

## Appendix 3: Summary Recommendation Table

Original Submission Point (SP)	Original Submitter	FS number	Further Submitter (FS)	Plan section	Provision	SP Position	FS Position	Reasons	Decision requested	FS decision sought	Officer Recommendation
S101.008	Wellington International Airport Limited (S101)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Amend		Considers GWRC should postpone any hearings on the Proposed NRP until such a time that decisions on the Proposed RPS are issued and any appeals resolved.	Postpone any hearings on the Proposed NRP until such a time that decisions on the Proposed RPS are issued and any appeals resolved.		Reject
	Wellington International Airport Limited	FS23.1261	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S101.009	Wellington International Airport Limited (S101)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Considers as notified, the Proposed NRP was unduly complex and difficult to follow.  Considers the numbering of the schedules used in the Proposed NRP also gives rise to potential confusion. Submitter assumes that Schedules A to Z will be renumbered 1 to 26, or Schedules 27 to 34 will be alphanumerically numbered. Opposes the schedules to the extent that it is not clear what comprises Schedules 1 to 26.	Issue a tracked change version of the Proposed NRP, both electronic and hard copy, prior to any directions requiring the preparation of s42A reports and evidence to ensure that it is clear which provisions are changing, where and how they sit within the wider context of the Operative NRP. This should include, as anticipated by the New Zealand Planning Standards, appropriate links to cross reference rules or provisions, or other documents. Reformat to provide appropriate links and a contents page.		No recommendation
	Wellington International Airport Limited	FS23.1262	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S101.010	Wellington International Airport Limited (S101)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers that in the absence of amendments to the Proposed NRP to address and give effect to the submission, the Proposal will not promote the sustainable management or efficient use and development of natural and physical resources, is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, particularly when having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means, and does not appropriately fulfil the requirements of section 32 of the RMA, particularly in terms of evaluation the costs of implementing the provisions under section 32(2)(a);  Considers the Proposal does not represent sound resource management practice particularly with respect to planning for Wellington Airport, as regionally significant infrastructure.	That the submission points contained in this submission be accepted, or that the Proposed NRP be amended in a similar or such other way as may be appropriate to address the submission points; and Any alternative, consequential changes (including to objectives, policies, methods and anticipated environmental results or other provisions), amendments or decisions that may be required to give effect to the matters raised in the submission. Where any submission point seeks to amend a provision, should that relief not be granted, delete that provision and revert to the Operative NRP.		No recommendation
	Wellington International Airport Limited	FS23.1263	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S103.003	Kim Bowen (S103)			2 Interpretation	Whaitua	Oppose		Concerned with the consultation process. Considers GWRC is not interested in genuine feedback and consultation from the affected community. Concerned the plan change will have a significant impact on farms in Makara and considers there has been minimal effort to notify the affected property owners.	Considers an improved consultation process with the community is required.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S107.001	Friends of Waipāhihi Karori Stream (S107)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the direction of PC1. Considers that strong implementation and enforcement of regulation is necessary to address aging infrastructure, inappropriate urban development and poor land use practices.	Not stated		Accept in part
S107.008	Friends of Waipāhihi Karori Stream (S107)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Support		Considers the costs of inaction in the future outweighs the financial cost to implement PC1.	Retain as notified		No recommendation
S107.009	Friends of Waipāhihi Karori Stream (S107)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers councils need to prioritise better to focus on the basics and new sources of funding can be found with the right leadership.	Not stated		No recommendation
S107.010	Friends of Waipāhihi Karori Stream (S107)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the Whaitua process and moves to implement the recommendations of Whaitua committee members and mana whenua.	<p>Not stated</p>		Accept
S113.001	Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne (S113)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the intent to stop further degradation of freshwater bodies in the Wellington region. Supports the collaborative planning process involving Whaitua committees. 	Not stated		Accept in part
	Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	FS23.1511	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept in part
S113.002	Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne (S113)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Advocates for the implementation of the proposed changes in the timeframes proposed to ensure that Wellington continues to be an exemplar of urban biodiversity management and further degradation of freshwater is halted.	<p>Not stated</p>		Accept in part
	Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	FS23.1512	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept in part
S114.001	Michael Marfell-Jones (S114)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Recommends withdrawal of PC1, due to concerns with lack of consultation with rural communities.	Withdraw PC1 in full		Reject
S114.002	Michael Marfell-Jones (S114)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Questions the legality of the process undertaken by GWRC as "regulation by fiat", citing recent Environment Court decisions.	Delete provisions that have not been informed through consultation [inferred]		No recommendation
S114.003	Michael Marfell-Jones (S114)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Expressed concern that some rules have immediate legal effect when consultation or on-site inspections have taken place, and that this may result in unknown or retrospective non-compliances.	<p>Remove requirement for all rules to have immediate legal effect.</p><p>Insert text which states "all rules in this plan change will be held in abeyance pending the plan change passing through all stages required by the RMA."</p>		Reject
S115.001	Mary Hutchinson (S115)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1, particularly the whaitua process for Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Te Awarua-o-Porirua. Considers that PC1 should be integrated with the related functions and initiatives of other statutory authorities.	Retain PC1 as notified (inferred)		Accept in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S115.002	Mary Hutchinson (S115)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Support		Considers PC1 requires effective community engagement and expressed disappointment with GWRC, Wellington Water and WCC community engagement as part of a previous project submitter was involved in. Supports Eugene Doyle's view (another submitter) that processes supporting community groups' participation in council and associated agencies' work needs to be improved.	Not stated		Reject
S115.006	Mary Hutchinson (S115)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.2 Policies	Support		Supports policies WH.P1 to WH.P33 and any associated target attribute states and flow requirements	Not stated		Accept in part
S116.001	Taumata Arowai (S116)			General comments	General comments - definitions	Amend		Notes differing terminology used by different groups in different regions makes national comparison of environmental performance difficult. Notes the National Planning Standards establish definitions local authorities must use, and that other wastewater, stormwater and drinking water terminology (including bore, community drinking water supply, drain, greywater, group drinking water supply, health needs of people, sludge, wastewater, wastewater network, water sensitive urban design) in the NRP have not been amended through PC1 to align with the Planning Standards. Supports amendments to these terms. 	Requests that terminology (existing terms not proposed to be amended in PC1, including bore, community drinking water supply, drain, greywater, group drinking water supply, health needs of people, sludge, wastewater, wastewater network, water sensitive urban design) is aligned with that used in the NPS, WSA, and that being developed by Taumata Arowai, as possible and appropriate.		Reject
	Taumata Arowai	FS23.569	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - definitions		Support	Submission points will assist with plan clarity and help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept in part
	Taumata Arowai	FS39.192	Wellington Water Ltd	General comments	General comments - definitions		Oppose	There is insufficient detail provided to understand how this would impact WWL's activities.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S116.016	Taumata Arowai (S116)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Policy P118: Water takes at minimum flows and minimum water levels.	Amend		Notes the WSA framework for identification, monitoring and management of risks to water sources is intended to work together with resource management legislation. Notes changes are made to rules that recognise proximity to source water intakes but that no change has been made to the reference to drinking water supplies (community drinking water supply and group drinking water supply) and these references are out of date due to the repeal of the Health (Drinking Water Amendment Act) 2007 and enactment of the WSA.	Amend provisions as appropriate to reflect legislative changes to what constitutes a drinking water supply.		No recommendation
	Taumata Arowai (S116)	FS23.584	Forest & Bird	9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Policy P118: Water takes at minimum flows and minimum water levels.		Support	Submission points will assist with plan clarity and help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S116.018	Taumata Arowai (S116)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Rule R106: Earthworks and vegetation clearance for renewable energy generation – restricted discretionary activity.	Amend		Notes the WSA framework for identification, monitoring and management of risks to water sources is intended to work together with resource management legislation. Notes changes are made to rules that recognise proximity to source water intakes but that no change has been made to the reference to drinking water supplies (community drinking water supply and group drinking water supply) and these references are out of date due to the repeal of the Health (Drinking Water Amendment Act) 2007 and enactment of the WSA.	Amend provisions as appropriate to reflect legislative changes to what constitutes a drinking water supply.		No recommendation
	Taumata Arowai	FS23.586	Forest & Bird	9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Rule R106: Earthworks and vegetation clearance for renewable energy generation – restricted discretionary activity.		Support	Submission points will assist with plan clarity and help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Taumata Arowai	FS47.151	Meridian Energy Limited	9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Rule R106: Earthworks and vegetation clearance for renewable energy generation – restricted discretionary activity.		Support in part	Meridian agrees amendment to reflect legislative change is appropriate and considers Rule R106 remains relevant for all Whaitua (with the amendment Taumata Arowai proposes);	Allow in part	Allow S116.018 by retaining Rule R106 for all Whaitua, amended as proposed by R116.018.	No recommendation
S117.003	John Bowen (S117)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers that the consultation process was insufficient. States PC1 should have been emailed to property owners to provide them with sufficient time to review it. Property owners with farms in Makara should also have been notified of PC1 as they will be impacted.	Improve the consultation process with the community.		Reject
S118.001	Wayne Robert Pettersson and Maureen Pettersson (S118)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers language used in Whāita The Whanganui-a-Tara and the__14 Awarua-o-Porirua Whāita documents is difficult to understand.  	Not stated.		No recommendation
S118.002	Wayne Robert Pettersson and Maureen Pettersson (S118)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers the consultation with affected parties regarding the plan change has been poor. Concerned the proposed plan is aimed at small block owners and there is no evidence or proof they are a problem.	Not stated.		Reject
S118.003	Wayne Robert Pettersson and Maureen Pettersson (S118)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the problems leading to the plan change result from large intensive farming and logging operations carried out within catchment areas not small blocks.  	Not stated.		No recommendation
S118.006	Wayne Robert Pettersson and Maureen Pettersson (S118)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Submitter strongly opposes PC1.	Suggests GW provide financial help for fencing, water troughs, pipe and fittings and a water tank. Suggests GW be responsible for maintenance of the fenced off stream area.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S119.002	Susan Sturman (S119)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers that fines should be enforced for contaminant discharges.   Concerned about the goals and timeframes set. Suggests small, achievable, and measurable goals should be the focus and then assess the value provided and use feedback and innovation to continuously improve interventions.  Considers that restoring water quality, preventing flooding, and protecting water supply is critical for council to fund and manage. Encourages councils to collectively resource enforcement, science, and complementary policy tools like education, industrial water plans, community governance, and citizen water-care activity.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
S120.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Van Nortwick & Jill Van NortwickJohn & Jill Van Nortwick (S120)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S120.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Van Nortwick & Jill Van NortwickJohn & Jill Van Nortwick (S120)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S120.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Van Nortwick & Jill Van NortwickJohn & Jill Van Nortwick (S120)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S121.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karen Wallace & Mark RobbinsKaren Wallace Mark Robbins (S121)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S121.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karen Wallace & Mark RobbinsKaren Wallace Mark Robbins (S121)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S121.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karen Wallace & Mark RobbinsKaren Wallace Mark Robbins (S121)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S122.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Lambert & Steph LambertPaul & Steph Lambert (S122)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S122.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Lambert & Steph LambertPaul & Steph Lambert (S122)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S122.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Lambert & Steph LambertPaul & Steph Lambert (S122)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S123.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sandy CooperSandy Cooper (S123)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S123.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sandy CooperSandy Cooper (S123)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S123.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sandy CooperSandy Cooper (S123)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S124.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Fredrick Steensma (S124)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S124.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Fredrick Steensma (S124)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S124.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Fredrick Steensma (S124)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S125.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Shoshanah (Shosh) Phillips (S125)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S125.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Shoshanah (Shosh) Phillips (S125)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S125.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Shoshanah (Shosh) Phillips (S125)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S126.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Russell Judd & Cecile Judd (S126)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S126.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Russell Judd & Cecile Judd (S126)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S126.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Russell Judd & Cecile Judd (S126)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S127.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Johanna Overdiep & Steve Sturgess (S127)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S127.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Johanna Overdiep & Steve Sturgess (S127)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S127.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Johanna Overdiep & Steve Sturgess (S127)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S128.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joany Grima & Allen Rockell (S128)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S128.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joany Grima & Allen Rockell (S128)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S128.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joany Grima & Allen Rockell (S128)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S129.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Keith Budd & Liz Budd (S129)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S129.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Keith Budd & Liz Budd (S129)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S129.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Keith Budd & Liz Budd (S129)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S130.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pete Clark (S130)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S130.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pete Clark (S130)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S130.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pete Clark (S130)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S131.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gillian Taylor & Chris Taylor (S131)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S131.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gillian Taylor & Chris Taylor (S131)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S131.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gillian Taylor & Chris Taylor (S131)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S132.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Hannah Dawson & Ryan Dawson (S132)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S132.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Hannah Dawson & Ryan Dawson (S132)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S132.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Hannah Dawson & Ryan Dawson (S132)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S133.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Len Drabble (S133)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S133.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Len Drabble (S133)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S133.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Len Drabble (S133)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S134.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Graeme Allan (S134)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S134.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Graeme Allan (S134)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S134.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Graeme Allan (S134)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S135.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joshua Wood (S135)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S135.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joshua Wood (S135)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S135.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joshua Wood (S135)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S136.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Micayla Wood (S136)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S136.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Micayla Wood (S136)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S136.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Micayla Wood (S136)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S137.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jonathan Wood (S137)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S137.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jonathan Wood (S137)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S137.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jonathan Wood (S137)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S138.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Tony Wood & Helen Wood (S138)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S138.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Tony Wood & Helen Wood (S138)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S138.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Tony Wood & Helen Wood (S138)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S139.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Glenda Arnold (S139)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S139.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Glenda Arnold (S139)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S139.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Glenda Arnold (S139)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S14.001	Bede Crestani (S14)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Amend		Submission period not long enough to provide response given the document size.	Not stated		Reject
S140.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Janet Collins (S140)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S140.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Janet Collins (S140)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S140.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Janet Collins (S140)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S141.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - George Hare (S141)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S141.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - George Hare (S141)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S141.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - George Hare (S141)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S142.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Arnold (S142)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S142.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Arnold (S142)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S142.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Arnold (S142)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S143.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Chilly Brook Trust (Mary Redington) (S143)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S143.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Chilly Brook Trust (Mary Redington) (S143)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S143.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Chilly Brook Trust (Mary Redington) (S143)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S144.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gaylene Ward & Mike Ward (S144)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S144.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gaylene Ward & Mike Ward (S144)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S144.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Gaylene Ward & Mike Ward (S144)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S145.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Nigel Parry & Judy Parry (S145)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S145.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Nigel Parry & Judy Parry (S145)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S145.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Nigel Parry & Judy Parry (S145)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S146.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Leanna Jackson & Carl Burns (S146)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S146.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Leanna Jackson & Carl Burns (S146)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S146.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Leanna Jackson & Carl Burns (S146)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S147.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joline Fowke & Owen Fowke (S147)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S147.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joline Fowke & Owen Fowke (S147)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S147.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Joline Fowke & Owen Fowke (S147)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S148.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Baker (S148)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S148.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Baker (S148)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S148.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Paul Baker (S148)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S149.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan MacDonald (S149)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S149.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan MacDonald (S149)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S149.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan MacDonald (S149)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S150.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phyllis Strachan (S150)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S150.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phyllis Strachan (S150)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S150.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phyllis Strachan (S150)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S151.015	Wellington Water Ltd (S151)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes the new coalition government has signalled a number of changes to national policy direction on freshwater including the replacement of the current National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM).	Seeks all changes to PC1 that are necessary to give effect to changes to the NPS-FM or its application, should such changes be progressed while PC1 is being considered.		Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS23.1342	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS28.131	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	The submission will enable a responsive approach to signalled NPS-FW changes.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS45.076	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission that PC1 should align provisions that are necessary to give effect to any changes to the NPS-FM.	Allow	Seeks all changes to PC1 that are necessary to give effect to changes to the NPS-FM or its application, should such changes be progressed while PC1 is being considered.	Reject
S151.033	Wellington Water Ltd (S151)			3 Objectives	Objective O6	Oppose		Considers it is important that the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of taking and using water are recognised when managing water, and this position is not contrary to Te Mana o te Wai. Refers to comments in Section A of submission.	Retain the application of O6 in all locations and amend as follows:  The social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>taking and using water &lt;del&gt;are recognized&lt;/del&gt;</li> <li>&lt;strong&gt;managing stormwater for the safety of people and property</li> <li>disposing of wastewater to achieve public health outcomes are recognized and provided for &lt;/strong&gt;when managing water.</li> </ul> Other relief as may be required to address the issues identified, including relief that is alternative, additional or consequential.		Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS8.039	Winstone Aggregates	3 Objectives	Objective O6		Support in part	Winstone support the proposed changes to the objective. Winstone note that there are additional social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits that should be recognised, including quarrying activities / regionally significant minerals.	Allow in part	Winstone seek that relief sought is allowed and that additional social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits are recognised.	Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS23.1360	Forest & Bird	3 Objectives	Objective O6		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Water Ltd	FS47.136	Meridian Energy Limited	3 Objectives	Objective O6		Support in part	The benefits described in Objective O6 should be recognised, regardless of location. The benefits described in Objective O2 include the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow in part	Allow S151.033 and retain Objective O6 as having application in both Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua.	Reject
S151.183	Wellington Water Ltd (S151)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Considers more specific objective and policy support is required in PC1 to ensure that the NRP gives effect to aspects of national and regional policy direction, and for consistency with Objective O10 of the NRP, specifically in relation to wastewater infrastructure.  Considers policies should recognise that robust, cost-effective, and efficient wastewater and stormwater networks are essential to human health, human safety and social and cultural well-being. Refers to comments in Section A of submission.	<p>Amend existing objective O9 as follows:</p><p>The social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of Regionally Significant Infrastructure, renewable energy generation activities and the utilisation of mineral resources are recognized <strong>and provided for.</strong></p><p>Reinstate and alter existing O6 as follows:</p><p>The social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of:</p><p>Taking and using water <del>are recognized</del></p><p><strong>managing stormwater for the safety of people and property</strong></p><p><strong>disposing of wastewater to achieve public health outcomes</strong></p><p><strong>are recognized and provided for </strong> when managing water.</p><p>Other relief as may be required to address the issues identified, including relief that is alternative, additional or consequential.</p>		Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS20.092	Transpower New Zealand Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Transpower supports the requested amendment to objective O9 as it would ensure that the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure (including the National Grid) are provided for through decision-making. This gives effect to policy 1 of the NPSET.	Allow in part	Transpower supports the requested amendment to existing objective O9: “The social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of Regionally Significant Infrastructure, renewable energy generation activities and the utilisation of mineral resources are recognized and provided for.”	Reject
	Wellington Water Ltd	FS23.1510	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought except for where points are consistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S152.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Raffan & Heather Raffan (S152)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S152.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Raffan & Heather Raffan (S152)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S152.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Raffan & Heather Raffan (S152)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC’s principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S153.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Redington Family Trust (Mary Redington) (S153)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S153.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Redington Family Trust (Mary Redington) (S153)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S153.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Redington Family Trust (Mary Redington) (S153)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S154.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Ash Barker & Kes Barker (S154)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S154.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Ash Barker & Kes Barker (S154)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S154.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Ash Barker & Kes Barker (S154)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S155.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Susan Davidson (S155)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S155.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Susan Davidson (S155)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S155.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Susan Davidson (S155)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S156.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Bryce (S156)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S156.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Bryce (S156)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S156.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Bryce (S156)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S157.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Patricia Laing (S157)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S157.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Patricia Laing (S157)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S157.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Patricia Laing (S157)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S158.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Erica Dawson (S158)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S158.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Erica Dawson (S158)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S158.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Erica Dawson (S158)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S159.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Bruce Stevens & Theresa Stevens (S159)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S159.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Bruce Stevens & Theresa Stevens (S159)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S159.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Bruce Stevens & Theresa Stevens (S159)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S16.001	Pauatahanui Residents Association (S16)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers not sufficient time or consultation with the community for landowners to consider the implications of the policies and rules.	Not stated		Reject
S16.003	Pauatahanui Residents Association (S16)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerns regarding modelling to inform the policies and rules rather than collecting data and 'ground truthing' and then applying appropriate actions	Not stated		No recommendation
S16.004	Pauatahanui Residents Association (S16)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerns regarding implementation of the plan, and concerns about the financial and time cost to landowners.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
S16.005	Pauatahanui Residents Association (S16)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned that poor implementation will penalise those engaging proactively and using good management practices while failing to identify or deal with those engaging in poor management practices.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
S16.006	Pauatahanui Residents Association (S16)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers better outcomes would be achieved if PC1 was weighted in accordance with Recommendations 58, 59, 60, 61 and 64 of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Implementation Programme, focusing on resourcing support and actions rather than on enforcement.	<p>Not stated</p>		Reject
S160.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Harold Cuffe (S160)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S160.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Harold Cuffe (S160)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S160.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Harold Cuffe (S160)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S161.001	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD (S161)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes the entirety of PC1	1. Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);OR2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in their submission;AND3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought as part of the submission		Reject in part
	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	FS47.002	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S161.002	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD (S161)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Notes several drafting errors which create unintended consequences for housing and land development because the provisions have immediate legal effect.	Not stated		No recommendation
S162.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phil Kirycuk (S162)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S162.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phil Kirycuk (S162)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S162.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Phil Kirycuk (S162)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC’s principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S163.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Simister (S163)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S163.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Simister (S163)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S163.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - John Simister (S163)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S164.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sarah Purdy (S164)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S164.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sarah Purdy (S164)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S164.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Sarah Purdy (S164)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S165.001	Pukerua Holdings Limited (S165)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes: 1. The entirety of PC1; and specifically: 2. Amendments to definitions; 3. Amendments to Chapters 5.2 and 5.3 – Discharges to land and water and Land use rules; 4. New Chapter 8 - Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara 5. New Chapter 9 – Te Awarua-o-Porirua 6. Amendments to schedules 7. Amendments to maps	Seeks the following amendments to PC1: 1. Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the relief sought set in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission.		Reject in part
S165.002	Pukerua Holdings Limited (S165)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Concerned about the unintended consequences of several drafting errors given the provisions took immediate legal effect at notification. Notes that responses to questions raised at the Q&A sessions are still pending and the application and interpretation of provisions remain in a state of flux	Seeks the following amendments to PC1: 1. Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief sought in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission.		Reject in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Pukerua Holdings Limited	FS47.003	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S165.003	Pukerua Holdings Limited (S165)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Concerns PC1 will impact housing affordability negatively. Opposes schedule 30 and associated provisions. Consider the financial contribution burdensome and may impede on urban growth and intensification. Concerned PC1 and supporting documentation fail to assess the impact on landowners and developers, potentially impacting the private sector’s commercial viability. Opposes a flat fee without evaluation, as it risks incentivising the provision of large lots over intensification, undermining Objective 2 and associated policies of the NPS-UD, which were not addressed in the Section 32 Report. Concerns about reliance on financial contributions vs alternative solutions within policy. Considers proposed financial contribution to offset residual stormwater deterioration should not be the only option, despite NPS prioritising water quality. Considers that Schedule 30 highlights the collection of funds for catchment-scale stormwater treatment systems, but the feasibility, effectiveness, and timing of such systems remain unclear. The submitter opposes the proposal from GWRC that this fee would be mandatory even if a development achieves greater than 85% reduction in wastewater, a stance strongly opposed as lacking proportionality and any effects-based rationale.	Seeks the following amendments to PC1: 1. Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in relation to specific provisions of PC1 as set out in Section 3 of the original submission.		Reject in part
S166.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Anna De Raadt & Roger Fairclough (S166)			General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S166.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Anna De Raadt & Roger Fairclough (S166)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S166.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Dr Anna De Raadt & Roger Fairclough (S166)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S167.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan and Sarah Kelly (S167)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S167.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan and Sarah Kelly (S167)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S167.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Allan and Sarah Kelly (S167)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S168.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Barry Hearfield & Carol McGhie (S168)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S168.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Barry Hearfield & Carol McGhie (S168)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S168.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Barry Hearfield & Carol McGhie (S168)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S169.041	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes the entirety of PC1	Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;		Reject in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.005	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S169.042	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - definitions	Oppose		Opposes amendments to definitions	Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;		Reject in part



