

Appendix 1 – Summary of submissions

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S32.006	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - natural hazards	Support	The proposed changes are an appropriate response to current information on climate change, and recognise that natural hazards and mitigation measures can impact on natural values.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
FS30.284	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S94.024	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - natural hazards	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S148.002	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - natural hazards	Not Stated / Neutral	WIAL is a lifeline utility operator under the CDEM 2002 in respect of its operation of Wellington Airport. In the event of a significant earthquake or other hazard event, the airport is recognised as potentially the only link between the city and the rest of the country given the vulnerability of the road and rail network, and the potential for	Not stated.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				the port and harbour access to be affected by liquefaction. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for Wellington Airport's ongoing operation and development.		
S148.007	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - natural hazards	Support in part	Wellington Airport is located near the coast, for example. There needs to be suitable recognition within the natural hazard provisions of the RPS that infrastructure often has a functional or operational requirement to locate in a certain area, even if that area is subject to natural hazard risk. Wellington Airport is located near the coast, for example. Infrastructure providers the RPS needs to suitably recognise that natural hazard tolerance is therefore inherently different to those without the same operational or functional need to be located in such areas.	Amend provisions to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part
S148.008	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - natural hazards	Not Stated / Neutral	NA	The provisions also need to suitably recognise that in some instances hard engineering structures can be an acceptable and most appropriate response to the management and protection of existing infrastructure assets (such as the sea wall adjacent to the south and western airport areas, which protect and support the adjacent road, 3 Waters and Airport infrastructure) and where nature-based solutions are simply not appropriate, including importantly for aircraft safety reasons.	Accept in part
S163.033	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - natural hazards	Oppose	Natural Hazards issues and objectives would more properly be considered in the full review of the RPS scheduled in 2024. The proposed amendments are principally tinkering with words; and not adding much of value which could not be more properly addressed in 2024.	That the proposed amendments to Chapter 3.8 be deleted	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS7.077	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.199	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.050	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements</p>	Not stated		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.			
FS30.106	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
S163.034	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - natural hazards	Oppose	Do not agree that any of the proposed natural hazard provisions are freshwater instruments, refer to submission for details on relevant case law.	Delete FW icons		Reject
FS28.034	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	HortNZ agree that the Freshwater Planning Process should be limited to freshwater focused provisions only	Allow	Allow relief, to the extent that the application of the freshwater planning process is reviewed.	Reject
FS7.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.200	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.		
FS29.051	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
FS30.107	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S167.042	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - natural hazards	Support in part		Amend chapter to include Māori names - e.g. Hutt River - Te Awa Kairangi	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S167.0197	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - natural hazards	Support in part		Give effect to higher order direction in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020.	Accept in part
S167.0198	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - natural hazards	Support in part		Reflect the updated scientific knowledge regarding climate change and its effects.	Accept in part
S167.0199	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - natural hazards	Not Stated / Neutral		Taranaki Whānui want to signal their intention to be involved in partnership and decision-making regarding Natural Hazards.	No recommendation
S16.068	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Natural hazards introductory text	Support in part	<p>Council supports the amendments proposed to this introduction text - in particular the shift in language to include references to risk, likelihood, and consequences. The updated information regarding sea level rise predictions and the likely impacts of this on flood events is also useful for Council plan-making responsibilities with respect to future coastal hazards and flood hazard plan changes.</p> <p>Council requests this section be amended to include an outline of the requirements of the RMA for natural hazard avoidance and mitigation under section sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.</p> <p>Council requests GWRC states it will put in place provisions that require the avoidance and mitigation of coastal hazards (such as predicted coastal erosion above MHWS) via policies in the RPS and provisions including rules in the PNRP. If this is not to be inserted, Council requests the chapter introduction is amended to clearly explain the legislative and policy justification for not including such provisions in the RPS and regional plan(s).</p>	Amend the chapter introduction to make it clear that city and district councils, and regional councils are responsible for provisions that require the avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards including significant coastal hazards (such as predicted coastal erosion above MHWS) via provisions in district plans, the RPS and the regional plan(s). Commit in the RPS that the regional plan will include provisions including rules to achieve the above.	Accept in part
S31.014	Robert Anker	Natural hazards introductory text	Oppose in part	The inclusion of this phrase is not necessary and implies that the effect on Iwi is deserving of special mention and differs from the effect on other sectors of the community.	Amend the regionally significant issues (p.69) to read: The regionally significant issues and the issues of significance to the	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					Wellington region's iwi authorities for natural hazards are: 	
S102.067	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Natural hazards introductory text	Support	Generally supports the inclusion of the 'Chapter Introductions' for Natural Hazards.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S115.020	Hutt City Council	Natural hazards introductory text	Support	No reasons provided	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S140.022	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Natural hazards introductory text	Support	Support as proposed	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.044	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Natural hazards introductory text	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM	Retain as notified	Accept in part
FS19.108	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.			
