

Submitter ID:

File No:

Further Submission

on Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region



Fold here

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991.

Please complete this form to make a further submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (**PNRP**). All sections of this form need to be completed for the submission to be accepted.

A further submission may only be made by a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest, or a person that has an interest in the PNRP greater than the interest that the general public has, or the Wellington Regional Council itself. A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of, or in opposition to, a submission made on the PNRP.

For information on making a further submission see the Ministry for the Environment website:
www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/everyday-guide-rma-making-submission-about-proposed-plan-or-plan-change

Return your signed further submission to the Wellington Regional Council by post or email by 5pm Tuesday 29 March 2016 to:

Greater Wellington Regional Council
Further Submission on Proposed Natural Resources Plan
for the Wellington Region
Freepost 3156
PO Box 11646
Manners Street
Wellington 6142

Regionalplan@gw.govt.nz

Fold here

FreePost Authority Number 3156



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION FORM

This is a further submission in support of, or opposition to, a submission on the PNRP.

A. DETAILS OF FURTHER SUBMITTER

FULL NAME

GBC Winstone (Attn: Ian Wallace)

ORGANISATION (* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of)

PO Box 17 195, Greenlane, Auckland

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (INCLUDING POSTCODE)

26 Patrick St, Petone, Lower Hutt 5012, c/o Allan Planning and Research Ltd

PHONE

021665155

FAX

EMAIL

sylvia.allan@ihug.co.nz

Only certain people may make further submissions

Please tick the option that applies to you:

- I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or
 I am a person who has an interest in the PNRP that is greater than the interest the general public has.

Specify below the grounds for saying that you are within the category you have ticked.

GBC Winstone has made submissions on the PNRP as notified, and owns and operates several major businesses within the wider Wellington Region which contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the people of the region.

Service of your further submission

Please note that you must **serve a copy of this further submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after this further submission has been provided to Wellington Regional Council.**

If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served on each original submitter.

Signature:

Date:

29/03/2016

Signature of person making further submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the further submission. A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Please note

All information contained in a further submission under the Resource Management Act 1991 becomes public information. All further submissions will be put on our website and will include all personal details included in the further submission.

B. APPEARANCE AT HEARING

Please select from the following:

- I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission; or
 I do wish to be heard in support of my further submission; and, if so,
 I would be prepared to consider presenting this further submission in a joint case with others making a similar further submission at any hearing.

Please enter further submission points in the table on the following pages

C. FURTHER SUBMISSION POINTS

Please complete the following table with details of which original submission points you support and/or oppose, and why, adding further rows as necessary.

Details of the submission you are commenting on	Original submission number	Position	Part(s) of the submission you support or oppose	Reasons	Relief sought
Name of person/ group making original submission and postal address.	The original submission number can be found on the submitter address list.	Whether you support or oppose the submission.	Indicate which parts of the original submission (which submission points) you support or oppose, together with any relevant PNRP provisions.	Why you support or oppose each submission point.	The part or whole of each submission point you wish to be allowed or disallowed.
<i>e.g.</i> Joanne Bloggs 12 Pine Tree Avenue Redwood	<i>e.g.</i> submitter S102	<i>e.g.</i> Oppose	<i>e.g.</i> Oppose all of submission point S102/41	<i>e.g.</i> The submission point does not recognise...	<i>e.g.</i> Disallow the parts of S102/41 relating to...
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S356/036	Support in part	The submission includes an alternative relief of removing the definition of "Natural processes" in its entirety. This alternative is supported and an alternative to GBC Winstone's own suggested rewording.	The wording of the current definition is untenable	Allow deletion as an alternative relief to the rewording sought by GBC Winstone
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/026	Support	The suggested additional words help clarify the definition of "offset".	The definition would be more workable with the addition suggested.	Allow relief sought in the original submission.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/031	Support in part	The addition of the suggested additional word "development" in the definition of "reverse sensitivity"	The term is relevant to major infrastructure such as quarries and cleanfills, as both operation and development is usually involved.	Allow relief supported in this further submission.
Porirua City Council	S163/015	Support	The general issue raised in this submission relating to lack of recognition of urban resources and their ongoing provision.	The submission is in line with an issue raised in GBC Winstone's own submission on the specific issue of lack of recognition of the need for quarry and cleanfill resources.	Ensure that the issues raised in this submission are reflected adequately in new or modified objectives in the Plan.

