

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.099	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Clear and concise definitions are critical to assist in interpretation and implementation of the RPS.	Add any further definitions for any terms that are unclear and where a definition would assist in interpretation and implementation, including any relevant terms proposed to be introduced in response to submissions.
<b>S32 Director-General of Conservation</b>	S32.038	General comments - definitions	Support in part	The proposed definitions generally appropriately reflect national direction and/or support changes to objectives, policies and methods.	Retain as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.
<b>S62 Philip Clegg</b>	S62.003	General comments - definitions	Support in part	I strongly recommend that GWRC consider moving the definitions to the start of the RPS. The definitions contain critical information that materially affects how the RPS will be applied. For instance, people will assume the natural and ordinary meaning of "restoration" will apply, unless they have seen the definition.	Move the definitions section to the front end of the RPS.
<b>S63 Mary Beth Taylor</b>	S63.005	General comments - definitions	Support in part	UHCC Plan Change 47 includes the Mangaroa Peatland as unstable for development. This should be reflected in Plan Change 1 to the RPS. By adopting the RAMSAR definition of a wetlands, the Mangaroa Peatland would qualify for protection and restoration.	Use the RAMSAR Convention definition to define wetlands (Article 1) as this incorporates peatlands as follows: <b>"areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six metres."</b>
<b>S78 Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited</b>	S78.040	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts, and neither supports nor opposes the following provisions of PC1 that are intended to give effect to the NPS-UD, including: The proposed definitions and amendments to or deletions of the definitions of 'city centre zone', 'complex development opportunities', 'future development strategy', 'high density development', 'hydrological controls', 'key centres', 'marae', 'medium density residential development', 'metropolitan centre zone', 'national grid', 'papakainga', 'regional form', 'regionally significant centres', 'relevant residential zone', 'small scale', 'tier 1 territorial authority', 'tier 1 urban environment', 'urban areas' and 'urban environment'	Retain as notified
<b>S94 Guardians</b>	S94.022	General comments	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
of the Bays Incorporated		- definitions			
S95 Tony Chad	S95.005	General comments - definitions	Support in part	UHCC Plan Change 47 includes the Mangaroa Peatland as unstable for development. This should be reflected in Plan Change 1 to the RPS. By adopting the RAMSAR definition of a wetlands, the Mangaroa Peatland would qualify for protection and restoration.	Use the RAMSAR Convention definition to define wetlands (Article 1) as this incorporates peatlands as follows: "areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six metres."
S96 Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	S96.001	General comments - definitions	Support in part	I strongly recommend that GWRC consider moving the definitions to the start of the RPS. The definitions contain critical information that materially affects how the RPS will be applied. For instance, people will assume the natural and ordinary meaning of "restoration" will apply, unless they have seen the definition.	Move the definitions section to the front end of the RPS.
S102 Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	S102.096	General comments - definitions	Support in part	'Ancestral land' is not defined and should be defined in the definitions chapter to avoid ambiguity in regards to individual's interpretation of ancestral lands and their extent.	Insert definition for 'Ancestral Land'.
S124 KiwiRail Holdings Limited	S124.015	General comments - definitions	Support in part	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a definition for "well-functioning urban environments" which is consistent with the NPS-UD.	New definition of "well- functioning urban environments" <b>Well-functioning urban environment has the meaning in Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</b>
S128 Horticulture New Zealand	S128.063	General comments - definitions	Support in part	Amend the existing RPS definition, to be more consistent with the NPS for Highly Productive Land 2022, and the WRGF, to capture Land use classes 1-3.	Amend as follows:Highly protective agricultural land is Class I <del>and</del> , II <b>and</b> III land in the land use capability classes of the New Zealand Land Resources Inventory. Also trigger consequential amendment to Policy 59
S128 Horticulture New Zealand	S128.064	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	To provide clarity to the policy direction relating to agricultural greenhouse gas emissions.	Insert new definition as follows: <b>Agricultural Green House Gas Emissions - Agricultural Green House Gas Emissions means methane from ruminant animals, and nitrous oxide from</b>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<b>animal waste and nitrogen in fertiliser.</b>
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.008	General comments - definitions	Support in part	It is more appropriate for the definition for climate resilient urban areas to sit within the definitions section of the document rather than in the explanation. This will assist with clarity and achieving the policy intent.	Insert a new definition for 'climate resilient urban areas' using the text currently in the explanation of Policy CC.4, as below: <b>Climate resilient urban areas: Means urban areas that have the ability to withstand:</b> • Increased temperatures and urban heat island • Increased intensity of rainfall and flooding • Droughts and urban water scarcity and security • Increased intensity of wind, cold spells, landslides, fire, and air pollution.
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.047	General comments - definitions	Support in part	A new definition is required to support submission points on Policies 55 and 56 until maps of highly productive land are operative in the RPS. The proposed submission aligns with NPS-HPL 2022 clause 3.5(7).	Insert new definition as shown below: <b>Highly Productive Land</b> Until highly productive land is mapped and operative in this Regional Policy Statement, highly productive land refers to land that, as of 17 October 2022: • Is zoned general rural or rural production and is Land Use Capability 1, 2, or 3 land; and • Is not identified for future urban development or subject to a Council initiated or adopted notified plan change to rezone it to urban or rural lifestyle.
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.062	General comments - definitions	Support in part	Including a definition for 'minimise' would assist with clarity for the natural hazards provisions. Greater Wellington proposes to use the Natural Resources Plan definition for minimise, which was agreed to by all appellants.	Insert new definition as shown below: <b>Minimise</b> Reduce to the smallest amount reasonably practicable. Minimised, minimising and minimisation have the corresponding meaning.
<b>S157 BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd</b>	S157.049	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	RPS Change 1 proposes to introduce a number of policies relating to 'transport infrastructure' and its role in contributing to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The term 'transport infrastructure' is not defined, such that it is unclear what activities will be subject to the associated policy framework. The	Insert a new definition of Transport Infrastructure to provide clarity around the scope and application of the proposed new policies that apply to Transport Infrastructure. This could be achieved by inserting a new definition along the following lines, or by amending policies CC.1, CC.9 and CC.11 in a way that clarifies the policies do not apply to service stations,

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				expectation is that these provisions will apply to 'structures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means', as per the wording of the RMA definition of 'infrastructure'. Would not support the application of the 'transport infrastructure' policies to service stations, truck stops or bulk fuel supply infrastructure. As such, and to improve certainty around the scope and application of the 'transport infrastructure' policies, seek the inclusion of a new definition of 'transport infrastructure'. Alternatively, seek consequential amendments to the 'transport infrastructure' policies (being policies CC.1, CC.9 and CC.11) to clarify that they do not apply to service stations, truck stops or bulk fuel supply infrastructure.	truck stops or bulk fuel supply infrastructure: <b>Transport InfrastructureStructures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means.</b>
<b>S158 Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</b>	S158.038	General comments - definitions	Support in part	Seeks that definitions are aligned with any relevant National Policy Statements or the National Planning Standards where applicable.	Amend definitions so that they are aligned with any relevant National Policy Statements or the National Planning Standards where applicable.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.019	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Should the proposed relief for Policy 39 be accepted, the term quarrying activities can either be explicitly provided for in the RPS or otherwise be as defined in the National Planning Standards. This will address the concerns we have regarding the RPS being silent on clean filling activities and recognition that extraction requires associated activities.	New definition: <b>Quarrying activities means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), the deposition of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</b>
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.034	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Winstone notes that the new definitions appear to be focused on indigenous biodiversity and do not appear to introduce definitions required by NPS-FM. This appears to be inconsistent. The introduced policies and objectives in PPC1 do use terms referred to and defined in NPS-FM and therefore those terms should be included and defined in the RPS.	NPS-FM definitions and any updated definitions are added to the plan.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.008	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	It is Rangitāne o Wairarapa's view that the plan change goes further than this, and proposes a number of policies which, in title at least, seek to manage land use and development as it impacts on freshwater in 'urban' environments. No definition of 'urban development' has been proposed, leaving this term open to interpretation as to what constitutes 'urban development', and what doesn't.	Add a definition of <b>'urban development'</b> .
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0118	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	No reasons given	Consequential amendments to definitions, deleted definitions, and new definitions as appropriate for our other requested relief.
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0120	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	New definition for "High carbon passenger transport modes". A definition for this term is needed to implement our requested relief for Policy CC.1. See the discussion of the term "low and zero-carbon modes" for details.	New definition: "Means passenger transportmodes that are not <i>low and zero-carbon modes</i> ."
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0122	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	New definition for "low and zero-carbon modes"  A definition for this term is needed for Policy CC.1 both as proposed and to implement our requested relief.  We have not provided the text for a proposed definition because this is an area best drafted by the Regional Council for consistency with other plans, policies, and strategies. We would assume the definition would encompass at least walking, cycling, and some public transport. The degree to which the definition covers micromobility, fossil-fuelled public transport, or personal electric cars should be consistent with other strategies on mode shift covering funding.	Provide a definition for the term that aligns with the national Emissions Reduction Plan, Waka Kotahi/NZTA's Regional Mode Shift Plan - Wellington, and other relevant strategies for mode shift.
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0128	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	For greater clarity, add a definition of 'Natural Ecosystem'.	Add: Definition of Natural Ecosystem