FS30.213	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
S165.026	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Natural hazards introductory text	Support	This is consistent with the RMA and higher order planning instruments	Retain.		Accept in part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM.	Disallow		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.043	Taranaki Whānui	Natural hazards introductory text	Support in part	<p>Taranaki Whānui support the introductory text for Natural Hazards. We note in particular the statement the Climate change will increase the frequency and magnitude of these.</p> <p>Acknowledgment of impacts on mana whenua supports Taranaki Whānui as Treaty partners and sets a precedent for a flow through of partnership in this chapter.</p>	Add description of the impacts of natural hazards on mana whenua and their areas of significance.	Accept in part
FS6.026	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Support	We support this submission as it is important to recognise the impacts on sites of significance to Māori and how they may be impacted by climate change, so that we can plan their protection.	Allow	Accept in part
S167.044	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 1: Risks from natural hazards	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this provision.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S128.009	Horticulture New Zealand	Issue 1: Risks from natural hazards	Support in part	As noted in the Section 32 report, 'Shifting and more variable weather patterns threaten food production, and ...', consequential to this are impacts on food security.	Amend paragraph 1 (p.69) 1. Risks from natural hazards Natural hazard events in the Wellington region have an adverse impact on people and communities, food production and food security , businesses, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
FS2.7	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support in part	Rangitāne support in part the amendments requested by the submitter. The natural environment (and its ability to provide food) can be significantly altered through a natural hazard event.	Allow in part	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.034	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Issue 1: Risks from natural hazards	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa supports that the Regional Council have explicitly outlined climate change will occur, rather than 'having the potential to' or 'expected to'. Ātiawa seeks that the natural environment be referred to in Issue 1. The natural environment is at risk and can be significantly altered through a natural hazard event, many of these natural environments have value including mana whenua values and should be protected. Ātiawa acknowledges that natural hazards are a naturally occurring phenomena and it is not possible or appropriate to protect everything, everywhere. However, there are parts of the natural environment that provide for mahinga kai, sites of significance including wāhi tapu, wāhi tupuna that should be considered in regard to reducing the impacts of natural hazards. This amendment complements Objective 19 and the reference to the environment.</p>	1. Risks from natural hazards Natural hazard events in the Wellington region have an adverse impact on people and communities, the natural environment , businesses, property and infrastructure.	Accept
FS2.58	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support	Rangitāne support Ātiawa's proposed amendment to the introductory text.	Allow	Accept
FS29.305	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S31.015	Robert Anker	Issue 2: Human actions can increase risk and consequences from natural hazards	Not Stated / Neutral	While there may be truth in this statement it should also be recognised that the converse is also true - eg. Hutt River stopbanks.	Amend paragraph 2 in the regionally significant issue section (p.69) to read: 2. Human actions can increase or decrease risk and consequences from natural hazards	Reject
S4.003	Dom Harris	Issue 3: Climate change will increase	Support in part	Sea level rise is a longer term problem (except for certain communities) floods, and resultants slips, of which we are seeing an increasing amount, should also be expected with increasing regularity and severity. It may be	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		the likelihood and consequences from natural hazard events		necessary/beneficial to separate genuine natural hazards from hazards caused/exacerbated by climate change, as these may need to be considered differently in the near future.		
S79.012	South Wairarapa District Council	Issue 3: Climate change will increase the likelihood and consequences from natural hazard events	Support in part	Not all natural hazard events, such as seismic or tsunami will increase either the likelihood or consequences as a result of climate change.	Amend to reflect that not all natural hazard events are impacted by the effects of climate change.	Accept
S167.045	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 3: Climate change will increase the likelihood and consequences from natural hazard events	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this provision	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S16.069	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 19	Support	Council supports the changes proposed to Objective 19, in particular the focus on the minimisation of risks and consequences to the environment including the effects of climate change.	Retain.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S30.017	Porirua City Council	Objective 19	Oppose	Council support the need to consider effects on the environment, although this duplicates changes to Objective 20.	<i>[Note reasoning references Objective 20, Chapter 3.8, Natural Hazards]</i> Amend the objective to remove duplication with other objectives.	Reject
FS25.050	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
FS25.176	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.086	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 19	Support in part	Council supports the need to recognise and address risks associated with natural hazards. See comments on Policies 29 and 51.	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 29 and 51.	Accept in part
S79.013	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 19	Support in part	The Objective is particularly high level and would benefit from some nuance, addressing how new and existing risk and development are treated. This will become more relevant as the effects of climate change increase in severity and frequency and sea level rise.	Retain as notified AND; Include additional objectives and policies that give direction as to when mitigation and adaptation should be considered and the outcomes sought by that mitigation and adaptation. AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	Accept in part
S102.064	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 19	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.021	Hutt City Council	Objective 19	Support	No reasons provided	Retain as notified	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S128.010	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective 19	Support in part	Natural hazards pose a risk to essential human health needs including food production, as these events can disrupt food supply. Natural hazard events (e.g., frequency of flood, drought) are set to be worsened by climate change.	Amend Objective 19, The risks and consequences to people, communities, food production and food security, their businesses, property, and infrastructure and the environment from natural hazards and the effects of climate change effects are reduced minimised.	Reject
FS2.8	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support in part	Rangitāne supports the intent of Objective 19 and agrees with the submitter that Objective 19 should include references to the natural environment and to food security.	Allow in part	Reject
S131.035	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 19	Support	Ātiawa supports Objective 19.	Retain as notified.	Accepted
FS2.59	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support		Allow	Accepted
FS29.306	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S132.002	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Objective 19	Support	We support the objective of minimizing the risks of natural hazards.	No Change	Accept
S140.023	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 19	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S144.053	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 19	Support		Retain as notified.	Accept
S148.044	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 19	Support in part	WIAL supports the intent of this objective, however it is unclear what is meant by the term	Define minimise as per the Council's PNRP namely "Reduce to the smallest	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				"minimise" This needs to be defined as per the Council's proposed Natural Resources Plan	amount reasonably practicable. Minimised, minimising and minimisation have the corresponding meaning." Otherwise delete the amendment.		
S163.036	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 19	Oppose	Defer to the RPS review in 2024	Delete the proposed amendments		Reject
FS7.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.202	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.053	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the	Not stated		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>		
FS30.109	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.027	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Objective 19	Support	This is consistent with the RMA	Retain as written	Accept
FS20.066	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Support	Ātiawa support these amendments, and seek that the provisions are retained as notified.	Allow	Accept
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S165.028	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Objective 19	Support	Consequential changes are appropriate. [Note: submission refers to 'Policies and Methods to Achieve Objective 19']	Support consequential changes to policies and methods to address relief sought in submission.	Accept in part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S166.016	Masterton District Council	Objective 19	Support in part	Objective is very high-level.	Retain as notified. However: Further clarity would help to understand what this means for our district in practice.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S167.046	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 19	Support	Taranaki Whānui support Objective 19. We note in particular the inclusion of Method 22	Retain as notified.	Accept
S16.070	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 20	Oppose	The proposed objective wording does not differentiate between the significance of different levels of risk arising from natural hazards. The objective also does not reflect the wording of sections 30 and 31 with respect to regional council and territorial local authority functions for the avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards.	Amend Objective 20 so it reads as follows: Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities avoid minimise the risks from significant natural hazards and mitigate the risks from all other natural hazards and impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.	Reject
FS17.023	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part
S30.018	Porirua City Council	Objective 20	Oppose	It is unclear what this objective is seeking to achieve and could be better worded.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcome sought is, and/or reword as follows: Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities minimise the risks from natural hazards and impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity. Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities do not compromise / are	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					consistent with Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.	
