomplete and to</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		make two separate points for which there is no supporting explanatory text.	
<p><u>Proposed overarching objective</u></p> <p><u>The overarching resource management objective for the Wellington Region is:</u></p> <p><u>Objective A: Integrated management of the region’s natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori and:</u></p> <p><u>(a) incorporates mātauranga Māori; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) recognises ki uta ki tai – the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai, and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</u></p> <p><u>(d) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment; and</u></p> <p><u>(e) recognises the role of both natural and physical resources in providing for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments; and</u></p> <p><u>(f) responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.</u></p>	Support in part	Whilst the proposed overarching objective is supported, Council is concerned that clause (f) with regards to population growth and development is unclear and could be difficult to achieve within the context of the provisions proposed within RSPSP1.	Retain objective largely as notified but amend provisions that Council seeks changes to within this submission, and amend clause (f) of the overarching objective to read: “ <u>responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change environmental issues such as climate change and water quality whilst providing for future population growth, required infrastructure delivery and development.</u> ”
Chapter 3.1A: Climate Change			
<p><u>Introductory Text</u></p> <p>1. <u>Greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced significantly, immediately and rapidly</u></p>	Support in part	Council understands the evidence supporting the climate change	Amend to recognise that there are tools to help address this, but that funding will be an

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Immediate, rapid, and large-scale reductions in greenhouse gas emissions are required to limit global warming to 1.5°C, the threshold to avoid significant impacts on the natural environment, the health and well-being of our communities, and our economy. Extreme weather events and sea level rise are already impacting our region, including on biodiversity, water quality and availability, and increasing the occurrence and severity of natural hazards. Historical emissions mean that we are already locked into continued warming until at least mid-century, but there is still an opportunity to avoid the worst impacts if global net anthropogenic CO2 emissions are reduced by at least 50 percent from 2019 levels by 2030, and carbon neutrality is achieved by 2050. In the Wellington Region, the main sources of greenhouse gas emissions are transport (39 percent total load in 2018- 19), agriculture (34 percent), and stationary energy (18 percent).</u></p> <p>3. <u>The risks associated with natural hazards are exacerbated by climate change. The hazard exposure of our communities, land, infrastructure, food (including mahinga kai), and water security is increasing because of climate change impacts on a range of natural hazards. Traditional approaches to development that have not fully considered the impacts on natural systems, and our over-reliance on hard engineered protection works, which will inevitably become overwhelmed and uneconomic to sustain, will ultimately increase the risk to communities and the environment.</u></p> <p>6. <u>Social inertia and competing interests need to be overcome to successfully address climate change</u></p> <p><u>Many people and businesses lack an understanding of the connection between their actions, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change</u></p>		<p>predictions and causes and supports the need to address climate change in the Wellington Region.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the provisions identified in the RPSPC1 do not support this, particularly without significant funding to provide infrastructure and tools to achieve this.</p> <p>Council sees no evidence within the Section 32 Assessment to support that some hard engineered solutions will inevitably become overwhelmed, and the provision fails to recognise that there also may be supporting solutions, alongside alternative</p>	<p>important factor in achieving this.</p> <p><u>Amend to read: "...and our over-reliance on hard engineered protection works, which will inevitably may become overwhelmed and uneconomic to sustain, will ultimately may increase the risk..."</u></p> <p>Amend to read: "Many people and businesses lack an an understanding of the</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>and the ways that it will impact their lives. In turn, this detracts from our ability to conceive of the changes we can make to help the transition to a low-emissions and climate-resilient future. Social inertia and competing interests are the biggest issues to overcome to address climate change.</u></p>		<p>solutions that can aid resilience. It is short-sighted to disregard a suite of tools which could contribute to the outcome sought.</p> <p>Regarding (6), this statement assumes that many people and businesses do not understand or do not want to address climate change. This is not necessarily true or evidenced. Many people are aware of the impacts of climate change but lack the ability or funding to support transition.</p>	<p>connection between their actions, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change and the ways that it will impact their lives. In turn, this detracts from our ability and support to conceive of the changes we can make to help the transition to a low-emissions and climate-resilient future. Social inertia and competing interests are the biggest issues to overcome to address climate change.</p>
<p><u>Objective CC.1:</u></p> <p><u>By 2050, the Wellington Region is a low-emission and climate-resilient region, where climate change mitigation and adaptation are an integral part of:</u></p> <p><u>(a) sustainable air, land, freshwater, and coastal management,</u> <u>(b) well-functioning urban environments and rural areas, and</u> <u>(c) well-planned infrastructure</u></p>	Support in part.	Council supports the intention to have a low emission and climate resilient region. However, Council has some concerns about the implementation measures proposed	<p>Retain the objective but seek amendments to some policies and methods to achieve this.</p> <p>Amend the explanatory text to reflect, and advocate, for the significant funding that will be required to support climate change adaptation and</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>to achieve this, and that the Section 32 does not adequately assess if the provisions are the most appropriate ways of achieving the desired outcome.</p> <p>There also seems to be a disconnect / conflict between what the RPSPC1 is saying and national direction / understanding.</p> <p>It needs to be recognised that success is not just a function of regional and district plans, but that funding and community buy in are also fundamental components.</p> <p>This includes central government funding, the relationship with long term plans and other measures that</p>	<p>mitigation in new developments.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>seek to support change such as the Emissions Reductions Plan.</p> <p>In addressing equity, it should also be recognised that, even with the proposed level of growth for Wellington Region, local authorities will not have sufficient funding through rates to support the step change necessary.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the capital costs associated with development, the maintenance and operation costs of infrastructure largely leave Councils able to only achieve a status quo if the proportion of funding required from territorial authorities remains at current levels. The</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		Section 32 needs to consider the true scale and significance of implementation.	
<p><u>Policy CC.4: Climate resilient urban areas – district and regional plan</u></p> <p><u>District and regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods to provide for climate-resilient urban areas by providing for actions and initiatives described in Policy CC.14 which support delivering the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u> <u>Policy CC.4 directs regional and district plans include relevant provisions to provide for climate resilient urban areas. For the purposes of this policy, climate-resilient urban areas mean urban environments that have the ability to withstand:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Increased temperatures and urban heat island</u> • <u>Increased intensity of rainfall and urban flooding</u> • <u>Droughts and urban water scarcity and security</u> • <u>Increased intensity of wind, cold spells, landslides, fire, and air pollution</u> <p><u>The policy is directly associated with Policy CC.14 which provides further direction on actions and initiatives to provide for climate resilient urban areas. It is noted that other policies of this RPS also provide for actions and initiatives to deliver climate resilient urban areas, including Policy FW.3.</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>Council supports the intent to enable climate resilient urban areas, however, it is considered inappropriate for RPS to direct many of the measures identified to achieve this in Policy CC.14.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by “the ability to withstand” the factors identified. This is not consistent with terminology in the RMA and the policy ignores the fact that provisions in district plans alone cannot achieve this policy. There is no evidence to support what level of intensity of these hazards should be</p>	<p>Delete the policy, or amend policy to read:</p> <p>“District and regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods to provide for climate-resilient urban areas.” by including provisions to address: providing for actions and initiatives described in Policy CC.14 which support delivering the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effects of increasing temperatures; and urban heat island; • increasing intensity of rainfall and urban flooding; • Droughts and urban water scarcity and security; • Increased intensity of wind, cold spells, landslides, fire, and air pollution

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>provided for nor recognition that other methods such as the three waters reform and the Building Act are relevant to the ability to achieve this policy.</p> <p>The policy fails to acknowledge that the desire to create climate resilience urban areas, will inevitably require the support of hard infrastructure alongside nature-based solutions.</p> <p>The explanation for Policy CC.4 also appears to provide direction / identifies factors that need to be addressed that more appropriately sit within a policy, rather than the reasoning for the policy. As explanatory text</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • natural hazards; and • water security <p>by providing for actions and initiatives described in Policy CC.14 which support delivering the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments.”</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>Policy CC.4 directs regional and district plans include relevant provisions to provide for climate resilient urban areas. For the purposes of this policy, climate resilient urban areas mean urban environments that have the ability to withstand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased temperatures and urban heat island • Increased intensity of rainfall and urban flooding • Droughts and urban water scarcity and security • Increased intensity of wind, cold spells, landslides, fire, and air pollution

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>Council is concerned that this would not have been through a sufficient Section 32 assessment.</p> <p>It is also considered problematic to cross reference both specifically and generally to another provision that is relevant in interpreting another policy.</p> <p>The relief sought by Council is more consistent with the issues identified in the RSPC1, provides territorial authorities flexibility to address specific issues in their areas.</p> <p>The relief sought by Council also allows recognition that there are limits to the practicality in urban</p>	<p>The policy is directly associated with Policy CC.14 which provides further direction on actions and initiatives to provide for climate resilient urban areas. It is noted that other policies of this RPS also provide for actions and initiatives to deliver climate resilient urban areas, including Policy FW.3”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		areas of measures to address drought and urban water scarcity, such as off grid water sources.	
<p><u>Policy CC.14: Climate-resilient urban areas – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, provide for actions and initiatives, particularly the use of nature-based solutions, that contribute to climate resilient urban areas, including:</u></p> <p><u>a) maintaining, enhancing, restoring, and/or creating urban greening at a range of spatial scales to provide urban cooling, including working towards a target of 10 percent tree canopy cover at a suburb-scale by 2030, and 30 percent cover by 2050,</u></p> <p><u>b) the application of water sensitive urban design principles to integrate natural water systems into built form and landscapes, to reduce flooding, improve water quality and overall environmental quality,</u></p> <p><u>c) capturing, storing, and recycling water at a community-scale (for example, by requiring rain tanks, and setting targets for urban roof area rainwater collection),</u></p> <p><u>d) protecting, enhancing, or restoring natural ecosystems to strengthen the resilience of communities to the impacts of natural hazards and the effects of climate change,</u></p> <p><u>e) providing for efficient use of water and energy in buildings and infrastructure, and</u></p> <p><u>f) buildings and infrastructure that are able to withstand the predicted future temperatures, intensity and duration of rainfall and wind.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p>	Oppose	<p>There appears to be no clear legislative or policy statement support for requiring the implementation of the specific measures proposed within this policy.</p> <p>The policy also contains several terms that are not clearly defined or clarified, e.g., ‘urban greening’ and requirements that neighbourhood scale infrastructure is provided for at all scales of development, with no direction on what threshold should be applied to these requirements.</p>	Delete policy CC.14 in its entirety and consider non regulatory methods as a means of compliance to achieve policy CC.4.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Climate change, combined with population growth and housing intensification, is increasingly challenging the resilience and well-being of urban communities and natural ecosystems, with increasing exposure to natural hazards, and increasing pressure on water supply, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and the health of natural ecosystems.</u></p> <p><u>This policy identifies the key attributes required to develop climate-resilience in urban areas and requires district and regional councils to take all opportunities to provide for actions and initiatives, particularly nature-based solutions, that will prepare our urban communities for the changes to come,</u></p>		<p>Council notes that the Section 32 report identifies that nature-based solutions are an important response to climate change adaptation and mitigation, but it is not considered that this meets the test of Section 32 (1) (b) of the RMA – that there has been sufficient examination on <i>“whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives”</i>.</p> <p>In respect of the individual clauses:</p> <p>Clause (a) – it is unclear how this can be achieved, measured and monitored. It is noted that in some areas there is more than 10% canopy already,</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>and many trees may not grow quickly enough to achieve the canopy requirements by 2030. It is also noted that 'tree canopy cover' is a very selective term which discounts a number of vegetation types which could contribute positively to the intent of the policy and the higher order objective but have been excluded by the use of the term 'canopy'. Council further notes that the requirements for tree canopy cover are at odds with NPS-UD, as canopy cannot work with townhouses, and it is impractical to rely solely on street trees to achieve this measure.</p> <p>Clause (c):</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>It is not considered appropriate to set, nor does there appear to be sufficient evidence, legislative support or justification for the setting of, targets for urban roof area rainwater collection in district plans. This also ignores that there could be other nature-based solutions that may support other objectives e.g., hydraulic neutrality and open space requirements in urban areas, through methods such as green rooves or rooftop gardens.</p> <p>Clauses (b) and (c), natural water systems and capturing rainwater at a community level and rainwater tanks</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>require space, which may not be available in an urban context. It may also be a resource burden that Council is not appropriately funded or resourced to maintain.</p> <p>Regarding clauses (e) and (f), it is unclear why the proposed provisions include requirements in district plans (or when considering consents) to address water use in buildings, and that buildings are able to withstand the effects of climate change. The proposed provisions do not address how this could be achieved in district plans, nor does there appear to be a higher order document that supports this. These</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		provisions seem to be more appropriately dealt with through the Building Act.	
<p><u>Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a notified resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional and district plan particular regard shall be given to achieving the objectives and policy outcomes of this RPS in an equitable and inclusive way, by:</u></p> <p><u>(a) avoiding compounding historic grievances with iwi/Māori; and</u> <u>(b) not exacerbating existing inequities, in particular but not limited to, access to public transport, amenities and housing; and</u> <u>(c) not exacerbating environmental issues; and</u> <u>(d) not increasing the burden on future generations.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>This policy requires that equity and inclusiveness are at the forefront of resource management and decision making to prevent any increase in existing inequities, to ensure intergenerational equity, and to improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities.</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>This policy reads more like an overarching objective or policy.</p> <p>Council supports clause a) but is concerned that clauses b) to d) may be difficult to achieve, particularly at a resource consent level.</p> <p>The language here is also very strong, which sets a high bar, and there are no measures to determine how you would know that these lists of matters were not being met. As an example, the location of development could have an impact on</p>	<p>Amend to be an overarching objective or policy, and amend to read:</p> <p><u>Policy / Objective IM.2 XX:</u> <u>Equity and inclusiveness – consideration</u></p> <p>When considering an application for a notified resource consent, a notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional and district plan particular regard shall be given to achieving the objectives and policy outcomes of this RPS in an equitable and inclusive way, by:</p> <p>(a) avoiding addressing compounding historic grievances with iwi/Māori; and <u>(b) not exacerbating existing addressing social inequities, in particular but not limited to,</u></p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>access to public transport if connections are severed or not properly planned. However, access is also related to service provision, which is a regional council function, and regional and district plans have no control over the implementation or withdrawals of public transport services.</p> <p>Clause b) is open to much interpretation that would also be difficult to evidence at a resource consent level.</p> <p>Clause c) would not require if the policy becomes an overarching objective / policy as this is already covered by</p>	<p>access to public transport, amenities and housing; and (c) not exacerbating environmental issues; and (d) not increasing the burden on supporting the sustainable management of resources for future generations.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>This policy requires that equity and inclusiveness are at the forefront of resource management and decision making to prevent any increase in existing inequities, to ensure intergenerational equity, and to improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>other provisions in the RPSPC1.</p> <p>Under clauses c) and d) it is unclear what the environmental issues and burdens are that this provision is seeking to address. There may also be circumstances where acting in a way that is not considered equitable, could reduce a future burden.</p> <p>The provisions should more accurately reflect the purpose of the RMA.</p>	
<p><u>Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan particular regard shall be given to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in resource management and decision making; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) recognising the interconnectedness between air, freshwater, land, coastal marine areas, ecosystems and all living things – ki uta ki tai; and</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the need to develop closer working relationships with mana whenua and the need to give effect to section 31 of the RMA in respect of integrated management, but it is	<p>Amend to define terms in particular:</p> <p>‘Data sovereignty’</p> <p>Delete clause g) or amend to exclude resource consents and notice of requirements.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(c) recognising the interrelationship between natural resources and the built environments; and</u> <u>(d) making decisions based on the best available information, improvements in technology and science, and mātauranga Māori; and</u> <u>(e) upholding Māori data sovereignty; and</u> <u>(f) requiring Māori data and mātauranga Māori to be interpreted within Te Ao Māori; and</u> <u>(g) recognising that the impacts of activities may extend beyond immediate and directly adjacent area, and beyond organisational or administrative boundaries</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>This policy requires that a holistic, integrated view is taken when making resource management decisions. It also requires both regional and district councils to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua are actively involved in in resource management and decision making, including the protection of mātauranga Māori and Māori data.</u></p>		<p>difficult to achieve some of these matters at resource consent or notice of requirement level.</p> <p>Clause g) does not work for a consent or a notice of requirement so should be deleted or constrained only to plan changes.</p> <p>Council supports clause c) but there needs to be a clear relationship with practical and workable methods to achieve this.</p> <p>Support in particular d) and e), in that Council believes that it requires going to mana whenua to obtain information on what they think is important to them and for mana whenua</p>	<p>Amend to ensure methods of implementation are achievable.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		to determine the information they choose to release.	