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0129	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	For greater consistency, add a definition of 'undeveloped state'.	Add: Definition of Undeveloped State
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0130	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	For greater consistency, add a definition of 'Resilience (in relation to climate change)'.	Add: Definition of resilience (in relation to climate change)
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0131	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	For greater clarity, add a definition of 'Low Carbon Emissions Transportation Mode'.	Add: Definition of Low Carbon Emissions Transportation Mode
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0132	General comments - definitions	Support	For greater clarity, add a definition of 'Zero Carbon Emissions Transportation mode'.	Add: Definition of Zero Carbon Emissions Transportation mode
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0106	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review	That all amendments to Appendix 3 be deleted
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0144	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Seek a definition for 'stationary energy' in the plan as this is not a commonly used term but a significant source of emissions so requires explanation.	Insert a new definition for 'stationary energy'.
<b>S167 Taranaki Whānui</b>	S167.0193	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	Insert a new definition <b>Mahinga kai</b> (Wording adopted from Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao):  <b>Mahinga kai is described as:</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Our kaitiaki relationship with water is through mahinga kai.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai are the places where we practice our cultural harvest.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai are the taonga species; plants, birds, fish, and animals that we provide for as kaitiaki.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai are the activities which we undertake as kaitiaki.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai activities enable us to maintain and transfer kaitiaki knowledge between generations.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai supports cultural wellbeing through manaaki tangata; the provision of kai to our guests.</b></li> <li>• <b>Mahinga kai enables us to assess the wellbeing of water and all that it supports; including people</b></li> </ul>
<b>S167 Taranaki Whānui</b>	S167.0196	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	Definition needed here as used widely throughout the RPS. Something that speaks to equality of voice, goals for equity, and power-sharing.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.0157	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	That a definition is included to define what is meant by ' <b>indigenous ecosystems</b> ' in the context of the RPS.
<b>S137 Greater Wellington</b>	S137.022	Biodiversity	Support in part	Amend to align with the offsetting definition and the similar definition in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft.	Amend definition as follows: Biodiversity compensation A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Regional Council (GWRC)		compensation		Also amend to reflect the fact that we are directing a net benefit outcome from the use of compensation.	actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects <del>that cannot be otherwise managed</del> <b>after avoidance, minimisation, remediation, and biodiversity offset measures have been applied.</b>
S162 Winstone Aggregates	S162.020	Biodiversity compensation	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	S168.084	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	<p>Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of a definition of biodiversity compensation. However, amendments are requested to clarify the purpose and use of biodiversity compensation.</p> <p>The definition must be clear that compensation is the riskiest management approach and comes after all measures to avoid, minimise, remedy or offset have been explored.</p> <p>Compensation is also not necessarily a measurable outcome.</p>	Amend the definition as follows: A <del>measurable</del> positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be <del>otherwise managed</del> <b>avoided, minimised, remediated or offset.</b>



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0125	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	The reference to 'otherwise managed' is unclear. We also suggest, as per the submission point re policy 24, that this definition should link to a set of mandatory compensation principles contained in the RPS.	Amend definition to: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be <b>avoided remedied mitigated or offset otherwise managed</b> . Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix.
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.023	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	Delete appropriate as it is imprecise. Also amend to reflect the fact that we are directing a net gain outcome from the use of offsetting.	Amend definition as follows: Biodiversity offsetting A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after <del>appropriate</del> avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve <del>no net loss, and preferably at least a</del> <b>10 percent</b> net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.021	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.  Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.083	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa generally support the biodiversity offsetting definition as it is consistent with New Zealand guidance. However, an amendment is required to ensure it aligns with the 10% net gain goal specified in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A.	Amend the definition to be consistent with the 10% net gain goal specified in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0126	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	The reference to minimisation is unclear. Suggest, as per the submission point re policy 24, that this definition should link to a set of mandatory offsetting principles contained in the RPS.	Amend definition to: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, <del>minimisation,</del> and remediation <b>and mitigation</b> measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss, and preferably a net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values. Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix.
<b>S158 Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</b>	S158.039	Carbon emissions assessment	Oppose	Seeks the deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition in its entirety.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0100	Carbon emissions assessment	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks that it be deleted. It lacks the necessary specificity required for a definition to enable effective and efficient implementation in regulatory frameworks (district plans and regional plans). For example, it refers to the carbon footprint but does not: • Detail what is meant by a footprint as intended to be used in a regulatory context.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity as to what activity the carbon footprint relates to.</li> </ul>	
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0127	Carbon emissions assessment	Support		Retain
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0128	Carbon emissions assessment	Support in part	Drafting improvement	Replace "moderate" with "reduce"
<b>S158 Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</b>	S158.040	City centre zone	Oppose in part	Seeks that the definition is amended to reflect the centres hierarchy proposed within Policy 30, recognising Wellington City as the only City Centre within the context of the RPS.	Amend the definition as follows: <del>Has the same meaning as in Standard 8 of the National Planning Standards: Areas used predominantly for a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. In the context of the Wellington Region, the City Centre Zone is that of Wellington City.</del> The zone is the main centre for the district or region.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0101	Climate change adaptation	Oppose	<p>Council opposes this definition and seeks that it be deleted. It lacks the necessary specificity required for a definition to enable effective and efficient implementation in regulatory frameworks (district plans and regional plans). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what is meant by "human systems" and how this is to be applied in</li> </ul>	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>regulatory frameworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It refers to "moderate harm" but not to which values, assets and/or other features this is to be applied.</li> <li>• The last sentence reads as a statement more appropriately included in a policy rather than a definition.</li> </ul>	
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0119	Climate change adaptation	Support in part	Definition is confusing and does not allow for a better understanding of what the RPS is aiming to achieve	Clarify definition
<b>S100 Meridian Energy Limited</b>	S100.024	Climate change mitigation	Support in part	The focus of RPS Change #1 is on reduction of emissions but that is only part of the solution. The complete solution will require a mix of reduction and replacement of energy sources.	<p>Amend the definition of 'climate change mitigation' to include positive actions that assist to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (including using and developing renewable energy) as follows or similar: Human actions to reduce emissions by sources or enhance removals by sinks of greenhouse gases. Examples of reducing emissions by sources include walking instead of driving, or replacing a coal boiler with a renewable electric-powered one, <b>or developing additional renewable energy sources to assist the transition to a zero emissions regional economy and reducing reliance on fossil fuels.</b> Examples of enhancing removals by sinks include growing new trees to absorb carbon, promoting and providing for active transport, and increasing public transport services and affordability.</p>
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0102	Climate change mitigation	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks that it be deleted. It describes actions which are more appropriately included in a policy rather than a definition. It also relies on the use of examples to provide clarity missing from the definition. It is also difficult to understand how this definition can be applied in a regulatory RMA framework that manages the development, use and subdivision of land.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S140 Wellington City</b>	S140.0120	Climate change mitigation	Support in part	Definition is confusing and does not allow for a better understanding of what the RPS is aiming to achieve	Amend: Human actions to reduce emissions <b>from entering the</b>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Council (WCC)					<del>atmosphere by sources</del> or enhance <del>the</del> removals <del>by sinks</del> of greenhouse gases. <del>Examples of reducing emissions by sources include walking instead of driving, or replacing a coal boiler with a renewable electric powered one. Examples of enhancing removals by sinks include growing new trees to absorb carbon, promoting and providing for active transport, and increasing public transport services and affordability.</del>
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0129	Climate change mitigation	Support in part	The examples are confusing	Delete examples
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.086	Complex development opportunities	Oppose	Council notes the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee has no statutory authority under the RMA. We consider it is inappropriate for a regional policy statement to include provisions that refer to committees and government agencies to jointly develop and implement plans and a framework for development opportunities.	Delete proposed definition for complex development opportunities and associated references throughout the plan change including Method 46.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0103	Complex development opportunities	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks that it be deleted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It relies on a committee rather than a statutory plan, Future Development Strategy or other planning instrument for identification of relevant land areas.</li> <li>• It is drafted as a policy rather than a definition and requires a level of assessment and judgement inappropriate for a definition.</li> </ul>	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0119	Complex development	Support	It is inappropriate for a definition to outsource the meaning of a definition to a third party, in this case the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee,	Delete definition. (Note our other relief would delete all uses of this term in the RPS in any case).