FS25.051	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
FS25.177	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.087	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 20	Support in part	Council supports the need to recognise and address risks associated with natural hazards. See comments on Policies 52, FW.7 and FW.8.	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 52, FW.7 and FW.8	Accept in part
S79.014	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 20	Support in part	This objective is supported. However, the framework for natural hazards overall does not give sufficient guidance for when intervention including mitigation, adaptation should be considered, including managed retreat. This is important to ensure at development and hazard management level (for example flood management) there are clear expectations around roles responsibilities.	Retain as notified AND; Include additional objectives and policies that give direction as to when mitigation and adaptation should be considered or required. AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	Accept in part
S102.065	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 20	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S113.007	Wellington Water	Objective 20	Support in part	Support general intention but the word 'minimise' is too strong unless it is defined as per the pNRP	Include a definition of minimise as per the pNRP	Accept
FS2.21	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support in part	Rangitāne supports the intention of Objective 20, and does not agree that 'minimise' is too strong in this context. Climate change and natural hazard mitigation and adaptation activities should preferentially employ nature-based solutions and should not adversely impact the environment, specifically Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S115.022	Hutt City Council	Objective 20	Support	No reasons provided	Retain as notified	Accept
S128.011	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective 20	Support in part	The drafting of this objective could be clearer, i.e. to confirm if the 'minimise' direction applies to both parts of the following sentence. HortNZ support the 'minimise' direction in the objective, as avoidance of any impacts on for example natural processes, will not always be possible. Does not support the explanation in the 'summary of amendments' table preceding the provisions (while recognising this is not part of the plan change) - which states "Amendment to add direction that natural hazard mitigation and adaption cannot have adverse environmental effects".	Consider clarifying the drafting of Objective 20. Retain 'minimise' policy direction in respect of managing the effects that may be associated with natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities.	Accept
FS2.9	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support in part	Rangitāne agree that rewording may assist to clarify the intent of the objective and that 'minimise' should continue to apply to both natural hazard mitigation and adaptation and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities. Many areas affected by natural hazard have associated values, indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems (eg rivers, coasts and wetlands) which are also impacted by these activities. Impacts from mitigation and adaptation activities on these areas should be minimised.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S131.036	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 20	Oppose in part	Ātiawa request that areas associated with mana whenua values are included in Objective 20, noting that natural hazard and climate change	Amend to: Objective 20 Natural hazard and climate change	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				mitigation and adaptation have traditionally impacted on our values, for example river works to alter the rivers natural course can destroy mahinga kai and sites of significance. Ātiawa seek to protect our values through Objective 20.	mitigation and adaptation activities do not cause or increase the risk from natural hazards or adversely impact on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Mana o te Taiao, areas associated with mana whenua values , natural processes, ecosystems and biodiversity.	
FS2.60	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Objective proposed by Ātiawa.	Allow	Reject
FS29.307	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p>	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S134.005	Powerco Limited	Objective 20	Oppose	<p>The anticipated environmental results for Objective 20 are identified as being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no increase in the risk from natural hazards as a result of subdivision, use or development (including mitigation works). 2. Where hazard mitigation and climate change measures are employed, there is a greater number and range of soft engineered measures used, that achieve integrated management and broad environmental outcomes. <p>The Objective focuses on 'natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities'. There is significant uncertainty in the definitions of 'climate change mitigation' and 'climate change adaptation' and the types of activities that will fall into these categories. However, they appear unlikely to apply to all subdivision, use or development, in which case the Objective will not achieve the first anticipated environmental result. The wording of existing Objective 20 appears likely to be more effective at achieving the first anticipated environmental result and provides greater certainty of the scope</p>	<p>Amend proposed Objective 20 to provide greater certainty as to the scope and intent, as described in the Anticipated Environmental Results for the objective. This could be achieved by retaining the wording of existing Objective 20 as follows, or making changes to the same effect:</p> <p>"Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities minimise the risks from natural hazards-Hazard mitigation measures, structural works and other activities do not increase the risk and consequences of natural hazard events and seek to minimise impacts on Te</p>	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				and intent of the objective. The term 'minimise' is considered to be too strong unless it is defined as per the PNRP.	Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity."	
S140.024	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 20	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.045	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 20	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	amend. Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities minimise the risks from natural hazards and impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, and indigenous and valued introduced ecosystems and biodiversity.	Reject
FS20.140	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept in part
FS19.109	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.	Disallow	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.			
FS30.214	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S148.045	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 20	Support in part	WIAL submits that it is unclear what is meant by the term "minimise" This needs to be defined as per the Council's proposed Natural Resources Plan	Define minimise as per the Council's PNRP namely "Reduce to the smallest amount reasonably practicable. Minimised, minimising and minimisation have the corresponding meaning." Otherwise delete the amendment.		Accept
S157.007	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Objective 20	Oppose	The anticipated environmental results for Objective 20 are identified as being: 1. There is no increase in the risk from natural hazards as a result of subdivision, use or development (including mitigation works). 2. Where hazard mitigation and climate change measures are employed, there is a greater number and range of soft engineered measures used, that achieve integrated management and	Amend proposed Objective 20 to provide greater certainty as to the scope and intent, as described in the Anticipated Environmental Results for the objective. This could be achieved by retaining the wording of existing Objective 20 as follows, or making changes to the same effect: Objective 20: Natural hazard		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				<p>broad environmental outcomes. The Objective focuses on 'natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities'. There is significant uncertainty in the definitions of 'climate change mitigation' and 'climate change adaptation' and the types of activities that will fall into these categories. However, they appear unlikely to apply to all subdivision, use or development, in which case the Objective will not achieve the first anticipated environmental result. The wording of existing Objective 20 appears likely to be more effective at achieving the first anticipated environmental result and provides greater certainty of the scope and intent of the objective.</p> <p>The term 'minimise' is considered to be too strong unless it is defined as per the pNRP.</p>	<p>and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities minimise the risks from natural hazards Hazard mitigation measures, structural works and other activities do not increase the risk and consequences of natural hazard events and seek to minimise impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.</p>		
FS2.1	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support in part	Rangitāne agree with the submitter that Objective 20 could benefit from further clarification as to the scope and intent.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS17.024	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Support	WIAL support the relief sought as it will achieve the management of natural and physical resources in a manner that is sustainable, efficient and effective for the Wellington community, including Wellington International Airport.	Allow		Reject
FS14.001	Masterton District Council		Support in part	<p>Agree with the following: It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthening against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure including regionally significant infrastructure should also be resilient and should have explicit mention under Objective CC.6.</p>	Not stated	<p>Agree with relief sought as follows: Objective CC.6: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the</p>	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
						short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change.	