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.006	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - definitions		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S169.043	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes amendments to Chapters 5.2 and 5.3	<p>Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);</p><p>OR</p><p>2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission;</p><p>AND</p><p>3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;</p>		Reject in part
	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.007	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part

								increased electricity generation from renewable sources;			
S169.044	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes Chapter 8	<p>&lt;p&gt;Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;OR&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;AND&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;&lt;/p&gt;</p>		Reject in part
	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.008	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	<p>Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;</p>	Allow in part	<p>Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).</p>	Reject in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S169.045	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes Chapter 9	<p>Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);</p><p>OR</p><p>2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission;</p><p>AND</p><p>3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;</p>		Reject in part
	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.009	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S169.046	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes Chapter 12	<p>Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);</p><p>OR</p><p>2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission;</p><p>AND</p><p>3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;</p>		Reject in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.010	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S169.048	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Notes there are several drafting errors in PC1 resulting in unintended consequences due to provisions taking immediate legal effect. Considers the Clause 16 amendments addresses some of these errors, but several uncertainties remain Concerned a number of questions asked at Q&A session have been deferred to GWRC’s legal counsel and remain unanswered Considers the application and interpretation of provisions remain in a state of flux with adverse outcomes for consenting housing and land development projects	Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;		Reject in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	FS47.012	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S169.052	KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED (S169)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned PC1 will have significant impacts on housing affordability and land development and this has not been addressed by PC1. Considers the introduction of a significant financial contribution for new residential units is burdensome and will have cascading effects on housing affordability throughout the region and will impede urban growth and intensification. Considers the new requirements are inconsistent with Objective 2 and housing affordability policies of the NPS-UD which have not been addressed in the section 32 report. Concerned the impact of PC1 on land owners and developers and the commercial viability of the private sector has not been assessed.  Strongly opposes Schedule 30 and associated provisions  Considers the acknowledgement that stormwater contaminant treatment is only practicable for a portion of the contaminant load highlights the limitations of the proposed solution  Believes the policy heavily relies on financial contributions without consideration for alternatives or new developments that improve water quality. Concerns the use of financial contributions to offset stormwater contaminations is not equitable or efficient. Policy WH.P15 and P.P13 outline the anticipation of potential deterioration in water quality which should prompt exploration of solutions rather than relying on financial contributions.  Concerned the feasibility, effectiveness and timing of catchment-scale stormwater treatment systems referenced in Schedule 30 is unclear. Opposes GWRC’s requirement for financial contributions even if a development could achieve an 85% reduction or more. Believes there is no effects-based reason for the charging of the proposed contribution which is inconsistent with the purported purpose outlined by the GWRC.	Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks); OR 2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in submission; AND 3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought in submission;		Reject in part
S17.009	John Easther (S17)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Policy P45: Protecting trout habitat.	Oppose		Considers the protection of introduced species is not relevant to fresh water policy.	Delete policy or amend to make clear this policy applies only to indigenous trout, not to introduced species.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S17.017	John Easther (S17)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers plan change must be amended to include statutory provisions for central and local government funding for retirement of land, land-use changes, certification costs and mitigation measures required to meet objectives.	Not stated.		Reject
S17.024	John Easther (S17)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		References the Rivers Control Act 1941 being a precedent for management of erosion and protecting property from flood damage.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S17.029	John Easther (S17)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned about the time it will take to achieve PC1's long-term goals and that the timeframes and expectations on landowners are unrealistic.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S17.030	John Easther (S17)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers PC1 needs to include provisions to address landowners being penalised for use of the land while those with lease agreements (using windfarms as an example) can avoid liability for diverting revenue into reforestation.	Not stated.		Reject
S17.031	John Easther (S17)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers land use changes that deal with runoff and reducing flood peaks in the Makara/Ohariu catchments will also deliver PC's objectives of reducing silt loads. Concerned PC1's focus on grade and cover of land (and not reducing flood flows) will not reduce transportation of silt.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S170.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karina Fraser & Grant Fraser (S170)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S170.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karina Fraser & Grant Fraser (S170)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S170.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Karina Fraser & Grant Fraser (S170)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process.	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S171.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jessica Perno & Gavin Perno (S171)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S171.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jessica Perno & Gavin Perno (S171)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S171.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Jessica Perno & Gavin Perno (S171)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process.	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S172.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Thomas Davies (S172)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S172.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Thomas Davies (S172)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform, and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S172.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Thomas Davies (S172)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S173.001	ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED (S173)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes the entirety of PC1	1. Withdrawal of PC1 in its entirety to allow for a more comprehensive review of the policy and rule framework as it relates to freshwater management (including stormwater management and earthworks);OR2. Should the relief sought in point 1) not occur, the Submitter seeks the relief set out in their submission;AND3. Any other relief (including consequential relief) to give effect to the decisions sought as part of the submission		Reject in part
	ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	FS47.014	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject in part
S173.002	ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED (S173)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Notes several drafting errors which create unintended consequences for housing and land development because the provisions have immediate legal effect.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S174.001	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pam Ritchie (S174)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports the intention for quality regarding freshwater and ecosystems but seeks an evidence-based approach that supports targeted strategies tailored for particular eco systems and environments. Considers that PC1 fails to provide sufficient evidence or appropriate targeting to rationalise its implementation and would render their land incapable of reasonable use (per section 85 of RMA), especially for those landowners who have yet to build on their property.	Stop the PC1 process immediately and engage with the affected communities using a proper and meaningful consultation process once government direction is clear.		Reject
S174.002	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pam Ritchie (S174)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes that the coalition government intends to replace the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and repeal the RMA reform and considers that it is unreasonable and a waste of ratepayer funds to consult with communities that lacks government policy direction.	Stop PC1 process until the policy direction is known.		Reject
S174.003	Akatarawa Valley Residents - Pam Ritchie (S174)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has failed to meaningfully consult with the community as required by the Local Government Act (2002) and GWRC's principles of consultation. Considers meaningful participation was difficult due to the lack of a summary being made available for consultation earlier in the process. 	All documents related to this proposal should be communicated in plain language as per the Plain Language Act (2002). Expects GWRC to meet the principles of consultation and engage with affected communities according to the Local Authorities Act.		Reject
S175.001	Tracy Simms (S175)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerns the consultation process has not included all affected properties.	Withdraw the Plan Change		Reject
	Tracy Simms	FS42.001	Tama Potaka, Minister of Conservation	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	The submission point seeks to withdraw Plan Change 1 (PC1). The Waitua processes and inclusion of FMU-specific freshwater visions, attributes and environmental outcomes are appropriate to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM 2020) and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement 2013 (GWRPS) and to have regard to the proposed Plan Change 1 to the GWRPS. MOC supports the Waitua processes and the Waitua statements being implemented in PC1.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
	Tracy Simms	FS47.015	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S175.002	Tracy Simms (S175)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Questions how provisions can be applied to properties both upstream and downstream where there are very few monitoring sites.	Withdraw the Plan Change		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S175.004	Tracy Simms (S175)			General comments	General comments - fresh water	Not Stated		Considers there is not enough water quality information to confirm where sediment is originating from and that more monitoring stations/points and more data are required to establish the source of any quality reduction.	<p>Withdraw the Plan Change</p>		Reject
S176.001	Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour and Catchments Community Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet (S176)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Submitter supports incorporating the appropriate Whaitua Committee's recommendations into PC1 to the NRP as proposed.	<p>Seeks PC1 should address issues to restore degraded and degrading ecosystems.</p><p>Integrate PC1 with the related functions and initiatives from the respective statutory agencies, including GWRC, Porirua and Wellington City Councils and Wellington Water as current water managers.</p>		Accept in part
S176.006	Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour and Catchments Community Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet (S176)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Amend		Supports inclusion of a method that provides for meaningful community engagement. Considers this would define requirements for structures and processes that enable communities to participate in all issues in advocating for environmental guardianship.	Include a method related to community engagement to ensure updates on progress of implementation are carried out – and actions are not deferred due to arguments of economic affordability or feasibility.		Reject
S176.008	Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour and Catchments Community Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet (S176)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Expects the implementation of actions that result from plan changes will be appropriately resourced and funded.	Not stated.		No recommendation
	Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour and Catchments Community Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	FS12.6	Diane Strugnell	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	The cost and resourcing to implement PC1 will be critical for the success of the Whaitua Implementation Programmes and for the desired environmental outcomes	Allow	The whole submission point	No recommendation
S177.001	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes PC1 should give effect to the NPS-FM whilst also giving effect to all other national policy statements including the NPSET and NESETA but the s32 report does not reference the NPSET and NESETA and appears that they have not been considered in the PC1 preparation. </p><p>Seeks to ensure the objective of the NPSET is given effect to through provisions of PC1 while also giving effect to the NPS-FM.	Ensure the objective of the NPSET is given effect to through provisions of PC1 while also giving effect to the NPS-FM.		No recommendation
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.744	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S177.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		The submitter recognises the objectives and policies of the RPS and NRP for regionally significant infrastructure will continue to apply under PC1. Considers it is not evident from the provisions of PC1, or s32 Report, that consideration has been given to providing for the RPS and NRP objectives and policies related to regionally significant infrastructure when developing provisions for the whaitua.	<p>Ensure that higher-order direction on regionally significant infrastructure continues to be provided for through PC1 while also giving effect to the NPS-FM.</p>		No recommendation
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.745	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS31.098	Wellington International Airport Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	WIAL supports consistency in the planning framework for regionally significant infrastructure, as set out by this submitter. In ensuring consistency with the RPS, the framework should also give effect to the NZCPS, in addition to the NPSFM.	Allow	Ensure that higher order direction on regionally significant infrastructure continues to be provided for through PC1 while also giving effect to the NPSFM.	No recommendation
S177.019	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.2 Policies	Support		Supports note as it provides for a range of existing operative policies to continue applying within the whaitua.	Retain as notified		Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.762	Forest & Bird	8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.2 Policies		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Reject
S177.028	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.3 Rules	Amend		Seeks reference to NESETA to highlight to plan users and assist with plan interpretation. Considers it relevant given the potential difference in standards and activity status.	Insert the following to the Interpretation section of the chapter:  <strong> Many activities relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation or removal of an electricity transmission line and ancillary structures that existed prior to 14 January 2010 are controlled by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (NESETA), separate to this Plan. Where the provisions of this Plan conflict with the requirements of the NESETA, the provisions of the NESETA apply. </strong>		Accept
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.771	Forest & Bird	8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.3 Rules		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S177.045	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	9.2 Policies	Support		Supports the note as it provides for a range of existing operative policies to continue to apply within the whaitua.	Retain as notified		Accept
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.788	Forest & Bird	9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	9.2 Policies		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Reject
S177.054	Transpower New Zealand Limited (S177)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	9.3 Rules	Amend		Seeks reference to NESETA to highlight to plan users and assist with plan interpretation. Considers it relevant given the potential difference in standards and activity status.	Insert the following to the Interpretation section of the chapter:  <strong>Many activities relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation or removal of an electricity transmission line and ancillary structures that existed prior to 14 January 2010 are controlled by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (NESETA), separate to this Plan. Where the provisions of this Plan conflict with the requirements of the NESETA, the provisions of the NESETA apply.</strong>		Accept
	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.797	Forest & Bird	9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	9.3 Rules		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S178.001	Eugene Doyle (S178)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1	Not stated		Accept in part
S178.002	Eugene Doyle (S178)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 but to be successful the Plan needs to be integrated with functions and initiatives of other statutory authorities and effective community engagement	Not stated		Accept in part
S178.003	Eugene Doyle (S178)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the submissions of Neil Deans and Lynn Cadenhead in full	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S178.005	Eugene Doyle (S178)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Recommends GWRC investment in a number of areas to ensure meaningful and effective community engagement. The areas include; digital platforms and other mechanisms for data sharing, increased funding for community/catchment monitoring programmes, financially supporting catchment communities and sufficient consultation on major resource consent approvals. Major resource consents should require data sharing in a form that the community can understand and that community panels be set up to participate in the monitoring of the effects of the activities	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
S178.006	Eugene Doyle (S178)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports ongoing collaboration work with local communities and other groups	Not stated		No recommendation
S179.001	John Coveney (S179)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers regional bodies are overregulating.	Not stated		No recommendation
S18.012	PF Olsen Ltd (S18)			4 Policies	Policy P36: Restoring Wairarapa Moana	Oppose		Notes the significance of adhering to legislative principles to ensure changes are effective, clear and fair, and that language should be used that allows adaptability to changing circumstances. Considers the use of "restore" or "avoid" inappropriate, as they do not allow adaptability to changing circumstances.	Amend to change the word restore for the aim of restoring the ecological health and significant values of Wairapara Moana.		Reject
S180.001	William Gill (S180)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned about the lack of consultation with affected property owners.	Not stated		Reject
S181.001	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports the Maymorn Collective submission in full	Not stated		No recommendation
S181.002	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes Plan Change 1	Not stated		No recommendation
S181.003	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned with the lack of consultation and consideration for the UHCC Proposed Plan Change 50 Rural (PC50r) which PC1 is inconsistent with	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S181.005	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Questions the credibility of PC1 due to the lack of a specialist economic impact assessment to quantify environmental and social benefits.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a publicly disclosed detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment that informs a revised plan change		Reject
S181.006	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Concerns with the drafting errors and failure to define key terms in PC1	PC1 is redrafted correctly and resubmitted for consultation.		Reject
S181.007	John Boyle (S181)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Suggests PC1 is inconsistent with the incoming Government's 2023 election platform related to unlocking land for housing	<p>Any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1 should be revised</p>		Reject
S182.001	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Agrees with the Maymorn Collective submission in all aspects	Not stated		No recommendation
S182.002	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposed to the proposed Plan Change 1.	Not stated		No recommendation
S182.003	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned that affected landowners have not been adequately consulted and that PC1 is inconsistent with UHCC Plan Change 50.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S182.005	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment. Challenges the credibility of the GWRC plan change.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake economic, social and cultural impact assessment to inform a revised plan change.		Reject
S182.006	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned PC1 contains many errors and fails to define what some key terms mean, preventing stakeholders from understanding what is proposed, and make well informed submissions.	PC1 is redrafted correctly and resubmitted for consultation.		Reject
S182.007	Susan Boyle (S182)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned PC1 is inconsistent with the incoming Government's 2023 election platform, specifically that major towns and cities will be required to zone land for '30 years' worth of housing demand immediately.	<p>Any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1 should be revised, to consider, the directive of Central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.</p>		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S183.001	Yvonne Weeber (S183)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the direction of PC1	Not stated		Accept in part
	Yvonne Weeber	FS27.001	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Accept in part
	Yvonne Weeber	FS42.002	Tama Potaka, Minister of Conservation	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	The submission points support all the provisions of PC1. MOC also supports the direction of PC1 and the inclusion of FMU-specific freshwater visions, attributes and environmental outcomes are appropriate to give effect to the NPS-FM 2020 and GWRPS and to have regard to the proposed Plan Change 1 to the GWRPS.	Allow	Not stated	Accept in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S183.070	Yvonne Weeber (S183)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Amend		Not stated	Amend Objective O19 as follows  Objective O19 Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in freshwater bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded such that: (a) water quality, flows, water levels and aquatic and coastal habitats are managed to maintain <strong>and improve biodiversity,</strong> <strong>aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai, and (b) where an objective in Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 or 3.8 is not met, a freshwater body or coastal marine area is meaningfully improved so that the objective is met within a reasonable timeframe, and (c) restoration of aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai is <del>encouraged.</del> <strong>undertaken and required where land is developed that contains freshwater bodies. </strong>  Note For the purposes of this objective 'a reasonable timeframe' is a date for the applicable water body or coastal marine area inserted into this Plan through the plan change/s required by the RMA to implement the NPS-FM 2020, <del>or 2050</del><strong>2035</strong> if no other date is specified by 31 December 2026.		Reject
	Yvonne Weeber	FS27.070	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S183.071	Yvonne Weeber (S183)			3 Objectives	Table 3.4 Rivers and Streams.	Amend		Not stated	Amend Table 3.4 as follows: Mahinga kai species, including taonga species, are present in quantities, size and of a quality that is <del>appropriate for the area </del><strong>in a healthy ecological state</strong> and reflective of a healthy functioning ecosystem <sup>18</sup> Huangā of mahinga kai as identified by mana whenua are achieved.		Reject
	Yvonne Weeber	FS27.071	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	3 Objectives	Table 3.4 Rivers and Streams.		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
S185.003	Ray Beentjes (S185)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to introduce to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S186.001	Guardians of the Bays Inc (S186)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the direction of Plan Change 1.	Not stated		Accept in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS27.424	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Accept in part
S186.024	Guardians of the Bays Inc (S186)			3 Objectives	Table 3.4 Rivers and Streams.	Amend	Not stated	Replace in table 3.4 the words " appropriate for the area" with "in a healthy ecological state".		Reject	