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
		opportunities		particularly regarding decisions to be made by that third party in future.	
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.022	Ecological connectivity	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.085	Ecological connectivity	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0121	Ecological connectivity	Support in part	<p>The current definition of "ecological connectivity" is confusing and does not provide a clear meaning for the term.</p> <p>It also ignores the Exposure Draft NPS-IB's definition of 'connectivity' which should replace the current definition</p>	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Refers to the degree of connection that provides for the movement of genetic alleles and species and the maintenance of ecosystem processes within and between populations and ecosystems.</p> <p>To the definition of connectivity used in the Exposure Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity: <b>"refers to the structural or functional links or connections between habitats and</b></p>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<b>ecosystems that provide for the movement of species and processes among and between the habitats or ecosystems"</b>
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0130	Ecological connectivity	Support in part	Drafting improvement	Replace "alleles" with "material"
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.024	Ecological integrity	Support in part	Amend to align with the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft.	Amend definition as follows: Ecological Integrity <del>The full potential of indigenous biotic and abiotic features and natural processes, functioning in sustainable communities, habitats, and landscapes.</del> <b>Means the extent to which an ecosystem is able to support and maintain its:(a) composition (being its natural diversity of indigenous species, habitats, and communities); and(b) structure (being its biotic and abiotic physical features); and (c) functions (being its ecological and physical processes)</b>
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.023	Ecological integrity	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.  Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.086	Ecological integrity	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0131	Ecological integrity	Support in part	The definition could be improved by replacing it with one that includes more appropriate detail.	<p>The current definition is: Delete definition and replace with: <b>"the ability of the natural environment to support and maintain the full range of indigenous biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, both within and across ecosystems. It requires supporting and maintaining:</b>a. ecological representation: the occurrence and extent of ecosystems and indigenous species and their habitats across the full range of environments; b.b. composition: the natural diversity and abundance of indigenous species, habitats, and communities within and across ecosystems;c. structure: the biotic and abiotic physical features and characteristics of ecosystems;d. functions: the ecological and physical functions and processes of an ecosystem; ande. resilience: any other</p>



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<b>properties that contribute to resilience of the indigenous components of ecosystems to the adverse impacts of natural or human disturbances."</b>
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.024	Ecosystem health	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.087	Ecosystem health	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of</b>	S165.0132	Ecosystem health	Support in part	<p>Support the definition. However, we seek clarification on how the definition will interact with the NPSFM compulsory value of 'ecosystem health', which is described in Appendix 1A NPSFM. Policy 44 for example refers to ecosystem health in</p>	Retain, but seek clarity on use of the term in freshwater provisions and make amendments as necessary. Two definitions may be needed to differentiate the terms.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>				terms of freshwater takes. It is not clear how the RPS definition and the NPSFM value would apply.	
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.063	Emissions	Oppose	Emissions is a generic term that applies to more than just greenhouse gases, however the notified definition only refers to greenhouse gases. It would be appropriate to remove this definition and instead amend the definition for 'greenhouse gases' to refer to 'greenhouse gas emissions'.	Remove definition for Emissions.
<b>S32 Director-General of Conservation</b>	S32.040	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support in part	Proposed definitions relating to indigenous biodiversity are generally appropriate. However, if an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity is gazetted prior to decisions being made on the definitions, then they should be reviewed for compliance with that document.	Retain as notified, subject to any changes which may be required to give effect to an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.025	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.088	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0133	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support		Retain
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.087	Future Development Strategy	Oppose	All Tier 1 local authorities have a requirement to prepare a FDS in accordance with Subpart 4 of the NPS-UD. All Tier 1 city and district councils in the region are authorised to prepare a FDS in accordance with the NPS-UD. On this basis the proposed definition is incorrect and should simply refer to subpart 4 of the NPS-UD.	Amend as follows: Future Development Strategy Means any Future Development Strategy prepared <b>and published for the Wellington Regional</b> in accordance with Subpart 4 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.064	Greenhouse gases	Support in part	Amend definition for greenhouse gases to refer to greenhouse gas emissions, to support the removal of the definition for emissions.	Amend the definition to read:  <b>Greenhouse Gases Emissions Atmospheric gases that trap or absorb heat and contribute to climate change. The gases covered by the Climate Change Response Act 2002 are The release of carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), or sulphur hexafluoride (SF6) into the atmosphere, where they trap heat or radiation and contribute to climate change.</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>S128 Horticulture New Zealand</b></p>	<p>S128.065</p>	<p>Hazard sensitive activity</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>It is not clear what scale of activity might be invertedly captured by 'hazardous facilities', whereas major hazardous facilities is a term defined through regulations e.g. Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: Means any building that....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>hazardous facilities and</del> major hazardous facilities</li> </ul>
<p><b>S157 BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd</b></p>	<p>S157.046</p>	<p>Hazard sensitive activity</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The terms 'hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities' are not defined. It is, therefore, uncertain what types of facilities will be considered 'hazard sensitive activities' and subject to the proposed policy framework, which as currently drafted, requires complete avoidance of such activities in areas identified as at high or extreme risk of natural hazard. An avoidance approach is not appropriate, particularly where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the acceptability of risk will vary depending on the hazard involved e.g. flooding, coastal erosion, rockfall, earthquake etc;</li> <li>- there is a need to continue to operate, maintain or upgrade existing facilities; or</li> <li>- there is an operational or functional need for an activity to locate in or traverse an area at risk from natural hazards.</li> </ul> <p>Many District Councils within the region have now removed provisions relating to hazardous facilities from their district plans, consistent with RLLA 2017, which removed the control of hazardous substances as an explicit function for councils. This reflects the high degree of control already in place in relation to these activities under other legislation, including under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act, the Health and Safety and Work Act and WorkSafe regulations. This includes with respect to managing natural hazard risk.</p> <p>Underground fuel storage tanks, for example, are not generally at risk during a flood event and compliance with industry best practice would, in any case, require the design of service station or truck stop facilities to maintain their integrity and function during natural hazard events. Further, the resilience of these facilities through the 2010 and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes, with no simultaneous compartment</p>	<p>Amend the definition of hazard sensitive activity to remove 'hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities', on the basis that these terms are not defined and it is uncertain what types of facilities will be considered 'hazard sensitive activities' and that the policy framework as currently drafted, requires complete avoidance of such activities and does not make appropriate provision for existing facilities, or activities that may have an operational or functional need to locate in a hazard sensitive area,</p> <p>Hazard sensitive activity Means any building that contains one or more of the following activities:</p> <p>....• <del>hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities</del></p>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				failures and no significant product losses, demonstrates the resilience of these structures to earthquake risk.	
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.088	High density development	Oppose	Specifying a minimum building height for high density development is not necessary or helpful to city and district councils in carrying out their functions when giving effect to the MDRS and the requirements of NPS-UD Policies 3 and 4. The proposed height specifications and list of activities that comprise high density development misinterpret NPS-UD requirements and the definition is not required for city and district councils to give effect to the NPS-UD. Council requests the proposed definition be deleted.	<del>Amend as follows: High density development</del> <del>Means areas used predominately for commercial, residential and mixed use activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities with a minimum building height of 6 stories.</del>
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0104	High density development	Support	The definition conflates built form, land use activities and spatial areas, and reads as a zone statement. It does not provide a definition of high-density development with a specificity appropriate for use in regulatory frameworks in RMA plans. Council also objects to the definition requiring that high density development must consist of buildings with a minimum of 6 storeys. This exceeds the requirements of the NPS-UD, is not supported by any urban design evidence, and is more appropriately included in a policy.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0100	High density development	Oppose in part	High density development should not have a 'minimum height of 6 storeys'. It is possible to have high density without 6 storeys. It is not for RPS to direct on matters of national direction and we note the definition is not consistent with UHCC permitted activity standards.	Delete reference to minimum storey requirements.
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0121	High density development	Support in part	The use of the term "minimum building height" is unclear. District plans do occasionally apply minimum building height standards but typically provide a maximum or anticipated building height.	Amend as follows: "Means areas used predominately for <del>commercial, residential and mixed use urban</del> activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities with <del>a minimum</del> <b>an anticipated</b> building height of <b>at least</b> 6 stories."

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0122	High density development	Support in part	The height limits go further than the NPS-UD and proposes unnecessary rigidity.	Means areas used predominately for commercial, residential or mixed-use activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities. <del>with a minimum building height of 6 stories.</del>
<b>S137 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)</b>	S137.013	Highly erodible land	Support in part	Amend the definition to remove the confusion introduced by referring to two different approaches to identify areas at risk of erosion. The proposed amendment aligns with the definition for highly erodible land used by MFE and Statistics NZ to inform national erosion management policy and state of the environment monitoring, with a spatial digital layer already available. The erosion susceptibility classification used in the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry 2017 (NES-PF) was developed to inform good plantation forestry practice specifically to implement the NES-PF, rather than identifying priority areas for recovering forest cover. This classification captures only a small sub-set of highly erodible land. The RPS policy intent is to increase forest extent on a much wider area of eroding hill country.	Amend the definition as shown below: Highly Erodible Land <del>Means</del> <b>Land</b> at risk of severe erosion (landslide, earthflow, and gully) if it does not have a protective cover of deep-rooted woody vegetation. <del>Land classified as very high (red) according to the erosion susceptibility classification in the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry 2017.</del>
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0105	Highly erodible land	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion for the following reasons: • The first sentence requires a level of assessment and judgement inappropriate for a definition. It is unclear what a protective cover of deep-rooted woody vegetation is and how this would be determined. The second sentence is appropriately certain.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan uses.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0107	Highly erodible land	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review  Further reasons set out in relation to Policy CC.6	Delete the new definition Delete the FW icon
<b>S113 Wellington Water</b>	S113.051	Hydrological controls	Oppose	The purpose of the definition is unclear. The intent might be better served by creation of a policy, rather than a definition.  The following issues need to be addressed: • The definition refers to annual means rather than annual peaks	The following issues need to be addressed:  • Refer to annual means rather than annual peaks • Include a more specific target in the practicability test for brownfield and infill developments. • Clarify whether modelling is based on an undeveloped state or the surrounding catchment also being in an undeveloped