S158.010	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objective 20	Support in part	Supports the intent of the objective, however seeks that the objective is amended to provide clarity but also recognises that natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities are not limited to mitigation measures.	Amend the objective as follows: Natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities do not increase minimise the risks from natural hazards and do not have an adverse effect on impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity		Reject
FS16.002	Stride Investment Management Limited		Support	Stride supports taking a practical approach to climate change risk assessment, including recognising that natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities should not increase risks from natural hazards.	Allow		Reject
FS20.033	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	The relief sought is inappropriate given the risk the region faces due to the impacts of climate change. The regions response to climate change must be to minimise and avoid risks from natural hazards and climate change.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS1.002	Investore Property Limited		Support	Investore supports taking a practical approach to climate change risk assessment, including recognising that natural hazard and climate change mitigation and adaptation activities should not increase risks from natural hazards.	Allow		Reject
S163.037	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 20	Oppose	Defer to the RPS review in 2024	Delete the proposed amendments Delete the FW icon		Reject
FS7.081	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.			
FS20.203	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.054	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS30.110	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.029	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Objective 20	Support	This objective is appropriate.	Retain	Accept
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S166.017	Masterton District Council	Objective 20	Not Stated / Neutral	Need to provide for impacts on the natural environment where the need for essential services or infrastructure is great. For example, protecting a communities drinking water supply. It is possible that mitigation measures to protect human life, regionally significant infrastructure, or critical facilities such as hospitals, will impact	Include hierarchy for mitigation and protection measures.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				on natural values of rivers and wetlands, etc. The RPS should look at including a hierarchy whereby mitigation or protection measures that impact on natural process are provided for if the need is great.		
FS19.024	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Support	Appropriate for providing RSI.	Allow	Reject
S167.047	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 20	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of Objective 20. Areas of significance to mana whenua need to be provided for in this objective.	Amend the provision to read:and impacts on Te Mana o te Wai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, areas of significance to mana whenua , natural processes, indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.	Accept
S169.006	Kahungunu Ki Wairarapa	Objective 20	Support	On behalf of a mandated iwi organisation, Kahungunu Ki Wairarapa, I, Rawiri Smith, an Environmental Manager for Kahungunu Ki Wairarapa would like to express our support for the iwi expressions of Te Mana o Te Wai in the proposed Regional Policy Statement of Greater Wellington 2022. I do this because it follows the process set out in regulation, namely the Resource Management Act and the key policies in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. By being in line with these two statutes we can recognise that the proposed Te Mana o Te Wai sections fulfill the intent of both regulations.	Retain as notified	Accept
FS31.007	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc		Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original	Not stated	Accept in part?

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>		
S30.019	Porirua City Council	Objective 21	Oppose	<p>It is unclear what this objective is seeking to achieve and could be better worded to be more certain and measurable. Issues of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear what 'strengthened' means in this context i.e. strengthened to what degree, to achieve what? • It is unclear what is meant by 'better prepared' i.e. better prepared than what? From what to date? How much better prepared? • Unsure why need to separate out short, medium and long term, and how this concept flows through to the policy direction. • The natural environment covered by objectives 19 and 20 and doesn't need to be mentioned in every objective as the objectives in the RPS should be read as a whole. 	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcome sought is.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS25.052	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
FS25.178	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.088	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 21	Support in part	Council supports the need to increase resilience. See comments on Policies 29, 51 and 52.	Retain objective as notified and seek relief sought in relation to policies 29, 51 and 52 and the definition of resilience.	Accept in part
S79.015	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 21	Support	This objective is supported. However, the framework for natural hazards overall does not give sufficient guidance for when intervention including mitigation, adaptation should be considered, including managed retreat. This is important to ensure at development and hazard management level (for example flood management) there are clear expectations around roles responsibilities.	Retain as notified AND; Include additional objectives and policies that give direction as to when mitigation and adaptation should be considered or required. AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	Accept in part
S102.066	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 21	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.023	Hutt City Council	Objective 21	Support	No reasons provided	Retain as notified	Accept
S128.012	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective 21	Support in part	Generally support the objective of strengthening resilience, however it seeks an amendment to specially reference food production, as one of the components of resilience. Natural hazards (and the effects of climate change) pose a risk to essential human health needs including food production, as these events can disrupt food supply. The Paris Agreement speaks to speaks to a 'fundamental priority of safeguarding food	Amend Objective 21 The resilience of our communities, including food production and food security , and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change, and	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				security' and action in a manner that does not threaten food production.	sea level rise is strengthened, and people are better prepared for the consequences of natural hazard events.	