<p>Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion Maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region’s urban areas (as at March 2009 August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>a) the urban proposed development is the most appropriate option to achieve Objective 22 contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors;</u> ii. <u>the location, design and layout of the proposed development shall apply the specific management or protection for values or resources identified by this RPS, including:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29,</u> 2. <u>Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values as identified by Policy 23,</u> 3. <u>Protecting outstanding natural features and landscape values as identified by Policy 25,</u> 4. <u>Protecting historic heritage values as identified by Policy 22,</u> 5. <u>Integrates Te Mana o Te Wai consistent with Policy 42,</u> 6. <u>Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17.</u> 	Oppose in part	<p>Council is concerned with some of the drafting of this policy and its application in relation to the definition of urban areas, which is zone based and does not recognise some of the zones of Upper Hutt, such as the Special Activity Zones, as well as the Settlements Zone, which is identified in the NPS-HPL as an urban zone. In this respect there seems to be a disconnect between this policy and the WRGF.</p> <p>It is unclear what “appropriate” means in the context of this policy and consider that the original policy wording title</p>	<p>Delete or amend to be consistent with the NPS-UD definition of a well-functioning urban environment, define ‘urban development’ and ‘planned urban area’ and read:</p> <p>“Policy 55: Providing for appropriate urban expansion Maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable <u>urban form</u> regional form – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region’s urban areas (as at March 2009 August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the urban development will be well-connected to the existing or planned urban area,

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>7. <u>Recognises and provides for values of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua,</u></p> <p>8. <u>Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure as identified by Policy 8; and</u></p> <p>b) the proposed urban development is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the Council’s regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district or region, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; and/or</p> <p>c) a structure plan has been prepared.; <u>and/or</u></p> <p>d) <u>Any urban development that would provide for significant development capacity, regardless of if the development was out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy 55 gives direction to the matters that must be considered in any proposal that will result in urban development occurring beyond the region’s existing urban areas. This includes ensuring that the qualities and characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment are provided for through clause (a), which includes recognising values or resources identified elsewhere in the RPS.</u></p> <p><u>Clause (b) requires consideration to be given to the consistency of the development with the Future Development Strategy which will look to deliver well-functioning urban environments through a regional spatial plan. To provide for the interim period where the Future Development Strategy is in development, clause (b) also requires consideration to be given to the consistency with any regional strategic growth and/or development framework which is currently the Wellington Regional Growth Framework. Clause (c) requires consideration to be given to whether a structure plan has been provided. A structure plan is a framework to guide the development or</u></p>		<p>identifies more articulately, the outcome wished to be achieved.</p> <p>The policy seems to be being used to define “a well-functioning urban environment” which is already defined in the NPS-UD and does not take account of locational differences across the region.</p> <p>It is unclear how the extent of the ‘urban development’ is defined e.g. the extent of the existing built urban environment or by zoning as at August 2022.</p> <p>This policy, along with other provisions within RPSPC1 will make it very difficult for greenfield</p>	<p>particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors;</p> <p>ii. the location, designincluding</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards as required by Policy 29, 2. Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; as identified by Policy 23, 6. Provides for climate resilience and supports a low or zero carbon transport network consistent with Policies CC.1, CC.4, CC.10 and CC17. <p>b) the proposed urban development is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the Council’s regional or local strategic growth</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>redevelopment of an area by defining the future development and land use patterns, areas of open space, the layout and nature of infrastructure (including transportation links), and other key features and constraints that influence how the effects of development are to be managed.</u></p> <p><u>Clause (d) requires consideration of any proposal that would add significantly to development capacity, regardless of whether it is out of sequence or unanticipated by growth or development strategies. This clause gives effect to Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. Clause (d) should be considered in conjunction with Policy UD.3.</u></p> <p><u>Urban development beyond the region’s urban areas has the potential to reinforce or undermine a compact and well designed regional form.</u></p> <p><u>The region’s urban areas (as at March 2009) include urban, residential, suburban, town centre, commercial, community, business and industrial zones identified in the Wellington city, Porirua city, Lower Hutt city, Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.</u></p> <p><u>Urban development is subdivision, use and development that is characterised by its planned reliance on reticulated services (such as water supply and drainage) by its generation of traffic, and would include activities (such as manufacturing), which are usually provided for in urban areas. It also typically has lot sizes of less than 3000 square metres.</u></p> <p><u>Examples of growth and/or development frameworks or strategies in the region are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>The Upper Hutt City Council Urban Growth Strategy</u> ● <u>Wellington City Northern Growth Management Framework</u> 		<p>development to be achieved, when it is necessary to meet our housing needs.</p> <p>Clause a) and a)i) seems to take a provision in section 3.8 of the NPS that applies to out of sequence developments. This does not take account of future planned long-term development and does not allow Council to address capacity issues.</p> <p>Clause a)ii)1) refers to Policy 29, which is now proposed to read “manage” and not “avoid inappropriate” development and so there should be consistency between the two provisions.</p>	<p>and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district or region, should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; and/or</p> <p>c) a structure plan has been prepared <u>and approved by the wellington regional local authorities</u>; and/or</p> <p>d) Any urban development</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>Clause (b) requires consideration... Development Strategy is in development, clause (b) also requires consideration to be given to the consistency with any regional strategic growth and/or development framework which <u>is prepared and approved by the Wellington Region local authorities</u> is currently the Wellington Regional Growth Framework.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p> • Porirua City Development Framework • Kapiti Coast: Choosing Futures Development Management Strategy and local outcome statements contained in the Kapiti Coast Long Term Council Community Plan </p> <p> <u>Policies 54 and 56 also need to be considered in conjunction with policy 55. In addition, there are also a range of ‘related policies’ in the Regional Policy Statement that set out matters to be considered in order to manage effects on natural and physical resources.</u> </p> <p> <u>Structure planning integrates land use with infrastructure – such as transport networks, community services and the physical resources. Structure planning should also deliver high quality urban design.</u> </p> <p> <u>The content and detail of structure plans will vary depending on the scale of development.</u> </p> <p> <u>Notwithstanding this, structure plans, as a minimum, should address:</u> </p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provision of an appropriate mix of land uses and land use densities</u> • <u>How environmental constraints (for example, areas at high risk from natural hazards) and areas of value (for example, indigenous ecosystems, rivers, streams and ephemeral streams, wetlands, areas or places with historic heritage, outstanding landscapes, or special amenity landscapes) are to be managed</u> • <u>Integration with existing and proposed infrastructure services, such as, connections to existing and proposed transportation systems and provision</u> 		<p>Clause a)ii)6) refers to policies that Council is seeking to be deleted or amended.</p> <p>Clause b) could apply to any document in the absence of the Future Development Strategy being released. It should be recognised that a future document should not be relied upon as is unknown what implications such a document would have. However, any future document that is incorporated through a future plan change should be sufficiently evidenced and supported or jointly developed by all local authorities.</p> <p>Clause c) it is unclear who is developing the structure plan and how. This needs to be</p>	<p>....Clause (d) requires consideration of any proposals that would add.....”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>of public and active transport linkages by undertaking an integrated transport assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The integration of the development with adjoining land use activities including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects</u> • <u>Integration of social infrastructure and essential social services as necessary</u> • <u>Development staging or sequencing</u> <p><u>How the region’s urban design principles will be implemented</u></p>		<p>collaborative and approved through a relevant process in order to be given any weight in decision making. A future plan change to incorporate this document should be undertaken at a later stage.</p> <p>Clause d) Council does not consider that Policy 8 of the NPS-UD intended that out of sequence or unanticipated development should be given regard to when considering an application for resource consent, since Policy 8 only appears to refer to plan changes. It is also unclear what is meant by significant / what thresholds or locations apply.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		Council also notes that there are interrelated factors that play a part in urban development including infrastructure delivery and funding (through mechanisms such as Long Term Plans and external funding programmes), that are not sufficiently financed and operate on different funding cycles.	
<p>Policy 56: Managing development in rural areas – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at March 2009 <u>August 2022</u>), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>(a) the proposal will result in a loss of productive capability of the rural area, including cumulative impacts that would reduce the potential for food and other primary production and reverse sensitivity issues for existing production activities, including extraction and distribution of aggregate minerals;</p> <p>(b) the proposal will reduce aesthetic and open space values in rural areas between and around settlements;</p> <p>(c) the proposals location, design or density will minimise demand for non-renewable energy resources; and</p>	Oppose in part	Regard should be given to local growth strategies in the absence of an FDS, not regional strategies for which the impact of provisions at a district level are unclear and unknown. It is inappropriate to rely on a document that does not exist and only existing documents available	<p>Amend to read:</p> <p>“When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at August 2022), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <p>(d) the proposal is consistent with any Future Development Strategy, or the city or district <u>regional or local</u> strategic growth and/or development</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(d) the proposal is consistent with <u>any Future Development Strategy</u>, or the city or district regional or local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development, <u>should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or</u> <u>(e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy 56 recognises the tension that exists between urban and rural development on the fringe of urban areas and seeks to manage this tension such that well-functioning urban environments and urban areas are established and maintained.</u></p> <p><u>Policy 56 addresses development in the region’s rural areas. This policy relates to urban development and rural residential development.</u></p> <p><u>Rural areas (as at March 2009) include all areas not defined as the region’s urban areas (as at March 2009).</u></p> <p><u>The region’s urban areas (as at March 2009) include urban, residential, suburban, town centre, commercial, community, business and industrial zones identified in the Wellington city, Porirua city, Lower Hutt city, Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.</u></p>		<p>at the time of policy development should be relied upon.</p>	<p>framework or strategy that addresses future rural development., should the Future Development Strategy be yet to be released; or (e) in the absence of such a framework or strategy, the proposal will increase pressure for public services and infrastructure beyond existing infrastructure capacity.”</p>
<p>Policy 57: Integrating land use and transportation – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Many of these matters are outside the control of district and city councils and</p>	<p>Define low carbon modes amend to read:</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>development, <u>require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way which:</u></p> <p><u>(a) supports a safe, reliable, inclusive and efficient transport network;</u> <u>(b) supports connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity;</u> <u>(c) minimises private vehicle travel and trip length while supporting mode shift to public transport or active modes and support the move towards low and zero-carbon modes;</u> <u>(d) encourages an increase in the amount of travel made by public transport and active modes;</u> <u>(e) provides for well-connected, safe and accessible multi modal transport networks while recognising that the timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where the provision of public transport may not be efficient or practical;</u> <u>(f) supports and enables the growth corridors in the Wellington Region, including:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>(i) Western Growth Corridor – Tawa to Levin;</u> <u>(ii) Eastern Growth Corridor – Hutt to Masterton;</u> <u>(iii) Let’s Get Wellington Moving Growth Corridor.</u></p> <p><u>to the following matters, in making progress towards achieving the key outcomes of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy:</u></p> <p><u>(a) whether traffic generated by the proposed development can be accommodated within the existing transport network and the impacts on the efficiency, reliability or safety of the network;</u> <u>(b) connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity, open spaces or recreational areas;</u> <u>(c) whether there is good access to the strategic public transport network;</u></p>		<p>so this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>This policy applies no threshold and means that even small developments or applications for alterations or a change of use to a building would be captured by this rule, placing undue burden on Council and developments.</p> <p>Clause b) is too onerous for resource consents. Particular examples are new tourism related activities in rural areas accommodation or experiences and will stymie comprehensive development opportunities that grow over time.</p> <p>d) is duplicating c)</p>	<p>“When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, for subdivision, use or development, require land use and transport planning within the Wellington Region is integrated in a way which:</p> <p>....(b) supports connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity; (c) minimises private vehicle travel and trip length while supporting mode shift to public transport or active modes and support the move towards low and zero-carbon modes; (d) encourages an increase in the amount of travel made by public transport and active modes; (e) provides for consider where practicable enabling a well-connected, safe and accessible multi modal transport networks while recognising that the</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(d) provision of safe and attractive environments for walking and cycling; and (e) whether new, or upgrades to existing, transport network infrastructure have been appropriately recognised and provided for.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Progress towards the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan key outcomes cannot be achieved by that Strategy alone. Subdivision, use and development decisions also Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region August 2022 Page 155 of 228 need to consider impacts on the Strategy’s outcomes. Policy 57 lists matters that need to be given particular regard when considering all proposals that affect land transport outcomes. It seeks to align with the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and support decarbonising the transport system in the Wellington Region.</u></p> <p>Policy 57 lists matters that need to be given particular regard when considering all proposals in terms of their effect on land transport outcomes.</p> <p><u>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy key outcomes are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Increased peak period passenger transport mode share</u> • <u>Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists</u> • <u>Reduced greenhouse gas emissions</u> • <u>Reduced severe road congestion</u> • <u>Improved regional road safety</u> • <u>Improved land use and transport integration</u> • <u>Improved regional freight efficiency</u> <p><u>The strategic public transport network is those parts of the region’s passenger transport network that provide a high level of service along corridors with high demand for public transport.</u></p> <p><u>Locations with good access to the strategic public transport network include those:</u></p>		<p>Under clause e) low carbon modes should be defined. Council is also concerned that the provision of public transport is not a function of the district plan and relies on services being provided by other organisations / agencies.</p>	<p>timing and sequencing of land use and public transport may result in a period where the provision of public transport may not be efficient or practical;</p> <p>...</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>....Policy 57 lists matters that need to be given particular regard when considering considered for all proposals that affect land transport outcomes. It seeks to align with the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and support decarbonising the transport system in the Wellington Region....”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Within reasonable walk times to stops or stations on the strategic public transport network (research indicates a walk time of up to 10 minutes is 'reasonable')</u> • <u>With frequent and reliable public transport services</u> • <u>With accessibility, by public transport, to key destinations in the region</u> • <u>Without physical barriers to public transport (for example, busy roads, lack of footpaths or crossing facilities, steep hills)</u> 			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy FW.8: Land use adaptation – non-regulatory</u></p> <p><u>Promote and support water resilience and climate change adaptation in land use practices and land use change including:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Preparing and disseminating information about climate resilient practices</u></p> <p><u>(b) promoting water resilience in Farm Plans; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) supporting primary sector groups and landowners in researching and promoting climate resilient land uses and pathways to move to new land uses.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.8 promotes and supports climate change adaption in land use practices and change.</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>It is unclear who will be promoting this and how, and at what scale properties are expected to have a farm plan.</p> <p>It is also unclear which mechanism is intended to be used to require farm plans and suggests regulatory processes such as resource consents may be intended to serve this function.</p> <p>Territorial authorities are unlikely to have the expertise or resources to support this.</p> <p>Farm plans under clause (b) are also not defined and this could have range of requirements.</p>	Clarify policy and define farm plans or delete clause (b).
<p>Method 14: Information about on natural hazards and climate change effects</p>	Oppose in part	It is unclear who is undertaking the research required by	Amend to make responsibilities clear and ensure that this is practical and feasible with the

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Undertake research</u>, prepare and disseminate information about natural hazards and climate change effects in order to:</p> <p>(a) guide local authority planning and decision-making; and (b) raise awareness and understanding of natural hazards Implementation: Wellington Regional Council*, city and district councils and Civil Defence Emergency Management Group</p>		<p>this method. We would support the approach, on the basis that it is a regional council responsibility.</p> <p>This method seems to now require territorial authorities to undertake research rather than prepare and disseminate, which presents a resourcing issue.</p>	<p>organisations / councils impacted by this provision.</p>
<p><u>Objective CC.2</u></p> <p><u>The costs and benefits of transitioning to a low- emission and climate-resilient region are shared fairly to achieve social, cultural, and economic well-being across our communities.</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Whilst Council supports the intent to share costs and benefits equally, it is unclear what is meant by this in practise, and how this can be achieved.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity on expectations from territorial authorities and it is noted that there are third party costs and benefits</p>	<p>Amend to identify how this can be measured and enforced in an RMA / RPS context.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		that are not within the remit of Local Government functions including resource consents.	
<p><u>Policy EIW.1: Promoting affordable high quality active mode and public transport services – Regional Land Transport Plan</u></p> <p><u>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan shall include objectives, policies and methods that promote equitable and accessible high quality active mode infrastructure, and affordable public transport services with sufficient frequency and connectedness, including between modes, for people to live in urban areas without the need to have access to a private vehicle, by contributing to reducing greenhouse emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u> <u>This policy provides direction to the Regional Land Transport Plan, acknowledging the role of the objectives and policies in that plan, to promote mode shift from private vehicles to public transport and active modes by providing connected, accessible, affordable and extensive multi modal infrastructure and services.</u></p>	Support in part	<p>Support insofar as it only applies to the RLTP.</p> <p>This provides appropriate direction for the regional land transport plan, which in turn will support advocacy for the regional and territorial authorities to seek funding for public transport and active modes. However, we consider this should go further and this should be prioritised not only promoted.</p> <p>Council notes however, that the implementation of which may be difficult to achieve and will</p>	<p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>“Policy EIW.1: <u>Prioritising</u> Promoting affordable high quality active mode and public transport services – Regional Land Transport Plan</p> <p>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan shall include objectives, policies and methods that <u>prioritise</u> promote equitable.....”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		require engagement with Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail for efficient regional planning for Wellington.	
<p><u>Method CC.1: Climate change education and behaviour change programme</u></p> <p><u>Support and enable climate education and behaviour change programmes, that include Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori perspectives, to support a fair transition to low-emission and climate resilient region.</u></p> <p><u>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council</u></p>	Support	Support in principle and that this is a regional function only.	Retain method as notified.
<p><u>Method CC.10: Establish incentives to shift to active and public transport</u></p> <p><u>Establish, support and promote a range of incentives for uptake of zero and low-carbon multi modal transport to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to support an equitable and inclusive transition.</u></p> <p><u>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council</u></p>	Support in part.	<p>Council supports measures to enable shift to active and public transport.</p> <p>However, it is unclear what an equitable and inclusive transition means or how this will be determined, enforced in an RMA context and measured</p> <p>It is also unclear who will be eligible to</p>	Clarify what is meant by an equitable and inclusive transition, who is eligible for funding, and establish or advocate for funding to address the identified issues.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>receive funding, e.g. Territorial Authorities.</p> <p>The funding of these incentives needs to be considered within the context of other funding needs and priorities in the region, such as the need to support underinvestment in walking and cycling, especially if these are established through the RLTP process.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes – non-regulatory</u></p> <p><u>Regional, city and district councils should, under the Local Government Act 2002, partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua and engage local communities in a decision-making process to develop and implement strategic climate change adaptation plans that map out management options over short, medium and long term timeframes, using a range of tools and methods including, but not limited to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori approaches;</u></p> <p><u>(b) Dynamic adaptive planning pathways or similar adaptive planning approaches;</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the intent of the policy, but it states it is non regulatory policy and then requires action under the Local Government Act, and for regulatory actions to be taken in district plans under clause (c).	Amend to make it non regulatory measures only and delete clause c).

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(c) City, district or regional plan objectives, policies and rules that address subdivision, use and development for areas impacted by climate change and sea level rise;</u> <u>(d) Options for managed retreat or relocation;</u> <u>(e) A consideration of Te Mana o te Wai and Te Rito o te Harakeke;</u> <u>(f) Hazard mitigation options including soft engineering, green infrastructure or room for the river, and methods to reduce the risks from natural hazards exacerbated by climate change and sea level rise; and</u> <u>(g) Equitable funding options required to implement the programme.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u> <u>Policy CC.16 provides a range of options for development and implementation of adaptation strategies or plans to suit a particular programme or local circumstances. In some instances, the outcomes may require implementation as objectives, policies, and rules in regional or district plans, but this is not expected to be a requirement</u></p>			
<p><u>Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans – non regulatory</u></p> <p><u>Regional council will assist mana whenua / tangata whenua in the development of iwi climate change adaptation plans to manage impacts that may affect Māori relationships with their whenua, tikanga and kaupapa Māori, sites of significance, wai Māori and wai tai values, mahinga kai, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p>	Support	Council supports mana whenua being supported to develop iwi climate change adaptation plans, to manage the impacts of climate change.	Retain provision as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy CC.17 recognises that climate change will disproportionately affect Māori, especially as a lot of Māori land is located in hazard prone areas near rivers and the coast. This policy directs the regional council to assist mana whenua / tangata whenua, where appropriate, with the development of iwi-led climate change adaptation plans.</u></p>			
<p><u>Objective CC.3</u></p> <p><u>To support the global goal of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, net greenhouse gas emissions from transport, agriculture, stationary energy, waste, and industry in the Wellington Region are reduced:</u></p> <p><u>(a) By 2030, to contribute to a 50 percent reduction in net greenhouse gas emissions from 2019 levels, including a:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(i) 35 percent reduction from 2018 levels in land transport generated greenhouse gas emissions, and</u> <u>(ii) 40 percent increase in active travel and public transport mode share from 2018 levels, and</u> <u>(iii) 60 percent reduction in public transport emissions, from 2018 levels, and</u> <p><u>(b) By 2050, to achieve net zero emissions.</u></p>	Support in part	<p>This objective refers to methods that are proposed for deletion under plan change 1.</p> <p>Under objective CC.3, the proposed method of implementation appears to be a regional council responsibility. However, the overarching policies identified in Objective CC.13 i.e., policies CC1, CC.2 and CC.3 requires actions from regional, district and city councils.</p> <p>Territorial authorities have some limited influence over clause a)(i) and no ability to</p>	<p>Delete references to methods proposed for deletion.</p> <p>Amend to clarify roles and functions with regards to implementation methods required to achieve this objective.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		influence a)(ii) and a)(iii),	
<p><u>Policy CC.1: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport infrastructure – district and regional plans</u></p> <p><u>District and regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to require that all new and altered transport infrastructure is designed, constructed, and operated in a way that contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Optimising overall transport demand;</u></p> <p><u>(b) Maximising mode shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) Supporting the move towards low and zero-carbon modes</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Council considers that there is no legislative support for this policy, and it is not clear how district plans are expected to give effect to this policy.</p> <p>The road controlling authorities are responsible for the design, construction and operation of the transport network and regional council is responsible for public transport provision.</p> <p>There is also a scale and significance issue with this policy, particularly when it is applied to altered transport infrastructure and no threshold has been proposed. For</p>	<p>Amend the provision to read:</p> <p>“Policy CC.1: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport infrastructure – district and regional plans</p> <p>District and regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to <u>consider how</u> require that all new and altered transport infrastructure is designed, constructed, and operated in a way that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by:</p> <p>(a) Optimising overall transport demand;</p> <p>(b) Maximising mode shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes; and</p> <p>(c) Supporting the move towards low and zero-carbon mode”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>example, many of the existing projects in Upper Hutt in the RLTP do not align with this and would be very difficult to achieve under this policy. The policy seems to be a catch all policy that is at odds with the projects named within the RLTP.</p> <p>The ability to do this is also wholly reliant on the provision of funding and this could have unintended consequences on the ability to perform maintenance and renewal function and create additional resource burdens on territorial authorities. Under clause a) optimising transport demand is also ambiguous.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy CC.2: Travel demand management plans – district plans</u></p> <p><u>By 30 June 2025, district plans shall include objectives, policies and rules that require subdivision, use and development consent applicants to provide travel demand management plans to minimise reliance on private vehicles and maximise use of public transport and active modes for all new subdivision, use and development over a specified development threshold where there is a potential for a more than minor increase in private vehicles and/or freight travel movements and associated increase in greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Location suitable development thresholds triggering a consent requirement for a travel demand management plan are to be developed by territorial authorities and should apply to residential, education, office, industrial, community, entertainment and other land use activities that could generate private vehicle trips and freight travel. Development thresholds should specify the trigger level (for example, number of dwellings, number of people accommodated or gross floor area) where the travel demand management plan requirement applies</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Council opposes the inclusion of arbitrary timescales and requirements on territorial authorities. The regional council not in a position to mandate this, particularly in a residential context. It is not considered that this is sufficiently evidenced, nor an appropriate RMA tool that is supported by legislation or a higher order document.</p> <p>The provision, and the deadline imposed by it, places an undue resource burden on territorial authorities to identify these thresholds and a definition of “more than minor” with respect to different parts of the local transport network and for different sites.</p>	<p>Delete provision or amend provision to read:</p> <p>“By 30 June 2025, dDistrict plans shall include objectives, policies and rules that require subdivision, use and development consent applicants to consider provide travel demand management plans to minimise reliance on private vehicles and maximise use of public transport and active modes for all new subdivision, use and development where there are known capacity issues over a specified development threshold, where there is a potential for a more than minor increase in private vehicles and/or freight travel movements and associated increase in greenhouse gas emissions.”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>A threshold in an area with known capacity issues, would be lower than where sufficient capacity exists. It also does not account for differences in site location and development typology.</p> <p>It would be unrealistic to reflect these differences in a rule and is unnecessary given that district plans contain provisions to address adverse effects, which include effects on the transport network.</p> <p>By making this a regulatory method – GWRC creates additional regulatory debate for each territorial authority with our communities, and</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		places additional consent burdens on each plan, likely limiting development in the process which is at odds with our housing needs and the intentions of the NPS-UD.	