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS27.447	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	3 Objectives	Table 3.4 Rivers and Streams.		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
S186.029	Guardians of the Bays Inc (S186)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Amend	Not stated	Amend as follows: Objective O19 Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in freshwater bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded such that: (a) water quality, flows, water levels and aquatic and coastal habitats are managed to maintain <strong>and improve biodiversity, </strong>aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai, and (b) where an objective in Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 or 3.8 is not met, a freshwater body or coastal marine area is meaningfully improved so that the objective is met within a reasonable timeframe, and (c) restoration of aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai is <del>encouraged </del> <strong>undertaken and required where land is developed that contains freshwater bodies </strong> Note For the purposes of this objective 'a reasonable timeframe' is a date for the applicable water body or coastal marine area inserted into this Plan through the plan change/s required by the RMA to implement the NPS-FM 2020, 2035 if no other date is specified by 31 December 2026.  Aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai objectives Table 3.4 Rivers and streams, page 16		Reject	



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS27.452	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
S187.003	Victoria University Canoe Club (S187)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S188.004	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers it important to include stakeholders like Wellington Fish and Game Council who have statutory responsibilities in consultation and management planning	Not stated		No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.004	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.009	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1160	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1093	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S188.005	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Suggests regular assessments and evaluations of Schedule I important to trout spawning and trout fishery rivers.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.005	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.010	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1161	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1094	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S188.008	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			General comments	General comments - stormwater management		Support	Considers it vital to manage stormwater, wastewater network catchment, and wastewater treatment plant discharges. Considers management and action plans should be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious but reasonable, Relevant, and Time-bound.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.008	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - stormwater management		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.013	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	General comments	General comments - stormwater management		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1164	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - stormwater management		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1097	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - stormwater management		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S188.016	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned with a lack of consultation and questions if the NPSFM process has been followed correctly, particularly Section 3.2 (b), which requires every regional council to engage with communities and tangata whenua to identify long-term visions, environmental outcomes, and other elements of the NOF.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS1.001	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	A clear engagement process is needed to achieve the requirements of the NPSFM 2020.	Allow	HortNZ supports the assertion that Greater Wellington Regional Council has an obligation to follow Section 3.2(2)(b) of the NPSFM 2020, which requires every regional council to engage with communities and tangata whenua to identify long-term visions, environmental outcomes, and other elements of the NOF.	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.016	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.021	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1172	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1105	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S188.017	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concern that lack of communication with Wellington Fish and Game Council during PC1 development has led to omission acknowledging the requirement to protect habitat for trout and salmon insofar as this is consistent with protections of the habitats of indigenous freshwater species (Policies 10 and Policies 9 of the NPSFM). Also, Appendix 1B requires that where FMUs or parts thereof have fishing values, attributes associated with this fishing value (for both indigenous and introduced freshwater fish) need to be specifically targeted to allow the numbers of fish to be sufficient and suitable for human consumption. Concerned limited engagement with community and no engagement with submitter potentially circumvented important aspects of NPSFM and allows for Plan to continue to not fulfil national level legislative obligations for freshwater health in key areas.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.017	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.022	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1173	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1106	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S188.019	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council (S188)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Amend		Considers clause c) requires strengthening: restoration of a degraded system or ecosystem is necessary under the NPS-FM, rather than merely encouraged.	Amend Clause (c) as follows: c)<del> restoration of aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai is encouraged. </del> <strong>Aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai values are maintained where in good health and restored where degraded.</strong>		Reject
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS9.019	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS21.024	Manor Park Golf Club (Incorporated) (MPGC)	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Support	In keeping with the sanctuary environment status that the MPGC has established and is looking to maintain.	Allow	Not stated	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS23.1175	Forest & Bird	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Support	Submission points will help maintain, protect, and restore indigenous biodiversity and waterways throughout Wellington and are consistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Allow	Support the whole of the submission and all relief sought be unless otherwise stated or where points are inconsistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	Reject
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS27.1108	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
	Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	FS39.273	Wellington Water Ltd	3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.		Oppose	Clause (c) does not require strengthening.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S193.002	Wairarapa Federated Farmers (S193)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers quality data is needed to inform models that are free of uncertainty and error to the extent that they can be used to underpin policies that drive system change.   Concerned that model outputs used for PC1 are inadequate for this purpose. Considers insufficient effort was put into ground-truthing the modelled data for PC1, and this should be a focus for the Council before some policies and rules can be proposed.	Not Stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS23.958	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S193.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers (S193)			General comments	General comments - fresh water	Not Stated		Supports an integrated catchment approach to the management of sediment and nutrient loss, supported by the Council and underpinned by non-regulatory methods such as FAPs and Regional Forest Spatial Plan. Considers this approach allows the Council to demonstrate best practice regarding the management and protection of natural ecosystems including freshwater ecosystems.	<p>Not Stated</p>		Accept
	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS23.962	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - fresh water		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Reject
S195.002	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA) (S195)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 is not necessary or desirable.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	FS23.405	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S195.003	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA) (S195)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Consider PC1 and S32 report do not meet requirements of S82(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002 .   Considers members lack sufficient knowledge of Māori to understand parts of the documents.	Define more terms so there is less confusion and ambiguity.  Translate Māori words into English, or have an English language version.		No recommendation
	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	FS23.406	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Reject
S195.028	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA) (S195)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 needs to be rethought if it is to be effective in controlling the continued degradation of water quality in the region and helping improve the NRP.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	FS23.431	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S196.001	Sera Moran (S196)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes PC1 .	Withdraw PC1.		Reject
S196.002	Sera Moran (S196)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned the rural community only discovered PC1 by word of mouth .	Withdraw PC1.		Reject
S197.003	Greg Davies (S197)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to improve water quality in catchments.  	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S199.001	Pikarere Farm Limited (S199)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the Plan is complicated and difficult to follow and the time to get to grips with it has been limited. Questions if the approach of PC1 is right, and notes that properties can vary greatly with steeper hill areas no more prone to erosion or run-off than valley floors. Is a party to the Ohariu/Makara Farmers' Submission and supports fresh, clean water and soil preservation.	Not stated		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S199.003	Pikarere Farm Limited (S199)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Considers cost is an important factor and should be given proper consideration.	Not stated		No recommendation
S2.006	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd (S2)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Whilst the submitter's concerns pertain to the Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara, to ensure consistency, the submitter supports consistent relief to the Whaitua Te Awarua-o-Porirua Objectives, Policies, and Rules.	<p>Amend relevant provisions in the Whaitua Te Awarua-o-Porirua (Objectives, Policies and Rules), consistent with relief sought in submission points within this submission.</p>		No recommendation
	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	FS31.100	Wellington International Airport Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	WIAL supports the relief to the extent that quarry activities are sufficiently provided for in the NRP. Quarries serve a critical support function to the upgrading and maintenance of regionally significant infrastructure, such as Airports, and this needs to be appropriately recognised in the NRP.	Allow in part	Amend relevant provisions in the Whaitua Te Awarua-o-Porirua (Objectives, Policies and Rules), consistent with relief sought in submission points within this submission.	No recommendation
S202.002	Graeme Iain Shellard , Sarah Elizabeth Shellard, Cameron Anthony Shellard, Finlay David ShellardGraeme Shellard (S202)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the plan change attempts to change behaviour through legislation without any understanding of cost or impact and without consideration of costs for enforcement Considers no serious attempt has been made with landowners to discuss and address the perceived issues. Considers PC1 is fundamentally flawed, expensive and unmanageable, does not align with the direction of the government, and the option to work with landowners was not explored effectively.	Withdraw PC1. Develop and implement improvements through community-based support / education supported by measurements and reporting		Reject
S202.003	Graeme Iain Shellard , Sarah Elizabeth Shellard, Cameron Anthony Shellard, Finlay David ShellardGraeme Shellard (S202)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Notes there is no information on RPS Plan Change 2. Considers the content of plan change 2 could have a material impact on submitters response to Plan Change 1 and could be detrimental to their understanding of the council's overall plan.	Share Plan change 2 high level changes or topics, and plan change 1 consultation be repeated to allow consideration of planned change 2 in response		Reject
S202.004	Graeme Iain Shellard , Sarah Elizabeth Shellard, Cameron Anthony Shellard, Finlay David ShellardGraeme Shellard (S202)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers the consultation process, including timeframes, was inadequate. Considers PC1 documents are not written in plain English, are difficult and cannot easily be viewed or digested.  	Stop PC1 process and split the plan into digestible sub plans with a focus on users. Complete discussions with the wider group to identify when support can best be provided.		Reject
S202.005	Graeme Iain Shellard , Sarah Elizabeth Shellard, Cameron Anthony Shellard, Finlay David ShellardGraeme Shellard (S202)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Considers the cost of this work and the impact has not been effectively considered. Notes a range of activities associated with PC1 that will incur additional costs and that these costs are either incurred by GWRC or the landowner Considers these costs are extreme for the value gained and the source and value of funding required is not addressed.  Considers it likely that there will be a split between landowners that comply and the approach to forcing landowners to comply, which is abrasive, divisive, expensive and unlikely to succeed.	Withdraw PC1. Develop and implement improvements through community-based support / education supported by measurements and reporting. Run workshops with the wider impacted community to review the originally considered high level options including all costs and benefits, impacts and high-level risks.		Reject
S203.001	Peter Thomson (S203)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports the submission of Robert Anker	Not stated		No recommendation
S203.002	Peter Thomson (S203)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Notes PC1 changes are largely drawn from, or a result of, the direction stated in the NPS-FM for Freshwater Management and that the Government has committed to replacing the NPS- FM. Considers it is inappropriate and a waste of ratepayers money to commit to the implementation / adoption of the Natural Resources Plan as the Government has indicated that the NPS FM will be replaced.	Withdraw PC1 until the new National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management has been released.		Reject
S205.001	Kelly & Lewis Few-Mackay (S205)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned there was no consultation with affected parties. Considers properties of 4-20 ha should have been contacted directly.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake effective consultation.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S206.015	Winstone Aggregates (S206)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers prohibited activity status is not reasonable, based on a wide range of activities that would be captured under the proposed prohibited rules, noting that prohibited activity status is afforded to activities causing significant and unmitigable adverse effect, or that are fundamentally contrary to a planning document. Considers that neither a sufficient evidence base or evaluation has been provided for the prohibited activity status, or for the consideration of alternative activity statuses to appropriately manage the resource management issue. Further considers the non-complying activity status overused and where the purpose of the RMA and objectives of the plan can be met by a less restrictive regime, that it should be adopted, citing an Environment Court decision. Considers discretionary activity status to generally be more efficient and effective and non-complying activity status as a default where an activity is not otherwise provided for inappropriate, noting that quarrying activities would trigger non-complying activity status for earthworks. Considers the proposed approach inconsistent with national direction that provides for clear consenting pathways for beneficial activities such as quarrying activities, noting the NPS-FM and NES for Freshwater in particular, which provide for a discretionary consenting pathway for quarrying and clean filling activities. Considers non-complying activity status would undermine the ability to implement national direction by bundling resource consent applications into non-complying activity status.	<span>Seeks that further consideration is given to the activity statuses proposed and whether proportionate evaluation has been given.</span>		No recommendation
S208.001	Julie Martin (S208)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes PC1 in relation to the management of freshwater within Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme, the amendments to the beds of lakes and rivers rules, and new sites with significant indigenous biodiversity values.  Notes objection to 'new national direction' due to the change of Government and potential for national direction to change making PC1 unfit for purpose.  Opposes the content of the Te Whaitua te Whanganui IP as it discusses the submitter's property. 	Not Stated		No recommendation
S208.002	Julie Martin (S208)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned about the timing of consultation on PC1 at a busy and stressful time of the year given its length and complexity. Also concerned about a lack of direct consultation.	Extend public consultation		Reject
S211.001	Hutt City Council (S211)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Supports the intent of PC1, however expressed concern with the inclusion of the 2040 E. coli target, and the prohibition of unplanned urban growth.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Hutt City Council	FS23.347	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose all submission points seeking to amend proposed 2040 E.coli target timeframe to 2060.	No recommendation
S212.001	Heather Phillips (S212)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers sections are missing from the plan.	Not stated		No recommendation
S212.003	Heather Phillips (S212)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		Concern that PC1 does not cover waterway obstructions which can cause waterways to deviate and cause more sediment. A requirement should be made that when a waterway becomes obstructed by trees or growth it needs to be cleaned before the waterway if forced to deviate.	Not stated		Reject
S212.010	Heather Phillips (S212)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Notes that fault lines will contribute to high levels of erosion and this cannot be regulated.	<p>Not stated</p>		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S212.011	Heather Phillips (S212)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concern that PC1 is not easily understood and that it has lost the opportunity to tackle issues that contribute to sediment in rivers such as fires, obstructions and climate change.  Concern that it has too much detail and lost sight of the bigger picture.  Concern that increasing frequency of flood events will deter people from reenforcing rules once they have been swept away by nature i.e. fences.	Not stated		No recommendation
S214.002	Megan Persico (S214)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 should be put on hold due to signalled repeal of NPS-FM from the new government.	<p>Put PC1 on hold.</p>		Reject
S214.003	Megan Persico (S214)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports the "Maymorn Collective" submission.	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S215.001	Paul Persico (S215)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers PC1 will create a problem and financial burden for lifestyle property owners in Mangaroa and Akatarawa areas, but will achieve nothing as no problem exists.  Considers PC1 will be a huge cost to rate payers and the money would be better of spent finding the source of the problem and rectifying it.  Agrees with the Maymorn Collective Submission in all aspects.	Not Stated		No recommendation
S216.003	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (Te Rūnanga) (S216)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the Te Whanganui a Tara and Te Awarua o Porirua planning frameworks implement the NPS-FM, the Ngāti Toa Statement on the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua and Te Mahere Wai for the Te Whanganui a Tara Whaitua.   Considers for the first time cultural health of Te Awarua o Porirua and Te Whanganui a Tara is of central importance and there is a pathway towards wai ora involving respect for taonga, restoration of mauri, ecological health, mahinga kai and kaimoana.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (Te Rūnanga)	FS2.001	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Support the intent of general comments. Support partnership with mana whenua in planning frameworks and implementation.	Allow	Considers the Te Whanganui a Tara and Te Awarua o Porirua planning frameworks implement the NPS-FM, the Ngāti Toa Statement on the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua and Te Mahere Wai for the Te Whanganui a Tara Whaitua. Considers for the first time cultural health of Te Awarua o Porirua and Te Whanganui a Tara is of central importance and there is a pathway towards wai ora involving respect for taonga, restoration of mauri, ecological health, mahinga kai and kaimoana.	No recommendation
S216.004	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (Te Rūnanga) (S216)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the new provisions set new targets and standards for coastal water, nationally threatened freshwater species, groundwater, water quality, habitats, water quantity, and ecological processes of rivers.   Submitter is committed to working with the local authorities and Wellington Water Ltd to make these targets achievable especially in relation to stormwater and wastewater discharge consents.  	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (Te Rūnanga)	FS2.002	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Support the intent of general comments. Support partnership with mana whenua in planning frameworks and implementation.	Allow	Considers the new provisions set new targets and standards for coastal water, nationally threatened freshwater species, groundwater, water quality, habitats, water quantity, and ecological processes of rivers. Submitter is committed to working with the local authorities and Wellington Water Ltd to make these targets achievable especially in relation to stormwater and wastewater discharge consents.	No recommendation
S218.001	Tim Moody (S218)			General comments	General comments - overall		Not Stated	Endorses the submission of Robert James Anker	Endorses the relief sought in the submission of Robert James Anker		No recommendation
S219.002	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd (S219)			General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Supports initiatives to improve the quality of freshwater and the state of freshwater and coastal environments.  Opposes PC1 in its current form and requests it be withdrawn to allow for genuine consultation to occur, consideration of matters raised through this submission process, and consideration of the new direction from the central Government.  Considers PC1 does not provide sufficient certainty or clarity in the implementation of rules  Considers PC1 will have significant financial impacts particularly on pre-committed development projects.  Considers PC1 does not provide sufficient certainty or clarity in the implementation of rules.  	Withdraw PC1		Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS16.001	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS16.023	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	There is insufficient detail on the types of hydrological controls required for various types and scales of development.   The standards pose significant burdens on property owners and developers.   Engineering advice should not be necessary for the creation of small impervious areas.  PC1 does not adequately evaluate financial costs on landowners, developers and ratepayers, including flow-on costs on the commercial viability of housing supply and affordability.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS13.062	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML considers that PC1 be delayed until all Waitua processes have been completed – including the Waitua Kāpiti.	Allow	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS29.010	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	PPFL considers that central government direction has changed, or is in the process of changing, and pausing progress on PC1 will allow the Council to better take stock of central government direction. PC1 should either give effect to updated central government direction, or be withdrawn and replaced with a Plan Change that achieves this outcome.	Allow	S219.002 in its entirety.	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS38.001	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.” A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA, PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS38.013	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	There is insufficient detail on the types of hydrological controls required for various types and scales of development. The standards pose significant burdens on property owners and developers. Engineering advice should not be necessary for the creation of small impervious areas. PC1 does not adequately evaluate financial costs on landowners, developers and ratepayers, including flow-on costs on the commercial viability of housing supply and affordability.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS47.016	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S219.004	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd (S219)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers adequate consultation was not carried out with the development community and is concerned the draft version was not sent to the development community despite Subpart 1 of the NPS-FM requiring regional councils to engage with communities and tangata whenua.  Considers that given the impact and extent of the proposed changes, the publication of a draft plan and consultation with the development community would minimise potential appeals and aid towards a more workable and functioning Natural Resources Plan.	Withdraw PC1		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS16.003	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.  There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS13.064	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti.	Allow	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS34.022	Orogen Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	PC1 presents unworkable policies listed in our original decision. The impact of PC1 on the civil construction sector and the development community have not been considered.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path to establish a workable NRP as sought by the submitter.	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS38.003	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: "Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region." A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS47.017	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S219.005	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd (S219)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers GWRC should wait to see what changes to the NPS-FM are proposed by the new government coalition to ensure PC1 is in alignment.   Considers PC1 was rushed as the plan does not need to be notified until 31st December 2024.   Considers the imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM as there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change has to be notified.	Withdraw PC1		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS16.007	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.  There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.  PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.  The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS13.065	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti.	Allow	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS34.023	Orogen Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Inconsistency to NPS-FM provides conflict in project planning between PC1 & NPS- FM.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 until the NPS-FM is resolved and provide clear alignment.	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS38.004	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: "Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region." A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	FS47.018	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S22.001	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		The state of water bodies reflects the use of land, water and other resources in their catchments.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S22.004	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports GWRC's Whaitua process, and supports the implementation of the recommendations made by Whaitua members to address freshwater issues.	<p>Not stated.</p>		Accept
S22.005	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the direction of PC1 with regard to water.	Not stated.		Accept in part
S22.010	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Considers the costs of inaction (in the future) outweigh the financial cost to implement PC1.	Not stated.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S22.011	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Amend		Not stated	Objective O19 Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in freshwater bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded such that: (a) water quality, flows, water levels and aquatic and coastal habitats are managed to maintain <strong>and improve </strong>biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai, and (b) where an objective in Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 or 3.8 is not met, a freshwater body or coastal marine area is meaningfully improved so that the objective is met within a reasonable timeframe, and (c) restoration of aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai is <del>encouraged </del><strong>undertaken and required where land is developed that contains freshwater bodies.</strong>  Note For the purposes of this objective 'a reasonable timeframe' is a date for the applicable water body or coastal marine area inserted into this Plan through the plan change/s required by the RMA to implement the NPS-FM 2020, or 2050 2035 if no other date is specified by 31 December 2026.		Reject
S22.012	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			3 Objectives	Table 3.4 Rivers and Streams.	Amend		Not stated	Mahinga kai species, including taonga species, are present in quantities, size and of a quality that is <del>appropriate for the area </del><strong>in a healthy ecological state </strong>and reflective of a healthy functioning ecosystem. Huangā of mahinga kai as identified by mana whenua are achieved.		Reject
S22.026	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.2 Policies	Support		Supports policies WH.P1-P.33 including the associated target attribute states and flow requirements.	Retain as notified		Accept in part
S22.027	Lynn Cadenhead (S22)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.3 Rules	Support		Supports Rules WH.R1 to WH.R36 and notes wherever possible, water sensitive urban design should be required to minimise increased runoff intensity due to increasing hard surfaces.	Include requirement for WSUD in Rules WH.R1-WH.R36 where possible.		No recommendation
S221.001	Generation Zero (S221)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the current quality of water disproportionately affects Ngāti Toa physical health and jeopardizes the cultural practices and mātauranga that reinforce them. Considers this also impacts mana whenua across the Wellington region. Considers collecting kai moana from the harbour is a standard indicator of waterway health in the catchments.	Not stated		No recommendation
S221.002	Generation Zero (S221)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		Support recommendations for improving the health and well-being of coastal waterbodies towards Te Mana o te Wai in Waituata Te Whanganui-a-tara. C. Suggests sections such as 4.6 on Biodiversity, where “maintain or where practicable restore” is used, could focus on improvement as well as restoration. Suggests goal for policy should not be maintenance but improvement and should align better with principles of stewardship and Kaitiakitanga inherent to Te Mana o te Wai.	Not stated		Reject
S221.009	Generation Zero (S221)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Suggests a collaborative approach with affected community members to promote social cohesion and minimise backlash to economic costs of improving infrastructure. Suggests simplified guides to RPS changes so submissions are accessible to the community.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S221.011	Generation Zero (S221)			4 Policies	4.6 Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai.	Not Stated		Suggests sections such as 4.6 on Biodiversity, where “maintain or where practicable restore” is used, could focus on improvement as well as restoration Considers the current wording presents restoration as optional. Suggests goal for policy should not be maintenance but improvement and should align better with principles of stewardship and Kaitiakitanga inherent to Te Mana o te Wai.	Not Stated		Reject
S224.001	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (S224)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Does not support the Plan Change 1 in its current form and opposes the broadbrush regulatory approach taken and the removal of local decision making. Agrees with the need to improve water quality – where it is poor and where the solutions are within our control – but considers fundamental information is required to do this effectively and equitably. Asks council to recognise the work the submitter has done to date and partner with us in this work rather than regulate us.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd	FS47.019	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	No recommendation
S224.002	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (S224)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned with a lack of consultation, content which is difficult for most people to understand, short timeframes to make submissions, and the submission timing just prior to Christmas. Notes opportunities that were missed that would have helped engagement, including: a. Direct mail contact with rural property owners, identified through council’s rating database. b. Formal engagement with our Community Board; and c. Provision of information on the GWRC website – more accessible written information, invitation to the PC1 rural webinars/meeting. Additional forms of communication are essential if GWRC really wants meaningful community feedback.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd	FS47.020	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	No recommendation
S224.005	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (S224)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Concerned that the PC1 provisions will result in non-compliances and subsequent prosecution within a short timeframe, noting that the transition time from current land uses is very short, considering the cost of implementation for farmers. Seeks for a collaborative approach to be taken rather than implementation of blanket regulation.	Take an approach based less on blanket rules, modelled scenarios and enforcement and more on empowering and partnering with the community.		Reject
	Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd	FS47.023	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S225.002	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Not stated	That GWRC undertakes a full legal and natural justice review of the provisions in light of the evolving national direction;		Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.001	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support this submission point that seeks a that GWRC undertakes a full legal and natural justice review of the provisions in light of the evolving national direction;	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.001	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support this submission point that seeks a that GWRC undertakes a full legal and natural justice review of the provisions in light of the evolving national direction;	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.830	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S225.003	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Not stated	Amend to remove actions that conflict with or are more onerous than the 2023 National led government direction included in the Incoming Government Coalition agreements, November 2023 and letter from Chris Bishop dated 13 December 2023 which identifies changes to RMA, NPSFM, NESFW and NPS-IB prior to end of 2023.		Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.002	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Supports this submission point that seeks to amend the provisions to remove actions that conflict with or are more onerous than the 2023 National led government direction included in the Incoming Government Coalition agreements, November 2023 and letter from Chris Bishop dated 13 December 2023 which identifies changes to RMA, NPSFM, NESFW and NPS-IB prior to end of 2023.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.002	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Supports this submission point that seeks to amend the provisions to remove actions that conflict with or are more onerous than the 2023 National led government direction included in the Incoming Government Coalition agreements, November 2023 and letter from Chris Bishop dated 13 December 2023 which identifies changes to RMA, NPSFM, NESFW and NPS-IB prior to end of 2023.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.831	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S225.004	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Not stated	Seek further work and consultation is undertaken in partnership with territorial authorities to accurately reflect roles and function in achieving outcomes and aspirations of Whaitua documents;		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.832	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS36.035	Wellington City Council	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S225.006	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Amend		Not stated	Amend to correctly implement national planning standards;		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt City Council	FS1.002	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	GWRC has an obligation to implement the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) as soon as practicable. PC1 to the NRP was notified October 2023, well after the NPS-HPL (October 2022). Clause 3.2 (1) (a) of the NPS-HPL requires regional councils to consider “how land-based primary production, including supporting activities, interact with freshwater management at a catchment level”.	Allow	HortNZ supports the need to amend PC1 to correctly implement national planning standards, including the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.003	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to amend the plan change to correctly implement national planning standards.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Accept in part
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS25.004	Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Request represents good planning practice and assists in the implementation of the NRP	Allow	Amend to correctly implement national planning standards	Accept in part
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.003	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to amend the plan change to correctly implement national planning standards.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Accept in part
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.834	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	Reject
S225.007	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Amend		Not stated	Delete or significantly amend provisions which have a lack of higher order document direction or evidentiary support;		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.004	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to significantly amend the provisions which have a lack of higher order document direction or evidentiary support.	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS25.005	Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit	Allow	Delete or significantly amend provisions which have a lack of higher order document direction or evidentiary support	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.004	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to significantly amend the provisions which have a lack of higher order document direction or evidentiary support.	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.835	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S225.008	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Amend		Not stated	Delete or significantly amend provisions which lack of any consideration of scale and significance and apply to all development without appropriate thresholds;		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.005	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to delete or significantly amend provisions which lack of any consideration of scale and significance and apply to all development without appropriate thresholds;	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.005	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Support the need to delete or significantly amend provisions which lack of any consideration of scale and significance and apply to all development without appropriate thresholds;	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.836	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S225.009	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Not stated	Delete the addition of onerous requirements for existing consents;		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.006	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Support the need to delete the addition of onerous requirements for existing consents;	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS25.012	Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice	Allow in part	Delete or amend Rule WH.R6 to remove thresholds and financial contributions	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS26.004	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice	Allow in part	Delete or amend Rule WH.R6 to remove thresholds and financial contributions	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.006	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Support the need to delete the addition of onerous requirements for existing consents;	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.837	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS39.208	Wellington Water Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	WWL supports all those parts of UHCC's submission addressing issues related to investment for achieving the target attribute states and implementation of consents for Council-owned infrastructure.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S225.010	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall		Amend	Considers where there is a lack of clarity in definitions and policies, these fail section 32 tests	Delete or significantly amend use of definitions and policies where there is a lack of clarity.		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.838	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S225.011	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall		Amend	Not stated	Delete or significantly amend policies and definitions which read as rules or conditions of consent;		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.839	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS39.209	Wellington Water Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	WWL supports all those parts of UHCC's submission addressing issues related to investment for achieving the target attribute states and implementation of consents for Council-owned infrastructure.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S225.013	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall		Amend	Not stated	Amend timeframes in NRP to give reasonable timeframes to implement new direction for landowners, ensure these are reasonable and achievable and where practicable, funded from external sources;		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.841	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS36.036	Wellington City Council	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S225.021	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Not stated	Seek amendment to delete references to Wellington Water throughout plan change and refer instead to water entities.		Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.849	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS36.039	Wellington City Council	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Not stated	Accept
S225.022	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Not stated	Seek that 'and/or' used throughout this document be amended to clarify whether it is inclusive or not as 'and/or' is inappropriate.		Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.850	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S225.023	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers fundamental issues with provisions requiring revision or deletion to ensure PC1 is reasonable, legally robust and practical to implement.	Seeks GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of proposed provisions and amend PC1 to address concerns. Seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought.		Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.010	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agrees that there are fundamental issues with provisions requiring revision or deletion to ensure PC1 is reasonable, legally robust and practical to implement.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.010	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agrees that there are fundamental issues with provisions requiring revision or deletion to ensure PC1 is reasonable, legally robust and practical to implement.	Allow	Support submission point in full	Reject
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.851	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S225.024	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports intent to develop regional provisions to achieve water quality and ecological health objectives within Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua.	Not stated		Accept in part
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.852	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept in part
S225.025	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Concerns with process, timing, and sequencing of aspects of the notified provisions of PC1 require significant amendments. Notes numerous instances throughout PC1 where little regard to national policy direction and principles of natural justice have been considered and reasonableness /evidence base and practical implementation of provisions has been inconsistently applied. Concerned with real-world financial and resource implications, particularly for territorial authority policy and road controlling authority functions.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt City Council	FS11.011	GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agrees with the concerns raised in relation to process, timing, and sequencing of aspects of the notified provisions of PC1. Agrees that there are numerous instances throughout PC1 where little regard to national policy direction and principles of natural justice have been considered and reasonableness /evidence base and practical implementation of provisions has been inconsistently applied.	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS16.015	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS30.011	Pukerua Holdings Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agrees with the concerns raised in relation to process, timing, and sequencing of aspects of the notified provisions of PC1. Agrees that there are numerous instances throughout PC1 where little regard to national policy direction and principles of natural justice have been considered and reasonableness /evidence base and practical implementation of provisions has been inconsistently applied.	Allow	Support submission point in full	No recommendation
	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.853	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	No recommendation
S225.027	Upper Hutt City Council (S225)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers GWRC has not learned from previous feedback provided by the submitter and has repeated structural problems that hamper the progress of the region. Questions the lawfulness and natural justice of the process in light of the signalled change in policy direction by the government. Concerned about practical implementation of the provisions – including the ability for territorial authorities to conduct business as usual plan-making and road controlling authorities activities.	Seeks plan change is amended or paused to remove problematic provisions identified in submission.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt City Council	FS23.855	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S229.001	Te Kamaru Station Ltd (S229)			General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Does not support the Plan Change 1 in its current form and opposes the broadbrush regulatory approach taken and the removal of local decision making. Agrees with the need to improve water quality – where it is poor and where the solutions are within our control – but considers fundamental information is required to do this effectively and equitably. Asks council to recognise the work the submitter has done to date and partner with us in this work rather than regulate us.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Te Kamaru Station Ltd	FS47.024	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	No recommendation
S229.002	Te Kamaru Station Ltd (S229)			General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Concerned with a lack of consultation, content which is difficult for most people to understand, short timeframes to make submissions, and the submission timing just prior to Christmas. Notes opportunities that were missed that would have helped engagement, including: a. Direct mail contact with rural property owners, identified through council's rating database. b. Formal engagement with our Community Board; and c. Provision of information on the GWRC website – more accessible written information, invitation to the PC1 rural webinars/meeting. Additional forms of communication are essential if GWRC really wants meaningful community feedback.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Te Kamaru Station Ltd	FS47.025	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	No recommendation
S229.005	Te Kamaru Station Ltd (S229)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Concerned that the PC1 provisions will result in non-compliances and subsequent prosecution within a short timeframe, noting that the transition time from current land uses is very short, considering the cost of implementation for farmers. Seeks for a collaborative approach to be taken rather than implementation of blanket regulation.	Take an approach based less on blanket rules, modelled scenarios and enforcement and more on empowering and partnering with the community.		Reject
	Te Kamaru Station Ltd	FS47.028	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S231.001	Te Marama Ltd (S231)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Does not support Plan Change 1 in its current form	Not stated		No recommendation
S231.002	Te Marama Ltd (S231)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Oppose the regulatory approach.	Seek council to work with community rather than regulate against it.		Reject
S231.003	Te Marama Ltd (S231)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned about lack of consultation.	Seeks additional forms of consultation are implemented by GWRC.		Reject
S231.006	Te Marama Ltd (S231)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned scale of PC1 provisions means many people will be non-compliant within a short timeframe and find themselves faced with prosecution. Considers transition time between current land use and implementing the proposed changes is very short considering the huge financial implications, farm system change required and land use change required.  	Seeks GWRC take an approach based less on blanket rules, modelled scenarios and enforcement and more on empowering and partnering with the community.		Reject
S232.001	Karen Pearce (S232)			3 Objectives	3.6 Water quality	Oppose		Considers the plan change should not be actioned because of the change in government.	Progress with the plan change should be stopped.		Reject
S233.003	Calum Bradbury (S233)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to introduce to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S234.001	David and Pauline Innes (S234)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers the plan change is inaccessible, difficult to read, and the maps are unclear.  Considers the document is difficult to read and is not fit for purpose. Concerned the connections between the policies and the geographic areas are inadequate.	Not stated		No recommendation
S234.010	David and Pauline Innes (S234)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Notes communication from GWRC on PC1 has been poor. Objects to the short period for submissions and the closing date for submissions being so close to Christmas.	Not stated		No recommendation
S235.003	Shonaugh Wright (S235)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S236.002	Parkvale Road Limited (S236)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers approach by PC1 contrary to directive of NPS-UD	Not stated		No recommendation
S236.004	Parkvale Road Limited (S236)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Concerns PC1 gives effect to NPS-FM which if removed, will be out of step with higher order policy direction. Considers this should give Council pause for thought in progressing with PC1.	Not stated		Reject
S240.004	Porirua City Council (S240)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers the use of the prohibited activity rule is a blunt instrument and careful consideration should be given to its use, particularly when considering the tensions that exist between national policy statements for freshwater and urban development (noting that the NPS-UD requires consideration be given to out of sequence urban development). Considers there is insufficient evidence to support the approach taken, especially considering the prohibited activity status approach. Considers the definition and associated provisions may result in unintended consequences with no consenting pathway to consider a proposal located in these areas that may have positive outcomes, including positive outcomes for freshwater.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Porirua City Council	FS16.032	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	The use of the prohibited activity rule is a blunt instrument which conflicts with the NPS-UD and in particular Policy 8 and as such could prevent TAs from meeting their ongoing requirements under the NPS-UD.  This provision is likely to lead to unintended consequences. Prohibited activity status will affect the ability of territorial authorities to make strategic decisions on growth and create difficulties with minor changes to urban zoning. The prohibited status has not been reasonably justified, and that alternatives that could achieve the strategic intent of the rule without requiring a dual plan change process. The prohibited status removes a consenting pathway for proposals that may have positive outcomes for the community and for freshwater. The s32 evaluation suggest that contaminants can be addressed through a combination of treatment and financial contributions, therefore prohibited activity status inappropriate. The requirement for two plan changes to enable greenfield development on the basis that it will create challenges for the private sector's responsiveness to the housing needs, is onerous and costly, and could jeopardise the economic viability of development and supply of affordable housing. The prohibition laden objective and policy framework (both in NRP and RPS) would render future plan change an impossibility due to not implementing the higher order documents, and any section 32 analysis would be at risk of identifying development as being contrary to objectives and policies in these plans. GWRC should be considering each development individually, based on the merits and the impacts it has on the environment and any mitigation propose.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 or remove prohibited activity status for greenfield development.	No recommendation
	Porirua City Council	FS9.101	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S240.008	Porirua City Council (S240)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers the PDF format of PC1 and the NRP, with no hyperlinked definitions and with A4 maps in appendices, is out of step with current technology and best practice where plans are presented in digital formats. Considers converting PC1 and the NRP to an eplan format will improve regulatory compliance and reduce costs through time savings for plan users.	Request that Greater Wellington convert both the PC1 and the NRP to an eplan format as soon as practicable to enable plan users to efficiently find information		No recommendation
	Porirua City Council	FS16.038	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	The PDF format of PC1 and the NRP, with no hyperlinked definitions and with A4 maps in appendices, is out of step with current technology and best practice where plans are presented in digital formats.   PC1 and the NRP should be converted to a plan format will improve regulatory compliance and reduce costs through time savings for plan users.	Allow	Request that Greater Wellington convert both the PC1 and the NRP to an eplan format as soon as practicable to enable plan users to efficiently find information	No recommendation
	Porirua City Council	FS9.105	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
	Porirua City Council	FS36.012	Wellington City Council	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S241.001	Pukerua Property Group Ltd (S241)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes entirety of PC1; specifically Amendments to Chapters 5.2 and 5.3 – Discharges to land and water and Land use rules; and Amendments to Chapter 9 – Te Awarua-o-Porirua	Withdrawal of PC1		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS13.002	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML also considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti which will also allow time to incorporate any review on national planning documents as indicated will occur by the present government coalition.	Allow in part	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject
	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS47.030	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S241.002	Pukerua Property Group Ltd (S241)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers PC1 has significant consequences for affordability of housing and land development in Wellington Region. Notes addition of a significant financial contribution for new residential units will have flow on housing affordability effects in the region and is inconsistent with Objective 2 and associated policies of NPS-UD. Concerned this has not been considered in the Section 32 report and completely ignores the affordability implications of the proposed changes, despite this being a key objective of the NPS-UD.	Withdrawal of PC1		Reject
	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS13.003	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support in part	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML also considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti which will also allow time to incorporate any review on national planning documents as indicated will occur by the present government coalition.	Allow in part	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S241.003	Pukerua Property Group Ltd (S241)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Notes haste in PC1 preparation with reference to the Clause 16 memo amending errors in rules. Highlights poor approach to planning policy.	Withdrawal of PC1		Reject
	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS13.004	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML also considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti which will also allow time to incorporate any review on national planning documents as indicated will occur by the present government coalition.	Allow in part	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject
	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS47.031	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S241.004	Pukerua Property Group Ltd (S241)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Notes the agreements of the government coalition to remove/replace legislation and suggest withdrawal of PC1 to allow a comprehensive review of PC1 provisions as they relate to national guidance. </>Because of those factors the submitter suggests the plan change is premature	Withdrawal of PC1		Reject
	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS13.005	Land Matters Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	LML considers that there has been a failure to carry out an evaluation to the level necessary to determine if proposed change 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and National Policy Statement – Freshwater Water as well as achieving the outcomes of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. LML also considers that PC1 be delayed until all Whaitua processes have been completed – including the Whaitua Kāpiti which will also allow time to incorporate any review on national planning documents as indicated will occur by the present government coalition.	Allow in part	LML supports withdrawal of PC1 to enable genuine consultation to occur, including with: the development community; landowners of greenfield landowners whereby the land has been identified as suitable for future urban use but not necessarily zoned future urban or urban; and communities who have yet to have freshwater management units.	Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Pukerua Property Group Ltd	FS47.032	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S242.001	Anya Pollock (S242)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports in full the submission of F.O.W.K.S. (Friends of Waipāhihi Karori Stream)	Not Stated		No recommendation
S242.002	Anya Pollock (S242)			General comments	General comments - water quality improvements	Support		 Notes that environmental community values of water bodies have been compromised but are worthy of collective action to improve them. Considers collective action of the regional plan can improve water bodies.  Supports Plan Change One and supports the efforts to further environmental education.   Supports funding sufficient support and enforcement activities. Considers the proposed Plan Change consolidates planning provisions that are about the environment into one place. Agrees that a consistent approach should be used across the region, both for the environment and to provide greater consistency and certainty for developers.  Considers that territorial authorities need to revisit their plans, strategies and investments to comply with the environmental standards and improvement pathways set in the regional plan. Supports regional direction, as ease and efficiency of consenting is best achieved by regional and territorial agencies working together to design and deliver integrated services across all of the planning and consenting requirements. Suggests legacy infrastructure should not be excluded from the need to reduce its impacts.	Supports the direction in Plan Change 1.		Accept in part
S242.004	Anya Pollock (S242)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Support		Supports Plan Change One regardless of financial cost Notes that GWRC can seek new sources of funding with the right leadership.	Not Stated		No recommendation
S243.033	Land Matters Limited (S243)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 has been hastily prepared and is having unintended effects as a result of drafting errors, and are creating significant implications for housing affordability and land viability already due to the immediate legal effect of provisions.	Withdrawal of PC1 to allow for a comprehensive review of provisions of plan change as they relate to national guidance		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Land Matters Limited	FS16.013	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Land Matters Limited	FS38.009	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.” A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Land Matters Limited	FS47.035	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S243.034	Land Matters Limited (S243)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes the agreements of the government coalition to remove/replace legislation and suggest withdrawal of PC1 to allow a comprehensive review of PC1 provisions as they relate to national guidance.	Withdrawal of PC1 to allow for a comprehensive review of provisions of plan change as they relate to national guidance.		Reject
	Land Matters Limited	FS16.014	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Land Matters Limited	FS38.010	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: "Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region." A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Land Matters Limited	FS47.036	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S244.003	Andrew Esler (S244)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S246.001	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Broadly supports PPC1 and its focus on water quality and ecological health objectives to implement the NPS-FM.	Not stated		Accept in part
S246.007	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes NRP must also be consistent with the Water Services Entities Act 2022 (section 253) provisions for a transport corridor manager that owns or operates a transport stormwater system.	Not stated		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S246.012	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		The Water Services Act 2021 introduces new mandatory requirements to monitor and report on the environmental performance of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater networks and their operators. Environmental limits and targets that affect three waters infrastructure need to align with the environmental performance measures, targets and standards set by Taumata Arowai in accordance with the Water Services Act 2021, specifically the Network Environmental Performance Measures. Taumata Arowai are currently drafting standards and consent conditions for wastewater networks, overflows and treatment plants and intend to introduce wastewater and stormwater measures at a future date. GWRC should consult with them on any proposed measures, for example the requirements in Schedule 32: Wastewater Improvement Strategy, to ensure consistency in requirements.	GWRC consult with Taumata Arowai on any proposed measures, for example the requirements in Schedule 32: Wastewater Improvement Strategy, to ensure consistency in requirements.		No recommendation
S246.013	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes inconsistencies in the requirements and the consent and compliance process across consent authorities creates inefficiencies, increases the regulatory burden for designers, technology providers and service providers.	Reduce inconsistencies to avoid situations where applicants receive substantially different requests for information, or even different decisions, when making applications for the same type of system.		No recommendation
S246.014	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes Regional councils will remain responsible for regulation, compliance, and enforcement of fresh, waste and storm water quality and natural hazards policy and planning under new regulatory tools from new economic and quality water regulators.	Council must enforce rules and plans in place and proposed – this includes, but not limited to, wastewater treatment plant consenting, sediment and erosion control, and land-use planning restrictions on high-risk susceptible land.		No recommendation
S246.016	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers engagement is important for all stages of the water sector- from Te Mana o Te Wai practitioners, to treatment plant designers and operators, to on-site contractors managing sediment and erosion control conditions.	Engage further with utility operators as plan users to ensure what is proposed in the plans is workable.		No recommendation
S246.017	Water New Zealand (S246)			General comments	General comments - definitions	Not Stated		Supports inclusion of terms of terms such as containment standard, core allocation, hydrological control, impervious surfaces, stormwater catchment, stormwater treatment system, wastewater network catchment and wet weather overflows.	Not stated		Accept in part
S246.019	Water New Zealand (S246)			3 Objectives	Amendments to Chapter 3 - Objectives	Support		Is pleased to see the amendments to Chapter 3 (Objectives) includes tables listing quantifiable measures for contact recreation, Māori customary use, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai objectives. Considers including numerical values for macrophytes, periphyton, biomass, invertebrate, fish and mahinga kai species in rivers, streams and lakes is a smart way of demonstrating achievement of the first priority of Te Mana o te Wai.	Not stated		No recommendation
S246.020	Water New Zealand (S246)			3 Objectives	Objective O18: Rivers, lakes, natural wetlands and coastal water are suitable for contact recreation and Māori customary use.	Support		Support the changes to expressly list the type of water body (rivers, lakes, natural wetlands and coastal water) and the activities these are suitable for (contact recreation, Māori customary use, mahinga kai, biodiversity, and aquatic ecosystem health).	Not stated		No recommendation
S246.021	Water New Zealand (S246)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Not Stated		Support the changes to expressly list the type of water body (rivers, lakes, natural wetlands and coastal water) and the activities these are suitable for (contact recreation, Māori customary use, mahinga kai, biodiversity, and aquatic ecosystem health).	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S246.022	Water New Zealand (S246)			3 Objectives	Objective O25: Outstanding water bodies identified in Schedule A (outstanding water bodies) and their significant values are protected and restored.	Not Stated		Support the changes to expressly list the type of water body (rivers, lakes, natural wetlands and coastal water) and the activities these are suitable for (contact recreation, Māori customary use, mahinga kai, biodiversity, and aquatic ecosystem health).	Not stated		No recommendation
S246.039	Water New Zealand (S246)			6 Other methods	Method M36: Freshwater Action Plan programme.	Support		Supports in terms of giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai, notes an error in the numbering, and believes this clause 6.16 should be 6.18.	Not stated		Accept
S247.002	Carrus Corporation Ltd (S247)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports initiatives to improve the quality of freshwater and the state of freshwater and coastal environments.  Opposes PC1 in its current form and requests it be withdrawn to allow for genuine consultation to occur, consideration of matters raised through this submission process, and consideration of the new direction from the central Government.  Considers PC1 does not provide sufficient certainty or clarity in the implementation of rules  Considers PC1 will have significant financial impacts particularly on pre-committed development projects.  Considers PC1 does not provide sufficient certainty or clarity in the implementation of rules.  	Withdraw PC1		Reject
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS16.004	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS27.1191	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS38.005	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.” A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS47.037	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S247.004	Carrus Corporation Ltd (S247)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers adequate consultation was not carried out with the development community and is concerned the draft version was not sent to the development community despite Subpart 1 of the NPS-FM requiring regional councils to engage with communities and tangata whenua  Considers that given the impact and extent of the proposed changes, the publication of a draft plan and consultation with the development community would minimise potential appeals and aid towards a more workable and functioning Natural Resources Plan.	Withdraw PC1		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS16.006	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS27.1193	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or	Disallow	Not stated	Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

								discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.			
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS34.002	Orogen Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	PC1 presents unworkable policies listed in our original decision. The impact of PC1 on the civil construction sector and the development community have not been considered.	Allow in part	Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path to establish a workable NRP as sought by the submitter.	Reject
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS38.007	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: "Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region." A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS47.039	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S247.005	Carrus Corporation Ltd (S247)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC should wait to see what changes to the NPS-FM are proposed by the new government coalition to ensure PC1 is in alignment.   Considers PC1 was rushed as the plan does not need to be notified until 31st December 2024.   Considers the imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM as there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change has to be notified.	Withdraw PC1		Reject
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS16.008	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.   There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

							significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.				
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS27.1194	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS38.008	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: "Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region." A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Carrus Corporation Ltd	FS47.040	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian's lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region's urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation's objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S248.001	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (S248)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports note under the Chapter 8 heading 'Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara Section 8.2: Policies', as it provides for a range of existing operative policies to continue to apply within the whaitua, including those that recognise the beneficial use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	<p>Retain as notified</p>		Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S249.009	Isabella Cawthorn (S249)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers any duplication between the statutory requirements, plans, policies and processes of the Water Services Entities Act 2022 and requirements of the RMA, Spatial Planning Act, Natural Built Environments Act (including regional councils' freshwater plans) should be avoided.   Considers There's a similar potential for duplication between the requirement for asset management plans (AMPs),.  Suggests if AMPs are not doing this job, they should be rewritten so they're strategically tied to manifesting the objectives of the relevant FMU or pFMU.  	Avoid duplication of legislation		Reject
S249.012	Isabella Cawthorn (S249)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Support		Considers the costs imposed on developers are important. Supports imposed costs that prevent developments from affecting wai as it will encourage them to innovate and improve processes, or exit the market.  	Not stated		No recommendation
S249.014	Isabella Cawthorn (S249)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Considers cost should not be pushed back on the environment. Considers there is an opportunity for a better system to be built with PC1.	Not stated		No recommendation
S250.001	John and Jacqueline Diggins (S250)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports ensuring high water quality and protecting waterways from sediment discharge but questions the data GWRC is relying on and the lack of consultation.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S250.002	John and Jacqueline Diggins (S250)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned about lack of consultation from GWRC and onerous set of requirements impacting rural land owners.	Withdraw PC1 and then engage with representative groups and wider public.		Reject
S250.004	John and Jacqueline Diggins (S250)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Suggests GWRC is contravening the Bill of Rights and there is erosion of property rights.   Concerned PC1 is proposing sanctions against property owners on factors they have no control over.   Suggests within any given catchment there will be upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point and penalised accordingly.	Remove all clauses in PC1 where GWRC has failed to establish an adequate network of monitoring sites.		No recommendation
S251.003	Peka Peka Farm Limited (S251)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Concerns the replacement of the NPS-FM creates uncertainty where higher order policy PC1 is giving effect to is subject to change. PC1 already takes a more restrictive position than what the NPS-FM and is further out of step with the higher order policy it is seeking to give effect to.	Not stated		Reject
S252.002	Thames Pacific (S252)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Supports initiatives to improve the quality of freshwater and the state of freshwater and coastal environments.  Considers PC1 will have significant financial impacts particularly on pre-committed development projects  Opposes PC1 in its current form and requests it be withdrawn to allow for genuine consultation to occur, consideration of matters raised through this submission process, and consideration of the new direction from the central Government.  Considers PC1 does not provide sufficient certainty or clarity in the implementation of rules  Considers PC1 will have significant financial impacts particularly on pre-committed development projects  Considers PC1 will hinder growth through the prohibition of unplanned greenfield development	Withdraw PC1		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Thames Pacific	FS47.041	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S252.004	Thames Pacific (S252)			General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Considers adequate consultation was not carried out with the development community and is concerned the draft version was not sent to the development community despite Subpart 1 of the NPS-FM requiring regional councils to engage with communities and tangata whenua.   Considers that given the impact and extent of the proposed changes, the publication of a draft plan and consultation with the development community would minimise potential appeals and aid towards a more workable and functioning Natural Resources Plan.	Withdraw PC1		Reject
	Thames Pacific	FS47.042	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

								increased electricity generation from renewable sources;			
S252.005	Thames Pacific (S252)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC should wait to see what changes to the NPS-FM are proposed by the new government coalition to ensure PC1 is in alignment. Considers PC1 was rushed as the plan does not need to be notified until 31st December 2024. Considers the imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM as there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change has to be notified.	Withdraw PC1		Reject
	Thames Pacific	FS47.043	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S253.003	John Western (S253)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports PC1 and the initiatives to improve water quality in the catchment.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part
S254.001	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd (S254)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers there has been a lack of consultation on PC1. Considers little or no consideration has been given to the NPS-UD, and that there is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by territorial authorities giving effect to the NPS-UD through urban area intensification and green field areas.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	FS16.009	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that: “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.” A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared. There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA. PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed. The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed. The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	No recommendation
S254.002	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd (S254)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers there is little or no consideration given in the plan change to the NPS-Urban Development 2020 that has equal status in the RMA plan hierarchy.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	FS16.010	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - consultation		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.  There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.   PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.   The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	No recommendation
S254.004	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd (S254)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose	Opposes the plan change.	The plan change be withdrawn or alternatively the hearing be suspended until the direction of the new government is clear.		Reject	