FS2.10	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Oppose	Rangitāne do not agree that it is necessary to elevate or specify one component of community resilience, while not specifying any other components. This matter could be addressed in supporting text, in the explanation as to what community resilience comprises.	Disallow	Accept
S131.037	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 21	Support	Ātiawa supports the amendments made to Objective 21	Retain as notified.	Accept
FS2.61	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support	Rangitāne endorse Ātiawa's support for this objective.	Allow	Accept
FS29.308	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p>	Not stated	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S132.003	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Objective 21	Support	We support increasing the resilience of communities to natural hazards, including the increase in risk likely to be caused by climate change.	No Change	Accept
S140.025	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 21	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S148.046	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 21	Support in part	WIAL supports ensuring that communities and the environment are made more resilient to and are better prepared for natural hazard events. This should be extended to also ensure regionally significant infrastructure is similarly managed	Amend the objective as follows: The resilience of our communities, regionally significant infrastructure, and...	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS19.063	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Support	The suggested change is appropriate for providing RSI	Allow		Reject
S158.011	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objective 21	Support in part	Seeks that the objective is amended to provide clarity to provide for measurable outcomes. The words strengthened and better prepared are ambiguous.	Amend the objective to provide measurable clarity. The resilience of our communities and the natural environment is strengthened to avoid loss of life and damage to property due to the to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change, and sea level rise is strengthened, and people are better prepared for the consequences of natural hazard events.		Reject
FS17.025	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
S163.038	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 21	Oppose	Defer to the RPS review in 2024	Delete the proposed amendments		Reject
FS7.082	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.204	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.		
FS29.055	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
FS30.111	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.030	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	Objective 21	Support	This objective is appropriate.	Retain.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)					
FS20.067	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Support	Ātiawa support these amendments, and seek that the provisions are retained as notified.	Allow	Accept
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S166.018	Masterton District Council	Objective 21	Support in part	Objective is supported but more guidance needed around how this would work in practice.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S167.048	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 21	Support	Taranaki Whānui support Objective 19. We note in particular the inclusion of Method 22	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.026	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective CC.6	Support	Ātiawa supports the inclusion of Objective CC.6 in RPS Change 1.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
FS29.297	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective CC.6	Support	Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S157.006	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Objective CC.6	Support in part	<p>It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure is particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents considerable financial investment that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6.</p>	<p>Amend Objective CC.6 to acknowledge the need for increased resilience of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, against the adverse effects of climate change. This could be achieved by making the following changes: Objective CC.6: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of</p>	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change.	
FS26.008	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	The Fuel Companies (p. 5) request inclusion of reference to infrastructure (including RSI).Meridian agrees the objective needs amendment to better provide for regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
S25.007	Carterton District Council	Objective CC.6	Support	CDC supports this objective and notes that the draft Wairarapa Combined District Plan will give effect to this.	Retain the policy.	Accept in part
S136.013	DairyNZ	Objective CC.6	Oppose	Believe the analysis included in the section 32 report to support this policy position is inadequate to determine the appropriateness of the policy settings, costs or benefits of this approach. Further analysis needed to ensure this objective is consistent with the latest science and will achieve community objectives.	Delete Objective CC.6 and any related provisions or methods and address the issue through a full review of the RPS.	Reject
FS30.019	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	B+LNZ supports the withdrawal of provisions relating to climate change in order to undertake the necessary analysis, use the most up to date science and be consistent with national direction on climate change.	Allow	Reject
S128.007	Horticulture New Zealand	Objective CC.6	Support	Resilience to the effects of climate change is important and should be recognised and enabled.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S115.011	Hutt City Council	Objective CC.6	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S158.008	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Objective CC.6	Support in part	The objective is considered too broad and is not measurable. Seeks clarity as to what degree of increase is considered appropriate.	Amend the objective to include measurable outcomes to define what an increase of the community's resilience is over the short, medium and long term. The resilience of communities and the natural environment is increased to avoid loss of life and damage to	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					property to the short, medium, and long-term due to the effects of climate change. Improved resource management and adaptation planning by regional and district councils, including increase	
S16.011	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective CC.6	Support	Council supports the intent of the objective that management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change.	Retain	Accept in part
S166.008	Masterton District Council	Objective CC.6	Support	Building community resilience to climate change is one of the main aims of our newly established Climate Action Plan so we are supportive of this objective.	Retain as notified. MDC requests involvement in the development of any plans or policies relating to adaptation planning, particularly in the Masterton District.	Accept in part
S100.006	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective CC.6	Support in part	It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure is particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents considerable financial investment that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6.	Insert into Objective CC.6 reference to infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure: "Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change."	Accept in part
FS14.012	Masterton District Council	Objective CC.6	Support in part	Agree with: It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure is particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents considerable financial investment that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6.	Agree with relief sought: Insert into Objective CC.6 reference to infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure: "Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change."	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS19.028	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective CC.6	Support	Necessary for delivery of regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept in part
S133.032	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Objective CC.6	Support	Supports requirements to reduce emissions and improve health and resilience while supporting people and communities.	Retain as notified. OR Alternative relief that maybe necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko's connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	No recommendation
FS20.379	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective CC.6	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect</p>	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
FS6.061	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Objective CC.6	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow	No recommendation
S30.009	Porirua City Council	Objective CC.6	Oppose	Resource management and adaptation planning is the method to achieve resilience and is not required to be included in the objective itself. Thought needs to be given as to what degree of increase is being sought so that the objective is measurable and certain. Otherwise, a very small increase would meet this objective, which we assume is not its intent.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcome sought is, and/or reword as follows: Resource management and adaptation planning increase The resilience of communities and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change is increased .	Reject
FS25.014 & FS25.140	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S134.002	Powerco Limited	Objective CC.6	Support in part	It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure is particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents	Amend Objective CC.6 to acknowledge the need for increased resilience of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, against the adverse effects of climate change. This could be achieved by	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				considerable financial investment that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6.	making the following changes: "Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change."	