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The practicability test for brownfield and infill developments may be better served with a more specific target</li> <li>It is unclear whether the modelling is based on an undeveloped state or the surrounding catchment also being in an undeveloped state? This would affect water flowing onto the site and water attenuation</li> <li>It is unclear what purpose the (a) clauses serve. The (b) clauses re to address stream scour that adversely impacts aquatic ecosystem health. If the (a) clauses are trying to achieve a different outcome to the (b) clauses, then this should be reflected in the policies. Currently the policies are only referring to one outcome, related to stream form.</li> </ul>	<p>state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the purpose of clause (a) and how it is different to clause (b)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p>Create as a policy, rather than a definition.</p>
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0106	Hydrological controls	Support	<p>Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is drafted as a rule or standard rather than a definition and requires a level of assessment and judgement inappropriate for a definition.</li> <li>It lacks the necessary specificity required for a definition to enable effective and efficient implementation in a regulatory framework (district plan and regional plan).</li> </ul>	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan uses.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0101	Hydrological controls	Not Stated / Neutral	<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 into the final land use?</p>	Include definition of 'undeveloped state'.
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0123	Hydrological controls	Support in part	Definition of 'Hydrological controls' does not provide a definition, rather it provides guidance for how hydrological controls should be implemented.	Add a new method using the current proposed definition of hydrological controls; and Add a new definition of hydrological controls.
<b>S100 Meridian Energy Limited</b>	S100.025	Large scale generators	Support in part	The requested insertion will avoid the perverse outcome that generators fuelled by renewable electricity are discouraged by policies that should be targeting fossil fuel use.	Amend the definition of 'large scale generators' to clarify that it is the burning of fossil fuel that is of concern, as follows: Any boiler, furnace, engine or other device designed to burn <b>fossil fuel</b> for the primary purpose of energy production having a net heat or energy output of

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					more than 40kW, but excluding motor vehicles, trucks, boats and aircraft. This definition excludes domestic fires.
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.089	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	Council notes restoration and enhancement are separate activities that require a greater level of intervention and action than that required to maintain. Council opposes the definition including restoration and enhancement activities as part of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity.	Amend as follows: Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) At least no reduction in the following: a) the size of populations of indigenous species b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems. <del>The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.</del>
<b>S100 Meridian Energy Limited</b>	S100.026	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose in part	Restoration and enhancement infer improvement, rather than maintenance. The need for and appropriateness of restoration or enhancement should be addressed in the relevant policies.	Delete the reference to restoration and enhancement in the last paragraph: (a) the size of populations of indigenous species (b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range (c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats (d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats (e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems (f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems. <del>The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.</del>
<b>S114 Fulton Hogan Ltd</b>	S114.006	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous	Support in part	This definition appears to respond to the NPS-IB, and should be consistent with the final version of that policy.	Retain as notified



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
		biodiversity )			
<b>S134 Powerco Limited</b>	S134.019	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	Distinct definitions of restoration and enhancement are included and infer improvement of the existing state. It is inappropriate to incorporate these terms in the defined concept of 'maintenance'. If restoration or enhancement are appropriate in relation to development within a certain ecosystem or habitat that should be addressed at a policy level.	Amend the definition of maintain / maintained / maintenance by deleting the reference to restoration and enhancement, as follows: Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) At least no reduction in the following: (a) the size of populations of indigenous species (b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range (c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats (d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats (e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems (f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems. <del>The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.</del>
<b>S148 Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)</b>	S148.057	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks to ensure that this definition is consistent with national direction that may be contained in the NPSIB. In its current drafting it also appears to achieve a level of protection, which is arguably higher than a requirement to "maintain".	Delete this definition
<b>S157 BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd</b>	S157.047	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	Distinct definitions of restoration and enhancement are included and infer improvement of the existing state. It is inappropriate to incorporate these terms in the defined concept of 'maintenance'. If restoration or enhancement are appropriate in relation to development within a certain ecosystem or habitat that should be addressed at a policy level.	Amend the definition of maintain / maintained / maintenance by deleting the reference to restoration and enhancement, as follow:  Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)  ..... <del>The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.</del>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.026	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.089	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0102	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous	Support in part	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.	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.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
		biodiversity )		In addition enabling activities such as trimming or 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).	
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0108	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review  Do not agree that "maintain" means "restore" or "enhance".	Delete the new definition  Delete the FW icon
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0134	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support in part	Defining the maintenance of biodiversity, and what it requires is critical for ensuring management actions are properly focused and are consistent across the region. There are, however, some issues with how the concept is framed in the RPS:  1. Para (c): the term "properties" is not defined. This is not clear. 2. Para (c): this para then refers to "the functions of ecosystems". We query whether a definition of ecosystem function may be needed. If one is included, we seek that it replicates the definition of 'ecosystem processes' used in the Critical factors report. [6]. [Note: 6 Walker et al, Critical factors to maintain biodiversity: what effects must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated to halt biodiversity loss? LC3116, May 2018.]  Strongly support the recognition that maintenance may require restoration or enhancement.	This definition appears to be based on the proposed NPSIB clause 1.5 definition. We repeat the relevant parts of our submission made in relation to that term here, and seek the same relief: Amend as follows: • Insert definition of "properties of ecosystems and habitats". It is suggested that Manaaki Whenua is asked for advice on this as it prepared the Critical factors report on which the concept is based. • Consider including a definition of ecosystem function to comprise full definition from Critical factors report:[7] [Note 7 references Walker et al, Critical factors to maintain biodiversity: what effects must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated to halt biodiversity loss? LC3116, May 2018. At pg. 41 as follows] "abiotic (physical) and biotic (biological) flows that are properties of an ecosystem, including the water cycle, nutrient cycling (including decomposition, plant nutrient uptake, microbial respiration, nitrification, denitrification), energy flow (photosynthesis, respiration, primary production), community dynamics (including population processes such as migration, dispersal, pollination, herbivory, population dynamics, predator-prey dynamics, competition, predation, succession, source-sink dynamics), and natural selection." Amend (c) to read: "ecosystem function and the properties of ecosystems and habitats".

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S131 Ātiawa ki Whakaron gotai Charitable Trust</b>	S131.0160	Marae	Oppose	Ātiawa seek to include a new definition of marae, drafted by mana whenua. Ātiawa are concerned that in the absence of any definition for marae, some developments may seek to fall under the policy framework for marae where this is not appropriate.	Ātiawa would like to request that mana whenua work together to draft an appropriate definition for marae.
<b>S167 Taranaki Whānui</b>	S167.0194	Marae	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui Note new definition needed.  Taranaki Whānui suggests regional council provide for mana whenua to develop their own definition of marae within each iwi and hapū.	Amend the definition of Marae with input from each iwi and hapū.
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.090	Medium density residential development	Oppose	Council notes medium density residential development is a description of the intensity of the use of a site. Medium density residential development can comprise developments less than 3 stories, and there are many examples of this throughout the region. The proposed definition conflicts with the definition for medium density housing proposed in Council's IPI. If it considered necessary for the RPS to include a definition for medium density residential development, it is crucial the definition is an umbrella term that does not conflict with the definitions and other provisions proposed within the Intensification Planning Instruments notified within the region.  It also appears the proposed height specification within the definition has cross-over with the height limits suggested in the proposed definition for high density development. Council considers it is not necessary or appropriate for the RPS to specify minimum heights for different types of development. Council notes the NPS-UD does not give the regional council the function of specifying what type of development can be considered medium density residential development within the region.  Council also notes including and other compatible activities without a qualifier creates uncertainty and opens the interpretation of the proposed definition to	Amend as follows: <del>Medium density residential development</del> <b>Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, and low-rise apartments, and other compatible residential activities with a minimum building height of 3 stories.</b>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				debate. Compatible activities will be defined differently within the district plans across the region. Council seeks the definition is deleted to avoid conflict with the IPIs notified by Tier 1 Councils in the region.	
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.027	Medium density residential development	Oppose in part	This definition on page 221 is incorrect in that it states "minimum" whereas it should be "maximum".	Amend the definition to read: Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities with a <b>maximum</b> <del>minimum</del> building height of 3 stories.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0107	Medium density residential development	Oppose	The definition conflates built form, land use activities and spatial areas, and reads as a zone statement. It does not provide a definition of medium density development with a specificity appropriate for use in regulatory frameworks in RMA plans. Council also objects to the definition requiring that medium density development must consist of buildings with a minimum of 3 storeys (noting height is actually expressed in terms of maximum height in metres in Schedule 3A(11) rather than the number of storeys). This exceeds the requirements of the MDRS, is not supported by any urban design evidence, and is more appropriately included in a policy.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0103	Medium density residential development	Support in part	Do not support including a minimum height of three stories. It is unclear why this has been included in the definition given MDH can be achieved without developments being three stories, as an example terraced housing may be two stories. MDRS rules also refer to a maximum of three stories. The definition is unhelpful and goes beyond what is required for the RPS.	Amend to delete reference to minimum storey requirements.
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0123	Medium density residential development	Support in part	The use of the term "minimum building height" is unclear. District plans do occasionally apply minimum building height standards but typically provide a maximum or anticipated building height.  In addition, the circumstances where this term is used either make it clear that the development is	Amend the term itself (and references): "Medium density residential development" And the definition: "Means areas used predominately for <del>residential</del> <b>urban</b> activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				residential, or there is no policy reason to limit the development to being residential. It should be amended to be consistent with the term "high density development	compatible activities with <del>a minimum an</del> <b>anticipated</b> building height of <b>at least 3 stories.</b> " And amend the term throughout the RPS when used.
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0124	Medium density residential developments	Support in part	The height limits go further than the NPS-UD and proposes unnecessary rigidity.	Means areas used predominately for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible <b>commercial and mixed-use activities.</b> <del>with a minimum building height of 3 stories.</del>
<b>S10 Transpower New Zealand Limited</b>	S10.007	National grid	Support in part	While Transpower supports the provision of a definition of National Grid, it seeks amendment to the definition to refer to that provided within the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008.	Amend the definition of National Grid as follows: National grid as defined by the <del>Electricity Industry Act 2010.</del> <b>National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008.</b>
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.027	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.091	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0104	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose in part	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. It is unclear the legislative basis for the inclusion of this definition, particularly ahead of the gazetting of the NPS-IB.	Delete the proposed definition and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted and more detailed information on these ecosystems is available.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0135	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support		Retain
<b>S20 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Paul Dyson</b>	S20.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S21 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson</b>	S21.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S23 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove</b>	S23.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S26 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_An drea Follett</b>	S26.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.028	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	The inclusion of the reference to peatland within a definition constitutes an attempt to regulate by stealth. GWRC needs to clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not one single one has been consulted. The community feels very strongly regarding the high-handed approach taken by GWRC and the devious manner in which it appears to be trying to gain control of all aspects regarding the peatland. The community perception is highly influenced by the past track record of GWRC in taking punitive action against this community.	Remove bullet point under the example section, to read: Examples include: ... <del>• protecting peatland to retain carbon stores</del>
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.029	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	The inclusion of the reference to peatland within a definition constitutes an attempt to regulate by stealth. GWRC needs to clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not one single one has been consulted. The community feels very strongly regarding the high-handed approach taken by GWRC and the devious manner in which it appears to be trying to gain control	GWRC be instructed to cease and desist in yet another attempt to gain control over the Mangaroa peatland.  GWRC be required to formulate extensive policies and methodologies regarding the peatland and the implications around loss of use by landowners.