Details of the submission you are commenting on	Original submission number	Position	Part(s) of the submission you support or oppose	Reasons	Relief sought
Fertiliser Assoc of New Zealand	S302/014	Support in part	Support first suggested new objective	The submission is in line with an issue raised in GBC Winstone's own submission on the specific issue of lack of recognition of the need for quarry and cleanfill resources.	Allow addition of fist suggested objective, or similar.
Wairarapa Regional Irrigation Trust	S127/007	Support	Reference in submission to "effects".	The submission would result in more appropriate wording for this objective.	Accept the submission or something similar (see further submission that follows).
Horticulture NZ	S307/016	Support	Reference in submission to "effects" and the need to "avoid remedy or mitigate" rather than minimise.	The submission is in line with a general matter raised in GBC Winstone's submission about the widespread, and incorrect, use of "minimise" in policy in this Plan.	Accept the submission or something similar.
Masterton District Council	S367/058	Support	Whole submission in relation to Objective O38.	The submission provides for clarification of a currently vaguely-worded objective for amenity landscapes, which are not identified or listed in the Plan.	Accept the submission or something similar.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/078	Support	Support, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with GBC Winstone's submissions.	A policy on consent durations for significant developments including infrastructure, worded as a positive provision, is a desirable addition to the Plan.	Add policy suggested.
Holcim (New Zealand) Ltd	S276/012	Support	Both new policies suggested.	The content of the submission would provide alternative relief to the relief sought in GBC Winstone's own submissions in relation to the existing policy gap relating to aggregates and other minerals.	Consider these policies as an alternative to the relief sought by GBC Winstones in relation to Policies P7, and P12 to P14.
Wellington International Airport Limited	S282/082	Support	Rewording relating to provision of regionally significant infrastructure, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with GBC Winstone's	The policy rewording suggested is desirable in relation to the RPS and to the Plan's relevant objective.	Accept the submission or something similar.

Details of the submission you are commenting on	Original submission number	Position	Part(s) of the submission you support or oppose	Reasons	Relief sought
			submissions.		
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/083	Support	Rewording or new policy relating to provision of regionally significant infrastructure, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with GBC Winstone's	The rewording or new policy suggested is desirable in relation to the RPS and to the Plan's relevant objective.	Accept the submission or something similar.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	S353/060	Oppose	Suggested additional wording to policy P13.	The additional words would be superfluous and/or confusing as existing activities are part of the existing environment and are either permitted or operating under consents.	Reject the submission.
Powerco	S29/017	Support	Suggested additional wording to policy P14.	The additional wording is appropriate and useful.	Accept the submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	S282/031	Support	Rewording relating to reverse sensitivity within policy, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with GBC Winstone's submissions.	The wording proposed is more appropriate. "Adjacent" has a specific legal connotation and is too limiting in this policy.	Accept the rewording proposed in the submission.
Porirua City Council	S163/062	Support	The whole submission, which raises the general issue of existing and beneficial activities in these areas.	The submission aligns with one made by GBC Winstone on the issue.	Make policy provision for existing and beneficial activities.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/109	Support	Suggested modifications and additional wording to policy P49.	The additional wording is appropriate and useful.	Accept the rewording proposed in the submission.

Details of the submission you are commenting on	Original submission number	Position	Part(s) of the submission you support or oppose	Reasons	Relief sought
Hutt City Council	S84/019	Support	The whole submission, which raises a general issue in relation to urban development and its infrastructure needs	The submission is in line with a submission by GBC Winstone, expressing concern about the impact of this provision on future quarry and cleanfill development.	Adequate relief through policy provision in relation to the issues raised in the submission.
Woodridge Homes	S105/001	Support	Support whole submission	The relief sought in the submission would clarify whether a consent is needed for air discharges from cleanfills.	Add a permitted activity rule, subject to a similar condition to rules 27 and 28.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/138	Support	Support whole submission point	Clarification of the interpretation and “proof” of compliance with relevant rules is beneficial to users.	Accept the submission.
Rural Residents Environmental Society Inc	S125/021	Oppose	Oppose whole submission point	The request for a further “default” non-complying rule relating to hazardous substances air discharges only is unnecessary and confusing.	Reject the submission.
Rural Residents Environmental Society Inc	S125/023	Oppose	Oppose whole submission point	The request for a further “default” non-complying rule relating to the discharge of hazardous substances to land only is unnecessary and confusing	Reject the submission.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/182	Support	The whole submission, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with GBC Winstone’s submissions.	The relief sought would provide an alternative means of achieving the outcome sought in GBC Winstone’s own submission, if quarries and cleanfills are included within the definition of significant infrastructure.	Accept the submission, if GBC Winstone’s submission is not accepted in full.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	S353/155	Oppose	The whole submission point	Prohibited activity status for this rule, as requested, would be unreasonable and impracticable, given the inclusion of (a) and that the categories are linked by “or”.	Reject the submission.
New Zealand Transport Agency	S146/214	Support	The whole submission, subject to recognition of quarries and cleanfills as regionally significant infrastructure in line with	The relief sought would provide an alternative means of achieving the outcome sought in GBC Winstone’s own submission, if quarries and cleanfills are included within the	Accept the submission

Details of the submission you are commenting on	Original submission number	Position	Part(s) of the submission you support or oppose	Reasons	Relief sought
			GBC Winstone's submissions.	definition of significant infrastructure.	

If you require more space for additional comments, please insert new rows as needed