<p><u>Policy CC.3: Enabling a shift to low and zero-carbon emission transport – district plans</u></p> <p><u>By 30 June 2025, district plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and methods that enable infrastructure that supports the uptake of zero and low-carbon multi modal transport that contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>District plans must provide a supportive planning framework (for example, permitted activity status) for zero and low-carbon multi modal transport infrastructure, such as public transport infrastructure, cycleways and public EV charging network</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Support intent but oppose provision as written and the inclusion of arbitrary timescales. Public transport relates to a range of vehicles, and it is not appropriate, for example, to provide for rail infrastructure to be a permitted activity when other environmental effects could be significant.</p> <p>Transport is the responsibility of the road controlling authority and district plans do not prevent</p>	Delete policy in its entirety or amend to delete timescale and provide clarity on how this can be achieved.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>the provision of such infrastructure.</p> <p>Most of this will be on public land which will be covered by other processes e.g., bylaws.</p> <p>Council notes, it is unclear how can district plans can support EV charging when all parking standards were required to be removed under the NPS-UD.</p>	
<p>Policy 2: Reducing adverse effects of the discharge of odour, smoke, dust and fine particulate matter, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions – regional plans</p> <p>Regional plans shall include policies, and/or rules <u>and/or methods</u> that:</p> <p>(a) protect or enhance the amenity values of neighbouring areas from discharges of odour, smoke and dust; and</p> <p>(b) protect people’s health from discharges of dust, smoke and fine particulate matter; and</p> <p>(c) <u>support industry to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from industrial processes, and</u></p>	Support	<p>Support the inclusion of greenhouses gasses and insofar as this relates to regional plans only.</p> <p>Note that some of this is going further than national direction and could be difficult to achieve, and a significant burden for industrial</p>	Retain policy as notified but recognise that funding may be an issue.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(d) phase-out coal as a fuel source for domestic fires and large-scale generators by 2030.</u> <u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy 2 seeks to protect neighbouring areas and people’s health from discharges of contaminants into the air. In addition, it seeks to support industry to reduce discharges of greenhouse gas emissions from industrial processes, and to phase out coal as a fuel source for domestic fires and large-scale industrial boilers by 2030.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>The amenity value of air reflects how clean and fresh it is. High amenity is associated with good visibility, low levels of deposited dust and with people’s ability to enjoy their outdoor environment. Amenity is reduced by contaminants in the air affecting people’s wellbeing – such as when dust or smoke reduces visibility or soils surfaces, or when odour is objectionable.</p> <p>Amenity values need to be considered in the context of different environments and they may change temporarily or seasonally. In effect, what constitutes an objectionable odour, or level of smoke or dust is, in part, dependant on the normal conditions experienced in a locality or at a time of year.</p> <p>Protecting people’s health from discharges to air includes considering the effects of fine particulate matter discharged from human activities. The Wairarapa (specifically Masterton), Wainuiomata and Upper Hutt are the airsheds known to be at risk of exceeding the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality, in relation to fine particulate matter (PM10), during cold-calm winter nights. Domestic fires are the main source of fine particulate emissions in these airsheds during winter</p>		<p>businesses if not properly supported / funded.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Policy 11: Promoting and enabling energy efficient design and small scale renewable energy generation – district plans</p> <p>District plans shall include policies and/or rules and other methods that:</p> <p>(a) promote energy efficient design and the energy efficient alterations to existing buildings;</p> <p>(b) enable the installation and use of domestic scale (up to 20 kW) and small scale distributed renewable energy generation (up to 100 kW); and provide for energy efficient alterations to existing buildings;</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 11 promotes energy efficient design, energy efficient alterations to existing buildings, and enables installation of domestic scale and renewable energy generation (up to 100kW).</u></p> <p><u>Energy efficient design and alteration to existing buildings, can reduce total energy costs (i.e., heating) and reliance on non-renewable energy supply.</u></p> <p><u>Small scale distributed renewable electricity generation means renewable electricity generation for the purpose of using electricity on a particular site, or supplying an immediate community, or connecting into the distribution network. (from NPS-REG 2011).</u></p> <p>Orientation, layout and design can have a significant influence on the energy efficiency of developments. Improved energy efficiency can be achieved by:</p> <p>1. Enabling everyday services – such as shops, schools, businesses and community facilities to be accessed by walking and cycling</p> <p>2. Enabling easy access to public transport services</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council notes that some of these matters can extend beyond what can be achieved by district plans, especially when it comes to buildings and it is unclear how district plans are expected to promote energy efficient design.</p> <p>Some matters for buildings are more appropriately dealt with under the Building Act or via non-regulatory guidance.</p> <p>Councils is also concerned that there is an issue of scale of significance in respect of alterations to existing buildings. Some alterations to a residential building, for example, may require a consent but</p>	<p>Amend policy to delete reference to alterations to existing buildings or apply a threshold and delete reference to “promote”.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>3. Locating and designing infrastructure and services to support walking, cycling or the use public transport</p> <p>4. Enabling the efficient use of the sun as a source of power and heating</p> <p>5. Incorporating renewable energy generation facilities – such as solar panels and domestic scale wind turbines</p> <p>Small scale distributed renewable energy generation facilities (up to 20 kW for domestic use and up to 100 kW for small community use) include solar generation particularly for water heating and wind turbines used for on-site or domestic purposes. Energy efficient alteration may include alterations of buildings for the installation of solar water heating systems or domestic scale wind turbines</p>		<p>only because they have a minor breach of height in relation to boundary rules.</p> <p>In this case it is not reasonable or practical to apply clause b) in particular.</p>	
<p>Policy 7: Recognising the benefits from renewable energy and regionally significant infrastructure – district and regional plans</p> <p>District and regional plans shall include policies and/or methods that recognise:</p> <p>(a) the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure, and <u>in particular low and zero carbon regionally significant infrastructure</u> including:</p> <p>(i) people and goods can travel to, from and around the region efficiently and safely <u>and in ways that support transitioning to low or zero carbon multi modal travel modes;</u></p> <p>(ii) public health and safety is maintained through the provision of essential services: - supply of potable water, the collection and transfer of sewage and stormwater, and the provision of emergency services;</p> <p>(iii) people have access to energy, <u>and preferably low or zero carbon energy, so as to meet their needs;</u> and</p> <p>(iv) people have access to telecommunication services.</p>	Support in part	<p>It is noted that there is no legislative support for ‘having particular regard for’ low and zero carbon regionally significant infrastructure or definition of what this means.</p> <p>It is unclear if this includes embodied carbon and if so how this would be addressed.</p> <p>Some regionally significant</p>	<p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>“District and regional plans shall include policies and/or methods that recognise:</p> <p>(a) the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure, <u>including and in particular</u> low and zero carbon regionally significant infrastructure <u>in ways that can:</u> including:</p> <p>(i) <u>encourage</u> people and goods <u>can to</u> travel to, from and around the region</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(b) the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of energy generated from renewable energy resources including:</p> <p>(i) security of supply and diversification of our energy sources;</p> <p>(ii) reducing dependency on imported energy resources; and (iii) reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Notwithstanding that renewable energy generation and regionally significant infrastructure can have adverse effects on the surrounding environment and community, Policy 7 recognises that these activities can provide benefits both within and outside the region, in particular if regionally significant infrastructure is a low or zero carbon development.</u></p> <p>Energy generated from renewable energy resources and regionally significant infrastructure can provide benefits both within and outside the region. Renewable energy benefits are not only generated by large scale renewable energy projects but also smaller scale projects.</p> <p>Renewable energy means energy produced from solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, biomass, tidal wave and ocean current sources. Renewable energy generation and regionally significant infrastructure can also have adverse effects on the surrounding environment and community. These competing considerations need to be weighed on a case by case basis to determine what is appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>Imported and non-renewable energy sources include oil, gas, natural gas and coal.</p>		<p>infrastructure, particularly roads may not in themselves be low or zero carbon but can accommodate low or zero carbon multi modal travel.</p> <p>Some of these matters are also not within the control of district plans to achieve, or it is unclear how the district plans can support low and zero carbon regionally significant infrastructure transitioning to low or zero carbon multi modal travel modes. As an example, district plans cannot influence travel choice, public transport fuel choice or funding to support and public transport.</p>	<p>efficiently and safely and in ways that support transitioning to promote low or zero carbon multi modal travel modes;</p> <p>(ii) <u>maintain public health and safety is maintained through the provision of and-enabling essential services:— supply of potable water, the collection and transfer of sewage and stormwater, and the provision of emergency services;</u></p> <p>(iii) people have support access to energy, and preferably low or zero carbon energy, so as to meet their needs; and</p> <p>(iv) people have support access to telecommunication services. ...”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>When considering the benefits from renewable energy generation the contribution towards national goals in the New Zealand Energy Strategy (2007) and the National Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy (2007) will also need to be given regard.</p> <p>Regionally significant infrastructure is defined in Appendix 3</p>			
<p>Policy 9: Promoting greenhouse gas emission reduction and uptake of low emission fuels – Regional Land Transport Plan Strategy Reducing the use and consumption of non-renewable transport fuels, and carbon dioxide emissions from transportation</p> <p>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan Strategy shall include objectives and policies that promote a reduction in:</p> <p>(a) <u>a reduction of the consumption of non-renewable transport fuels; and</u> (b) the emission of carbon dioxide from transportation</p> <p>(b) <u>a reduction of the emission of greenhouse gases, and other transport generated harmful emissions such as nitrogen dioxide; and</u></p> <p>(c) <u>the uptake of low emission or zero carbon fuels, biofuels and new technologies.</u></p> <p>including through prioritising public and active transport investment to serve future urban areas, to enable development in a sequential manner which minimises the risk of increasing car journeys in the region</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>This policy provides direction to the Regional Land Transport Plan, acknowledging the role of the objectives and policies in that plan, in promoting a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions to decarbonise the transport system,</u></p>	Support	Support insofar as this relates to regional plans.	Retain provisions as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>promotes the uptake of low emission or zero carbon fuels and new technologies. Regionally, in 2019, transport was the biggest source of greenhouse gas emissions. Transport emissions accounted for 39 percent of total gross emissions.</u></p> <p>Transportation is a significant and growing contributor to the consumption of non renewable fuels and the emission of carbon dioxide. In 2004, 86 per cent of the oil consumed in New Zealand was used by the transport sector. The transport sector also accounts for around 45 per cent of the country's carbon dioxide emissions. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas that contributes to climate change.</p> <p>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy is a statutory document, prepared under the Land Transport Act 2003, which Wellington Regional Council must produce. It is a strategy for the development of the region's land transport system over the next 30 years and provides policies to guide regional transport decisions and action programmes. The operative Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy 2007-2016 was prepared under the Land Transport Act 1998 for the required timeframe of 10 years.</p> <p>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy will play an important role in ensuring that the demand for non-renewable energy and the emissions of carbon dioxide are reduced through improving the passenger transport network, promoting an increased uptake in walking and cycling, managing the demand for travel and increasing travel efficiency. It is, however, only one of the mechanisms to achieve national targets for reducing carbon dioxide-equivalent emissions from transportation and complements other central government and industry mechanisms</p>			
<p><u>Policy CC.9: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport infrastructure – consideration</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the intent of this policy	Amend to read:

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan, particular regard shall be given to whether the subdivision, use and development have been planned to optimise overall transport demand, maximising mode shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes, in a way that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p>		<p>but considers that district plans, and in particular resource consents and notice of requirements cannot achieve this, particularly in relation to optimising travel demand and influencing travel choice and ensuring public transport service provision, given public transport is a regional function.</p> <p>It is also unclear what is meant by optimising travel demand.</p> <p>As with other policies there is also an issue of significance of scale. As an example, it is inappropriate for alterations of buildings to have particular regard to this.</p>	<p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan, particular regard shall be given to whether the subdivision, use and development have been planned to optimise overall transport demand, maximising mode shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes, in a way that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		The NPS-UD already directs that district plans cannot require parking standards, the effects of which are yet to be fully identified.	
<p><u>Policy CC.10: Freight movement efficiency and minimising greenhouse gas emissions – consideration.</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan for freight distribution centres and new industrial areas or similar activities with significant freight servicing requirements, particular regard shall be given to the proximity of efficient transport networks and locations that will contribute to efficient freight movements and minimising associated greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>This policy requires decisions for freight land use or servicing to consider transport efficiency to contribute to minimising greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p>	Support in part	These matters, especially new industrial areas, are also most appropriately dealt with at a plan change or variation scale.	Amend policy to read: “When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan for freight distribution centres and new industrial areas or similar activities with significant freight servicing requirements, particular regard shall be given to the proximity of efficient transport networks and..”