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				of all aspects regarding the peatland. The community perception is highly influenced by the past track record of GWRC in taking punitive action against this community.	
<b>S33 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy, Judith, Kauika-Stevens</b>	S33.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S38 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay</b>	S38.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S39 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Colin Hawes</b>	S39.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S40 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lauritz &amp; Julie Rust</b>	S40.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S41 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrew</b>	S41.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Ayrton &amp; Carol Reeves</b>					
<b>S42 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor &amp; Stephanie Kempt</b>	S42.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S43 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer</b>	S43.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S44 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer</b>	S44.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S45 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Weiston Hill</b>	S45.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S46 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill</b>	S46.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Stance</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>
<b>S47 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill</b>	S47.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S48 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael</b>	S48.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S52 Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S52.005	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S54 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters</b>	S54.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S55 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw</b>	S55.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S57 Colleen Munro_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S57.005	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S58 Grant Munro_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S58.005	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S59 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandra &amp; Mat Gerrard</b>	S59.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S62 Philip Clegg</b>	S62.026	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of the reference to peatland within the definition of 'nature-based solutions' as this is contrary to the Environment Court's finding in GWRC v Adams and ors. Concerned that the reference to peatland being protected to retain carbon stores will be used as justification to limit the use of the peatland by its owners.	Remove " <del>protecting peatland to retain carbon stores</del> " from the definition.
<b>S87 Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_</b>	S87.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S91 Mangaroa Peatland</b>	S91.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Focus Group_Gavin Kirton				<p>overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted. The community feels very strongly regarding the high-handed approach taken by GWRC and the devious way it appears to be trying to gain control of all aspects regarding the peatland.</p> <p>The inclusion of the reference to peatland within a definition constitutes an attempt to regulate by stealth, and flies in the face of the Environment Court's expectation that people on the peatland would be left to the quiet enjoyment on their land. It smacks of bad faith regulation.</p> <p>The community is aware that GWRC officials have long sought to limit use of the peatland, first through wetland rules, then using SNA rules and now, it seems by citing it as a carbon sink.</p>	Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S96 Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	S96.022	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of the reference to peatland within the definition of 'nature-based solutions' as this is contrary to the Environment Court's finding in GWRC v Adams and ors. Concerned that the reference to peatland being protected to retain carbon stores will be used as justification to limit the use of the peatland by its owners.	Remove " <del>protecting peatland to retain carbon stores</del> " from the definition.
S97 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell	S97.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S99 Genesis Energy Limited	S99.005	Nature-based solutions	Support in part	Genesis considers the development of electricity from renewable sources is a nature-based solution that reduces greenhouse gas emissions whilst providing resilience for people. In taking actions to address climate change, it is necessary to consider the natural and the built environment in a holistic manner, and provide integration as much as possible.	Amend the definition as follows: Nature-based solutions 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. Examples include: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions (climate change

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					mitigation): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• planting forests to sequester carbon</li> <li>• protecting peatland to retain carbon stores</li> </ul> Increasing resilience (climate change adaptation): <p>(a) providing resilience for people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• planting street trees to provide relief from high temperatures</li> <li>• restoring coastal dunelands to provide increased resilience to the damaging effects of storms linked to sea level rise</li> <li>• leaving space for rivers to undertake their natural movement and accommodate increased floodwaters</li> <li>• the use of water sensitive urban design, such as rain gardens to reduce stormwater runoff in urban areas</li> <li>• <b>maximising electricity generation from renewable energy sources, recognising that renewable electricity generation can often be incorporated within the natural and built environments (e.g. wind farm and carbon forestry, solar panels on rooftops)</b></li> </ul> <p>(b) providing resilience for ecosystems and species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• restoring indigenous forest to a healthy state to increase its resilience to increased climate extremes</li> <li>• leaving space for estuarine ecosystems, such as salt marshes, to retreat inland in response to sea level rise.</li> </ul>
<b>S101 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Madeline Keown</b>	S101.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S103 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_ Stacy Jack-Kino</b>	S103.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S104 Hamish McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S104.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S105 Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S105.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S107 Lisa Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S107.005	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S108 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan</b>	S108.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S109 Mangaroa Peatland Focus</b>	S109.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Group_Christine withey				overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S110 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_John Ryan	S110.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S111 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan	S111.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S112 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Russell Flood-Smith	S112.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S113 Wellington Water	S113.052	Nature-based solutions	Oppose	The definition doesn't give effect to the NPS-FM and would benefit from the addition of an additional example.	Amend the definition (with new bullet point added) to state:  Actions to protect, enhance, or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions <b>or give effect to Te Mana o te Wai</b> and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change. Examples include: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions (climate change mitigation):



Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					...• <b>application of wastewater sludge to land rather than landfills</b>
<b>S121 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Shane Stratford</b>	S121.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S122 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh</b>	S122.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S138 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair &amp; Josh Lowny</b>	S138.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S139 Ian Gunn</b>	S139.010	Nature-based solutions	Support in part		Definition of Nature based solutions be expanded to include farming scale methods such as swales, bunds, leaky dams to slow down runoff ie reduce flood peaks plus a range of additional benefits.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S144 Sustainable Wairarapa Inc</b>	S144.036	Nature-based solutions	Support in part	Nature based solutions for water resilience are essential.	Expand to include nature-based solutions for water resilience such as farm-scale structures for slowing water down (swales, bunds, leaky dams), managing flooding to increase ground water recharge and improving the water holding capacity of soils (e.g. reducing compaction).
<b>S146 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell</b>	S146.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S149 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell</b>	S149.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S150 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Anna Brodie &amp; Mark Leckie</b>	S150.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S156 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell</b>	S156.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
<b>S159 Mangaroa Peatland Focus</b>	S159.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Group_Antony & Jemma Ragg				overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S160 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen & Chris Priest	S160.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	GWRC must clearly state what it means by "protecting" peatland and exactly what form that protection would take. The Mangaroa peatland overlay encompasses over 75 individual landowners and not on single one has been consulted.	That the concept of "protecting peatland to retain carbon stores" is struck out pending thorough and extensive consultation with community and Upper Hutt City Council. Formulate simple, clear rules regarding the peatland and the implications around and compensation for any loss of use by landowners.
S161 Grant O'Brien	S161.004	Nature-based solutions	Oppose in part	As a resident who would be affected by this change we do not support this statement in absence of engagement to explain what is meant by 'protecting peatlands'. For example, is GW talking about limiting earthworks or protecting the peatlands with a designation? The options are unknown and for this reason we do not support this statement at this time. Internationally recognised science-based methods need to be considered. Landowners would need compensation for losses of investment and livelihood on their land.	Remove 'protecting peatlands to retain carbon stores' until the peatlands in question are mapped and understood, landowners engaged with/advised and further explanation about what is meant by 'protection'.
S162 Winstone Aggregates	S162.028	Nature-based solutions	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	
<b>S166 Masterton District Council</b>	S166.006	Nature-based solutions	Support in part	<p>Agree in principal, but guidance is needed as to what the nature based solutions to climate change will be and why they would be chosen over other types of solutions.</p> <p>Noting specifically, it is about better preparation for the predicted impacts of climate change, so long as the 'nature-based' solutions aren't disproportionately in the Wairarapa (Carbon Sink Mitigation).</p>	Request a clearer definition of nature-based solutions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.090	Nature-based solutions	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0108	Nature-based solutions	Oppose	<p>Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It lacks the necessary specificity required for a definition to enable effective and efficient implementation in a regulatory framework (district plan and regional plan).</li> <li>• The lack of clarity is illustrated by the need to include a wide range of examples.</li> </ul>	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0105	Nature-based solutions	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.
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0124	Nature-based solutions	Not Stated / Neutral	This definition is not clear enough to provide direction to plan users. The need for a significant number of examples illustrates this.	Amend the definition to provide clarity about what is covered by the term.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0125	Nature-based solutions	Support in part	Actions such as planting street trees and water sensitive urban design are not enhancing natural ecosystems as they are often isolated from other areas of biodiversity and serve a different function than the 'natural ecosystem' would perform. The definition should not include examples as that should be incorporated into the implementation (method) of the policy.	Amend: Actions to protect, enhance, <b>mimic</b> , 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.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0109	Nature-based solutions	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review  Alternatively, use the definition of nature-based solutions from the NZ Biodiversity Strategy 2020 as it is more succinct.	Delete the new definition OR Insert the following definition of nature-based solutions to align with the NZ Biodiversity Strategy: <b>Solutions that are inspired and supported by nature, cost-effective and simultaneously provide environmental, social and economic benefits and help build resilience.</b>  Delete the FW icon
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0136	Nature-based solutions	Support		Retain, but include further examples for ecosystems and species that go beyond forests and estuarine ecosystems. Alternatively, make it more clear that the examples are not exhaustive.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.029	Organic waste	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	
<b>S102 Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee</b>	S102.093	Papakāinga	Oppose	The reason for the removal of "Papakāinga" is entirely unclear. In the absence of a good reason, the definition should be reinstated and should include reference to residential accommodation, communal buildings and facilities for iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners who whakapapa to the area. Consultation with iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners should be undertaken.	Oppose the removal of "Papakāinga". Amend the "Papakāinga" definition following further consultation with iwi, hapu and Māori landowners to include reference to residential accommodation, communal buildings and facilities for iwi, hapu and/or Māori landowners who whakapapa to the area.
<b>S131 Ātiawa ki Whakaron gotai Charitable Trust</b>	S131.0161	Papakāinga	Oppose	Ātiawa seek to include a new definition of papakāinga, drafted by mana whenua. Ātiawa are concerned that in the absence of any definition for marae, some developments may seek to fall under the policy framework for papakāinga where this is not appropriate.	Papakāinga means housing and any ancillary activities (including social, cultural, educational, recreational, and commercial activities) for mana whenua on their ancestral land.
<b>S167 Taranaki Whānui</b>	S167.0195	Papakāinga	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui note new definition needed.  Taranaki Whānui suggests regional council provide for mana whenua to develop their own definition of marae within each iwi and hapū.	Amend the definition of Papakaainga with input from each iwi and hapū.
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.092	Permanent forest	Oppose	The definition includes a qualifier that relies on the intention of the owner of the forest. Council notes it is difficult to enforce provisions that contain such	Amend as follows: For the purpose of the RPS permanent forest is a forest established for long term forest cover <del>and that</del> is not

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				qualifiers - confirming and enforcing the intention of a person or persons is not possible under the RMA.	intended to be harvested.
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0109	Permanent forest	Oppose	<p>This definition should draw from and be consistent with the terminology contained in the NES-PF, which in itself regulates plantation forestry. For instance, the definition could be reworded to include plantation forestry as a specific exclusion. It could also include an exclusion of any other harvesting that is not within the NES-PF.</p> <p>Remove "for the purpose of the RPS" from the start of the definition, as this is superfluous when it is a definition in the RPS.</p> <p>There is already a definition for plantation forestry in the NES-PF. To introduce a separate definition to that of the NES-PF would be confusing and potentially lead to inconsistency. Where the term plantation forestry is used in the RPS, it needs to be done so in a manner that is consistent with the NES-PF, which is a higher level RMA document than the RPS.</p>	<p>Amend the definition so that it uses the same terminology as in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Remove "for the purpose of the RPS" from the start of the definition, as this is superfluous when it is a definition in the RPS.</p> <p>Delete definition and replace it with the definition from the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017</p>
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0110	Permanent forest	Oppose	<p>Defer to the 2024 RPS review</p> <p>Further reasons set out in our relief on Objective CC.5 and Policy CC.6</p>	<p>Delete the new definition</p> <p>Delete the FW icon</p>
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.091	Plantation forestry	Oppose	Council considers the definition should align with that used in the NES-PF. In the absence of amendments to ensure consistency with the NES-PF the proposed definition captures orchards and other similar activities.	Amend to align with the NES-PF definition for plantation forestry.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0111	Plantation forestry	Oppose	<p>Defer to the 2024 RPS review</p> <p>Further reasons set out in our relief on Objective CC.5 and Policy CC.6</p>	<p>Delete the new definition</p> <p>Delete the FW icon</p>
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.030	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	This is another definition that is draconian in that it can be read to cover everything everywhere if GWRC believes it to be appropriate. Again there has been no consultation and its wide sweeping nature can be viewed as abuse of power by GWRC.	Require GWRC to engage in meaningful consultation with the community regarding the powers that is seeking to give to itself.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S62 Philip Clegg</b>	S62.027	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose in part	The definition of 'protect' is worryingly broad and vague and needs to be made more specific.	Make the components of the 'protect' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.
<b>S96 Sarah (Dr) Kerkin</b>	S96.023	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose in part	The definition of 'protect' is worryingly broad and vague and needs to be made more specific.	Make the components of the 'protect' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.
<b>S148 Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)</b>	S148.058	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks to ensure that this definition is consistent with national direction that may be contained in the NPSIB.	Delete this definition.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.030	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.092	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0106	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	The definition itself is very directive, and it is unclear how this relates to the NPS-IB, and the legal protection included.	Delete and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0112	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review	Delete the new definition  Delete the FW icon
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0138	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity )	Oppose	The definition is vague and unhelpful. It starts with the words "looking after", which provides little guidance. It then refers to maintain, which is a different concept. The reference to extinction is not appropriate, as it implies that all that is sought is to ensure that species are not made extinct.	Either delete or redraft along the following lines: Ensure that biodiversity and the ecosystem processes are kept safe from harm in both the short and long term. This involves managing all threats to species and ensuring that populations are buffered from the impacts of the loss of genetic diversity and longer-term environmental events such as climate change
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0125	Regionally significant centres	Support	Support the amendments to the definition as proposed.	Amend the definition as proposed.
<b>S10 Transpower New Zealand Limited</b>	S10.008	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	Transpower supports the amended definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as it relates to the National Grid.	Retain the amended definition.
<b>S16 Kāpiti Coast District Council</b>	S16.093	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support in part	Council supports the inclusion of the following in the definition of regionally significant infrastructure:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the local authority water supply network (including intake structures) and water treatments plants</li> <li>• the local authority wastewater and stormwater</li> </ul>	<b>Retain the inclusion of the following infrastructure:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the local authority water supply network (including intake structures) and water treatments plants</li> <li>• the local authority wastewater and stormwater</li> </ul>