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	FS16.012	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - overall		Not stated	Agree that inadequate consultation was undertaken before PC1 was notified. As a result, PC1 is contrary to Subpart 1/Clause 3.2(1) of the NPS-FW which specifies that:   “Every regional council must engage with communities and tangata whenua to determine how Te Mana o te Wai applies to water bodies and freshwater ecosystems in the region.”  A draft should have been released for consultation with the community, including the development community. Doing so would limit appeals and ensure a more workable less idealistic document is prepared.  There is a disconnect between the outcomes being sought by TAs giving effect to the NPS-UD and PC1. Even though the NPS-FW and the NPS-UD have the same status under the RMA.  PC1 conflicts with the intended outcomes of the NPS-UD, being to provide for well-functioning urban environments, including both through infill, and greenfield developments. NPS-UD Policy 6 requires planning decisions that affect urban environments to consider the benefits of urban development and the contributions that development makes to provide or realise development capacity, and this has not been sufficiently considered in PC1 as economic impacts have not been adequately assessed.  The number of significant issues with PC1 is a clear indication that there was a lack of meaningful consultation (as required by the NPS-FM) and that its preparation was rushed.  The imposition of new rules with immediate legal effect is inconsistent with subpart 1 of the NPS-FM. As there is still a significant amount of time before the plan change must be notified (31st December 2024) and the new government is proposing changes so it should be withdrawn.	Allow	Withdraw PC1	Reject
	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	FS29.008	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	PPFL considers that central government direction has changed, or is in the process of changing, and pausing progress on PC1 will allow the Council to better take stock of central government direction. PC1 should either give effect to updated central government direction, or be withdrawn and replaced with a Plan Change that achieves this outcome.	Allow	S254.004 in its entirety.	Reject
	Best Farm Ltd, Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd & Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	FS47.044	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - overall		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

								increased electricity generation from renewable sources;			
S255.001	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned with lack of consultation with key landowners and the development community during the preparation of PC1.	Withdraw PC1 and consult all relevant parties before releasing a replacement.		Reject
	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	FS34.033	Orogen Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support	Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path to establish a workable NRP as sought by the submitter.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path to establish a workable NRP as sought by the submitter.	Reject
	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	FS47.045	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S255.002	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Little or no consideration of NPS-UD which has equal status and there is a disjoint between the outcomes being sought by the Territorial Authorities actively promoting development as required by the NPS-UD and the restrictive approach WRC is proposing via PC1.	Withdraw PC1 and review and amend all provisions in light of this issue.		Reject
S255.003	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 uses vague language like "where practicable" which lacks clarity as to when stormwater treatment systems will and won't be required.	Review all provisions to remove or eliminate vague language.		Reject
S255.004	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 repeats the same objectives, policies and rules with a different heading for a different catchment and this is an unnecessary complication  Suggests a set of objectives, policies and rules which apply to all catchments and supplementary ones where a specific objective, policy or rule as necessary for a specific catchment.	Withdraw PC1, review all objectives, policies and rules and remove all duplications by combining them wherever possible.		Reject
S255.017	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			3 Objectives	Objective O2	Amend		Notes the objectives refers to improving water quality. Resource consents are assessed in terms of their effects on the environment being "less than minor", "minor" or "more than minor". While positive effects can be used offset negative adverse effects and s108(10) provides for financial contributions for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to offset any adverse effect, there is no requirement for the effects of a development upon the environment to be positive.  	All objectives and polies and rules should be reviewed and rewritten so that it is clear that improvements in water quality are not required but are encouraged.		Accept in part
S255.018	Woodridge Holdings Ltd (S255)			4 Policies	Policy P30: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai.	Amend		Suggests policy is missing words, uses vague words and cannot be complied with if there are any indigenous aquatic species and indigenous birds present.	Amend wording "Manage the adverse effects of use and development <strong>[of land] </strong> on biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai to: ..." and be more specific by removing the words "where practical" as they are vague.  The wording or Item (e) relates to "Critical habitat for indigenous aquatic species and indigenous birds". But the wording covers every situation, not just "critical" ones such as breeding and migration. As a result, if there is any indigenous aquatic species or bird species in the area compliance cannot be achieved. It also uses the vague wording "where practical."		Reject
S256.001	Waste Management NZ Limited (S256)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports maintaining and improving water quality in the Wellington Region, but considers PC1 goes beyond the control of land for the purpose of maintaining the quantity and quality of water bodies and coastal waters, and steps into strategic planning and controlling the location of land use development.  Considers without the amendments proposed by the submitter to PC1, the provisions will not: a) promote the sustainable management of resources or achieve the purchase of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; b) enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community; c) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; d) achieve integrated management of the effects of use, development or e) protection of land and resources in the Wellington Region; e) enable the efficient use and development of Waste Management's assets and operations, and of those resources; and f) appropriately achieve the objectives of the Regional Policy Statement, in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Waste Management NZ Limited	FS27.1045	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S26.003	Christine Stanley (S26)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerns with the ability of PC1 to achieve the desired outcomes	Not stated		No recommendation
S26.004	Christine Stanley (S26)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerns with GWRC's ability to monitor, manage or respond to pollution	Not stated		No recommendation
S26.005	Christine Stanley (S26)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned costs of implementing PC1 will reduce the ability of landowners to invest in improvements for water quality and that better outcomes would be achieved by encouraging and rewarding good land management.	Not stated		No recommendation
S26.007	Christine Stanley (S26)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Supports Porirua City Council's submissions regarding the need for a digital format similar to those of ePlans. Recommends converting the format to improve efficiency, regulatory compliance and reduced costs for users.	Convert to eplan format		No recommendation
S261.001	Forest & Bird (S261)			General comments	General comments - definitions	Not Stated		Considers amendments are required for some definitions which set out limits or define key terms inappropriately. Notes many definitions cross-reference to definitions in other legislation, and seeks that the text is set out instead for ease of use.	Amend definitions which cross-reference to other legislation to the actual text for those definitions.		Reject
	Forest & Bird	FS9.328	New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	General comments	General comments - definitions		Oppose	Not stated	Disallow	Not stated	Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Forest & Bird	FS27.620	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - definitions		Support	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Allow	Not stated	Reject
S262.002	Southern North Island Wood Council (S262)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers that PC1 is inconsistent with the whitua committee recommendations and is too onerous.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Southern North Island Wood Council	FS50.135	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group (‘NZCF’)	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	NZCF supports the submission and agrees that Proposed Plan Change 1 is inconsistent with the whitua committee recommendations. NZCF considers that greater weight should be given to these recommendations in Proposed Plan Change 1.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S263.006	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group (‘NZCF’) (S263)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Submitter notes Proposed Plan Change 1 WRPS is to give effect to the NPSFM and is therefore a freshwater planning instrument (in part). Notes that submissions on Proposed Change 1 are currently being heard and the final form of the WRPS (incorporating decisions on Proposed Change 1) is not known.  Considers PC1 is also a freshwater planning instrument that is to give effect to the NPSFM. Considers it can be concluded that the final form of provisions in the WRPS as a result of Plan Change 1 to the WRPS will be relevant, and need to be given effect to, in the NRP. Considers that, because content of the WRPS that gives effect to the NPSFM is yet to be determined, it is premature and inefficient to notify NRP provisions that are also to give effect to the NPSFM.	<p>Seeks that PC1 is withdrawn (or the Proposed Plan Change is not included in the NRP).</p>		Reject
	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group (‘NZCF’)	FS23.377	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird’s submission points and specific relief.	Accept