<p><u>Policy CC.11: Encouraging whole of life carbon emissions assessment – Consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan, a whole of life carbon emissions assessment is encouraged for all new or altered transport infrastructure as part of the information submitted with the application. This information will assist with evaluating the potential greenhouse gas emissions,</u></p>	Oppose	This will place unnecessary and additional burdens on Councils including consent processes and does not consider scale.	Delete provision in its entirety or amend to provide non-regulatory guidance.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>options for reducing direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions and whether the infrastructure has been designed and will operate in a manner that contributes to the regional target for a reduction to transport-related greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>This policy encourages a whole of life carbon emissions assessment for new or altered transport infrastructure. This assessment will provide information and evidence on predicted emissions to enable assessment of impacts and options in the context of regional targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Waka Kotahi has a tool providing accepted assessment methodology.</u></p>		<p>'Altered infrastructure' is an all-inclusive term can range from a change from a roundabout to traffic lights to significant road widening.</p> <p>It is also unclear how a policy that 'encourages' an action can be classified as a regulatory policy.</p> <p>Councils have no control over the end user of the infrastructure beyond enabling mode shift through, for example, the provision of cycle lanes and the operation of transport infrastructure is a function of the road controlling authority and not district plans.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>It is noted that around 51% of transport funding comes from Waka Kotahi, which has its own investment prioritisation method including criteria to assess effects on climate change. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to duplicate or conflict with this (or future) Waka Kotahi assessment processes.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.8: Prioritising greenhouse gas emissions reduction over offsetting – district and regional plans</u></p> <p><u>District and regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to prioritise reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the first instance rather than applying offsetting, and to identify the type and scale of the activities to which this policy should apply</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>This policy recognises the importance of reducing gross greenhouse gas emissions as the first priority, and only using carbon removals to offset emissions from hard-to abate sectors. Relying heavily on offsetting will delay</u></p>	Oppose	<p>It is unclear whether this policy applies to urban or rural areas, or both and how these are defined</p> <p>Council is unclear on the legislative basis for the approach. Given the lack of statutory basis it is unclear how district plan could give regard</p>	<p>Delete provision in its entirety or amend to provide options in guidance for a suite of non-regulatory methods that could achieve an outcome rather than a regulatory approach.</p> <p>Should provision be retained, it should be amended to read:</p> <p>“District and Regional plans shall include objectives,</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>people taking actions that reduce gross emissions, lead to higher cumulative emissions and push the burden of addressing gross emissions onto future generations.</u></p>		<p>to this policy in its decision making under the RMA. Therefore, Council considers this policy should relate to only regional plans should the provision be retained.</p> <p>Council considers that a suite of tools should be applied to address greenhouse gas emissions, not just one option, as all sites are all different.</p> <p>In addition, Council notes proposed methods don't seem to sit with the policy, for example, the methods include producing guidance, programmes to support reduction, and review regional response. It is inappropriate to be in a position where</p>	<p>policies, rules and/or methods to prioritise..."</p> <p>District and city councils will still be required to give effect to the RPS, and assessment and appropriate measures can be assessed on a site-by-site basis.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>guidance outside of the RPS sets direction for inclusion of elements in district plan.</p> <p>This places undue obligation on the applicant and territorial authorities to assess, enforce and monitor as well as identifying thresholds.</p> <p>Council notes that there was not response by GWRC to the KCDC submission in the Section 32 report on this policy.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.5: Avoid increases in agricultural greenhouse gas emissions – regional plan</u></p> <p><u>Regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to avoid changes to land use activities and/or management practices that result in an increase, in gross greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p>	Oppose in part.	<p>There is no clear evidence that this is a particular issue in the Wellington Region compared to other regions where agricultural emissions are much higher, for example Waikato where the percentage</p>	<p>Delete the policy in its entirety or clarify that this policy and the method to achieve it are a regional only function.</p> <p>Review proposal to ensure that this is feasibly able to be implemented and does not place undue obligations on landowners.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>As agriculture is the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the Wellington Region, contributing 34 percent of the region’s greenhouse gas emissions, reducing emissions from the agricultural sector is critical to contribute to achieving Objective CC.3. While central government is taking the lead on the policy approach to reduce agricultural greenhouse gas emissions through the use of a pricing mechanism (the Emissions Trading Scheme), this policy sets a minimum expectation that there should be no increase in agricultural greenhouse gas emissions in the Wellington Region. As of 30 November 2022, regional councils are able to make rules to control the discharge of greenhouse gases having regard to the effects on climate change. A plan change process will determine the way in which Policy CC.5 is given effect to and will need to consider issues such as equity and the relationship with the national pricing approach for agricultural emissions.</u></p>		<p>of emissions from agriculture is over 50% according to Stats.NZ regional emissions data.</p> <p>This policy is identified as a regional function, but method CC.8 (d) (non-regulatory) appears to imply the requirement of farm plans through a resource consent process. The scale and thresholds for farm plan requirements are unclear and it does not appear scale has been considered.</p> <p>There are many minor changes to land use, or between agricultural activities where the public would be required to undergo an assessment to determine</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>greenhouse gas emissions as a result of this policy. This places an unnecessary burden on the consents and applications. This is likely to disincentivise positive changes in land and be counterproductive to the aim of the objective.</p> <p>Council does not consider it appropriate to require landowners to go through a form of consent for a land use change which may be positive.</p> <p>It is noted that work is the Emissions Trading Scheme does not yet cover agriculture and that this does not address land use changes that would traditionally appear to</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>have a greater possibility of emissions, but these could be remedied.</p> <p>There is no definition of what these activities might be or what tools are available to remedy, measure or monitor the effects that the RPSPC1 is seeking to address.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.13: Managing agricultural gross greenhouse gas emissions – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, associated with a change in intensity or type of agricultural land use, particular regard shall be given to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) reducing gross greenhouse gas emissions as a priority where practicable, and</u> <u>(b) where it is not practicable to reduce gross greenhouse gas emissions, achieving a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and</u> <u>(c) avoiding any increase in gross greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>As agriculture is the second largest emitter of GHG in the region, contributing 34 percent of the region’s GHG emissions, reducing emissions from this sector is critical to contribute to achieving Objective CC.3. As of 30 November 2022,</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>This is a significant change to regional consents and will place onerous requirements on all consents, even those that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are relatively small • propose a reduction in intensity • result in a less than minor effects or 	<p>Delete policy or amend policy to clarify that this relates to regional consents only, and set a threshold for when the provision applies, Review proposal to ensure that this is feasibly able to be implemented and does not place undue obligations on landowners.</p> <p>Clarify how this will relate to the NPS-HPL.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>consent authorities may have regard to the effects of discharges into air of greenhouse gases on climate change in considering an application for a discharge permit or coastal permit. Where resource consent is required in association with a change in land use intensity or type of agricultural land use, the policy requires a hierarchy of effort, seeking to reduce gross greenhouse gas emissions in the first instance, followed by achieving a net reduction, with a minimum expectation that any increase in gross emissions is avoided.</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce environmental effects. <p>Council considers this policy does not consider future growth being required to meet our housing needs and is contrary to the outcomes sought under the NPS-UD. It also does not allow for innovation and reductions in activity without the need for a resource consent.</p>	
<p>Method 34: Prepare a regional water supply strategy</p> <p><u>With interested parties prepare a regional water supply strategy, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua, to guide local authorities on how to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) improve and maximise efficient allocation of water including economic, technical and dynamic efficiency; sustainable water use</u> <u>(b) reduce leakage and wastage from reticulation systems;</u> <u>(c) encourage efficient use of water including through onsite storage;</u> <u>(d) secure sustainable water supplies for communities across the region, preparing for climate change;</u></p>	Support in part	This method is supported in principle, but it is unclear which mechanism territorial authorities would use to give effect to the measures identified in this method, and how this will work within the context of three waters reform.	<p>Review and amend method to address these issues and ensure that responsibilities can feasibly be supported under the RMA.</p> <p>Amend g) to read ...future and existing <u>public potable water supply</u> sources</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(e) <u>plan additional sources of water, including through storage (including raintanks), treatment, and distribution systems;</u> (f) <u>demand management and water conservation programmes and security of supply;</u> and (g) <u>developing methods to protect future and existing sources, rural and urban water quality</u></p> <p>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council* and city and district councils, and water infrastructure providers</p>			
<p>Policy 33: Supporting well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form – Regional Land Transport Plan Strategy</p> <p>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan Strategy shall contain objectives and policies that support <u>well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle kilometres travelled of the light vehicle fleet, maintenance and enhancement of a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form.</u></p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 33 provides direction to the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan, acknowledging the role of the objectives and policies in that plan in achieving well-functioning urban environments and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><u>The Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy provides a policy framework for regional transport decisions that play an important role in the maintenance and enhancement of a compact, and well designed and sustainable regional form.</u></p>	Support in part	<p>Integration between transport and land use is important to ensure that growth is supported by infrastructure. The RLTP is appropriate place for this to be.</p> <p>Support insofar as it only relates to the RLTP and that it can be used to support advocacy for funding.</p>	Retain provision as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Objective 22 outlines the elements that are to be achieved by a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form. Elements of particular relevance will include efficient use of existing infrastructure and improved east west transport linkages.</p>			
<p>Objective CC.4</p> <p><u>Nature-based solutions are an integral part of climate change mitigation and adaptation, improving the health and resilience of people, biodiversity, and the natural environment.</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The is supported in principle but the Council has some concerns over the policies that relate to this objective.</p> <p>There is no full understanding of the maintenance costs associated with nature-based solutions, such as rain gardens in the long term and to whom this burden should fall within the context of limited territorial authority resources. It is noted that nature-based solutions have been defined in a loose way which can lead to inconsistencies and</p>	<p>Amend to read that “<i>nature-based solutions are recognised as an integral part</i>”</p> <p>Allow district councils to define and provide guidance on what tools best work under this policy as a mean of compliance, through their own definition of nature-based solutions.</p> <p>Provide clarity on nature-based solutions vs. green infrastructure and apply consistent terms throughout the RPS.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>confusion. It is unclear whether it is expected that territorial authorities would define what this means, given the policies in the RPSPC1 that require provisions in district plans for them.</p> <p>It is also noted that nature-based solutions seem too be used interchangeably with green infrastructure, which has not been defined. Council seeks consistency in terms used within the RPS.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.15: Improve rural resilience to climate change – non-regulatory</u></p> <p><u>Support rural communities in their <i>climate change adaptation</i> and mitigation efforts, including by:</u></p> <p><u>(a) providing practical and easily accessible information on climate change projections at a local level,</u></p>	Oppose in part	This policy stretches the legislative powers and authority of territorial authorities and Council considers this policy should be a regional council function only.	Amend to clarify as a regional council function only, what is meant and review to ensure that this can be achieved.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(b) promoting and supporting land management practices and/or land uses that improve resilience to climate change, including <i>nature-based solutions</i>,</u> <u>(c) promoting and supporting land management practices and/or land uses that will reduce gross greenhouse gas emissions,</u> <u>(d) giving preference to climate change efforts that also deliver benefits for indigenous biodiversity, land, fresh and coastal water.</u></p> <p>Explanation <u>This policy promotes and supports low emission agriculture and increased rural resilience to climate change.</u></p>		<p>It is unclear what nature-based solutions would mean in a rural context, or how this would be achieved in a non-regulatory way. This could place additional burden without required financial support.</p> <p>The policy also does not consider how benefits would be apportioned when something is generated or demanded in an urban and rural area.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.6: Increasing regional forest cover and avoiding plantation forestry on highly erodible land – regional plans</u></p> <p><u>Regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that support an increase in the area of <i>permanent forest</i> in the region to contribute to achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, while:</u></p> <p><u>(a) promoting and incentivising the planting or regeneration of permanent indigenous forest over exotic species, particularly on <i>highly erodible land</i> and in catchments where water quality targets for sediment are not reached, and</u></p>	Support in part	Support the measures to increase forest and that this is a regional function only, however, it is unclear how this will be balanced against housing need, and it does not appear that this is supported by the Emissions Trading	Advocate for central government supporting indigenous forest cover in the Emissions Trading Scheme as the primary incentive for the implementation of this method.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(b) avoiding <i>plantation forestry on highly erodible land</i>, particularly in catchments where water quality targets for sediment are not reached.</u></p>		<p>Scheme Credit which may impact on willingness to adopt the practice.</p> <p>There is a need to ensure that regional council adequately resources incentives for landowners.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.7: Protecting, restoring, and enhancing ecosystems and habitats that provide nature-based solutions to climate change – district and regional plans</u></p> <p><u>District and regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that provide for nature-based solutions to climate change to be part of development and infrastructure planning and design.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Development and infrastructure planning and design should include nature-based solutions as standard practice, including green infrastructure, green spaces, and environmentally friendly design elements, to manage issues such as improving water quality and natural hazard protection. Nature-based solutions can perform the roles of traditional infrastructure, while also building resilience to the impacts of climate change and providing benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community wellbeing.</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Council is concerned that there is no legislative ability to direct district plans on the use of nature-based solutions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of the full maintenance costs associated with these solutions over long term.</p> <p>Council also notes that there are other solutions which can achieve positive outcomes, which do</p>	<p>Delete or amend to make this policy a regional council function only.</p> <p>“District and Regional plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods...”</p> <p>Allow district councils to define and provide guidance on what tools best work under this policy as a mean of compliance, through their own definition of nature-based solutions.</p> <p>Provide clarity on nature-based solutions vs. green infrastructure and apply consistent terms throughout the RPS.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>not necessarily have natural components, e.g., subsurface water attenuation</p> <p>See our notes on Objective CC.4 for comments regarding clarity of the definition of nature-based solutions.</p>	
<p><u>Method CC.6: Identifying nature-based solutions for climate-change</u></p> <p><u>By 30 June 2024, the Wellington Regional Council will, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua, identify ecosystems in the Wellington Region that should be prioritised for protection, enhancement, and restoration for their contribution as a nature-based solution to climate change, including those that:</u></p> <p><u>(a) sequester and/or store carbon (e.g., forest, peatland),</u></p> <p><u>(b) provide resilience to people and the built environment from the impacts of climate change (e.g., coastal dunelands, street trees, and wetlands),</u></p> <p><u>(c) provide resilience for indigenous biodiversity from the impacts of climate change, enabling ecosystems and species to persist or adapt (e.g., improving the health of a forest to allow it to better tolerate climate extremes).</u></p> <p><u>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council</u></p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>Whilst this is identified as a GWRC action it is unclear whether and how territorial authorities will be involved in this important work.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether there is an expectation that this will also require a regulatory response by territorial authorities, given that the RPSPC1 proposes that district plans identify and provide for nature-based solutions and seeks to</p>	<p>Amend to clarify role for territorial authorities. See also related comments on Policy CC.7 and Objective CC.4.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>include provisions in district plans relating to indigenous ecosystems.</p> <p>See our notes on Objective CC.4 for comments regarding clarity of the definition of nature-based solutions.</p>	
<p><u>Policy CC.12: Protect, enhance and restore ecosystems that provide nature-based solutions to climate change – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, a determination shall be made as to whether an activity may adversely affect a <i>nature-based solution</i> to climate change and particular regard shall be given to avoiding adverse effects on the <i>climate change mitigation or adaptation</i> functions.</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>It is unclear what the intent of this provision is, regarding climate change mitigation or adaptation functions. Is this intending to address existing nature-based solutions or future planned solutions?</p> <p>It is also unclear how territorial authorities are supposed to identify these effects, the scale of the effects and ensure that that they are avoided.</p>	<p>Delete policy in its entirety.</p> <p>See also comments on Policy CC.7 and Objective CC.4.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>Council does not oppose the intent of what the RPSPC1 is trying to achieve but considers that this places an onerous burden on territorial authorities and applicants.</p> <p>See our notes on Objective CC.4 for comments regarding clarity of the definition of nature-based solutions.</p>	
<p><u>Objective CC.5</u></p> <p><u>By 2030, there is an increase in the area of permanent forest in the Wellington Region, maximising benefits for carbon sequestration, indigenous biodiversity, land stability, water quality, and social and economic wellbeing.</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports a desire to increase cover, but is concerned about timeframe, balancing this against forecasted projections of growth and subsequent development over the next 10 years and willingness and ability to implement.	Amend to remove arbitrary timeframe and review policies associated with this objective to ensure that they can be achieved (as a Tier 1 Council under the NPS-UD) and that this is identified as a regional function only.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>It is also not identified how this will be achieved, measured and monitored by the policies and methods below.</p> <p>It is notes that the regulatory policy relating to this objective is a regional function.</p>	
<p><u>Objective CC.6</u></p> <p><u>Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change.</u></p>	Support in part	Support the need to increase resilience, however Council is concerned about some of the policies supporting this objective.	Retain objective as notified and review policies to ensure an ability to reasonably implement.
<p><u>Policy FW.5 Water supply planning for climate change and urban development – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan particular regard shall be given to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) climate change impacts on water supply, including water availability and demand;</u></p> <p><u>(b) demand from future population projections;</u></p> <p><u>(c) development of future water sources, storage, treatment and reticulation;</u></p> <p><u>and</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the intent but considers that the policy should be specific to changes, variations or reviews which deal with public potable water supply only.	<p>Amend to read:</p> <p>When considering a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan <u>which includes a requirement for a public potable water supply</u> particular regard shall be given to.....</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(d) protection of existing and future water sources.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.5 requires water supply planning to adequately considered including the impacts of climate change and new urban development.</u></p>			<p>(a) climate change impacts on <u>public potable</u> water supply, including water availability and demand...”</p>
<p><u>Policy 29: Avoiding inappropriate Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards – district and regional plans</u></p> <p>Regional and district plans shall:</p> <p>(a) identify areas <u>affected by</u> natural hazards; and</p> <p>(b) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over a 100-year planning horizon;</p> <p>(c) include <u>objectives</u>, polices and rules to <u>manage</u> subdivision, use and development in those areas <u>where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate</u>; and</p> <p>(d) include objectives, polices and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>Policy 29 establishes a framework to:</p> <p>1. identify natural hazards that may affect the region or district; and then</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council notes that section 6 of the RMA identifies the management of significant risks from natural hazards as a matter of national importance</p> <p>In this regard it would seem more appropriate to avoid inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas of high to extreme risk, whilst managing development in areas assessed as having a low to moderate risk. It is also noted that under section 30 and 31 there is a direction</p>	<p>Define extreme, high, moderate and low risk and amend policy to read to read:</p> <p><u>Policy 29: Avoiding inappropriate Managing</u> subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards – district and regional plans.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>2. apply a risk-based approach for assessing the potential consequences to new or existing subdivision, use and development in those areas; and then 3. develop provisions to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas.</p>		<p>for the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards.</p> <p>The term ‘managing’ is a bit ambiguous and this policy should provide a strong message that inappropriate development should be avoided.</p> <p>It is unclear how an area of extreme, high, moderate or low risk is defined in this context.</p>	
<p>Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure shall be minimised, and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>(a) the frequency and magnitude likelihood and consequences of the range of natural hazards that may adversely affect the proposal or development</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council supports the provisions that recognise and seek to address issues relating to natural hazards.</p> <p>It is noted that under sections 6, 30 and 31 of the RMA it recognises the need to manage significant</p>	<p>Retain provision a notified, except amend to read:</p> <p>“Policy 51: Minimising Addressing the risks and consequences of natural hazards – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement,</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>subdivision, use or development, including residual risk those that may be exacerbated by climate change and sea level rise,</u> (b) the potential for climate change and sea level rise to increase in the frequency or magnitude of a hazard event; (c) whether the location of the <u>subdivision, use or development</u> will foreseeably require hazard mitigation works in the future; (d) the potential for injury or loss of life, social <u>and economic</u> disruption and civil defence emergency management implications – such as access routes to and from the site; (e) <u>whether the subdivision, use or development causes any change in the risk and consequences from natural hazards in areas</u> beyond the application site; (f) <u>minimising effects on the impact of the proposed subdivision, use or development on any natural features that may act as a buffer to or reduce the impacts of a</u> from natural hazards event; and where development should not interfere with their ability to reduce the risks of natural hazards; (g) <u>avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme; in areas at high risk from natural hazards;</u> (h) appropriate hazard <u>risk management and/or adaptation and/or mitigation</u> measures for <u>subdivision, use or development in areas where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate hazard areas, including an assessment of residual risk;</u> and (i) <u>the allowance for floodwater conveyancing in identified overland flow paths and stream corridors;</u> and (j) <u>the need to locate habitable floor areas levels of habitable buildings and buildings used as places of employment above the 1% AEP (1:100 year) flood level, in identified flood hazard areas.</u></p> <p>Explanation</p>		<p>risk and avoid or mitigate effects. In this regard, Council wonder whether the policy is strong enough by using the term minimised. It is also unclear what ‘minimises’ means and what level of minimisation would be acceptable.</p>	<p>or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure shall be minimised, and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to: ...</p> <p>Policy 51 aims to <u>address minimise the risk and consequences...</u>”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy 51 aims to minimise the risk and consequences of natural hazards events through sound preparation, investigation and planning prior to development. This policy reflects a need to employ a precautionary, risk-based approach, taking into consideration the likelihood of the hazard and the vulnerability of the development.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typical natural hazards in the region include, but are not limited to: • Flooding and inundation (river, stormwater, coastal) • Earthquake (groundshaking, amplification, liquefaction, ground displacement) • Coastal hazards (erosion, storm surge, tsunami) • Mass movement (landslip, rockfall) <p>Other site specific hazards may become apparent during the course of an assessment for a proposal or development; however, those above are the most serious hazards to consider.</p> <p>Policy 51 refers to residual risk, which is the risk that remains after protection works are put in place. Stopbanks, seawalls and revetments and other engineered protection works can create a sense of security and encourage further development. In turn, this increases the extent and value of assets that could be damaged if the protection works fail or an extreme event exceeds the structural design parameters.</p> <p>Policy 51(g) will cease to have effect once policy 29 has been given effect to in the relevant district plan.</p> <p>The term areas at high risk refers to those areas potentially affected by natural hazard events that are likely to cause moderate to high levels of damage to the</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>subdivision or development, including the land on which it is situated. It applies to areas that face a credible probability of experiencing significant adverse impacts in a hazard event — such as such as fault rupture zones, beaches that experience cyclical or long term erosion, failure prone hill slopes, or areas that are subject to repeated flooding.</p> <p>Policy 51(i) requires that particular regard to be given, in identified flood hazard areas, to the need to locate floor levels above the expected level of a 1 in 100 year flood or 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP), to minimise damages. It also recognises that access routes should be located above this level, to allow evacuation or emergency services access to and from a site. The clause uses the 1% annual exceedance probability as a minimum standard, allowing for the possibility that it may need to be higher in certain areas, depending on the level of risk.</p> <p>To promote more resilient communities that are better prepared for natural hazards, including climate change impacts, there is a need to support the Civil Defence Emergency Management principles of hazards and/or risk reduction, readiness, response and recovery.</p> <p>Reduction is concerned with minimising the adverse impacts from natural hazards through sound planning and management. Readiness is about preparing for hazard events before they occur and involves local authorities, civil defence emergency management and the community. An important way to achieve this is through public education and by providing information and advice in order to raise awareness of natural hazard issues. Response and recovery are the important functions carried out by local authorities and civil defence emergency management during and after a civil defence emergency.</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>The policy recognises the need to involve the community in preparing for natural hazards. If people are prepared and able to cope, the impacts from a natural hazard event are effectively reduced.</p>			
<p>Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, for hazard mitigation measures, particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>(a) the need for structural protection works or hard engineering methods; (b) <u>whether non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution;</u> (c) <u>avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development, regionally significant infrastructure or property from unacceptable risk and the works form part of a long-term hazard management strategy that represents the best practicable option for the future;</u> (d) <u>the long-term viability of maintaining the structural protection works with particular regard to how climate change may increase the risk over time;</u> (e) <u>adverse effects on Te Mana o te Wai, mahinga kai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, or the local indigenous ecosystem and biodiversity;</u> (f) <u>sites of significance to mana/tangata whenua identified in a planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with a local authority or scheduled in a city, district or regional plan;</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council queries the use of nature-based solutions vs. green infrastructure throughout RPSPC1, as noted on other provisions, and asks that there be consistency in terms.</p> <p>It is recognised that the green infrastructure is an appropriate method, but there will also be long-term maintenance and associated costs which should be recognised. It is also unclear of what the land requirements associated with “room for the river” means, as well an</p>	<p>Provide clarity, recognise that there will be costs associated with non-hard engineered measures that territorial authorities do not have the resources to meet, and amend the policy to read:</p> <p>“Policy 52: Addressing Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures – consideration</p> <p>.... variation or review of a district or regional plan, for hazard mitigation measures, particular regard shall be given....</p> <p>.... Mātauranga Māori options provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution;</p> <p>...”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(g) a no more than minor increase in risk to nearby areas as a result of changes to natural processes from the hazard mitigation works;</u> <u>(h) the cumulative effects of isolated structural protection works;</u> <u>(i) any residual risk remaining after mitigation works are in place, so that they minimise reduce and do not increase the risks from of natural hazards.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy 52 recognises that the effects of hard protection structures can have adverse effects on the environment, increase the risks from natural hazards over time and transfer the risks to nearby areas. It provides direction to consider lower impact methods of hazard mitigation such as non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options, that may be more appropriate providing they can suitably mitigate the hazard.</u></p> <p><u>Objective 19 seeks to reduce the risks and consequences from natural hazards, while Objective 20 aims to ensure activities, including hazard mitigation measures, do not increase the risk and consequences from natural hazards. Policy 52 promotes these objectives.</u></p> <p><u>Having established there is a need for protection works, non-structural and soft engineering methods should be the first option for hazard mitigation. Soft engineering methods may include, for example; hazard avoidance or controlled activity zones; setback or buffer distances; managed retreat or land retirement; a ‘do nothing’ policy;</u></p>		<p>acceptable level if minimisation means in this context.</p>	<p>Amend for consistency between nature-based solutions and green infrastructure.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>restoration projects for wetlands, dunes or hillslopes prone to flooding, slipping or erosion.</p> <p>Activities such as river bed gravel extraction which may assist in the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards are also a consideration under this policy. Structural measures or hard engineering methods can have significant environmental effects and should be considered as the least desirable option for natural hazard control. Where there is an unacceptable risk to development or property, there may be a place for structural measures or hard engineering methods, if they are part of a long-term hazard management strategy that includes other measures. Policy 51 will need to be considered alongside policy 52(c) when deciding whether a development faces an unacceptable risk or not.</p> <p>The risk that remains after protection works are put in place is known as the residual risk. Stopbanks, seawalls, and revetments and other engineered protection works can create a sense of security and encourage further development. In turn, this increases the extent and value of assets that could be damaged if the protection works fail or an extreme event exceeds the structural design parameters.</p>			
<p><u>Objective CC.7</u></p> <p><u>People and businesses understand what climate change means for their future and are actively involved in planning and implementing appropriate mitigation and adaptation responses.</u></p>	Support in part	Whilst the non-regulatory tools promoted in this objective are supported, Council notes that the desire to implement relies heavily on the ability	Review wording of policy and amend to reflect an understanding of the barriers to implementation for our communities and support provided to allow them to be more involved.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>of the community to engage.</p> <p>It is considered that the current wording of 'understand' is patronising to our communities and disregards funding, resourcing, and other barriers which limit their ability to engage with climate change adaptation responses. We should instead be seeking to provide support to allow engagement and implementation.</p>	<p>Review policies to determine ability to engage and whether they will achieve the objective.</p> <p>Assist by distributing clear messaging for the region on what climate change means for the region. In order to contribute to 'understanding'</p>
<p><u>Objective CC.8</u></p> <p>Iwi and hapū are empowered to make decisions to achieve climate-resilience in their communities.</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support the intent of the objective but seek amendments to some of the policies relating to it.</p>	<p>Retain objective as notified and seek specific relief identified in relation to policies as identified in this submission.</p> <p>Clarify the role of urban Māori and how they are represented within the RPSPC1.</p>
<p>Chapter 3.3: Energy, infrastructure and waste</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
Chapter removes reference to out-of-date national policy direction and makes consequential amendments to account for policy changes.	Support in part	Support the intent of the changes but seek some amendments to the policy updates in this chapter.	Seek specific relief identified in relation to policies as identified in this submission.