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>networks and systems, including treatment plants and storage and discharge facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following local arterial routes: Masterton-Castlepoint Road, Blairlogie-Langdale/Homewood/Riversdale Road and Cape Palliser Road in Wairarapa, Titahi Bay Road and Grays Road in Porirua, and Kāpiti Road, Marine Parade, Mazengarb Road, Te Moana Road, Akatārawa Road, Matatua Road, Rimu Road, Epiha Street, Paekakariki Hill Road, The Parade [Paekakariki] and The Esplanade [Raumati South] in Kāpiti</li> <li>• Kapiti Coast Airport</li> </ul> <p>Council also seeks that the following roads be added to the definition, which will become Council's responsibility once revocation occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Raumati) - from Poplar Avenue to Raumati Road Roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Paraparaumu) - from Raumati Road roundabout to Otaihanga Road roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Waikanae) - from Otaihanga Road roundabout to Peka Peka Road roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Te Horo) - from Peka Peka Road roundabout to Otaki River Bridge.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Otaki) - Otaki River Bridge to Taylors Road</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road North Otaki) - Taylors Road to District Boundary</li> </ul>	<p>networks and systems, including treatment plants and storage and discharge facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following local arterial routes: Masterton-Castlepoint Road, Blairlogie-Langdale/Homewood/Riversdale Road and Cape Palliser Road in Wairarapa, Titahi Bay Road and Grays Road in Porirua, and Kāpiti Road, Marine Parade, Mazengarb Road, Te Moana Road, Akatārawa Road, Matatua Road, Rimu Road, Epiha Street, Paekakariki Hill Road, The Parade [Paekakariki] and The Esplanade [Raumati South] in Kāpiti</li> <li>• Kapiti Coast Airport</li> </ul> <p><b>Amend definition as necessary to also include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Raumati) - from Poplar Avenue to Raumati Road Roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Paraparaumu) - from Raumati Road roundabout to Otaihanga Road roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Waikanae) - from Otaihanga Road roundabout to Peka Peka Road roundabout.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Te Horo) - from Peka Peka Road roundabout to Otaki River Bridge.</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road Otaki) - Otaki River Bridge to Taylors Road</li> <li>• Old SH1 (Main Road North Otaki) - Taylors Road to District Boundary</li> </ul>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S49</b> Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	S49.008	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	The definition of regionally significant infrastructure as amended in Proposed Change 1 appropriately recognises statutory definitions of both telecommunications and radiocommunications.	Retain as notified
<b>S99</b> Genesis Energy Limited	S99.006	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	Genesis considers the proposed definition is appropriate to support the provisions contained in RPS Change 1.	Retain the fifth bullet: Regionally significant infrastructure includes: ... • facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National grid and/or the local distribution network
<b>S100</b> Meridian Energy Limited	S100.028	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	The definition is appropriate to support the proposed objectives, policies and methods.	Retain the fifth bullet unchanged: 'facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National grid and/or the local distribution network'.
<b>S113</b> Wellington Water	S113.053	Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose	Fails to give effect to the NPS-FM	Amend the definition as follows: ... • the local authority wastewater and stormwater networks and systems, including treatment plants <del>and</del> , storage and discharge facilities <b>and any infrastructure, assets or interventions to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai</b> ...
<b>S114</b> Fulton Hogan Ltd	S114.007	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support in part	Given the recognition that has been provided in national level policy such as the NES-F and NPS-HPL for aggregate extraction, we recommend that there be provision for regionally or nationally significant aggregate quarries in the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure"	Add a bullet point to the activities listed in the definition of regionally significant infrastructure.  • <b>Aggregate extraction that provides significant national or regional public benefit that could not otherwise be</b>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<b>achieved using resources within New Zealand.</b>
<b>S117 Sustainable Electricity Association of New Zealand (SEANZ)</b>	S117.002	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	The definition is suitable	Retain "facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National grid and/or the local distribution network" as part of the definition
<b>S124 KiwiRail Holdings Limited</b>	S124.013	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support in part	KiwiRail supports the definition of Regional Significant Infrastructure and inclusion of the Strategic Transport Network including ancillary structures required to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop that network. The amended definition applies to both rail and ferry terminal infrastructure which is supported by KiwiRail. KiwiRail seeks an addition to clarify that the Interislander ferry terminal is expressly included in this definition. The description of the Strategic Transport Network in Appendix B of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 refers to railway corridors. While the railway corridor extends to the Interislander ferry terminal, it is not expressly referenced in the description. KiwiRail seeks to avoid any ambiguity that the ferry terminal is not part of the Strategic Transport Network.	Amend as follows: Regionally significant infrastructure includes: ... • <b>Interislander Ferry Terminal, Wellington City bus terminal and Wellington Railway Station terminus;</b> .....
<b>S126 Templeton Kapiti Limited (TKL)</b>	S126.001	Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose in part	Kāpiti Coast Airport does not significantly support efficient travel to and from the region or significantly support the maintenance of public health and safety through essential services. There is no legal obligation for, or basis for an assumption that, KCA will remain as operational infrastructure.  The inclusion of KCA in the RSI Definition effectively prevents a potentially more appropriate use and development of the TKL Land for other purposes that would better enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and would better achieve the Urban Design Amendments, the Freshwater Amendments and the	Remove Kāpiti Coast Airport from the definition of regionally significant infrastructure.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				Indigenous Biodiversity Amendments. The site is ideally suited being bounded by urban development.	
<b>S134 Powerco Limited</b>	S134.020	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	The definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure appropriately recognises the gas and electricity distribution networks and reflects the definition recently agreed through mediation as part of the PNRP.	Retain as notified.
<b>S148 Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)</b>	S148.056	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support in part	WIAL supports the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure	Retain the definition and for clarity amend to include all associated supporting infrastructure for the Airport, such as its navigational infrastructure and the sea wall
<b>S157 BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd</b>	S157.048	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support	That part of the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure relating to petroleum pipelines and associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment will apply to wharflines and bunkerlines and associated equipment and bulk storage tanks and is supported. The clause relating to commercial port areas should, however, be amended to remove the reference to 'the Lambton Harbour Area'. This reference was not included in the mediated wording of the definition of regionally significant infrastructure in the PNRP as confirmed by Environment Court consent order dated 1 July 2021. It effectively excludes the bulk fuel supply infrastructure located at Seaview in Lower Hutt and those located at Kaiwharawhara and is opposed.	Retain the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure to the extent it applies to petroleum pipelines and associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment, but amend that part of the definition relating to commercial port areas to ensure the bulk fuel supply infrastructure where it is associated with port activities is clearly recognised as regionally significant infrastructure, as follows: Regionally significant infrastructure includes: • pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum, including any associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment. • ... • Commercial Port Areas and infrastructure associated with Port related activities <del>in the Lambton Harbour Area</del> within Wellington Harbour (Port Nicholson) and adjacent land used in association with the movement of cargo and passengers and including bulk fuel supply infrastructure, and storage tanks for bulk liquids, and associated wharflines
<b>S158 Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</b>	S158.041	Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose	Seeks that the definition is deleted to reflect the centres hierarchy proposed within Policy 30.	Delete definition in its entirety.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0110	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support in part	The RPS should use the One Network Framework for roading hierarchy, which Waka Kotahi now requires for all transport planning. Paekakariki Hill Road is also located within Porirua City Council's district. It does not make sense to only include that part of the Paekakariki Hill Road that is located within the Kapiti Coast as a local arterial route, when the road has been reclassified as a secondary collector under the One Network Framework now that Te Aranui o Te Rangihaeata has opened.	Amend definition to use the One Network Framework for roading hierarchy.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0113	Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review.  Further reasons set out in our relief on Chapter 3.3.  The definition does not provide for the expanded range of water storage infrastructure - municipal, community and rural - which will be critical across all sectors in the future.	Delete the amendments to the definition
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0137	Regionally significant infrastructure	Support		Retain
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.031	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.  Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.093	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem )	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0107	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem )	Not Stated / Neutral	Should relate to all resilience identified in the plan not just ecosystems e.g., resilience for people.	Amend to address comments.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0139	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem )	Support		Retain
<b>S20 Mangaroa Peatland Focus</b>	S20.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined,	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Group_Paul Dyson				<p>as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	
S21 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson	S21.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
S23 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove	S23.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
S26 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrea Follett	S26.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.031	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support.</p>	<p>Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community and only proceed with community approval in each case.</p>
<b>S33 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy, Judith, Kauika-Stevens</b>	S33.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	<p>Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.</p>
<b>S38 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay</b>	S38.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly</p>	<p>Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.</p>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
<b>S39 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Col in Hawes</b>	S39.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S40 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lauritz &amp; Julie Rust</b>	S40.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S41 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrew Ayrton &amp; Carol Reeves</b>	S41.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S42 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor &amp; Stephanie Kempt</b>	S42.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S43 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer</b>	S43.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S44 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer</b>	S44.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
<b>S45 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_ Weston Hill</b>	S45.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S46 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill</b>	S46.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S47 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill</b>	S47.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S48 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael</b>	S48.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S52 Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S52.006	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S54 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters</b>	S54.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S55 Mangaroa Peatland</b>	S55.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw</b>				community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S57 Colleen Munro_Mangaro a Peatland Focus Group</b>	S57.006	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S58 Grant Munro_Mangaro a Peatland Focus Group</b>	S58.006	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S59 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sa</b>	S59.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>ndra &amp; Mat Gerrard</b>				Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
<b>S62 Philip Clegg</b>	S62.028	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Make the components of the 'restoration' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.
<b>S87 Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_</b>	S87.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.  Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S91 Mangaroa Peatland Focus</b>	S91.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined,	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
Group_Gavin Kirton				as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
S96 Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	S96.024	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Make the components of the 'restoration' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.
S97 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell	S97.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
S101 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Madeline Keown	S101.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
<b>S103 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_ Stacey Jack-Kino</b>	S103.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S104 Hamish McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S104.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S105 Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S105.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	
<b>S107 Lisa Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group</b>	S107.006	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S108 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan</b>	S108.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S109 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Christine withey</b>	S109.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S110</b> <b>Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_John Ryan</b>	S110.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case
<b>S111</b> <b>Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan</b>	S111.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S112</b> <b>Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Russell Flood-Smith</b>	S112.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S121</b> <b>Mangaroa Peatland</b>	S121.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Focus Group_Shane Stratford</b>				community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S122 Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh</b>	S122.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S138 Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair &amp; Josh Lowmy</b>	S138.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S146 Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell</b>	S146.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	
<p><b>S149</b>  <b>Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell</b></p>	<p>S149.005</p>	<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	<p>Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.</p>
<p><b>S150</b>  <b>Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ana Brodie &amp; Mark Leckie</b></p>	<p>S150.005</p>	<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	<p>Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.</p>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S156 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell</b>	S156.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S159 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Antony &amp; Jemma Ragg</b>	S159.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S160 Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen &amp; Chris Priest</b>	S160.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.
<b>S161 Grant O'Brien</b>	S161.005	Restoration	Oppose in part	Supportive of restoration in principal, however there are concerns about adequate engagement with affected communities and impacts on people's mental	Insert text to require GWRC to adequately map out areas requiring restoration and engage with the affected