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S265.001	The Maymorn Collective - Amanda and Rami Mounla - Marita Manns Trustee Limited (S265)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S265.003	The Maymorn Collective - Amanda and Rami Mounla - Marita Manns Trustee Limited (S265)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S265.004	The Maymorn Collective - Amanda and Rami Mounla - Marita Manns Trustee Limited (S265)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S265.005	The Maymorn Collective - Amanda and Rami Mounla - Marita Manns Trustee Limited (S265)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government’s 2023 election platform sought to ‘unlock land for housing’ stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for ‘30 years’ worth of housing demand immediately’.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S266.001	The Maymorn Collective - Tamara Hrstich (S266)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S266.003	The Maymorn Collective - Tamara Hrstich (S266)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S266.004	The Maymorn Collective - Tamara Hrstich (S266)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S266.005	The Maymorn Collective - Tamara Hrstich (S266)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government’s 2023 election platform sought to ‘unlock land for housing’ stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for ‘30 years’ worth of housing demand immediately’.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S267.001	The Maymorn Collective - Marluk Agistments Ltd - Richard and Lynn Bialy (S267)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S267.003	The Maymorn Collective - Marluk Agistments Ltd - Richard and Lynn Bialy (S267)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S267.004	The Maymorn Collective - Marluk Agistments Ltd - Richard and Lynn Bialy (S267)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S267.005	The Maymorn Collective - Marluk Agistments Ltd - Richard and Lynn Bialy (S267)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government’s 2023 election platform sought to ‘unlock land for housing’ stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for ‘30 years’ worth of housing demand immediately’.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S268.001	The Maymorn Collective - Bruce Bates and Kim			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Cheeseman (S268)										
S268.003	The Maymorn Collective - Bruce Bates and Kim Cheeseman (S268)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S268.004	The Maymorn Collective - Bruce Bates and Kim Cheeseman (S268)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S268.005	The Maymorn Collective - Bruce Bates and Kim Cheeseman (S268)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government’s 2023 election platform sought to ‘unlock land for housing’ stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for ‘30 years’ worth of housing demand immediately’.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S269.001	The Maymorn Collective - Paul and Megan Persico (S269)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S269.003	The Maymorn Collective - Paul and Megan Persico (S269)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S269.004	The Maymorn Collective - Paul and Megan Persico (S269)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S269.005	The Maymorn Collective - Paul and Megan Persico (S269)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government’s 2023 election platform sought to ‘unlock land for housing’ stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for ‘30 years’ worth of housing demand immediately’.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S27.001	Lara Keane (S27)			5.2 and 5.3 Discharges to land and water and land use rules	5.2 and 5.3 Discharges to land and water and land use rules	Support		Supports PC1 provisions regarding water and the Te Whanganui-a-Tara catchment objectives. Seeks for beaches to be swimmable year-round. Supports promoting activities on brownfield activity over greenfield activity. Considers that collaboration is necessary for the resourcing of improving water. Suggests councils collectively resource enforcement, science and complementary policy tools.	Retain as notified [inferred]		Accept in part
S270.001	The Maymorn Collective - Dean and Michelle Spicer and Benjamin Shaw (as Trustees for Bridgewater Trust) (S270)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S270.003	The Maymorn Collective - Dean and Michelle Spicer and Benjamin Shaw (as Trustees for Bridgewater Trust) (S270)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S270.004	The Maymorn Collective - Dean and Michelle Spicer and Benjamin Shaw (as Trustees for Bridgewater Trust) (S270)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S270.005	The Maymorn Collective - Dean and Michelle Spicer and Benjamin Shaw (as Trustees for Bridgewater Trust) (S270)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government's 2023 election platform sought to 'unlock land for housing' stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for '30 years' worth of housing demand immediately'.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S271.001	The Maymorn Collective - John and Susan Boyle (S271)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S271.003	The Maymorn Collective - John and Susan Boyle (S271)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S271.004	The Maymorn Collective - John and Susan Boyle (S271)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S271.005	The Maymorn Collective - John and Susan Boyle (S271)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government's 2023 election platform sought to 'unlock land for housing' stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for '30 years' worth of housing demand immediately'.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S272.001	The Maymorn Collective - Philip and Teresa Eales (S272)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers GWRC have not adequately consulted with affected landowners or considered proposed UHCC Plan Change 50, and PC1 is inconsistent with PC50r.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S272.003	The Maymorn Collective - Philip and Teresa Eales (S272)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers the environmental and social benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake a detailed economic, social and cultural impact assessment, that is publicly disclosed, and this is used to inform the revised plan change.		Reject
S272.004	The Maymorn Collective - Philip and Teresa Eales (S272)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers PC1 contains errors in drafting and fails to define what some key terms mean.   Considers approach prevented stakeholders from understanding what is proposed and being able to be consulted and making well informed submissions.	Redraft PC1 correctly and renotify for consultation.		Reject
S272.005	The Maymorn Collective - Philip and Teresa Eales (S272)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Notes new Government's 2023 election platform sought to 'unlock land for housing' stating Councils in major towns and cities will be required to zone land for '30 years' worth of housing demand immediately'.	Revise any decision that prohibits the ability to unlock land for housing as proposed by PC1, to take into account, the directive of central Government policy initiatives, such as changes to the Resource Management Act.		No recommendation
S273.001	Robert Pavis-Hall, Gaynor Rowswell, Katie Norman, Megan Norman (S273)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned about the lack of communication and consultation around PC1.	Withdraw PC1.		Reject
S273.002	Robert Pavis-Hall, Gaynor Rowswell, Katie Norman, Megan Norman (S273)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Suggests that it might be prudent to delay PC1 until the new govt makes a decision on legislation/policy direction.	Withdraw PC1 until the new govt has confirmed new legislation.		Reject
S273.006	Robert Pavis-Hall, Gaynor Rowswell, Katie Norman, Megan Norman (S273)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers the consultation period too short due to lack of prior knowledge, the size and the technicality of the report.   Notes that consultation period also too close to Christmas when people are winding down for the year.	Withdraw PC1 to allow proper consultation when new government legislation is clear.		Reject
S273.008	Robert Pavis-Hall, Gaynor Rowswell, Katie Norman, Megan Norman (S273)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Reserves the right to add to this submission as considers consultation period too short.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S275.001	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S275)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Concerned at the scale of changes proposed in the Plan change and the timeframes for implementation. Considers the section 32 analysis has not considered the costs associated with introducing such wide-ranging changes with immediate legal effect, including the cost of projects which are in construction and/or budgeted for this earthworks season but which have no allocated funding for additional consents and/or more restrictive working conditions	Remove the immediate legal effect of provisions via a variation.  Any further alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought.		Reject
	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS23.695	Forest & Bird	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Submission points would likely result in the further loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of waterways throughout Wellington and be inconsistent with higher order documents, including the NPS-FM, the NPS-IB, the NZCPS, and the RMA (including s6).	Disallow	Oppose the whole of the submission and all relief sought unless otherwise stated or where points are consistent with Forest & Bird's submission points and specific relief.	Accept
S276.001	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned about the lack of consultation on PC1.	Withdraw PC1		Reject
S276.002	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Questions the legality of the process undertaken by GWRC, citing recent Environment Court decisions.	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat and demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation
S276.003	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers in any given catchment there will be upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites. Notes that the Managaroa catchment and Akatarawa Valley are complex networks of waterways and all properties in the catchment will be assessed, based on the downstream results from this single monitoring point and penalised accordingly. Considers this unacceptable.	Remove all such clauses where GWRC has failed to establish an adequate network of monitoring sites.		No recommendation
S276.004	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has decided that freshwater Management is pre-eminent and over-rules other national Policy Statements. Considers GW has erroneously decided to regard clauses (a), (b), and (c) of the Te Mana o te Wai hierarchy as mutually exclusive rather than regarding them as equally weighted and inter-dependent.  Considers that GWRC has chosen to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation and has exacerbated that choice by taking in to account an opinion by one Whaitua in respect of levels of copper and zinc in stormwater which are not recognised in NPS-FM.	Give equal weighting to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject
S276.005	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers there is confusion among GWRC staff and that contradictory advice has been given relating to the immediate legal effect of provisions and the fencing of waterways.	Delete the statement that all rules have immediate legal effect and substitute "all rules in this plan change will be held in abeyance pending the plan change passing through all stages required by the RMA".		Reject
S276.007	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey Lynn Browne (S276)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers there are errors in drafting which change the intended meaning	Review and undertake an edit of PC1		Reject
S276.011	Jody Louise Sinclair, Joshua William Lowry, Anne Friedarika Sinclair & Tracey			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers there is no quantification for the benefits or quantification of the costs and that just because GWRC consider they are obliged to do something is not a valid reason to have no idea of the value or cost of the exercise.	Produce a thorough cost-benefit exercise and recognise ratepayers are not a limitless source of funds.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Lynn Browne (S276)										
S277.001	Craig Innes (S277)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers the plan change is inaccessible, difficult to read, and the maps are unclear. Considers the document is difficult to read and is not fit for purpose. Concerned the connections between the policies and the geographic areas are inadequate.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S277.008	Craig Innes (S277)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Notes communication from GWRC on PC1 has been poor. Objects to the short period for submissions and the closing date for submissions being so close to Christmas.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S278.001	Alex Pfeffer (S278)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports maintaining a high level of water quality. Concerned new regulations are blanket rules that are unnecessary in some catchments, would be unfairly applied, and prevent further development of productive use of land.	Not Stated		No recommendation
S28.001	Jonny Osborne (S28)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		The submitter supports the direction in Plan Change 1.	Councillors to continue to support these changes through to their implementation.		Accept in part
S28.002	Jonny Osborne (S28)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers addressing matters like aging and leaky infrastructure, inappropriate urban development and poor land use practices takes a strong (and enforced) regulatory backbone.	Not stated		No recommendation
S28.003	Jonny Osborne (S28)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports measures that will end harmful wastewater entering directly into streams and coastal waters, water sensitive urban design implemented as the norm across the region, and rural and forestry practices improved so they no longer harm waterways and the wildlife.	Not stated		No recommendation
S28.005	Jonny Osborne (S28)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		The submitter considers the costs of inaction outweigh those of action, and ultimately those costs fall on future generations.	Not stated		No recommendation
S280.001	.Peter Handford (S280)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers focus of PC1 should be achieving environmental outcomes, not prescriptive blanket removal of land uses from particular areas	Not stated.		No recommendation
	.Peter Handford	FS50.114	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group ('NZCF')	General comments	General comments - overall		Support	NZCF supports the submission and considers that the effects of activities should be managed, rather than the activities prevented.	Allow	Not stated	No recommendation
S281.001	Kirsty Gill (S281)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Concerned PC1 puts excessive restrictions on land owners.	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S281.002	Kirsty Gill (S281)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers the community has received insufficient information about the plan. Considers that meetings and deadlines to lodge a submission have been unfair and difficult to meet.	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S281.006	Kirsty Gill (S281)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Opposes the broad-brush regulatory approach taken under PC1 and the removal of local decision making from the community. Agrees with the need to improve water quality where it is poor and where solutions are within landowners control. Considers fundamental evidence is required to do this effectively and equitably. Suggests GWRC recognise the personal work done by landowners and partner with the community rather than regulate against them. Notes they will be providing an additional submission in February.	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S282.004	Pat van Berkel (S282)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Recognises four TA's will be required for PC1 and Whaitua's recommendations and notes addressing water issues in cities is vital.	<p>Not stated</p>		No recommendation
S283.003	Todd Henry (S283)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and water quality improvement initiatives.	Requests that GWRC initiatives are carried through to the operative plan, particularly where they protect and restore ecosystem health, contact recreation values, natural form and character, and amenity.		Accept in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S285.001	Civil Contractors New Zealand (S285)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Considers PC1 will have significant impacts on the region's civil construction industry, will result in increased costs for ratepayers, and is unlikely to result in better environmental or consenting outcomes.	Not stated		No recommendation
	Civil Contractors New Zealand	FS35.001	Goodman Contractors Limited	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support	I also support the rest of the points made in the Civil Contractors New Zealand submission, and ask you to consider the impacts this plan change will have on horizontal construction across the region, which will increase costs across the board, including housing, transport and water construction. Overall, I feel direct consultation with the civil construction industry has been absent in the creation of this plan, and is required to make sure the Natural Resources Plan is fit for purpose. I also feel that the consultation process is very difficult to follow, ruling most contractors out of having a say. Accordingly, I request the plan change does not go ahead.	Allow	Plan change 1 does not go ahead	No recommendation
	Civil Contractors New Zealand	FS32.001	PCL Contracting Ltd as part of CCNZ	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support	The potential economic impact to many companies will be significant, causing not only loss of businesses, reduced projects and housing, further delays in the consenting process with considerable impact on social outcomes. With reduced work, companies will be forced to restructure, causing an increase in unemployment. As with any proposed changes the proposal must take a holistic approach to considering all areas of impact.	Allow	Considers PC1 will have significant impacts on the region's civil construction industry, will result in increased costs for ratepayers, and is unlikely to result in better environmental or consenting outcomes.	No recommendation
	Civil Contractors New Zealand	FS34.012	Orogen Limited	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support	The blanket policies ceasing winter works, influencing cleanfill, influencing stormwater will create greater costs for consenting and delivery as a short active construction year is now imposed by PC1 following a longer more complex planning pathway. The industry is effective with environmental management. Consultation will enable stronger policies to be established than the blanket detrimental policy in PC1. A risk based approach to earthworks provides a better outcome for industry and compliance.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path to establish a workable NRP as sought by the submitter. Withdraw PC1 and provide a consultation path for a workable NRP.	No recommendation
	Civil Contractors New Zealand	FS49.001	Multi Civil Contractors Ltd	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support	Not stated	Allow	Request that plan change does not go ahead	No recommendation
S286.001	Taranaki Whānui (S286)			General comments	General comments - definitions	Amend		Considers consequential changes may be required to provide for the relief sought by Taranaki Whānui for other provisions.	Amend definitions as necessary to provide for the relief sought by submitter.		No recommendation
	Taranaki Whānui	FS24.002	Rangitāne o Wairarapa	General comments	General comments - definitions		Support in part	We wish to highlight the regional impact of this change, but want to ensure we move forward to address Taranaki Whānui's concerns with the best outcome for all mana whenua.	Allow in part	We support in principle, however we believe a wananga with mana whenua across the region to determine the best approach to meet Taranaki Whānui's concerns would be appropriate as this will impact all Mana Whenua.	No recommendation
S287.001	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Considers that meaningful consultation on PC1 has not been undertaken	Withdraw PC1		Reject
S287.002	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Questions the legality of the process undertaken by GWRC, citing recent Environment Court decisions.	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation
S287.003	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers in any given catchment there will be upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites.  Notes that the Mangaroa catchment and Akatarawa Valley are complex networks of waterways and all properties in the catchment will be assessed, based on the downstream results from this single monitoring point and penalised accordingly. Considers this unacceptable.	Remove all clauses where GWRC has failed to establish an adequate network of monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S287.004	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers GWRC has decided that Freshwater Management is pre-eminent and over-rules other National Policy Statements. Considers GW has erroneously decided to regard clauses (a), (b) and (c) of the Te Mana o te Wai hierarchy as mutually exclusive rather than regarding them as equally weighted and inter-dependent.  Considers that GWRC has chosen to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation and has exacerbated that choice by taking in to account an opinion by one Whaitua in respect of levels of copper and zinc in stormwater which are not recognised in NPS-FM.	Give equal weighting to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject
S287.005	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers there is confusion among GWRC staff and that contradictory advice has been given relating to the immediate legal effect of provisions and the fencing of waterways.  	Delete the statement that all rules have immediate legal effect and substitute "all rules in this plan change will be held in abeyance pending the plan change passing through all stages required by the RMA."		Reject
S287.009	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers there are errors in drafting which change the intended meaning	Review and undertake an edit of PC1		Reject
S287.013	M. Garcia (S287)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers there is no quantification for the benefits or quantification of the costs and that just because GWRC consider they are obliged to do something is not a valid reason to have no idea of the value or cost of the exercise.	<p>Produce a thorough cost-benefit exercise and recognise ratepayers are not a limitless source of funds.</p>		No recommendation
S29.001	Neil Deans (S29)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports GWRC's Whaitua process, and supports the implementation of the recommendations made by Whaitua members to address freshwater issues.	<p>Not stated.</p>		Accept
S29.002	Neil Deans (S29)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Support		The state of water bodies reflects the use of land, water and other resources in their catchments.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S29.013	Neil Deans (S29)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.2 Policies	Support		Supports policies WH.P1-P.33 including the associated target attribute states and flow requirements.	Retain as notified		Accept in part
S29.014	Neil Deans (S29)			8 Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara	8.3 Rules	Support		Supports Rules WH.R1 to WH.R36 and notes wherever possible, water sensitive urban design should be required to minimise increased runoff intensity due to increasing hard surfaces.	Include requirement for WSUD in Rules WH.R1-WH.R36 where possible		No recommendation
S3.004	Dougal Morrison (S3)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Changes go beyond the recommendations of the relevant Whaitua.	<p>Not stated.</p>		No recommendation
S30.001	Dean Spicer (S30)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Considers GWRC failed to adequately consult affected landowners. Considers GWRC failed to consider proposed UHCC plan Change 50 rural 'PC50'.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S30.002	Dean Spicer (S30)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers PC1 is inconsistent with UHCC PC50, highlighting lack of due process of PC1.	Withdraw PC1 and conduct appropriate consultation and engagement.		Reject
S30.003	Dean Spicer (S30)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned environmental and cultural benefits have not been quantified through an economic impact assessment and the process has been rushed and poorly developed. Considers council may have breached duties under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Challenges the credibility of the plan change.	GWRC withdraw current PC1 and undertake economic, social and cultural impact assessment that is publicly disclosed, and use it to inform revised plan change.		Reject
S30.004	Dean Spicer (S30)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers PC1 contains drafting errors and fails to define key terms. Considers stakeholders have been prevented from understanding what is proposed which has impacted their ability to make well informed submissions.	PC1 redrafted correctly and resubmitted for consultation.		Reject
S34.001	John Hill (S34)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Legislation or council directions must be clear and precise.	Legislation or council directions must be clear and precise.		No recommendation
S34.002	John Hill (S34)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		The plan change should not be able to be misinterpreted or used to support the ideology of any member or group within GWRC	Plan change should not be able to be misinterpreted or used to support the ideology of any member or group within GWRC		No recommendation
S34.003	John Hill (S34)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		An independent commissioner should be available to manage misuse or interpretation of rules.	Seeks access to a commissioner where situations outlined in submission occur.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S35.001	Amos Mann (S35)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		Considers protection of water quality is of upmost importance as it is vital for all life.	Not stated		No recommendation
S35.002	Amos Mann (S35)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		Supports Plan Change 1 water elements.	Not stated		Accept in part
S35.005	Amos Mann (S35)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Considers costs are important but costs should not be dodged or kicked down the road, and the task is to problem-solve how best we can resource doing water better.	Not stated		No recommendation
S35.006	Amos Mann (S35)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Encourages councils to resource enforcement, science, and policy tools like education, industrial water plans, iwi and community governance, and citizen water-care activity.	Not stated		No recommendation
S36.002	Wellington Branch of New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (S36)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Notes the new government has announced intentions to review the NPS-FM and related legislation and the plan change needs to maintain consistency with revised objectives.	Not stated		Reject
S39.002	Fenaughty Partnership - Riu Huna Farm (S39)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Suggests GWRC take an approach of partnership and consulting with the community to achieve water quality outcomes.  Concerned GWRC's community engagement for PC1 was lacking, with a GWRC presentation organised less than three weeks before submissions closed.  Questions why affected parties did not have direct mail contact from GWRC regarding PC1 and why there was no formal agreement from the community board.  Concerned PC1 information on GWRC website was not easily accessible and in relevant form.  Considers GWRC 90-minute workshop was insufficient to provide information required for community to make informed decisions. Considers the timing of the consultation was unworkable as it was several weeks before Christmas and during a very busy farming season.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S39.003	Fenaughty Partnership - Riu Huna Farm (S39)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Objects the lack of direct consultation with landowners and the community board and the short time frame for submissions.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S39.005	Fenaughty Partnership - Riu Huna Farm (S39)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers the transition time should be determined by the implementation of the new freshwater regulations by central government.  Concerned GWRC is acting prematurely and duplicating the process, adding costs for landowners and GWRC as well as reducing the available time to understand the problems that are trying to be solved.  Considers plan change is a blunt instrument attempting to compensate for the lack of 'actual' local water quality information by proposing broad rules across multiple catchments rather than targeting usable and effective interventions for the best outcomes. Concerned wide-ranging proposed regulatory implications will create additional financial and time costs on community and there is a strong risk of not achieving the outcomes efficiently or effectively.  Concerned under PC1 proposal, many people will be non-compliant within a short timeframe and face prosecution. Considers the proposed time to transition between current land use and implementing the proposed changes is unrealistically short and does not account for significant financial implications and requires potentially unneeded changes in our farm system and in land use.  Considers solutions are best achieved on-farm by individual properties rather than through a wider approach based on the current whaitua or "Freshwater Management Unit".  Considers many of small streams cross property boundaries and therefore must be implemented and monitored at an appropriate scale. Concerned of potential for perverse outcomes as these measures impose more cost and reduce the ability of farmers to operate economically.   	Not stated.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S40.001	Pamela Govan (S40)			General comments	General comments - water bodies	Not Stated		Supports PC1.	Not stated.		Accept in part
S40.005	Pamela Govan (S40)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Encourages councils to resource enforcement, science and complementary policy tools (education, industrial water plans and community governance) and the continued involvement of mana whenua and citizen water-care activity.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S42.003	Maryanne Gill (S42)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose		Concerned with the communication to affected parties and considers there has been insufficient information regarding PC1.   	Not stated.		No recommendation
S42.008	Maryanne Gill (S42)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Strongly opposes PC1 and the removal of community decision making.  Agrees with the need to improve poor water quality where it is poor and where the solutions are within submitters control. Considers fundamental evidence is required to do this effectively and equitably.  Requests GWRC to recognise the work that has been done and ask GWRC to partner and work with landowners rather than regulating against.	Recognise the work that submitter has done and partner and work with landowners rather than regulating against them.		Reject
S43.001	Fulton Hogan Ltd (S43)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Seeks consistency in definitions and plan provisions.	Not stated		No recommendation
S43.002	Fulton Hogan Ltd (S43)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Supports the improvement of water quality and ecosystem outcomes through PC1, but concerned some parts of PC1 go too far and do not provide sufficient flexibility for day-to-day activities without resource consent.	Not stated		No recommendation
S45.001	Heather Blissett (S45)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Requests the word "resource" be changed to "taonga" as the term resource implies something to be used as people see fit for financial gain.	Requests the word <del>"resource"</del> be changed to <strong>"taonga"</strong> as the term resource implies something to be used as people see fit for financial gain.		Reject
S45.002	Heather Blissett (S45)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Requests mauri be added to restoring statements to reflect that we are restoring the mauri of the water (life energy).	Requests <strong>mauri </strong>be added to restoring statements to reflect restoring the mauri of the water (life energy).		Reject
S45.005	Heather Blissett (S45)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned the plan contains the right words and drawn-out action plans which won't prevent Te Awakairangi and Peatland dying along with the tributaries.	Not stated		No recommendation
S45.006	Heather Blissett (S45)			General comments	General comments - fresh water	Not Stated		Considers the statement "fish communities are resilient" to be too passive and that the term resilience suggests that fish communities could be forced to live in extremities of survival. (references Pg. 16)	Not stated		No recommendation
S45.008	Heather Blissett (S45)			4 Policies	4.6 Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai.	Not Stated		Submitter supports hydrology provision (a).   Requests mauri be added to water quality provision (b). Wording proposed is "Improve the mauri of the water"	Requests mauri be added to water quality provision (b). Wording proposed is "Improve the <strong>mauri </strong>of the water"		Reject
S45.009	Heather Blissett (S45)			9 Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Rule R104: Vegetation clearance on erosion prone land – permitted activity.	Not Stated		Questions this rule on the understanding the roots of vegetation hold land together.	Not stated		No recommendation
S5.001	Diane Strugnell (S5)			3 Objectives	Objective O19: Biodiversity, aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and the coastal marine area are safeguarded.	Amend		Concerned that without clear support, both advisory and financial, encouragement is required. Cites that Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua committee suggested there were greater benefits to "carrots rather than sticks".	Amend: (c) restoration of aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai is encouraged <strong>with appropriate support from central and regional government.</strong>		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S51.001	Mākara and Ohariu large farms (S51)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Supports individual submissions made by other members of the Mākara/Ohariu community. Does not support PC1 in its current form, noting that feedback on PC1 is similar to that provided in the Whaitua process. Notes work undertaken by the community to improve water quality and biodiversity, including retiring coastal and steep land; and revegetation of wetlands, streams and hillsides.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S51.002	Mākara and Ohariu large farms (S51)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Opposes PC1 on the basis of it having a broad regulatory approach and a lack of local consultation. Supports the improvement of water quality where it is shown to be poor and where solutions are within community control, provided that the necessary information is available. Seeks that GWRC collaborates with the local community rather than imposing regulations. Expressed concern with a lack of consultation and short timeframes to make submissions.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S51.003	Mākara and Ohariu large farms (S51)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		High cost of implementing PC1 will fall to a small number of individual landowners rather than developers or communities as is the case for urban provisions. Concerned with how short timeframes for implementation in PC1 are. Seeks the removal of the regulatory approach for PC1, or otherwise that GWRC provides targeted support mechanisms to compensate for potential losses in farm income.	Remove the regulatory approach for PC1.		Reject
	Mākara and Ohariu large farms	FS12.2	Diane Strugnell	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Support	As identified by the submitter. The benefits of working alongside landowners to incentivise best practice are likely to be far more effective than a regulatory approach. This was very much the emphasis from the Whaitua Implementation Programmes for both Te-Whanganui-a-Tara and Te-Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	Allow	Removal of the regulatory approach for PC1	Reject
S51.005	Mākara and Ohariu large farms (S51)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Concerned with how short the timeframes for implementation of PC1 are given the financial implications.	<p>Revise the approach in PC1 to be more focused on community participation than regulation.</p>		Reject
S53.002	Bob Curry (S53)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose		Considers there is conflict and inconsistency between the implementation of the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Land by Upper Hutt City Council and the implementation of the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management by GWRC. Notes that government has indicated National Policy Statements will be reviewed to ensure land is available to meet population increase.	Await government Review of National Policy Statements before implementing Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan.		Reject
S57.003	Sally Kean (S57)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Believes that GWRC as an authority should not enforce restrictions on what can and can't be done with property.	<p>Not Stated</p>		No recommendation
S57.004	Sally Kean (S57)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Feels GWRC should not be making any changes until the RMA has been revamped.	Opposes GWRC making decisions until the RMA is revamped (inferred).		Reject
S57.005	Sally Kean (S57)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerns the notification process was not suitable and believes a letter drop process should have been used. Believes the PC1 document is too lengthy to read and hard to understand.	Amend notification process to include a letter drop rather than solely newspaper advertisements (inferred).		Reject
S57.006	Sally Kean (S57)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Opposes GWRCs attempt to control the materials and conditions of driveways.	Not Stated		No recommendation
S57.007	Sally Kean (S57)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Considers PC1 is regulatory over-reach.	<p>Not Stated</p>		No recommendation
S59.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker/Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1250	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S59.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1251	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S59.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1252	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S59.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1253	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S59.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1254	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S59.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1256	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S59.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker (S59)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation
	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS16.020	Woodridge Holdings Ltd	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Not stated	The section 32 analysis does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits of introducing such wide-ranging changes with immediate legal effect, including the cost of projects which are in construction and/or budgeted for this earthworks season but which have no allocated funding for additional consents and/or more restrictive working conditions. PC1 will have significant consequences for affordability of housing and land development in Wellington Region. The significant financial contribution for new residential units will have flow on housing affordability effects in the region and is inconsistent with Objective 2 and associated policies of NPS-UD. This has not been considered in the Section 32 report which ignores the housing affordability implications of the proposed changes.	Allow	Withdraw PC1 and Complete a cost- benefit analysis	Accept in part