Chapter 3.4: Fresh water (including public access)			
<p>Objective 12</p> <p><u>Natural and physical resources of the region are managed in a way that prioritises:</u></p> <p><u>(a) first, the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems</u></p> <p><u>(b) second, the health needs of people (such as drinking water)</u></p> <p><u>(c) third, the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future; and</u></p> <p><u>Te Mana o te Wai encompasses six principles relating to the roles of tangata whenua and other New Zealanders in the management of freshwater, and these principles inform this RPS and its implementation. The six principles are:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Mana whakahaere: the power, authority, and obligations of tangata whenua to make decisions that maintain, protect, and sustain the health and well-being of, and their relationship with, freshwater</u></p> <p><u>(b) Kaitiakitanga: the obligation of tangata whenua to preserve, restore, enhance, and sustainably use freshwater for the benefit of present and future generations</u></p> <p><u>(c) Manaakitanga: the process by which tangata whenua show respect, generosity, and care for freshwater and for others</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>Council supports the objective in principle. However, is considered unnecessary to repeat the provisions of the NPS-FM. It is also noted that the provisions included are inaccurate, and inconsistent with the wording of the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Clause c) may be an issue for parts of the communities, especially for those reliant on/the users of irrigation and bore water.</p>	Amend (c) to reflect the NPS-FM accurately.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(d) Governance: the responsibility of those with authority for making decisions about freshwater to do so in a way that prioritises the health and well-being of freshwater now and into the future</u></p> <p><u>(e) Stewardship: the obligation of all New Zealanders to manage freshwater in a way that ensures it sustains present and future generations, and</u></p> <p><u>(f) Care and respect: the responsibility of all New Zealanders to care for freshwater in providing for the health of the nation.</u></p> <p><u>And the Statements of Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and Rangitāne o Wairarapa</u></p> <p>The quantity and quality of fresh water:</p> <p>(a) meet the range of uses and values for which water is required;</p> <p>(b) safeguard the life-supporting capacity of water bodies; and</p> <p>(c) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.</p>			
<p>Policy 12: Management purposes for of surface water bodies – regional plans</p> <p>Regional plans shall give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that:</p> <p>(a) require that water quality, flows and water levels, and the aquatic habitat of surface water bodies are to be managed for the purpose of safeguarding aquatic ecosystem health; and</p> <p>(b) manage water bodies for other purposes identified in regional plans.</p> <p><u>(a) are prepared in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua;</u></p> <p><u>(b) achieve the long-term visions for freshwater;</u></p> <p><u>(c) identify freshwater management units (FMUs);</u></p> <p><u>(d) identify values for every FMU and environmental outcomes for these as objectives;</u></p>	Support in part	<p>Council supports the intent of the policy to implement Te Mana o Te Wai.</p> <p>It is unclear what outcomes and visions need to be achieved under clause f)</p> <p>Council notes that the policy states regional plans will identify</p>	Amend to provide more clarity on clause g) and the application of the policy.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(e) identify target attribute states that achieve environmental outcomes, and record their baseline state;</u> <u>(f) set environmental flows and levels that will achieve environmental outcomes and long-term visions;</u> <u>(g) identify limits on resource use including take limits that will achieve the target attribute states, flows and levels and include these as rules;</u> <u>(h) identify non-regulatory actions that will be included in Action Plans that will assist in achieving target attribute states (in addition to limits); and</u> <u>(i) identify non-regulatory and regulatory actions in Actions Plans required by the NPS-FM</u></p>		<p>target attribute state, however it is unclear if/ how district plans are expected to respond and enforce these targets under Policy 15, and in response to action plans required by 3.12 of the NPS-FM.</p>	
<p><u>Policy FW.3: Urban development effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area – district plans</u></p> <p><u>District plans shall include objectives, policies, and methods including rules, that give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and section 3.5(4) of the NPS-FM, and in doing so must:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua in the preparation of district plans;</u> <u>(b) Protect and enhance Māori freshwater values, including mahinga kai;</u> <u>(c) Provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, wāhi tapu and other taonga;</u> <u>(d) Incorporate the use of mātauranga Māori to ensure the effects of urban development are considered appropriately;</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council supports the intent to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai but is concerned that this policy appears to include a list of matters over which authorities should restrict their discretion and some matters seem to go beyond what is required in the NPS-FM.</p>	<p>Work with territorial authorities to clarify roles and functions and develop a policy that is achievable.</p> <p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>“District plans shall include objectives, policies, and methods including rules, that give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and section 3.5(4) of the NPS-FM, and in doing so must <u>where relevant and practicable: ...”</u></p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(e) Adopt an integrated approach, ki uta ki tai, that recognises the interconnectedness of the whole environment to determine the location and form of urban development;</u></p> <p><u>(f) Integrate planning and design of stormwater management to achieve multiple improved outcomes – amenity values, recreational, cultural, ecological, climate, vegetation retention;</u></p> <p><u>(g) Consider the effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area of subdivision, use and development of land;</u></p> <p><u>(h) Consider the use and development of land in relation to target attribute states and any limits set in a regional plan;</u></p> <p><u>(i) Require that Water Sensitive Urban Design principles and methods are applied during consideration of subdivision, the extent of impervious surfaces and in the control of stormwater infrastructure;</u></p> <p><u>(j) Require that urban development is located and designed to minimise the extent and volume of earthworks and to follow, to the extent practicable, existing land contours;</u></p> <p><u>(k) Require that urban development is located and designed to protect and enhance gully heads, rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs, riparian margins and estuaries;</u></p> <p><u>(l) Require riparian buffers for all waterbodies and avoid piping of rivers;</u></p> <p><u>(m) Require hydrological controls to avoid adverse effects of runoff quantity (flows and volumes) and maintain, to the extent practicable, natural stream flows;</u></p> <p><u>(n) Require efficient use of water;</u></p> <p><u>(o) Manage land use and development in a way that will minimise the generation of contaminants, including building materials, and the extent of impervious surfaces;</u></p> <p><u>(p) Consider daylighting of streams, where practicable; and</u></p>		<p>The policy also seems want to transfer some of the regional council functions to district and city council without fully understanding the implications of doing so and could make some infrastructure projects difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Some clauses such as clause (i) seem to require a consent requirement, which Councils may not be resourced to address.</p> <p>Council considers that this policy is overly prescriptive using ‘in doing so must’ and is not consistent with the Ministry for the Environment guidance on the NPS-FM, which identifies that:</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(g) Consider the effects of land use and development on drinking water sources.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.3 requires district plans to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater and the coastal marine area.</u></p>		<p><i>“The NPS-FM 2020 does not provide specific directions about what approaches territorial authorities should use to manage the effects of land use and development on freshwater in district plans. The approach provides flexibility for territorial authorities to determine the objectives, policies, and methods that would best apply in their district”</i></p>	
<p><u>Policy FW.4 Financial contributions for urban development – district plans</u></p> <p><u>District plans shall include policies and rules that require financial contributions to be applied to subdivision and development as a condition of the resource consent where off site stormwater quality and quantity treatment is required, as set out in a Stormwater Management Plan (required as a condition of a network discharge consent for that catchment). The district plan policy shall outline how a fair share of the cost is determined, and the nature of the contribution. A financial contribution will not be required where a development</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the intent to fund stormwater infrastructure but does not consider that it is appropriate to ‘require’ that financial contributions are used as a mechanism for this.	<p>Amend to read:</p> <p>District plans shall <u>may</u> include policies and rules that require financial contributions to be applied to subdivision and development as a condition of the resource consent, <u>particularly</u> where off site stormwater quality and</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>contribution (as required by a Development Contribution Policy under the Local Government Act) has been collected from the same development for the same purpose.</u></p> <p><u>Note: financial contributions cannot be imposed against Minister of Education or Minister of Defence</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.4 requires financial contributions, or alternatively development contributions to be collected for the construction of catchment scale stormwater solutions, so that urban new urban development pays their fair share.</u></p>		<p>It is also unclear how territorial authorities are expected to determine how a fair share of the cost is determined or how this links to other local authority funding processes such as the long-term plan. It should be for the local authority to determine the most appropriate funding mechanism.</p> <p>We note that network discharge consents are also a function of the regional council.</p> <p>There appears to be an issue here where territorial authorities are required to apply for a discharge consent but then are also required to collect financial contributions.</p>	<p>quantity treatment is required, as set out in a Stormwater Management Plan (required as a condition of a network discharge consent for that catchment). The district plan policy shall outline how a fair share of the cost is determined, and the nature of the contribution. A financial contribution will not be required where a development contribution (as required by a Development Contribution Policy under the Local Government Act) has been collected from the same development for the same purpose.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy FW.6: Allocation of responsibilities for land use and development controls for freshwater</u></p> <p><u>Regional and district plans shall recognise and provide for the responsibilities below, when developing objectives, policies and methods, including rules, to protect and enhance the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Wellington Regional Council has primary responsibility for freshwater. Wellington Regional Council shall be responsible for the control of the use and development of land for the purposes of water quality and quantity.</u></p> <p><u>(b) In relation to wetlands, Wellington Regional Council is responsible for managing land use within, and within a 10m margin of natural wetlands as directed by the NES-F 2020, as well as areas adjoining and/or upstream for the purpose of protecting wetlands;</u></p> <p><u>(c) city and district councils are responsible for the control of land use and subdivision. City and district councils must include objectives, policies, and methods in district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy or, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects) of land use and subdivision on the health and wellbeing of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments (as required by NPS-FM 3.5 (4)). They must carry out their responsibility in regard to the NPS-FM through their functions under Section 31 of the RMA.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.6 outlines the allocation of responsibilities for land use and development controls for freshwater between Wellington Regional Council and territorial authorities</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Some of this is already current practice and district plans must give effect to the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Council supports the amendments that move from district councils ‘managing discharges’ to ‘managing land’.</p> <p>However, it is noted that territorial authorities do not have functions to control activities to achieve target attributable states or discharge to water.</p>	<p>Amend to clarify this is a regional function.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy FW. 7: Water attenuation and retention – non-regulatory</u></p> <p><u>Promote and support water attenuation and retention including:</u></p> <p><u>(a) nature based solutions including slowing water down in the landscape and increasing groundwater recharge (riparian management, wetland enhancement/restoration, flood management); and</u></p> <p><u>(b) built solutions including storage at community, farm, and domestic (rain tanks) scales, groundwater augmentation, built retention (wetlands, bunds).</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.7 promotes and supports natural and built solutions to attenuate and retain water.</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the need to attenuate and retain water and considers that this should be a regulatory approach, except that the measures to achieve this should be non-regulatory, particularly given our comments on nature-based solutions.	Retain clauses a) and b) as a non-regulatory means of compliance but include a new regulatory policy that identifies that plan changes and variations should promote and support water attenuation and retention.
<p><u>Policy 14: Urban development effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area Minimising contamination in stormwater from new development – regional plans</u></p> <p><u>Regional plan objectives, policies, and methods including rules, must give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and in doing so must:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Enable the active involvement of mana whenua / tangata whenua in freshwater management (including decision-making processes), and Māori freshwater values are identified and provided for;</u></p> <p><u>(b) Adopt an integrated approach, ki uta ki tai, that recognises the interconnectedness of the whole environment to determine the location and form of urban development;</u></p>	Support in part	<p>Council supports the policy intent and that this should apply to regional plans.</p> <p>However, in developing the objectives, policies, and methods including rules, GWRC must work with territorial authorities to ensure that the impacts any new provisions may have</p>	Retain policy as notified but acknowledge the need include a method of delivery to address the comments from Council.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(c) Require the control of both land use and discharge effects from the use and development of land on freshwater and the coastal marine area;</u></p> <p><u>(d) Achieve the target attribute states set for the catchment;</u></p> <p><u>(e) Require the development, including stormwater discharges, earthworks and vegetation clearance meet any limits set in a regional plan;</u></p> <p><u>(f) Require that urban development is designed and constructed using the principles of Water Sensitive Urban Design;</u></p> <p><u>(g) Require that urban development located and designed to minimise the extent and volume of earthworks and to follow, to the extent practicable, existing land contours;</u></p> <p><u>(h) Require that urban development is located and designed to protect and enhance gully heads, rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs, riparian margins and estuaries;</u></p> <p><u>(i) Require riparian buffers for all waterbodies and avoid piping of rivers;</u></p> <p><u>(j) Require hydrological controls to avoid adverse effects of runoff quantity (flows and volumes) and maintain, to the extent practicable, natural stream flows;</u></p> <p><u>(k) Require stormwater quality management that will minimise the generation of contaminants, and maximise, to the extent practicable, the removal of contaminants from stormwater; and</u></p> <p><u>(l) Identify and map rivers and wetlands.</u></p> <p>Regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that protect aquatic ecosystem health by minimising ecotoxic and other contaminants in stormwater that discharges into water, or onto or into land that may enter water, from new subdivision and development.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p>		<p>on infrastructure delivery, operation and maintenance are understood and addressed.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy 14 manages the effects of urban development, including the effects of contamination in stormwater, earthworks and vegetation clearance from new and existing subdivision and development to halt and reverse the degradation of freshwater and coastal water.</u></p> <p>Ecotoxic contaminants in this policy are substances that are capable of causing ill health, injury or death to any living organism—such as heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, organochlorine pesticides and antifouling compounds.</p> <p>Carried in stormwater, ecotoxic contaminants can bind with sediment and accumulate where the sediment settles, on the seabed or the bed of a freshwater body, particularly in low energy aquatic receiving environments.</p> <p>Wellington Harbour and Porirua (Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui Inlet) Harbour are places where ecotoxic contaminants in bottom sediments have been found to occur at concentrations that exceed guidelines for aquatic life.</p> <p>There may be other low energy aquatic receiving environments in the region—such as inlets, estuaries, lakes, wetlands and lowland streams—in which the sediments contain elevated ecotoxic contaminants that may threaten aquatic life, but which have not yet been monitored.</p> <p>Reducing the rate of accumulation of sediment with toxic contaminants derived from surrounding catchments can be achieved by requiring stormwater treatment devices for discharges from new subdivision and development.</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Discharges to land that may enter water include discharges to existing and new stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>Stormwater design features set out in policy 42 will also reduce accumulation rates of ecotoxic contaminants in the sediments of low energy aquatic receiving environments. Policy 42 is directed at city and district councils when they are considering district plan provisions and resource consents for new subdivisions and land use. This policy and policy 42 provide an integrated approach to managing the adverse effects of stormwater discharges.</p>			
<p>Policy 15: Minimising Managing the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance – district and regional plans</p> <p>Regional and district plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that control earthworks and vegetation disturbance to <u>minimise the extent necessary to achieve the target attribute states for water bodies and freshwater ecosystems including the effects of these activities on the life-supporting capacity of soils, and to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</u></p> <p>(a) erosion; and (b) silt and sediment runoff into water, or onto land that may enter water, aquatic ecosystem health is safeguarded.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>An area of overlapping jurisdiction between Wellington Regional Council and district and city councils is the ability to control earthworks and vegetation disturbance, including clearance. Large scale earthworks and vegetation</p>	Oppose in part	<p>Council supports the intent to manage freshwater to provide for mana whenua and their relationship with te taiao.</p> <p>This represents a change in approach that would relate to all vegetation even where vegetation disturbance is a permitted activity on which district plans cannot then impose conditions. Regional council already provide guidance on</p>	<p>Amend so that this applies to regional plans only or to identify measures over which territorial authorities have control.</p> <p>Amend to read:</p> <p>“Regional and district plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that control earthworks and vegetation disturbance removal to...”</p> <p>If necessary, add a specific district plan policy related to erosion and sediment run-off from small scale earthworks in urban areas.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>disturbance on erosion prone land in <i>rural areas</i> and many <i>small scale</i> earthworks in urban areas – such as driveways and retaining walls – can cumulatively contribute large amounts of silt and sediment to stormwater and water bodies. This policy is intended to minimise erosion and silt and sedimentation effects associated with these activities.</p> <p>Minimisation requires effects to be reduced to the extent reasonably achievable whilst recognising that erosion, siltation and sedimentation effects can not always be completely avoided.</p> <p>This policy is to ensure that Wellington Regional Council and district and city councils integrate the control of earthworks and vegetation disturbance in their regional and district plans. Method 31 is for Wellington Regional Council and city and district councils to develop a protocol for earthworks and erosion from vegetation disturbance. The protocol will assist with implementation of the policy.</p> <p>Some activities, such as major road construction, are likely to require resource consents from both the regional council and city or district councils, which will work together to control the effects of the activity</p> <p>Vegetation disturbance includes harvesting plantation forestry.</p>		<p>earthworks management alongside provisions relating to earthworks.</p> <p>Council considers that water quality is a regional council function and the NPS-FM in its guidance identifies “<i>flexibility for territorial authorities to determine the objectives, policies, and methods that would best apply in their district</i>”</p> <p>We consider that the measures the policy is now trying to manage, is outside the scope territorial authority. Council notes that some forms of vegetation disturbance (such as trimming) do not alter</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		the ground conditions.	