FS26.009	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	Powerco requests amendment to acknowledge the need for increased resilience of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, against the adverse effects of climate change. This could be achieved by making the following changes: Objective CC.6 Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure(including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change.Meridian agrees that explicit reference to regionally significant infrastructure should be included in the objective.	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
FS3.012	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Objective CC.6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports recognition of regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept in part
S168.0110	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Objective CC.6	Support		Rangitāne o Wairarapa strongly support any measures to require a reduction in greenhouse emissions through the RPS, land use and transport planning, where these measures are equitable and enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic, cultural, wellbeing (noting that achieving this does not mean that it has to be a no-cost solution).	Accept in part
FS31.036	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective CC.6	Support	We'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p>		
S165.008	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Objective CC.6	Support	This objective aligns with, and helps to give effect to, the National Adaptation Plan.	Retain	Accept in part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Objective CC.6	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S79.006	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective CC.6	Support	A long-term view is required to build in resilience to natural hazards generally as well as those exacerbated by climate change. Support the development of a multitude of regulatory and non- regulatory methods	Including the following amendments to CC.6: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities and the natural environment to in the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change and natural hazards . [End of amendments to Objective CC.6] Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	Reject
FS14.019	Masterton District Council	Objective CC.6	Support	Agree with: A long-term view is required to build in resilience to natural hazards generally as well as those exacerbated by climate change. Support the development of a multitude of regulatory and non- regulatory methods	Agree with relief sought: Including the following amendments to CC.6: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities and the natural environment to in the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change and natural hazards . [End of amendments to Objective CC.6] Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	Reject
S144.027	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective CC.6	Support	Planning for resilience will reward communities by freeing up resources that will be needed to cover increased living costs due to unavoidable climatic and environmental changes.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S167.023	Taranaki Whānui	Objective CC.6	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports Objective CC.6	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S34.047	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective CC.6	Support in part	Support the need to increase resilience, however Council is concerned about some of the policies supporting this objective.	Retain objective as notified and review policies to ensure an ability to reasonably implement.	Accept in part
S170.010	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Objective CC.6	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>This objective can be strengthened from 'recognises and provides for', especially considering Policy 29, Policy 51, Policy 52, and CC.13 being non-regulatory, specifying how these policies performed and whether the current wording would improve the status quo. Since the first generation regional and district plans, the objectives could not avoid inappropriate subdivision and development in natural hazard overlays, and in some cases, plans could not deliver the objective of reducing the risk and consequences faced from natural hazards.</p> <p>Looking at Policy 52 to deliver this Objective, somewhat contradicts the strength of the Objective CC.4. Given that Policy CC.13 is also non-regulatory, the regulatory impact of CC.4 can be diluted in the consent process. 'recognises and provides for' could be redrafted to say 'Land use planning will respond with appropriate tools and practices...'</p>	Use stronger wording than 'recognises and provides for'. e.g. 'Land use planning will respond with appropriate tools and practices...'	Reject
FS29.124 & FS29.196	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective CC.6	Support	Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making - Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 - Support in principal Wai Mate O1, O2, O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S102.009	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective CC.6	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Climate Change' chapter.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S132.001	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Objective CC.6	Support	Support increasing the resilience of communities to climate change by adaptation planning	No Change	Accept in part
S163.017	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective CC.6	Oppose	Agree with intent, however the alternate overarching Objective A and Objective B are preferred as these provide more concrete objectives and pathways to achieve a similar result.	That Objective CC.6 be deleted	Reject
FS30.090	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023	Allow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
FS29.034	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective CC.6	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – Oppose Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE. It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
FS20.183	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective CC.6	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S140.012	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective CC.6	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S148.019	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective CC.6	Support in part	It is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure can be particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents a considerable financial investment	Amend the objective as follows: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure(including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short,	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6.	medium, and long-term effects of climate change.	
FS26.007	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective CC.6	Support	WIAL considers it is not only the resilience of communities and the natural environment that need strengthened resilience against the adverse effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure can be particularly vulnerable to climate change effects and represents a considerable financial investment that is critical to the resilience of communities. It warrants explicit mention in Objective CC.6. WIAL requests amendment of the objective as follows: Resource management and adaptation planning increase the resilience of communities, infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) and the natural environment to the short, medium, and long-term effects of climate change. Meridian agrees that the regionally significant infrastructure is essential to support the resilience of communities and this needs to be addressed in the objective.	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
FS7.008	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Objective CC.6	Oppose	It's not clear that this is the appropriate policy to include infrastructure as infrastructure and RSI is covered elsewhere in the RPS.	Disallow insertion of infrastructure into the policy.	Reject
S163.035	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Table 8(a)	Oppose	Defer to the full RPS review in 2024.	Delete Table 8A OR Amend objectives and policies in Table 8A as per details in submission and make consequential amendments to related methods.	Reject
FS7.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out	Disallow Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.			
FS20.201	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.052	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated		Accept in part
FS30.108	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should	Allow		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
S167.049	Taranaki Whānui	Table 8(a)	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui want to see objectives in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi that enable partnership in the incorporation of Te Mana o Te Wai and Te Rito of te Harakeke.	Include specific objective to partner with mana whenua in the protection of iwi/hapū against natural hazards.	Reject
FS6.027	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Support	We support this submission because mana whenua should be partnered with in matters such as natural hazards to ensure their aspirations are upheld.	Allow	Reject
S10.003	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Policy 29 would benefit from clarification of what is meant by a 'low', 'moderate', 'high' or 'extreme' hazard or risk. The use of "low to moderate" in (c) and "high to extreme" in (d) makes it unclear whether it means low or moderate or a separate category of 'low to moderate'. Policy 29 drafting indicates (d) only applies where both hazards and risks are high to extreme, so an activity could locate in a high hazard area if the risk was moderate. However, this also needs clarification.	Define the terms used in Policy 29 or provide the reader with guidance. For example, in the Explanation, on where definition of these terms can be found. Clarify the wording of Policy 29 in relation to hazards and risks and different hazard and risk levels or categories.	Accept
FS12.020	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora agrees that low, medium, and high categorization of risk is consistent with best practice. Kāinga Ora considers that definitions should be provided for consistent use throughout the region.	Allow	Accept in part
S11.017	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at	Support in part	Not stated.	Amend Policy 29(c) to read: "Include objectives, policies and rules to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas where hazards and risks	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans			are assessed as low to moderate;	
S16.071	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>The proposed shift in language from avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development to managing these activities is not consistent with the avoidance and mitigation requirements of sections 30 and 31 of the RMA. Council also opposes the proposed reference to high risk, as this would make the policy less consistent with section 6(h) of the RMA, which refers to the management of significant risks from natural hazards.</p> <p>Council also notes the use of the verb manage or managing within resource management policy gives little direction to decision makers on what is required. Council is not aware of any agreed meaning of this term in resource management practice or relevant case law.</p> <p>Council requests all verbs used in the RPS align with those required under the RMA or relevant higher-level statutory planning documents and are chosen for their clear meaning and direction for decision makers. In the case of regional, city and district council requirements under the RMA for the management of natural hazards, the verbs are avoid or mitigate, while under the NZCPS the verbs are avoid inappropriate (in the case of significant natural hazard risk).</p> <p>Council notes for parts of the proposed policy to be able to be implemented they rely on parts of the explanation, yet explanatory text has no legal status in a plan under the RMA. An example of this is policy clause (d) relying on all clauses in the explanation. We request this be addressed by including the explanatory text within the policy and deleting any reference to 'Explanation' from the policy entirely. We note that clearly drafted</p>	<p>Amend Policy 29 so it reads as follows: Policy 29: Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development in areas at high subject to significant risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans.<i>[Note: Below comments do not form part of requested amendments to Policy 29]</i></p> <p>Replace all references to manage with appropriate verbs that provide clear direction to decision makers. Ensure the chosen verbs are consistent with requirements of the RMA and relevant higher-level statutory planning documents. Move the explanatory text so it forms part of the policy. Delete all remaining explanatory text following the</p>	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				policies should require no explanatory text.	transfer of relevant text into the policy.	