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Anker Robert Anker	FS27.1257	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S60.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1328	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S60.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1329	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S60.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1330	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S60.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1331	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S60.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1332	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S60.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1334	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S60.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S60)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1335	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S61.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1497	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S61.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1498	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S61.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1499	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S61.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1500	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S61.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1501	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S61.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1503	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S61.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble (S61)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lenard Drabble	FS27.1504	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S62.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1393	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S62.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1394	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S62.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1395	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S62.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1396	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S62.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1397	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S62.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1399	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S62.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson (S62)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jacqui Thompson	FS27.1400	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S63.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1302	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S63.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1303	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S63.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1304	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S63.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1305	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S63.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1306	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S63.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1308	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S63.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes (S63)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Callum Graeme Ritchie Forbes	FS27.1309	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S64.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1510	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S64.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1511	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S64.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1512	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S64.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1513	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S64.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1514	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S64.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1516	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S64.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson (S64)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Linda Forbes Williamson	FS27.1517	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S65.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1588	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S65.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1589	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S65.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1590	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S65.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1591	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S65.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1592	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S65.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1594	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S65.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S65)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1595	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S66.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1458	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S66.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1459	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S66.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1460	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S66.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1461	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S66.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1462	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S66.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1464	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S66.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey (S66)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jon-Luke Clarke Harvey	FS27.1465	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S67.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1562	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S67.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1563	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S67.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1564	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S67.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1565	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S67.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1566	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S67.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1568	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S67.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell (S67)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Darren Pettengell	FS27.1569	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S68.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1354	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S68.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1355	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S68.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1356	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S68.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1357	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S68.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1358	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S68.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1360	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S68.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson (S68)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Gail Thomson	FS27.1361	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S69.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1614	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S69.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1615	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S69.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1616	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S69.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1617	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S69.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1618	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S69.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1620	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S69.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle (S69)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Susan Patricia Boyle	FS27.1621	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S70.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1445	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S70.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1446	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S70.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1447	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S70.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1448	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S70.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1449	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S70.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1451	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S70.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle (S70)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - John Peter Boyle	FS27.1452	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S71.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1276	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S71.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1277	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S71.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1278	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S71.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1279	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S71.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1280	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S71.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1282	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S71.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig (S71)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Brendon Allen Greig	FS27.1283	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S72.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1263	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S72.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1264	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S72.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1265	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S72.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1266	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S72.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1267	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S72.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1269	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S72.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig (S72)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Angela Marie Greig	FS27.1270	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S73.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1575	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S73.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1576	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S73.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1577	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S73.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1578	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S73.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1579	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S73.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1581	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S73.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales (S73)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Philip Eales	FS27.1582	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S74.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1627	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S74.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1628	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S74.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1629	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S74.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1630	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S74.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1631	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S74.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1633	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S74.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales (S74)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Teresa Eales	FS27.1634	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S75.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1523	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S75.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1524	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S75.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1525	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S75.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1526	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S75.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1527	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S75.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1529	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S75.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy (S75)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Lynn Marion Bialy	FS27.1530	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S76.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1601	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S76.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1602	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S76.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1603	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S76.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1604	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S76.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1605	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S76.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1607	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S76.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy (S76)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Richard Charles Bialy	FS27.1608	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S77.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1432	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S77.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1433	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S77.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1434	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S77.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1435	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S77.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1436	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S77.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1438	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S77.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready (S77)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - JoAnn McCready	FS27.1439	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S78.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1237	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S78.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1238	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S78.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1239	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S78.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1240	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S78.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1241	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S78.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1243	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S78.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry (S78)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob Curry	FS27.1244	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S79.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1224	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S79.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1225	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S79.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1226	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S79.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1227	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S79.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1228	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S79.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1230	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S79.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan (S79)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bob McLellan	FS27.1231	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S80.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1289	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S80.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1290	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S80.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1291	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S80.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1292	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S80.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1293	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S80.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1295	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S80.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles (S80)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Bridget M Myles	FS27.1296	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S81.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1341	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S81.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1342	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S81.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1343	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S81.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1344	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S81.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1345	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S81.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy	FS27.1347	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S81.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCreedy (S81)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - David McCready	FS27.1348	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S82.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1536	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S82.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1537	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S82.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1538	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S82.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1539	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S82.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1540	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S82.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1542	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S82.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald (S82)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Meaghan Fitzgerald	FS27.1543	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S83.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1484	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S83.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1485	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S83.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1486	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S83.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1487	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S83.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the ‘immediate legal effect’ statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1488	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S83.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1490	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S83.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash (S83)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Kevin Nash	FS27.1491	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S84.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1471	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S84.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1472	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S84.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1473	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S84.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1474	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S84.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1475	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S84.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1477	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S84.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash (S84)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Karen Nash	FS27.1478	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S86.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1406	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S86.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1407	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S86.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1408	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S86.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1409	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S86.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1410	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S86.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1412	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S86.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow (S86)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Jennifer Sparrow	FS27.1413	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S87.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1380	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S87.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1381	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S87.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1382	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S87.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1383	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S87.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1384	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S87.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1386	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S87.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro (S87)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Grant Munro	FS27.1387	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S88.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1315	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S88.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1316	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S88.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1317	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S88.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1318	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S88.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1319	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S88.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1321	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S88.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro (S88)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Colleen Munro	FS27.1322	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S89.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1419	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S89.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1420	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S89.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1421	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S89.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1422	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S89.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1423	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S89.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1425	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S89.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson (S89)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Joan Elizabeth Hutson	FS27.1426	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S9.001	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports the group submission made by Mākara/Ohariu farmers'. 	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S9.002	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Concerned PC1 detail is very different from WIP and considers requirement for testing through consultation to assess the reflection of community recommendations.	Not Stated.		Reject
S9.003	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Concerned the partnership approach recommended by WIP has not continued into PC1 delivery process and document.  Considers it important for PC1 to prioritise partnership mechanisms, recognise the values and to provide a equitable and effective approach. Considers it important for GWRC actively considers impacts of these provisions on local communities in order to design support.  Considers GWRC has not investigated the extent of waterway protection required under the provisions, land retirement (based on lay of the land opposed to mapped polygons) or financial implications for farmers.  Concerned the ETS liabilities for not replanting forestry on certain land classes has not been considered.	Not Stated.		Reject
S9.005	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Notes the Government’s recent changes to the NPS-FM and timeframes for implementation may change the effectiveness of this WIP recommendation.	Not Stated.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S9.006	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - overall	Amend		Notes PC1 was prepared swiftly to implement regulatory measures within NPS-FM timeframe and for GWRC's longer-term commitment to non-regulatory measures. Concerned non-regulatory measures outside of PC1 haven't occurred yet.  Notes WIP identified fundamental barriers in the geographic areas such as: lack of data on the issue, identification solutions, need for community catchment group support, need for additional funding for on-farm works and a current lack of GWRC's compliance/enforcement of poor practice.	Give non-regulatory measures equal priority to PC1 (including outside of PC1 development process) and apply these measures in areas where regulation will be most prominent		Reject
S9.007	Louise Askin (S9)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Amend		Concerned of PC1 public consultation process, with community awareness relying on local information channels and as PC1 will have significant implications for Wellington (particularly rural landowners), a higher level of community engagement is warranted.	Not Stated.		No recommendation
S90.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject
	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1549	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S90.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling   	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1550	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S90.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1551	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S90.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1552	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS31.029	Wellington International Airport Limited	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Support	WIAL supports the intent of Policy WH.P9.	Allow	Support the intent of the policy	Accept
S90.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1553	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S90.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1555	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S90.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson (S90)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.    	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Peter Jeffery Hutson	FS27.1556	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S91.001	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned there was virtually no consultation completed on PC1 with those most affected. Notes the rural community heard of PC1 through word of mouth.   	Withdraw PC1 and undertake further consultation		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1367	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - consultation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S91.002	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Considers PC1 to be lacking supporting evidence. Considers rules and methods classifying streams, drains, ditches, and ephemeral flows as rivers in PC1 should be struck out. States these rules were developed to get around the GWRC v UHCC ruling  	Remove clauses that are demonstrably regulating by fiat. Demonstrate respect for the rule of law.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1368	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S91.003	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Concerned that PC1 is proposing sanctions on property owners for factors that they cannot control. Considers within any catchment there are upstream and downstream properties and very few indicative monitoring sites, such as the Mangaroa and Akatarawa Valley catchments. Concerned properties will be assessed based on downstream results from a single monitoring point	Remove clauses where there is an insufficient network of water quality monitoring sites.		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1369	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate (“MPHRCI”)	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that “planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the ‘planned / existing urban area’”. This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as ‘planned urban’. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	No recommendation
S91.004	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Not Stated		Questions the decision to prioritise freshwater management over other National Policy Statements such as the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Concerned GWRC has erroneously decided to regard the Te Mana o the Wai hierarchy of obligations (a)-(c) as mutually exclusive rather than equally weighted and interdependent. Concerned the decision to give maximum weight to one piece of legislation was exacerbated by the decision to take into account the opinion of one Whaitua with regard to copper and zinc levels. Levels of copper and zinc are not recognised in NPS-FM. Determines that this is a case of legislation by committee.	Give equal weight to all government legislation and disregard regulation by committee.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1370	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - current legislation		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S91.005	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Questions whether staff have been advised of the inclusion of the statement that all rules in PC1 will have immediate legal effect as they meet the requirements of section 86B. Concerned about differing requirements for riparian margins outlined in PC1 and supporting information for PC1. 	Delete the 'immediate legal effect' statement in the Section 32 report to indicate that PC1 rules will attain legal effect upon PC1 becoming fully operative.		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1371	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S91.007	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - overall	Not Stated		Identifies drafting errors in PC1 that alter the intended meanings of sections and render the second paragraph meaningless.	Subject PC1 to further editing		Reject

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1373	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - overall		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Accept
S91.008	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard (S91)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Not Stated		Concerned the section 32 does not adequately quantify the economic, environmental, and cultural costs and benefits through an economic impact assessment.	Requests a cost- benefit exercise be completed to ensure the concept of financial accountability is followed .		No recommendation



Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Upper Hutt Rural Communities - Graeme Shellard	FS27.1374	Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporate ("MPHRCI")	General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact		Oppose	Our natural environment should be protected or improved where it is degraded or risks being degraded, especially our remaining native bush areas and all streams and rivers in the Dry Creek Catchment and surrounding area. MPHRCI supports retention of provisions (and plan amendments) that will help achieve this outcome, and opposes provisions that will not help achieve or will frustrate this outcome. 30 Benmore Street had, until very recently, relatively high natural character and ecological values, open space values, and rural amenity values. Recent substantial vegetation clearance and earthworks activities on the site have resulted in significant adverse environmental effects which should be remedied and mitigated. There is substantial community objection to this land being rezoned from rural to urban. MPHRCI does not agree with Waste Management New Zealand Limited that "planning for the site to be used for a resource recovery park is well advanced, with several expert assessments undertaken that demonstrate the use is suitable and environmental effects and as such it should be considered part of the 'planned / existing urban area'". This is a disingenuous and arrogant statement to make. There is considerable community concern about, and opposition to, 30 Benmore Street being considered as a potentially appropriate site for urban development, let alone being considered appropriate for industrial and waste management land uses. MPHRCI does not agree with the relief sought by those submitters seeking to facilitate the rezoning of 30 Benmore Street to an urban zone. Similarly, MPHRCI does not agree with the submitters reasoning. 30 Benmore Street is rural land zoned for rural purposes and in no way should it be considered as urban or as 'planned urban'. A prohibited activity status to prevent urban land uses on this site, or discharges to water from activities on this site, is appropriate.	Disallow	Not stated	Reject
S92.001	Callum Forbes (S92)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose	Expressed concern with lack of consultation with rural communities. Supports submissions made by Mangaroa and Akatarawa residents.	Withdraw PC1 in full		Reject	
S92.002	Callum Forbes (S92)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose	Questions the legality of the process undertaken by GWRC, citing recent Environment Court decisions.	Not stated		No recommendation	
S92.003	Callum Forbes (S92)			General comments	General comments - current legislation	Oppose	Considers that PC1 imposes unfair sanctions on property owners.	Delete provisions where there are insufficient monitoring sites.		No recommendation	
S94.001	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Oppose	Concerned with consultation and insufficient time for the community/landowners to fully consider the implications of the policies and rules proposed in PPC1 before entering the formal submission process.  Considers GWRC has not undertaken appropriate consultation with affected parties.	Withdraw PC1 and undertake an effective period of consultation.		Reject	

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

	Jo McCready	FS47.001	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments	General comments - consultation		Support in part	Meridian is concerned that proposed PC1 has been promulgated without consultation with all providers of regionally significant infrastructure and without proper consideration of the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including Meridian’s lawfully established renewable electricity generation wind farms. Proposed PC1 raises potentially significant adverse operational impacts for regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities, that conflict with the National Policy Statements for Renewable Electricity Generation and Electricity Generation. Proposed PC1 also overrides or upends, without reasonable cause, provisions in the operative NRP for regionally significant infrastructure that were settled by agreement (including the agreement of GWRC) only recently through mediation of appeals on the NRP. Meridian considers that the particular issues of conflict raised in the following submission are capable of resolution by providing appropriate exclusions or exemptions for regionally significant infrastructure (and particularly for lawfully established existing regionally significant infrastructure). These exclusion or exemption provisions are necessary in order for the region’s urban and rural communities to function effectively and efficiently, and to enable achievement of the nation’s objectives relating to adaptation to climate change. These objectives include enabling increased electricity generation from renewable sources;	Allow in part	Allow the submission points and withdraw PC1 or, as alternative relief, make the amendments to PC1 detailed in the following further submission points (or such further or other relief as will achieve the outcome sought by the submission points).	Reject
S94.003	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers heavy reliance on modelling to inform the policies and rules rather than emphasising collection of reliable data and applying appropriate actions.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S94.004	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Considers inadequate information on clearly committed resourcing from GWRC for implementation of PC1, leaving landowners unsure of the costs (financial and time) associated with PC1.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S94.005	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers lack of information on support resourcing, including monitoring the implementation of PC1, means it is likely to potentially penalise those engaging proactively and using good management practices while failing to identify or deal with those engaging in poor management practices unless there are very blatant breaches.	Not stated.		No recommendation
S94.006	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - overall	Oppose		Considers overall emphasis within PC1 is on regulatory methods and “requirements” on landowners rather than incentives to engage best practice.  Considers better outcomes would be achieved weighted in accordance with Recommendations 58, 59, 60, 61 and 64 of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Implementation Programme. Considers focusing on resourcing positive supports and actions rather than enforcements.	Not stated.		Reject
S94.007	Jo McCready (S94)			General comments	General comments - economic cost/impact	Oppose		Concerned not all costs have been economically quantified and the environmental and cultural benefits have not been quantified through a specialist economic impact assessment.  Considers if the benefits had been quantified, the benefits would not outweigh the costs associated with improving the environment in the manner directed by NPS-FM – particularly urban areas.  Concerned of financial cost to ratepayers.	Produce a cost-benefit exercise and follow a clear concept of financial accountability.		No recommendation
S96.001	Urban Edge Planning Group on behalf of M & J Walsh Partnership Ltd (S96)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concern about lack of consultation with affected landowners/developers.	Not stated		No recommendation

Section 42A Report – Hearing Stream 1 – Overarching Matters – 3 October 2024

S98.003	Urban Edge Planning Group on behalf of Pandion Limited (S98)			General comments	General comments - consultation	Not Stated		Concerned about the apparent lack of engagement with landowners and developers about the intended approach to greenfield development.	Not stated		No recommendation
S99.001	Simon Wright (S99)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Supports PC1 and the rules and incentives that will make development more sustainable. PC1 will not just help address environmental challenges but will inspire innovation with unexpected social and economic benefits that may have impacts beyond the Wellington region. Considers it is unacceptable to allow developments that pollute the water or degrade the land, or for associated costs to be socialised and/or passed on to future generations.	Not stated		Accept in part
S99.002	Simon Wright (S99)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Important that compliance is achieved and that monitoring for impacts and outcomes occurs. Compliance teams will need to be adequately resourced.	Not stated		No recommendation
S99.003	Simon Wright (S99)			General comments	General comments - overall	Support		Suggests the use of participatory approaches that encourage and support members of the public to contribute. This might be through the education system, citizens science, participatory evaluation or re-purposed Whaitua committees.	Not stated		No recommendation