<p>Policy 40: Maintaining Protecting and enhancing the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems aquatic ecosystem health in water bodies – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a regional resource consent, particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>(a) requiring that water quality, flows and water levels and aquatic habitats of surface water bodies are managed <u>in a way that gives effect to <i>Te Mana o Te Wai</i> and protects and enhances the health and well-being of waterbodies and the health and wellbeing of freshwater ecosystems for the purpose of safeguarding aquatic ecosystem health;</u></p> <p>(b) that, requiring as a minimum, water quality in the <i>coastal marine area</i> is to be managed <u>in a way that protects and enhances the health and well-being of waterbodies and the health and wellbeing of marine ecosystems; for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing aquatic ecosystem health; and c) managing water bodies and the water quality of coastal water for other purposes identified in regional plans.</u></p> <p>(c) providing for <u>mana whenua / tangata whenua values, including mahinga kai;</u></p> <p>(d) <u><i>maintaining</i> or enhancing the functioning of ecosystems in the water body;</u></p> <p>(e) <u><i>maintaining</i> or enhancing the ecological functions of riparian margins;</u></p> <p>(f) <u>minimising the effect of the proposal on groundwater recharge areas that are connected to surface water bodies;</u></p> <p>(g) <u><i>maintaining</i> or enhancing the amenity and recreational values of rivers and lakes, including those with significant values listed in Table 15 of Appendix 1;</u></p> <p>(h) <u>protecting the significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values of rivers and lakes, including those listed in Table 16 of Appendix 1;</u></p>	Support in part	<p>Support changes since the exposure draft, to refer to regional consents only.</p> <p>However, the change from ‘maintain’ to ‘protect’ is significant, as well as the change in verbs from ‘discourage’ to ‘restrict’ and ‘avoid’ and the need to ‘restore’.</p>	<p>Planning and legal review of the verbs to ensure this is feasibly able to be achieved.</p> <p>Amend the Section 32 Assessment to adequately assess this significant difference in policy direction.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(i) maintaining natural flow regimes required to support aquatic ecosystem health;</u> <u>(j) maintaining or enhancing space for rivers to undertake their natural processes;</u> <u>(k) maintaining fish passage;</u> <u>(l) protecting and reinstating riparian habitat, in particular riparian habitat that is important for fish spawning;</u> <u>(m) discouraging-restricting stock access to estuaries rivers, lakes and wetlands;</u> <u>and</u> <u>(n) discouraging avoiding the removal or destruction of indigenous wetland plants in wetlands.</u></p> <p>Explanation <u>Policy 40 provides criteria for considering regional consents to protect the health and wellbeing of waterbodies, particularly during the transition period before regional plans are changed to give effect to the NPS-FM.</u> <u>Clause (a) identifies ecosystem health as a water management purpose for surface water bodies and clause (b) identifies water quality in the coastal marine area is to be managed for the purpose of aquatic ecosystem health.</u> <u>Other water management purposes for water bodies and coastal waters in clause (c) are to be established in regional plans as required by policies 5 and 12.</u> <u>Application for a resource consent refers to all types of resource consent. Policy 40 shall cease to be considered for resource consents processed by the Wellington Regional Council once policy 5 and 12 are given effect to in a regional plan. Policy 40 shall continue to be considered by city and district councils when processing resource consents, notices of requirement and making changes, variations or reviews of district plans.</u></p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Policy 41: Minimising Controlling the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan, particular regard shall be given to controlling earthworks and vegetation disturbance by to <u>minimise:</u></p> <p>(a) erosion; and <u>(a) considering whether the activity will achieve environmental outcomes and target attribute states; silt and sediment runoff into water, or onto or into land that may enter water, so that healthy aquatic ecosystems are sustained; and</u> <u>(b) avoiding discharges to water bodies, and to land where it may enter a waterbody, where limits for suspended sediment are not met.</u></p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>An area of overlapping jurisdiction between Wellington Regional Council and district and city councils is the ability to control earthworks and vegetation disturbance, including clearance. Large scale earthworks and vegetation disturbance on erosion prone land in <i>rural areas</i> and many <i>small scale</i> earthworks in urban areas – such as driveways and retaining walls – can cumulatively contribute large amounts of silt and sediment to stormwater and water bodies. This policy is intended to minimise erosion and silt and sedimentation effects associated with these activities.</p> <p>Minimisation requires effects to be reduced to the extent reasonably achievable whilst recognising that erosion, siltation and sedimentation effects can not always be completely avoided.</p> <p>This policy provides for consideration of earthworks and vegetation disturbance to minimise erosion and sediment runoff prior to plan controls being adopted by regional and district plans in accordance with policy 15. This policy shall</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support insofar as it pertains to regional functions.</p> <p>This place additional costs on our landowners with unclear/unjustified benefits.</p> <p>Districts and city councils don't control discharges and NPS-FM clause 3.5 (4) refers to managing effects of urban development on water, not discharges.</p> <p>The urban stormwater network has a regional consent and Council considers this process is better suited to manage any sediment issues.</p>	<p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>Policy 41: <u>Controlling</u> the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a <u>regional</u> resource consent, particular regard shall be given to controlling earthworks and vegetation disturbance by:</p> <p>(a) erosion; and (a) considering whether the activity will achieve environmental outcomes and target attribute states; silt and sediment runoff into water, or onto or into land that may enter water, so that healthy aquatic ecosystems are sustained; and (b) avoiding discharges to water bodies, and to land where it may enter a waterbody, where limits for suspended sediment are not met.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>cease to have effect once method 31 is implemented and policy 15 is given effect to in regional and district plans.</p> <p>Policies 15 and 41 are to ensure that Wellington Regional Council and district and city councils integrate the control earthworks and vegetation disturbance in their regional and district plans. Method 31 is for Wellington Regional Council and district and city councils to develop a protocol for earthworks and erosion from vegetation disturbance. The protocol will assist with implementation of policies 15 and 41.</p> <p>Some activities—such as major road construction—are likely to require resource consents from both Wellington regional council and district or city councils, which will work together to control the effects of the activity. Vegetation disturbance includes harvesting plantation forestry.</p>			<p>See comment in Policy 40 for inclusion of new district plan specific policy.</p>
<p>Policy 42: <u>Effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area from urban development – consideration</u> Minimising contamination in stormwater from development – consideration</p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent the regional council must give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and in doing so must have particular regard to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Adopt an integrated approach, ki uta ki tai, that recognises the interconnectedness of the whole environment to determine the location and form of urban development;</u></p> <p><u>(b) Protect and enhance mana whenua /tangata whenua freshwater values, including mahinga kai;</u></p> <p><u>(c) Provide for mana whenua/tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, wāhi tapu and other taonga;</u></p> <p><u>(d) Incorporate the use of mātauranga Māori to ensure the effects of urban development are considered appropriately;</u></p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support amendment to apply to regional consents only.</p>	<p>Retain the policy as notified, as regional consents only.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(e) The effects of use and development of land on water, including the effects on receiving environments (both freshwater and the coastal marine area);</u> <u>(f) The target attribute states set for the catchment;</u> <u>(g) Require that the development, including stormwater discharges, earthworks and vegetation clearance meets any limits set in a regional plan;</u> <u>(h) Require that urban development is located and designed and constructed using the principles of Water Sensitive Urban Design;</u> <u>....</u> <u>”</u></p>			
<p>Policy 18: Protecting aquatic and restoring ecological function <u>Protecting and restoring ecological function health of water bodies – regional plans</u></p> <p><u>Regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that protect and restore the ecological health of water bodies, including:</u></p> <p><u>(a) managing freshwater in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai;</u></p> <p><u>(b) actively involve mana whenua / tangata whenua in freshwater management (including decision-making processes), and Māori freshwater values are identified and provided for;</u></p> <p><u>(c) there is no further loss of extent of natural inland wetlands and coastal wetlands, their values are protected, and their restoration is promoted;</u></p>	Support	In regard to clause (c), Council recommends caution around how the extent of natural inland wetlands is determined and defined, and to ensure that this is consistent with the NES-F 2020.	Retain policy as notified.
<p>Policy 14: Urban development effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area <u>Minimising contamination in stormwater from new development – regional plans</u></p>	Oppose in part	This uses general and undefined terms including ‘urban development’, ‘requiring the control’	Amend to clarify definitions of identified undefined terms. Clarify role of urban Māori and how they are represented.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Regional plan objectives, policies, and methods including rules, must give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and in doing so must:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Enable the active involvement of mana whenua / tangata whenua in freshwater management (including decision-making processes), and Māori freshwater values are identified and provided for;</u></p> <p><u>(b) Adopt an integrated approach, ki uta ki tai, that recognises the interconnectedness of the whole environment to determine the location and form of urban development;</u></p> <p><u>(c) Require the control of both land use and discharge effects from the use and development of land on freshwater and the coastal marine area;</u></p> <p><u>(d) Achieve the target attribute states set for the catchment;</u></p> <p><u>(e) Require the development, including stormwater discharges, earthworks and vegetation clearance meet any limits set in a regional plan;</u></p> <p><u>(f) Require that urban development is designed and constructed using the principles of Water Sensitive Urban Design;</u></p> <p><u>(g) Require that urban development located and designed to minimise the extent and volume of earthworks and to follow, to the extent practicable, existing land contours;</u></p> <p><u>(h) Require that urban development is located and designed to protect and enhance gully heads, rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs, riparian margins and estuaries;</u></p> <p><u>(i) Require riparian buffers for all waterbodies and avoid piping of rivers;</u></p> <p><u>(j) Require hydrological controls to avoid adverse effects of runoff quantity (flows and volumes) and maintain, to the extent practicable, natural stream flows;</u></p>		<p>and ‘require the development’. This creates unnecessary confusion and will result in inequal application of the policy.</p> <p>Clarity is required to determine if development includes small scale rural development, especially where it adjoins urban zones, and thresholds relating to clause (e). Through clause e), GWRC is acting in ultra vires, as it relates to limits which have not yet been defined.</p> <p>The policy direction is very strong in respect of the need to protect and enhance features under (h). This places resource burdens on territorial authorities</p>	<p>Amend policy to address comments.</p> <p>Amend (i) to read: “Require riparian buffers for all <u>natural</u> waterbodies and avoid piping of rivers <u>where practicable</u>”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(k) Require stormwater quality management that will minimise the generation of contaminants, and maximise, to the extent practicable, the removal of contaminants from stormwater; and</u> <u>(l) Identify and map rivers and wetlands.</u></p> <p>Regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that protect aquatic ecosystem health by minimising ecotoxic and other contaminants in stormwater that discharges into water, or onto or into land that may enter water, from new subdivision and development.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy 14 manages the effects of urban development, including the effects of contamination in stormwater, earthworks and vegetation clearance from new and existing subdivision and development to halt and reverse the degradation of freshwater and coastal water.</u></p> <p>Ecotoxic contaminants in this policy are substances that are capable of causing ill health, injury or death to any living organism – such as heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, organochlorine pesticides and antifouling compounds.</p> <p>Carried in stormwater, ecotoxic contaminants can bind with sediment and accumulate where the sediment settles, on the seabed or the bed of a freshwater body, particularly in low energy aquatic receiving environments. Wellington Harbour and Porirua (Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui Inlet) Harbour are places where ecotoxic contaminants in bottom sediments have been found to occur at concentrations that exceed guidelines for aquatic life. There may be</p>		<p>and developments and goes beyond what is required by section 3.5 (4) if the NPS-FM</p> <p>Council is concerned that (i) would relate to very small streams and wetlands even if they are ephemeral.</p> <p>Urban development design required under (f) would also appear to require a change to district plans as well as (l), to give effect to mapped rivers and wetlands. Council notes that this put resource burdens on territorial authorities.</p> <p>A definition of wetland is required. It is unclear whether the use within the RPS is consistent with the definition under the NPS-FM.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>other low energy aquatic receiving environments in the region – such as inlets, estuaries, lakes, wetlands and lowland streams – in which the sediments contain elevated ecotoxic contaminants that may threaten aquatic life, but which have not yet been monitored. Reducing the rate of accumulation of sediment with toxic contaminants derived from surrounding catchments can be achieved by requiring stormwater treatment devices for discharges from new subdivision and development. Discharges to land that may enter water include discharges to existing and new stormwater infrastructure. Stormwater design features set out in policy 42 will also reduce accumulation rates of ecotoxic contaminants in the sediments of low energy aquatic receiving environments. Policy 42 is directed at city and district councils when they are considering district plan provisions and resource consents for new subdivisions and land use. This policy and policy 42 provide an integrated approach to managing the adverse effects of stormwater discharges.</p>			
<p>Method 36: Support Industry-led environmental accords and codes of practice.</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The proposed method considered appropriate, however as no explanation has been provided for the method, Council’s ability to provide comments is constrained. It is unclear whether this method is a regulatory or non-regulatory method and Council notes</p>	<p>Provide an explanation for the method and develop in conjunction with submitters.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>there are no clear regulatory mechanisms for territorial authorities to utilise.</p> <p>Council also notes that industry led standards may also not be best practice, or in the greater public good.</p>	
<p><u>Policy FW.1: Reducing water demand – regional plans</u></p> <p><u>Regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods to reduce demand of water from registered water suppliers and users, including:</u></p> <p><u>(a) provisions addressing public and private water losses, including leaks;</u></p> <p><u>(b) provisions requiring efficient end use of water for new developments;</u></p> <p><u>(c) provisions addressing alternate water supplies for non-potable uses, particularly in the summer months; and</u></p> <p><u>(d) water conservation measures, particularly in the summer months.</u></p>	Support in part	In regard to clause (a) it is unclear how provisions in a RPS are expected to address leaks when this is a maintenance issue, and delivery will be impractical within the context of three waters reform.	Review to ensure provisions can be implemented.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy FW.2: Reducing water demand – district plans</u> <u>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods to reduce demand of water from registered water suppliers and users, including where practicable:</u></p> <p><u>(a) provisions improving the efficiency of the end use of water on a per capita basis for new developments; and</u> <u>(b) provisions requiring alternate water supplies for non-potable use in new developments.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy FW.2 requires district plans to address the reduction of demand in municipal water supplies.</u></p>	Oppose	<p>It is unclear what is meant by ‘registered water suppliers and users’. Is this intended to have the same definition as Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Act 2020?</p> <p>Council notes that if the RPS also refers to existing registered water suppliers and users, territorial authorities have no authority to impose conditions over them.</p> <p>There appears to be no provisions in section 31 of the RMA to support this requirement and section 30 of the RMA identifies the development of rules “if appropriate”, for the taking and use of water, as a function of the regional council. It</p>	Delete policy or amend to establish non-regulatory methods.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		<p>is also unclear how this will work within the context of the three waters reform.</p> <p>Beyond this, if they are existing registered users, we do not have the ability to impinge on existing use rights in district plans, this is a regional council function only.</p> <p>A policy within an RPS should not direct joint processing of developments. This is impracticable given the separation of powers between regional and district/city councils.</p> <p>Council does not consider district plans an appropriate mechanism to regulate end water</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		use per capita and considers this is best handled within the Building Act.	
Statement of Rangitāne o Wairarapa Te Mana o te Wai expression	Support	No comment	No relief sought
Statement of Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Te Mana o te Wai expression	Support	No comment	No relief sought
Chapter 3.6: Indigenous ecosystems			
Objective 16 Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant <u>ecosystem functions and services and/or</u> biodiversity values are maintained <u>protected, enhanced</u> , and restored to a healthy functioning state	Support in part	Council does not support amendments to this Chapter until the NPS-IB has been gazetted. Changing this chapter at this time will result in duplication of effort and waste of ratepayer’s money, and mana whenua resources, throughout the whole region. Council notes that ‘protect’ and ‘enhance’ is a change in direction that may be difficult to achieve	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted. If policy is retained, amend the policy to read: “Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant <u>ecosystem functions and services and/or</u> biodiversity values are maintained <u>protected, enhanced</u> maintained and where possible enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state”

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		within the context of limited resources.	
<p>Policy 23 - Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values – district and regional plans</p> <p><u>By 30 June 2025</u>, District and regional plans shall identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; these ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <p>(a) Representativeness: the ecosystems or habitats that are typical and characteristic examples of the full range of the original or current natural diversity of ecosystem and habitat types in a district or in the region, and: (i) are no longer commonplace (less than about 30% remaining); or (ii) are poorly represented in existing protected areas (less than about 20% legally protected).</p> <p>(b) Rarity: the ecosystem or habitat has biological or physical features that are scarce or threatened in a local, regional or national context. This can include individual species, rare and distinctive biological communities and physical features that are unusual or rare.</p> <p>(c) Diversity: the ecosystem or habitat has a natural diversity of ecological units, ecosystems, species and physical features within an area.</p> <p>(d) Ecological context of an area: the ecosystem or habitat: (i) enhances connectivity or otherwise buffers representative, rare or diverse indigenous ecosystems and habitats; or (ii) provides seasonal or core habitat for protected or threatened indigenous species.</p>	Oppose	<p>Councils opposes the arbitrary timeframe imposed on territorial authorities, particularly in advance of the NPS-IB. It is impractical to require territorial authorities to implement this policy by 2025, particularly given timeframes within the NPS-IB indicate a timeframe of 5 years from implementation.</p> <p>Council notes implementation of this policy ahead of the NPS-IB would duplicate a resource heavy and expensive process unnecessarily.</p> <p>Council supports the amendments to refer to the correct</p>	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted but include wording changes referring to mana whenua.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(e) <u>Mana whenua / tTangata whenua values: the ecosystem or habitat contains characteristics of special spiritual, historical or cultural significance to <u>mana whenua / tangata whenua, identified in accordance with tikanga Māori.</u></u></p> <p>Explanation Policy 23 sets out criteria as guidance that must be considered in identifying indigenous <i>ecosystems</i> and <i>habitats</i> with significant <i>biodiversity</i> values. <u>This evaluation is to be undertaken by 30 June 2025.</u></p> <p>....</p>		wording of mana whenua.	