S30.050	Porirua City Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	<p>Council supports taking a risk-based approach to natural hazard management, the Proposed Porirua District Plan takes this approach which is in line with national best practice.</p> <p>It is unclear what direction is sought in terms of the use of the term 'manage' in this context. Is it to ensure that there is no increased risk to people or properties?</p> <p>In regard to (b), amending the policy to require identification of low, medium or high hazards would be consistent with a risk-based approach to hazard management. The qualifier "at least" is requested as some hazards can have a return period of greater than 1:100 years but still be considered high, medium or low hazard risk such as fault lines.</p> <p>In regard to (d) it is unclear what would constitute an "extreme" risk and how it should be managed differently from a "high" risk. Council considers that the categorization of low, medium or high risk is consistent with a best practice risk-based approach to natural hazard management.</p>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives, and/or reword policy as follows: Regional and district plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and / or other methods that:</p> <p>(a) identify areas affected by natural hazards; and</p> <p>(b) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over at least a 100 year planning horizon, which identifies the hazards as being low, medium or high;</p> <p>(c) include objectives, policies and rules to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate; and</p> <p>(d) include objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, use or</p>	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme .	
FS12.013	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	It is unclear what constitutes an "extreme" risk. Kāinga Ora agrees that low, medium, and high categorization of risk is consistent with best practice. Kāinga Ora further considers that definitions should be provided for consistent use throughout the region.	Allow in part	Accept in part
FS25.083	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
FS25.209	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S32.020	Director-General of Conservation	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and	Support in part	While the proposed changes are generally appropriate in most locations, they fail to give effect to NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, especially clauses a and b of that Policy which require avoiding increasing risk.	Amend the policy to give effect to the NZCPS, including by adding a new subclause as follows or words to like effect: "include objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development within the coastal environment that would increase the risk of	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
		regional plans			adverse effects from coastal hazards"		
FS12.001	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission to the extent that it would apply to any coastal hazard. Policy 25 of the NZCPS is relevant only to areas potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years. Notwithstanding this, District Plans are required to give effect to the NZCPS therefore any duplication of such requirement through the RPS, in the absence of additional guidance, is unnecessary and superfluous.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS17.026	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission and does not appropriately provide for regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS10.003	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)		Oppose	The changes sought introduce a requirement to avoid all subdivision, use and development that results in any increase in risk and are more onerous than NZCPS Policy 25. The proposed change does not recognise that some activities, such as Ports and associated infrastructure, have a functional need to locate in the coastal environment and can be designed and operated in a way that enables risk to be managed to acceptable levels.	Disallow	Disallow the submission and do not include the new subclause sought in Policy 29.	Accept in part
FS24.002	Powerco Limited		Oppose	The changes sought introduce a requirement to avoid all subdivision, use and development that results in any increase in risk and are more onerous than NZCPS Policy 25. The proposed change does not recognise that some activities, such as gas and electricity networks will not be able to entirely avoid locating in areas subject to natural hazard risk and can be designed and	Disallow	Disallow the submission and do not include the new subclause sought in Policy 29.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				operated in a manner that ensures they are resilient to the risk.			
FS20.015	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Support in part	Ātiawa acknowledges that it is important to avoid development in areas where risk is high to extreme; however any remnants of land held by Māori that trigger this policy would be significantly limited. Ātiawa, alongside Māori landowners would like to work with Regional Council to determine which areas are affected by natural hazards (both low/tolerable and intolerable) to work together through any issues that capture land held by Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai uri.	Allow in part	Allow in part, allow suggested amendment in so far as council agree to partner with mana whenua to identify risks and the appropriateness of activities in the coastal environment.	Awaiting recommendation
FS30.298	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Accept in part
S34.049	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at	Support in part	Council notes that section 6 of the RMA identifies the management of significant risks from natural hazards as a matter of national importance In this regard it would seem more appropriate to avoid inappropriate subdivision, use and	Define extreme, high, moderate and low risk and amend policy to read: Policy 29: Avoiding inappropriate Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans		<p>development in areas of high to extreme risk, whilst managing development in areas assessed as having a low to moderate risk. It is also noted that under section 30 and 31 there is a direction for the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards.</p> <p>The term 'managing' is a bit ambiguous and this policy should provide a strong message that inappropriate development should be avoided.</p> <p>It is unclear how an area of extreme, high, moderate or low risk is defined in this context.</p>	from natural hazards - district and regional plans.	