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
				health and basic human rights. Concerns about previous incorrect interpretations of parts of Whitemans Valley being an 'inland wetland' and the impacts on the community of subsequent court proceedings when the area was not mapped as being significant or requiring protection.	community.
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.032	Restoration	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.094	Restoration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S147 Wellington Fish and Game Council</b>	S147.0109	Restoration	Oppose in part	Re-wording this definition to include valued ecosystem properties and species, whether indigenous or introduced, captures a wider range of important physical and ecological attributes for protection and restoration.	Amend. The active intervention and management of modified or degraded habitats, ecosystems, landforms and landscapes in order to reinstate <del>indigenous</del> natural character, <b>indigenous and valued</b> ecological and physical

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					processes, and cultural and visual qualities. The aim of restoration actions is to return the environment, either wholly or in part, to a desired former state, including reinstating the supporting ecological processes.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0149	Restoration	Support in part	Drafting improvement	Add "or improve" after "reinstate"
<b>S124 KiwiRail Holdings Limited</b>	S124.014	Strategic Transport network	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of all railway corridors as identified in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 in this definition.	Retain as notified.
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0108	Strategic Transport network	Not Stated / Neutral	This is only referred to in definitions so there are no provisions relating to it.  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.	Amend to address comments.
<b>S131 Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust</b>	S131.0162	Te Mana o Te Wai	Support in part	Ātiawa support defining Te Mana o te Wai in accordance with Section 1.3 of the NPS-FM (2020) Ātiawa note that Te Mana o te Wai will also include local context and interpretation as defined through Te Whaitua o Kāpiti (for Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai rohe) and then given effect through a Freshwater Plan Change Process.	Ātiawa seek that our expression of Te Mana o te Wai (which will be determined through Te Whaitua o Kāpiti) will be included in the RPS at the appropriate time through the Freshwater Plan Change Process.
<b>S165 Royal</b>	S165.0140	Te Mana o Te Wai	Support		Retain



SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>					
<b>S31 Robert Anker</b>	S31.032	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose in part	Te Rito is not about indigenous biodiversity but is about the importance of family in its widest sense. You ask me - what is the most important thing - it is people, it is people, it is people. The concept is that if you take out the young then the family will disintegrate and scatter asunder. Te Rito has been hijacked by ecologists who have made up 6 factors to suit their own agenda.	Delete reference to Ti Rito in connection with biodiversity.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.095	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	The definition of Te Rito o te Harekeke is supported, noting that a process is requested to develop a local expression of Te Rito o Te Harekeke.	Retain as notified.
<b>S131 Ātiawa ki Whakaron gotai Charitable Trust</b>	S131.0163	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Ātiawa support the inclusion of the definition of Te Rito o te Harakeke	Retain as notified.
<b>S147 Wellington Fish and Game Council</b>	S147.0110	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Values, supports, and acknowledges the web of interconnectedness between indigenous species, ecosystems, the wider environment, and the community.	Retain as notified.
<b>S163 Wairarapa Federated Farmers</b>	S163.0114	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review.	Delete the new definition  Delete the FW icon
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird</b>	S165.0141	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support in part	This definition reflects the proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.  Te Rito o te Harakeke is supported in principle. It	Amend as follows: • Replace "elements" in para 3 to refer to "principles" consistent with the approach in the NPSFM.

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<p><b>Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b></p>				<p>recognises the reciprocity of the human-nature relationship, rather than viewing the natural environment and social or economic outcomes as opposites to be weighed against each other. It also does this in a way that recognises the additional whakapapa aspect of the human-nature relationship for Māori.</p> <p>Te Rito o te Harakeke also recognises the interconnected relationship between terrestrial indigenous biodiversity and the wider environment. However, the way in which Te Rito o te Harakeke has been included means that it risks being interpreted to introducing a balancing of human use against maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. This was not the intention of the Biodiversity Collaborative Group. Its version of the concept was carefully drafted to put maintenance of indigenous biodiversity first, on the basis this was essential for human wellbeing of all types.</p> <p>The exposure NPSIB's (and therefore RPS's) balancing approach also conflicts with that of Te Mana o Te Wai in the NPSFM. There is no clear reason for a different approach. Te Mana o Te Wai expressly contains a hierarchy of obligations, with the first being the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Te Rito o Te Harakeke should include a similarly clear hierarchy of obligations, consistent with the statutory obligations underpinning the exposure NPSIB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert a new para underneath the principles as follows, and consistent with the approach in the NPSFM: "There is a hierarchy of obligations in Te Rito o te Harakeke that prioritises: (a) First, te hauora o nga koiora (the health of indigenous biodiversity), recognising the connections between this and: (i) Te hauora o te taonga (the health of taonga); and (ii) Te hauora o te Taiao (the health of the wider natural environment): Second, the ability for people and communities to use natural and physical resources to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>S32 Director-General of Conservation</b></p>	<p>S32.039</p>	<p>Threatened ecosystems or species</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The definition applies to ecosystems and species, but the content only addresses ecosystems. In order to be effective the definition needs to include species as well, and the New Zealand Threat Classification System is the appropriate standard for this.</p>	<p>Amend the definition as follows, or words to like effect (or provide separate definitions for threatened ecosystems and threatened species): "<del>These</del> ecosystems <b>which</b> are described by the IUCN Red List categories <b>as</b> Critically Endangered, Endangered <del>and</del> <b>or</b> Vulnerable; <b>or species which are classified by the New Zealand Threat Classification System as Nationally Critical, Nationally Endangered, Nationally Vulnerable</b></p>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<b>or Nationally Increasing.</b>
<b>S162 Winstone Aggregates</b>	S162.033	Threatened ecosystems or species	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.096	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New</b>	S165.0142	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support in part	The definition only refers to ecosystems not species. In terms of species the proper reference is the New Zealand Threat Classification System.	Amend to includes reference to species, in particular, the NZTCS with the classification of "threatened" and "at risk" declining

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>					
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0111	Tier 1 territorial authority	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion and replacement with the definition of Tier 1 territorial authority under s2 of the RMA. The reason is that the RMA is the primary piece of legislation and the definition applies broader than just the NPS- UD.	Delete definition and replace it with the definition under s2 of the RMA
<b>S34 Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council</b>	S34.0109	Tier 1 territorial authority	Not Stated / Neutral	Tier 1 authorities - words missing in the note.	Amend definition to fix errors.
<b>S168 Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc</b>	S168.097	Tree canopy cover	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.
<b>S165 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird)</b>	S165.0143	Tree canopy cover	Support		Retain
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0112	Travel demand management plan	Oppose	Council opposes this definition and seeks its deletion for the following reasons: It is drafted as a policy and includes actions and thresholds that should be the subject of policy direction.	Delete definition, or amend so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users.
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0126	Travel demand management plan	Support in part	Part of the definition reads as policy and should be incorporated into the relevant policy/method or be removed.	Amend: A travel demand management plan sets out interventions and actions to influence travel behaviour, with the aim of minimising travel demand or redistributing demand from traditional car usage to more sustainable transport modes for

Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Stance	Reasons	Decision Requested
					new subdivision, use and development. <del>A travel demand management plan should include mitigation measures that so that planned subdivision, use and development is designed and implemented to maximise quality of life for people without access to a private vehicle, reducing the demand for vehicle trips and associated externalities like greenhouse gas emissions. For example, a travel demand management plan for a new retail development might promote cycle parking facilities and a delivery service, as an intervention to promote travel with low carbon emissions.</del>
<b>S158 Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</b>	S158.042	Urban areas	Support in part	Seeks that the definition is amended to include open space zones.	Amend the definition as follows: The region's urban areas include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <b>open space zones</b> and industrial zones <b>identified in the District Plans of the Wellington Region.</b> <del>city, Porirua city, Lower Hutt city, Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.</del>
<b>S30 Porirua City Council</b>	S30.0113	Urban areas	Support in part	Definition wording should align with National Planning Standards.	Amend definition as follows: The region's urban areas include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <b>sport and open space zones</b> , and industrial zones identified in the Wellington
<b>S115 Hutt City Council</b>	S115.0126	Urban areas	Support in part	Support but seek amendment to be consistent with the term used for our district plan: the City of Lower Hutt District Plan.	Instead of amending to " <del>Lower Hutt city</del> ", amend as " <b>City of Lower Hutt city</b> ".
<b>S140 Wellington City Council (WCC)</b>	S140.0127	Urban areas	Support in part	To be consistent with the wording and intent of the NPSUD 2020.	Urban areas The region's urban areas (as at February 2009) include residential zones, commercial, mixed use zones, <del>and</del> industrial zones <b>and Future Development Areas</b> identified in the Wellington city, Porirua city, <b>Lower</b>

SUBMISSION POINTS BY PLAN CHAPTER – Appendix 3: Definitions

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Stance</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>
					Hutt city, Upper Hutt city, Kāpiti coast and Wairarapa combined district plans.