<p>Method 21: Information to assist with the Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values</p> <p><u>The regional council will liaise with the region’s territorial authorities to ensure that all district plans include, by 30 June 2025 at the latest, a schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values and plan provisions to protect them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u></p> <p><u>Where a district-wide indigenous biodiversity assessment has not been initiated by 30 June 2024, the regional council will liaise with the territorial authority to agree on a programme of works and an understanding as to whether:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the territorial authority shall continue to have sole responsibility; or</u></p> <p><u>(b) the regional council shall take full responsibility; or</u></p> <p><u>(c) the territorial authority and the regional council shall share responsibilities.</u></p> <p><u>Prepare and disseminate information to assist with the interpretation of the criteria set out in policies 23 and 24, which require the identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.</u></p>	Oppose	Council fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of NPS-IB being gazetted but notes that Council may be interested in working with regional council if the provision remains.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><i>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council* and city and district councils</i></p>			
<p>Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values – district and regional plans</p> <p>By 30 June 2025, Ddistrict and regional plans shall include policies, rules and methods to <i>protect</i> indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p><u>Where the policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of <i>biodiversity offsetting</i> or <i>biodiversity compensation</i> for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values, they shall:</u></p> <p><u>(a) not provide for <i>biodiversity offsetting</i>:</u> <u>(i) where there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset;</u> <u>or</u> <u>(ii) when an activity is anticipated to causes residual adverse effects on an area after an offset has been implemented if the ecosystem or species is <i>threatened</i> or the ecosystem is <i>naturally uncommon</i>;</u> <u>(b) not provide for <i>biodiversity compensation</i> where an activity is anticipated to cause residual adverse effects on an area if the ecosystem or species is <i>threatened</i> or the ecosystem is <i>naturally uncommon</i>;</u> <u>(c) ecosystems and species known to meet any of the criteria in (a) or (b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to <i>biodiversity offsetting</i> and <i>biodiversity compensation</i>);</u> <u>(d) require that the outcome sought from the use of <i>biodiversity offsetting</i> is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity gain, or from <i>biodiversity compensation</i> is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit.</u></p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Council fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of NPS-IB being gazetted but notes that the intent of the provision by could be useful if the provision remains.</p>	<p>Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Explanation Policy 24 applies to provisions in regional and district plans.</p> <p><u>The policy provides clarity about the limits to, and expected outcomes from, biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values. Ecosystems and species known to meet the criteria in clauses (a and b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation).</u></p> <p><u>Calculating a 10 percent net biodiversity gain (offsetting) or a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit (compensation) employs the same or a similar calculation methodology used to determine ‘no net loss or preferably net gain’ under a standard offsetting approach. The distinction between ‘net gain’ and ‘net benefit’ is to recognise that the outcomes achievable through the use of offsetting and compensation are different. An offsetting ‘net biodiversity gain’ outcome is expected to achieve an objectively verifiable increase in biodiversity values while a compensation ‘net biodiversity benefit’ outcome is more subjective and less preferable.</u></p> <p>Table 16 in Appendix 1 identifies rivers and lakes with significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values by applying criteria taken from policy 23 of rarity (habitat for threatened indigenous fish species) and diversity (high macroinvertebrate community health, habitat for six or more migratory indigenous fish species).</p> <p>Policy 47 will need to be considered alongside policy 24 when changing, varying or reviewing a regional or district plan.</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Policy 24 is not intended to prevent change, but rather to ensure that change is carefully considered and is appropriate in relation to the biodiversity values identified in policy 23.</p>			
<p><u>Method IE.3 Regional biodiversity strategy</u></p> <p><u>Develop and implement, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua and in collaboration with territorial authorities, communities and other key stakeholders, a regional biodiversity strategy to maintain and restore indigenous biodiversity at a landscape scale, incorporating both Mātauranga Māori and systematic conservation planning.</u></p> <p><u>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>Council supports the intent to work in partnership with mana whenua regarding indigenous biodiversity, however it is inappropriate to do so prior to the NPS-IB being gazetted.</p> <p>Council is also concerned that the proposed non-regulatory method, appears to rely on a future regulatory process.</p>	Delete method in its entirety and review once NPS-IB is gazetted.
<p><u>Method IE.2 : Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities</u></p> <p><u>Partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engage with interested parties to develop a regional inventory of opportunities for offsetting or compensating for any residual adverse effects on ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.</u></p>	Support	Council supports the targets being removed from proposed provision seen in the draft RPS.	Retain method as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<u>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council* and iwi authorities</u>			
<p>Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, a determination shall be made as to whether an activity may affect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values, and in determining whether the proposed activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>(a) maintaining connections within, or corridors between, habitats of indigenous flora and fauna and/or enhancing the connectivity between fragmented indigenous habitats;</p> <p>(b) providing adequate buffering around areas of significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats from other land uses;</p> <p>(c) managing wetlands for the purpose of aquatic ecosystem health, <u>recognising the wider benefits, such as for indigenous biodiversity, water quality and holding water in the landscape;</u></p> <p>(d) avoiding the cumulative adverse effects of the incremental loss of indigenous ecosystems and habitats;</p> <p>(e) providing seasonal or core habitat for indigenous species;</p> <p>(f) protecting the life supporting capacity of indigenous ecosystems and habitats;</p> <p>(g) remedying or mitigating <u>minimising or remedying adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity values where avoiding adverse effects is not practicably achievable; and</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Council is concerned that this policy aims to direct territorial authorities in advance of identifying indigenous ecosystems under Policy 23 and 24 (the timelines of which Council opposes).</p> <p>It is impractical to apply requirements, or consider whether a proposed activity is inappropriate, ahead of the NPS-IB or appropriately considered criteria and is likely to result in inconsistencies should changes be made to Policy 23 and 24.</p>	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(h) the need for a precautionary approach when assessing the potential for adverse effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats;</u></p> <p><u>(i) the limits to, and expected outcomes from biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation set out in Policy 24.</u></p>			
<p><u>Objective 16A</u></p> <p><u>The region’s indigenous ecosystems are maintained, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state, increasing their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.</u></p>	Oppose	Intent of objective is supported but is inappropriate until the NPS-IB is gazetted.	Delete in its entirety and review once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.
<p><u>Method 22 – Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning</u> information about areas at high risk from natural hazards</p> <p><u>Integrate hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning in the Wellington region by:</u></p> <p><u>(a) developing non-statutory strategies, where appropriate, for integrating hazard risk management and climate change adaptation approaches between local authorities in the region;</u></p> <p><u>(b) developing consistency in natural hazard provisions in city, district and regional plans;</u></p> <p><u>(c) assisting mana/tangata whenua in the development of iwi climate change adaptation plans.</u></p> <p>Prepare and disseminate information about how to identify areas at high risk from natural hazards, as relevant to the development of hazard management strategies to guide decision-making.</p> <p>Implementation: Wellington Regional Council* and city and district councils</p>	Support in part	Supports consistency across the region but Council is concerned that a proposed non-regulatory method, appears to require a regulatory response.	<p>Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.</p> <p>If the method is retained, amend method to delete clause (b) to ensure that method can be fully achieved using non regulatory methods.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy IE.3 - Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health – non-regulatory</u></p> <p><u>To maintain, enhance and restore the ecosystem health, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity of the region’s indigenous ecosystems, and the ecological processes that support them, giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, the Regional Policy Statement shall, as soon as practicable:</u></p> <p><u>(a) identify the characteristics required for the region’s indigenous ecosystems to be in a healthy functioning state, including the processes that enable them to persist over the long-term, and</u></p> <p><u>(b) identify strategic targets and priorities to ensure that management and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats (including pest management) are directed at areas where the greatest gains can be made for indigenous biodiversity. Where possible, priorities should also deliver benefits for climate change mitigation and/or adaptation, and freshwater; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) focus restoration efforts on achieving the strategic targets and priorities identified in (b).</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy IE.3 gives effect to Objective 16A, identifying the characteristics required for the region’s indigenous ecosystems to be in a healthy functioning state, providing resilience to the impacts of increasing environmental pressures, and identifying strategic priorities and targets for restoration to ensure that regional conservation actions are applied efficiently, prioritising protection of the ecosystems and habitats of most pressing concern.</u></p>	Oppose	<p>Council is concerned that the proposed non-regulatory approach, appears to be setting targets. It is unclear how these targets are intended to be applied via a non-regulatory mechanism.</p> <p>Council also notes that any targets set under the RPS require consultation.</p>	Delete policy in its entirety and review once NPS-IB is gazetted.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Objective 16B</u></p> <p><u>Mana whenua / tangata whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity, particularly taonga species, and the important relationship between indigenous ecosystem health and well-being, are given effect to in decision making, and mana whenua / tangata whenua are supported to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity</u></p>	Support	Notwithstanding the general comments on waiting for the NPS-IB, we support the need to recognise mana whenua values.	Retain provision as notified.
<p><u>Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity – district and regional plans</u></p> <p><u>District and regional plans shall include objectives, policies, methods and/or rules to partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) apply mātauranga Māori frameworks, and support mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga, in managing and monitoring indigenous biodiversity;</u></p> <p><u>(b) identify and protect taonga species;</u></p> <p><u>(c) support mana whenua / tangata whenua to access and exercise sustainable customary use of indigenous biodiversity, including for mahinga kai and taonga, in accordance with tikanga.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy IE.1 directs regional and district plans to recognise and provide for Māori values for indigenous biodiversity, and for the role of mana whenua as kaitiaki in the region.</u></p>	Support	<p>Notwithstanding the general comments on waiting for the NPS-IB, we support the need to recognise mana whenua values.</p> <p>However, the district or regional plan components of this method need to occur once the NPS-IB has been gazetted, in order to avoid duplication and unnecessary waste of Council effort, mana whenua resources and ratepayer’s money.</p>	Retain provision as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy IE.2: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan for subdivision, use or development, particular regard shall be given to enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their role as kaitiaki, including, but not restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua values associated with indigenous biodiversity, including giving local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, (b) incorporating the use of mātauranga Māori in the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) supporting mana whenua / tangata whenua to access and exercise sustainable customary use of indigenous biodiversity, including for mahinga kai and taonga, in accordance with tikanga.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy IE.2 requires consideration of enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga in the region.</u></p>	Support in principle but oppose at this time	Council supports the intent of the policy, but it cannot be implemented until the NPS-IB, given the uncertainty of provisions once finally gazetted.	Delete indigenous biodiversity provisions until the NPS-IB is gazetted.
<p><u>Objective 16C</u></p> <p><u>Landowner and community values in relation to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and provided for and their roles as stewards are supported.</u></p>	Support in principle but oppose at this time	Council supports and recognises the role of landowners and the community; however, it is unclear how conflicting values and requirements will work in practice to balance and	Delete indigenous biodiversity provisions until the NPS-IB is gazetted.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		management expectation. Council considers this is inappropriate at this time.	
Chapter 3.8: Natural hazards			
<p>Objective 19</p> <p>The risks and consequences to people, communities, their businesses, property, and infrastructure <u>and the environment</u> from natural hazards and <u>the effects of</u> climate change effects are reduced minimised.</p>	Support in part	<p>Council supports the need to recognise and address risks associated with natural hazards.</p> <p>See comments on Policies 29 ad 51.</p>	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 29 and 51.
<p>Objective 21</p> <p><u>Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities minimise the risks from natural hazards and impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.</u></p> <p>Hazard mitigation measures, structural works and other activities do not increase the risk and consequences of natural hazard events</p>	Support in part	<p>Council supports the need to recognise and address risks associated with natural hazards.</p> <p>See comments on Policies 52, FW.7 and FW.8.</p>	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 52, FW.7 and FW.8
<p>Objective 21</p> <p><u>The resilience of our C</u>ommunities are more resilient to natural hazards, including the impacts and the natural environment to the short, medium, and</p>	Support in part	Council supports the need to increase resilience.	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 29, 51 and 52 and the definition of resilience.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<u>long-term effects of climate change, and sea level rise is strengthened, and people are better prepared for the consequences of natural hazard events.</u>		See comments on Policies 29, 51 and 52.	
Chapter 3.9: Regional form, design and function			
<p>Objective 22</p> <p><u>Urban development, including housing and infrastructure, is enabled where it demonstrates the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, which:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Are compact and well designed; and</u> <u>(b) Provide for sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of current and future generations; and</u> <u>(c) Improve the overall health, well-being and quality of life of the people of the region; and</u> <u>(d) Prioritise the protection and enhancement of the quality and quantity of freshwater; and</u> <u>(e) Achieve the objectives in this RPS relating to the management of air, land, freshwater, coast, and indigenous biodiversity; and</u> <u>(f) Support the transition to a low-emission and climate-resilient region; and</u> <u>(g) Provide for a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and</u> <u>(h) Enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and</u> <u>(i) Support the competitive operation of land and development markets in ways that improve housing affordability, including enabling intensification; and</u> <u>(j) Provide for commercial and industrial development in appropriate locations, including employment close to where people live; and</u></p>	Oppose in part	Council is concerned that this objective goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD, and what an RPS can specify the districts should do to give effect to NPS-UD.	Amend objective to address concerns by deleting sub clauses a-k and allowing district plans flexibility to respond to local characteristics and issues.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(k) Are well connected through multi-modal (private vehicles, public transport, walking, micromobility and cycling) transport networks that provide for good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open space.</u></p> <p>A compact well designed and sustainable regional form that has an integrated, safe and responsive transport network and:</p> <p>(a) a viable and vibrant regional central business district in Wellington city; (b) an increased range and diversity of activities in and around the regionally significant centres to maintain vibrancy and vitality;</p> <p>(c) sufficient industrial based employment locations or capacity to meet the region's needs;</p> <p>(d) development and/or management of the Regional Focus Areas identified in the Wellington Regional Strategy</p> <p>(e) urban development in existing urban areas, or when beyond urban areas, development that reinforces the region's existing urban form;</p> <p>(f) strategically planned rural development;</p> <p>(g) a range of housing (including affordable housing);</p> <p>(h) integrated public open spaces;</p> <p>(i) integrated land use and transportation;</p> <p>(j) improved eastwest transport linkages;</p> <p>(k) efficiently use existing infrastructure (including transport network infrastructure); and</p> <p>(l) essential social services to meet the region's needs.</p>			
<p>Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres – district plans</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Council supports the intent to support</p>	<p>Retain policy as notified.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of regional central business district in the Wellington city and the:</p> <p>1. <u>the regionally significant central business district of Wellington City;</u></p> <p>2. <u>other regionally significant centres:</u></p> <p>(i) Upper Hutt city centre; (ii) Lower Hutt city centre; (iii) Porirua city centre; (iv) Paraparaumu town centre; (v) Masterton town centre; and the</p> <p>3. <u>the locally significant centres of Suburban centres in:</u></p> <p>(i) Petone; (ii) Kilbirnie; and (iii) Johnsonville.; (iv) Ōtaki; (v) Waikanae; (vi) Featherston; (vii) Greytown (viii) Carterton; and (ix) <u>Martinborough.</u></p> <p>(a) Sub-regional centres of:</p> <p>(i) Upper Hutt city centre;</p>		<p>vitality and vibrancy of the range of centres in the region.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(ii) Lower Hutt city centre; (iii) Porirua city centre; (iv) Paraparaumu town centre; (v) Masterton town centre; and the (b) Suburban centres in: (i) Petone; (ii) Kilbirnie; and (iii) Johnsonville.;</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 30 identifies the hierarchy of regional and locally significant centres within the Wellington Region for which district plans must maintain and enhance their vibrancy and vitality. The centres identified are of significance to the region's form for economic development, transport movement, civic or community investment. Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of these centres is important in order to encourage investment and development that supports an increased range and diversity of activities. It is also important for their prosperity and resilience in the face of social and economic change. The regional central business district is the major centre in the Wellington region; the other key centres also provide significant business, retailing and community services. This policy does not limit territorial authorities from identifying additional centres of local significance within the district plan.</u></p> <p>The centres listed in policy 30 were identified during the development of the Wellington Regional Strategy as centres of significance to the region's form for economic development, transport movement, civic or community investment.</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>The Wellington central business district is the regional central business district, with 73,000 people working there each day. The subregional centres of regional significance are the civic centres of Upper Hutt city centre, Lower Hutt city centre, Porirua city centre, Paraparaumu town centre, and Masterton town centre. The suburban centres of regional significance are in Petone, Kilbirnie and Johnsonville. Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of these centres is important in order to encourage investment and development that supports an increased range and diversity of activities. It is also important for their prosperity and resilience in the face of social and economic change. The regional central business district is the major centre in the Wellington region; the sub-regional centres also provide significant business, retailing and community services. The range of appropriate land uses to be encouraged through this policy will vary depending on the character and context of each centre. For this reason, policy 30 requires the region's district and city councils to determine the range and location of land uses, supported by appropriate social infrastructure to be encouraged and/or controlled in order to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the relevant centre managed through its district plan. However, when maintaining and enhancing regionally significant centres within a district, councils also need to consider the viability and vibrancy of the regionally significant centres outside their district, including the regional central business district as the major centre in the Wellington region.</p>			
<p>Policy 31 Identifying and <u>enabling a range of building heights and density promoting higher density and mixed use development</u> – district plans</p> <p><u>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that identify and enable a range of different building heights and density within <i>urban areas</i></u></p>	Oppose	Council considers this policy is unnecessary and may cause confusion, as clause (b) does not seem	Delete entirely or refer to 'enabling a range of building heights and density to give effect to the NPS' only without specific sub clause a) and b).

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>where it contributes to maintaining, establishing or improving the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning <i>urban environments</i>, including as a minimum:</u></p> <p><u>(a) For any tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for high density development within:</u></p> <p><u>(i) City centre zones and metropolitan centre zones; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) any other locations, where there is with good access to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. existing and planned rapid transit;</u> <u>2. edge of city centre zones and metropolitan centre zones; and/or</u> <u>3. areas with a range of commercial activities and community services.</u> <p><u>(b) For any tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for medium density residential development within any relevant residential zone.</u></p> <p><u>(c) For any other territorial authority not identified as a tier 1 territorial authority, identify areas for greater building height and density where: (i) there is good access to existing and planned active and public transport to a range of commercial activities and community services; and/or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) there is relative demand for housing and business use in that location.</u></p> <p>District plans shall:</p> <p>(b) identify key centres suitable for higher density and/or mixed use development;</p> <p>(c) identify locations, with good access to the strategic public transport network, suitable for higher density and/or mixed use development; and</p> <p>(d) include policies, rules and/or methods that encourage higher density and/or mixed use development in and around these centres and locations, so as to maintain and enhance a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form.</p> <p>Explanation</p>		<p>consistent with MDRS requirements.</p> <p>Council notes that the NPS-UD provides all the criteria necessary for adjustments to district plans as a matter of national direction and this is not required to be repeated, inaccurately, in the RPSPC1.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy 31 requires identification of areas suitable for intensification, and enables intensification in these areas, giving effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Policy 31 also enables greater building height and densities to be provided for in non-tier 1 territorial authorities which includes Masterton being a tier 3 territorial authority as well as Carterton and South Wairarapa. Providing for this development is consistent with Policy 5 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</u></p> <p>Policy 31 directs district and city councils to determine key centres and other locations with good access to the strategic public transport network, suitable for higher density or mixed use development, where they will reinforce the region's compact form. District plans will then need to include policies, rules and/or other methods to encourage higher density and mixed use activities in these locations to support this form.</p> <p>Objective 22 outlines the range of elements to be achieved by a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form. This includes a viable and vibrant regional central business district in Wellington city and an increased range and diversity of activities in and around other centres listed in policy 30.</p> <p>Key centres include the regionally significant centres identified in policy 30, as well as other significant local centres that a city or district council considers are integral to the functioning of the region's or a district's form. This includes centres identified for higher density and/ or mixed use development in any Council growth and/or development framework or strategy.</p> <p>Examples of growth and/or development framework or strategies in the region are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Upper Hutt Urban Growth Strategy • Wellington City Northern Growth Management Framework • Porirua Development Framework • Kapiti Coast: Choosing Futures Development Management Strategy and local outcomes statements contained in the Kapiti Coast Long term Council Community Plan. 			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Higher density and mixed-use development can be achieved in a number of ways — such as infill development, comprehensive re-development and/or multi-storey developments that support complementary living and other uses. Mixed use development means a variety of compatible and complementary uses within an area. This can include any combination of residential, commercial, industrial, business, retail, institutional or recreational uses. Density is a measure of how compact development is in a given area. For example, the number of people per square kilometre, the variety of land uses or activities (mixed use development) per square kilometre, or square meters of retail space per square kilometre of land area.</p> <p>The strategic public transport network is those parts of the region’s passenger transport network that provide a high level of service along corridors with high demand for public transport. It connects the region’s centres with the central business district in Wellington city. It includes the rail network and key bus corridors within Wellington region.</p> <p>Locations with good access to the strategic public transport network include those:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within reasonable walk times to stops or stations on the strategic public transport network (research indicates a walk time of up to 10 minutes is ‘reasonable’) • With frequent and reliable public transport services • With accessibility, by public transport, to key destinations in the region, and • Without physical barriers to public transport (for example, busy roads, lack of footpaths or crossing facilities, steep hills). 			
<p>Policy 32: Identifying and protecting key industrial-based employment locations – district plans</p> <p>District plans should <u>shall</u> include policies, rules and/or methods that identify and protect key industrial-based employment locations where they <u>contribute</u></p>	Support in part	It is beyond the legislative ability of GWRC to direct or require district plans to protect some types	Amend policy to delete sub clauses b) and d) and not amend ‘should’ to “shall”

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments by: maintain and enhance compact, well-designed and sustainable regional form</p> <p><u>(a) Recognising the importance of industrial based activities and the employment opportunities they provide.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Identifying specific locations and applying zoning suitable for accommodating industrial activities and their reasonable needs and effects including supporting or ancillary activities.</u></p> <p><u>(c) Identifying a range of land sizes and locations suitable for different industrial activities, and their operational needs including land-extensive activities,</u></p> <p><u>(d) Managing the establishment of non-industrial activities, in industrial zones, by avoiding activities likely to result in reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities, or likely to result in an inefficient use of industrial zoned land or infrastructure.</u></p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 32 directs that district plans must protect key industrial based employment opportunities where they contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning <i>urban environments</i>. Further direction is provided on how this is achieved though clauses (a) – (d). Key industrial employment locations are important as they provide for economic growth, employment opportunities and development.</u></p> <p><u>Management of other land use activities where significant historical investment or existing infrastructure may be adversely affected by competing or conflicting activities.</u></p> <p>This policy uses “should” to recognise that in some locations there is limited information about the supply of and demand for industrial employment activities, and that this makes it difficult for city and district councils to identify key industrial based employment locations.</p> <p>Objective 22 outlines the range of elements to be achieved by a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form.</p>		<p>of industrial development.</p> <p>Council notes that this policy is quite directive given the use of ‘shall; and ‘protect’ and questions the role of the RPS to direct this.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>The introduction of non-industrial uses such as large scale retail, wholesaling activities, showrooms, offices and residential activities into industrial-based employment locations can displace industrial employment activities from established industrial areas. Key industrial-based employment locations that maintain and enhance the region's compact form need to be protected in order to, amongst other matters, reduce the demand for new infrastructure, and promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure.</p>			
<p><u>Policy UD.1: Providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land – district plans</u></p> <p><u>District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods that provide for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land, by:</u></p> <p><u>(a) enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their Tino Rangatiratanga; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) recognising that marae and papakāinga are a Taonga and making appropriate provision for them; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) recognising the historical, contemporary, cultural, and social importance of papakāinga; and</u></p> <p><u>(d) if appropriate, identifying a Māori Purpose Zone; and</u></p> <p><u>(e) recognising Te Ao Māori and enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise Kaitiakitanga; and</u></p> <p><u>(f) providing for the development of land owned by mana whenua / tangata whenua.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p>	Support	Support provisions that enable Māori to express their culture and traditions.	Retain as notified.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>Policy UD.1 directs that district plans must provide for the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land and provides the minimum requirements in doing so. Enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise Tino Rangatiratanga may be achieved through District Councils working in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua during the plan review, change or variation process. Papakāinga is specifically referenced in the policy and are required to be provided for, which is consistent with Policy 1(a)(ii) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Clause (d) provides the ability for identifying a Māori Purpose Zone, having the same meaning as the National Planning Standards.</u></p>			
<p><u>Policy UD.2: Enable Māori cultural and traditional norms – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change of a district plan for use or development, particular regard shall be given the ability to enable Māori to express their culture and traditions in land use and development, by as a minimum providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy UD.2 supports Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms in land use and development. This includes recognising taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places to where mana whenua / tangata whenua still practice mātauranga.</u></p>	Support	Support provisions that enable Māori to express their culture and traditions.	<p>Retain provision as notified.</p> <p>Consider amendment to read:</p> <p>“Policy UD.2 supports Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms in land use and development. This includes recognising taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places to where mana whenua / tangata still practice mātauranga in accordance with <u>Mātauranga Māori</u>”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
			Consider role of urban Māori and how they are presented within the objective and policy.
<p><u>Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity – consideration</u></p> <p><u>When considering a change of a district plan for a development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:</u></p> <p><u>(i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</u></p> <p><u>(iii) for housing will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development,</u></p> <p><u>(b) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage identified in monitoring for:</u></p> <p><u>(i) a variety of housing that meets the regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the particular type, size, or format,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</u></p> <p><u>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, and</u></p>	Oppose	Clarify that this policy relates to urban development outside of existing urban areas	<p>Amend policy to clarify that this relates to urban development only including the following amendments:</p> <p>“When considering a change of a district plan for a <u>an urban development</u> in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met: ...”</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>(iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</u></p> <p><u>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal’s contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal’s contribution:</u></p> <p><u>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner,</u></p> <p><u>(iii) is likely to be taken up, and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term,</u></p> <p><u>(d) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p><u>Policy UD.3 provides for responsiveness in considering significant development capacity under Policy 55(d) and outlines the criteria that need to be met for a development to be considered to provide ‘significant development capacity’ as required by Subpart 2 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</u></p>			
<p>Policy 58 Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure – consideration</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>Many of these matters are outside</p>	<p>Amend policy by deleting all references to ‘require’</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan for subdivision, use or development, <u>require all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the development, funding, implementation and operation of infrastructure serving the area in question is provided for; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) all infrastructure required to serve new development, including low or zero carbon, multi modal and public transport infrastructure, is available, or is consented, designated or programmed to be available prior to development occurring particular regard shall be given to whether the proposed subdivision, use or development is located and sequenced to:</u></p> <p><u>(a) make efficient and safe use of existing infrastructure capacity; and/or</u></p> <p><u>(b) coordinate with the development and operation of new infrastructure.</u></p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 58 requires development to be sequenced such that infrastructure that is necessary to service the development will be provided before the development occurs. This includes both three waters infrastructure and transport infrastructure that would be necessary to support the development.</u></p> <p><u>Subdivision, use and development, (including infrastructure) decisions have a direct bearing upon or relationship to the sequencing and development of new infrastructure, including new infrastructure for the electricity transmission</u></p>		<p>the legislative control and authority of district and city councils and so this cannot be achieved. It is inappropriate for these to be directed by the RPS.</p>	

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>network and the region's strategic transport network. The region's strategic transport network is described in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy 2007-2016</p>			
<p>Policy 67: Establishing and maintaining and enhancing the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments and enhancing a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form – non-regulatory</p> <p>To establish and maintain and enhance <u>the qualities and characteristics of well functioning urban environments a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form</u> by:</p> <p>(a) <u>implementing the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and any urban design guidance that provides for best practice urban design and amenity outcomes, including for high density development and medium density residential development;</u></p> <p>(b) promoting best practice on the location and design of rural residential development;</p> <p>(c) recognising and enhancing the role of the region's open space network;</p> <p>(d) encouraging providing for <u>a range of housing types and developments to meet the community's social, cultural, and economic needs, including affordable housing and improve the health, safety and well-being of the community;</u></p> <p>(e) implementing the actions in the Wellington Regional Strategy for the Regional Focus Areas <u>Future Development Strategy, or the regional and local strategic growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in the region; and</u></p>	Oppose	Council is concerned that the proposed non-regulatory method, appears to rely on a future regulatory process under clause (e). In addition, it is inappropriate to rely on future plans and strategies where the content of these is unknown. References to an undeveloped strategy are ultra vires.	Amend policy to provide clarity on where this should apply and include non-regulatory methods that could achieve an outcome rather than a regulatory approach and remove all references to the yet to be developed Future Development Strategy.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>(f) work together and partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua to prepare papakāinga design guidelines that are underpinned by kaupapa Māori.</p> <p>(g) safeguarding the productive capability of the rural area.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p><u>Policy 67 supports the non-regulatory measures such as urban design guidance and other best practice guidance in contributing to the qualities and characteristics a well-functioning urban environment.</u></p> <p>The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol promotes a national cross-sector commitment to the principles of good urban design. It provides access to resources, training and a network of signatories with a range of urban design experience.</p> <p>The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol plays an important role in improving the quality of urban design in the region.</p> <p>Rural residential activities offer investment, development and growth opportunities, but present challenges in terms of rural productivity, provision of infrastructure and sustainable management.</p> <p>Best practice guidance will look at how districts and cities can benefit from rural residential activities while:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining rural economies that are functioning and productive • Managing sensitive environmental and amenity values 			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding natural hazards • Considering infrastructure limitations and requirements • Managing urban development and protecting future urban development areas <p>The region's open space network has helped define the region's existing urban form and is a fundamental element of quality of life for residents. The region's open space is managed by a number of organisations, including Wellington Regional Council, the region's district and city councils and the Department of Conservation. Policy 67 seeks to enhance the role of the region's open space network in supporting the region's compact form. This will require authorities to work together and identify gaps and opportunities.</p> <p>The location of the Regional Focus Areas is shown in Figure 3 below. These are areas predicted to either come under significant development pressure (for example, the northern Waikanae edge and Pauatahanui Inlet) or provide significant development opportunities for a range of land use activities (for example, Porirua, Aotea, Linden and Upper Hutt). They are areas of critical importance to the achievement of a compact and well designed regional form. Developing growth and/or development frameworks or strategies, as identified in the Wellington Regional Strategy, for each of the Regional Focus Areas is therefore an important action to be carried out by the relevant district and city councils. Figure 3: Regional focus Areas (also proposed for deletion)</p> <p>Housing design and the quality of housing developments can have a significant role in improving housing choice and affordability. Different housing types, particularly those that are less land intensive, can offer greater opportunities</p>			

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>for more affordable housing. Likewise, housing developments that incorporate, or are well connected to, transport infrastructure and services, employment opportunities and community centres are likely to enhance the social and economic wellbeing of residents. At present housing in the region generally becomes more affordable with distance from the regional central business district and other places of work. This has negative implications in terms of travel demand, associated living costs, access to employment and community networks. It can also limit economic development opportunities by reducing the ability of businesses to attract and retain a workforce with appropriate skills</p>			
<p><u>Objective 22B</u></p> <p><u>Development in the Wellington Region’s rural area is strategically planned and impacts on significant values and features identified in this RPS are effectively managed</u></p>	Support in part	Council supports the intent of this objective, insofar as the key fundamental issues within the RPS are addressed	<p>See comments on provisions relating to the inclusion of NPS-IB provisions, throughout this submission.</p> <p>Clarify how NPS-HPL relates to this objective and how it is proposed to be implemented.</p>
<p>Policy 61 - Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity</p>	Support	Support changes to Policy 61 to refer to the correct term of ‘biodiversity’ not ‘biological’	Retain policy as notified.
<p>Appendix 3 – Proposed amendment to Appendix 3: Definitions</p>			
<p>High density development</p> <p><u>Means areas used predominately for commercial, residential and mixed use activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities with a minimum building height of 6 stories.</u></p>	Oppose in part	High density development should not have a ‘minimum height of 6 storeys’. It	Delete reference to minimum storey requirements.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		is possible to have high density without 6 storeys. It is not for RPS to direct on matters of national direction and we note the definition is not consistent with UHCC permitted activity standards.	
<p>Hydrological controls <u>For greenfield development:</u> (a) <u>the modelled mean annual runoff volume generated by the fully developed area must not exceed the mean annual runoff volume modelled from the site in an undeveloped (pastoral) state</u> (b) <u>the modelled mean annual exceedance frequency of the 2-year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) so-called 'channel forming' (or 'bankfull') flow for the point where the fully developed area discharges to a stream must not exceed the mean annual exceedance frequency modelled for the same site and flow event arising from the area in an undeveloped (pastoral) state.</u> <u>For brownfield and infill development:</u> (a) <u>the modelled mean annual runoff volume generated by the fully developed area must, when compared to the mean annual runoff volume modelled for the site prior to the brownfield or infill development, be reduced as far as practicable towards the mean annual runoff volume modelled for the site in an undeveloped state</u> (b) <u>the modelled mean annual exceedance frequency of the 2-year ARI so-called 'channel forming' (or 'bankfull') flow for the point where the fully developed</u></p>		<p>'Undeveloped state' is not defined but is referred to regarding hydrological controls for greenfield and brownfield developments.</p> <p>Would a site which has been cleared and infrastructure included still considered to be undeveloped? Or which has buildings etc, which must be removed to develop</p>	<p>Include definition of 'undeveloped state'.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>area discharges to a stream, or stormwater network, shall be reduced as far as practicable towards the mean annual exceedance frequency modelled for the same site and flow event in an undeveloped state.</u></p>		<p>into the final land use?</p>	
<p>Maintain/maintained/maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) At least no reduction in the following: <u>(a) the size of populations of indigenous species</u> <u>(b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range</u> <u>(c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats</u> <u>(d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats</u> <u>(e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems</u> <u>(f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems.</u></p> <p>The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Regarding the definition of maintenance of IB – the definition refers to at least no reduction in which may result in perverse outcomes in relation to any restoration or enhancement activities and the statement at the end of the definition does not resolve this if some temporary ‘reduction’ is required to carry out effective restoration or enhancement activities.</p> <p>In addition enabling activities such as trimming or</p>	<p>Amend definition to be more clearly enabling of restoration or enhancement activities which may temporarily reduce components of the ecosystem or habitat and enable modification that is a functional need for infrastructure, health and safety and access.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		modification of vegetation to occur as necessary for the maintenance of infrastructure or prevention of harm (such as fire breaks or clearance on roads or near powerlines)	
<p>Medium density residential development <u>Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities with a minimum building height of 3 stories.</u></p>	Support in part	Do not support including a minimum height of three stories. It is unclear why this has been included in the definition given MDH can be achieved without developments being three stories, as an example terraced housing may be two stories. MDRS rules also refer to a maximum of three stories. The definition is unhelpful and goes	Amend to delete reference to minimum storey requirements.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
		beyond what is required for the RPS.	
<p>Naturally uncommon ecosystems <u>Ecosystems with an estimated maximum total area of <0.5 percent (i.e., <134,000ha) of New Zealand’s land area (268,680 km²) before human colonization.</u></p> <p><u>The 72 naturally uncommon ecosystems in New Zealand are described in Wiser, Susan K et al “New Zealand's Naturally Uncommon Ecosystems” 2013 available at https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/uploads/public/researchpubs/uncommon-ecosystems-book-section.pdf</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>Only 15 of 72 across NZ are mapped so we cannot know what the implications of these are. Council notes these seem to relate mainly to coastal features including dunes and areas, but they also talk about strongly leached terraces, inland dunes from river sands and habitats of acutely and chronically threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>It is unclear the legislative basis for the inclusion of this definition, particularly ahead of the gazetting of the NPS-IB.</p>	Delete the proposed definition and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted and more detailed information on these ecosystems is available.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p>Nature based solutions <u>Actions to protect, enhance, or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change.</u> <u>Examples include:</u> <u>Reducing greenhouse gas emissions (climate change mitigation):</u> <u>planting forests to sequester carbon</u> <u>protecting peatland to retain carbon stores</u></p> <p><u>Increasing resilience (climate change adaptation):</u> <u>(a) providing resilience for people</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>planting street trees to provide relief from high temperatures</u> • <u>restoring coastal dunelands to provide increased resilience to the damaging effects of storms linked to sea level rise</u> 	Support in part	<p>Council supports the intent of the definition but notes there needs to be a balance between increased trees with increased need for development. See comments on not directing in above policies and methods.</p> <p>Council considers planting forest as an action to reduce greenhouse gases, but the protection of peatlands is not an action (at least in the Upper Hutt context) and is not considered to be a good example for inclusion in the RPS.</p>	That the definition is amended to delete 'protecting peatland to retain carbon stores'.
<p>Protect – (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) <u>Looking after biodiversity and the ecosystem processes that create and maintain it in the long term. This involves managing all threats to secure species</u></p>	Oppose	The definition itself is very directive, and it is unclear how this	Delete and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<p><u>from extinction and ensuring that their populations are buffered from the impacts of the loss of genetic diversity and longer-term environmental events such as climate change. This includes, but is not restricted to, legal protection.</u></p>		<p>relates to the NPS-IB, and the legal protection included.</p>	
<p>Resilience <u>The ability of an ecosystem to absorb and recover from disturbances.</u></p>		<p>Should relate to all resilience identified in the plan not just ecosystems e.g., resilience for people.</p>	<p>Amend to address comments.</p>
<p>Strategic Transport Network <u>The Strategic Transport Network includes the following parts of the Wellington Region’s transport network:</u> <u>(a) All railway corridors and ‘core’ bus routes as part of the region’s public transport network identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021, and</u> <u>(b) All existing and proposed state highways, and</u> <u>(c) Any other strategic roads that are classified as a National High Volume Road, National Road, or Regional Road as part of the region’s strategic road network identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021, and</u> <u>Any other road classified as a high productivity motor vehicle (HPMV) route identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021, and</u> <u>(e) All sections of the regional cycling network classified as having a combined utility and recreational focus identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 and</u> <u>(f) Any other existing and proposed cycleway and/or shared paths for which the New Zealand Transport Agency and/or a local authority is/was the requiring authority or is otherwise responsible.</u> <u>The strategic public transport network is those parts of the region’s passenger transport network that provide a high level of service along corridors with high</u></p>		<p>This is only referred to in definitions so there are no provisions relating to it.</p> <p>Method 16 still refers to the strategic public transport network, but this is just provision of information on areas with good access to the network. May require amendment for consistency.</p>	<p>Amend to address comments.</p>

Proposed Provision	Support / Oppose	Comments	Relief Sought
<u>demand for public transport. It connects the region's centres with the central business district in Wellington city. It includes the rail network and key bus corridors within Wellington region.</u>			
Tier 1 Territorial Authority		Tier 1 authorities – words missing in the note.	Amend definition to fix errors.