FS12.025	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora agrees that definitions should be provided for each hazard profile, for consistent use throughout the region.</p> <p>Any reference to "avoiding" and/or "avoid" should be followed with "inappropriate" in the context of Policy 29.</p>	Allow in part	Accept in part
S49.003	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	<p>Policy 29 is supported in that it is entirely appropriate for regional and district plans to identify and map areas susceptible to natural hazards. Telecommunication companies rely on this identification to help understand the risk profile of their infrastructure, and influence decisions as to where new infrastructure should go, and how it should be designed to be resilient. However, there is no need for regional or district plans to regulate the resilience of telecommunications infrastructure where it is located in natural hazard areas. In some instances, avoiding a natural hazard area is not possible for technical and operational reasons. The telecommunication companies have obligations under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEMA) to provide resilient infrastructure. This is regulated under the CDEMA, and adding another layer of regulation of resilience through regional and district plans is not necessary.</p>	Remove the ability for regional and district plans to regulate the resilience of infrastructure to identified natural hazards.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>This is also recognised in Regulation 57 of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 (NESTF). Regulation 57 of the NESTF is as follows, and clearly exempts regulated activities under the NESTF from having to comply with District Plan rules about natural hazards:</p> <p>57 District rules about natural hazard areas disapplied</p> <p>(1) A territorial authority cannot make a natural hazard rule that applies to a regulated activity .</p> <p>(2) A natural hazard rule that was made before these regulations came into force, does not apply in relation to a regulated activity.</p> <p>(3) In this regulation, natural hazard rule means a district rule that prescribes measures to mitigate the effect of natural hazards in an area identified in the district plan as being subject to 1 or more natural hazards.</p> <p>Section 6.11 of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 Users' Guide, published by the Ministry for the Environment (August 2018) confirms the exemption of regulated telecommunications activities from having to comply with District Plan natural hazard rules, via the following statement: Regulation 57 makes it clear that natural hazard rules in district plans do not apply to a regulated activity under the NESTF. It also makes clear that territorial authorities cannot make natural hazard rules that apply to regulated activities under the NESTF. This is because resilience is already factored into industry practice, and they will either avoid hazard areas or engineer structures to be resilient to the hazard risk. Natural hazards encompass the full breath of hazards including flooding, instability, earthquake and climate change. Given this direction is provided at a national level, it would be appropriate for regional and district statutory planning documents to be</p>		

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				consistent. It is entirely appropriate for district and regional plans to regulate infrastructure in natural hazards whereby that regulation is to ensure that the development on infrastructure does not exacerbate the effect of the natural hazard on any other party.		
S79.036	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	The provisions are generally supported when examined alongside policies 51 and 52.	Retain as notified. Include additional methods to support consistent implementation of risk assessment and provision/communication of natural hazards and associated risks.	Accept in part
S102.068	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support	Generally supports Policy 29 in the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S113.027	Wellington Water	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development	Support in part	Not all activities can avoid high risk areas. For example, anywhere wet is considered high risk under the pNRP but many Wellington Water activities need to occur in wet locations.	Amend clause (d) as follows: (d) include objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation	
		ent in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans			are assessed as high to extreme or to appropriately manage the risk for regionally significant infrastructure.		
FS23.006	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	Notwithstanding the clarification sought in its original submission, Transpower supports the recognition within the policy for regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Reject	
FS10.023	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)		Support	Agree with S113 that not all activities can avoid high risk areas.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Policy 29 to provide for the appropriate management of risk to regionally significant infrastructure, in addition to the changes sought in the Fuel Companies own submission.	Reject
FS24.019	Powerco Limited		Support	Agree with S113 that not all activities can avoid high risk areas.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Policy 29 to provide for the appropriate management of risk to regionally significant infrastructure, in addition to the changes sought in Powerco's own submission.	Reject
FS3.029	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)		Support	Waka Kotahi supports the recognition that regionally significant infrastructure cannot always avoid high risk areas, and often have a functional need to locate in such areas. For example, the transport network often provides a lifeline function to communities that cannot be relocated.	Allow		Reject
S115.050	Hutt City Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivisio	Support in part	Support the intent of this policy. As some hazards recur with a frequency of less than 1 in 100 years (such as fault ruptures) it should be	Retain the amendments to Policy 29, but with the following change to clause (b):	Accept	

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		n, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans		clarified that it does not preclude consideration of hazards beyond this time period.	"use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over at least a 100 year planning horizon;"	
S128.036	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support using a risk-based approach, this is valid both in determining natural hazard risk and in the management response - for example, a non-habitable farm buildings for example are less of a risk compared to new residential development. The direction of avoiding all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme may be too onerous in all circumstances.	Amend as follows:(d) include objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, or inappropriate use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme.	Reject
FS11.012	Fulton Hogan Limited		Support	Avoiding all subdivision, use and development in areas where hazards are high to extreme is too onerous. Low vulnerability structures/activities may be acceptable in certain circumstances and this should be based on a site specific consideration	Allow	Reject
FS20.023	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submission point. Allowing non-habitable agricultural/horticultural infrastructure where the hazard and risks are assessed as high to extreme creates unnecessary risk - risk that the materials held in these facilities could cause damage to te taiao in a hazard event, additionally, landowners may then lobby council to provide protection to hazards (e.g. increase or maintain stop banks) to protect their investment in infrastructure.	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.074	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support	While Ātiawa supports the overall intent of Policy 29, Ātiawa is concerned with details of the policy. In particular, (d), Ātiawa is concerned that Regional Council is determining how mana whenua can develop and use their land. Ātiawa acknowledges that it is important to avoid development in areas where risk is high to extreme; however any remnants of land held by Māori that trigger this subclause would be significantly limited. Ātiawa would like to work with Regional Council to determine which areas are affected by natural hazards (both low/tolerable and intolerable) to work together through any issues that capture land held by Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai uri.	Amend to: Regional and district plans shall: (a) partner with mana whenua to identify areas affected by natural hazards; and (b) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over a 100 year planning horizon; (c) include objectives, policies and rules to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate; and (d) include objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards are assessed as high to extreme.	Reject
FS29.344	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S132.007	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	We support minimizing the risk from natural hazards by avoiding new or further residential development in areas most at risk. Guidance should be provided to district and city councils on which situations constitute high risk from natural hazards.	Strengthen, change to: "Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas at high risk from natural hazards and manage in areas of lower risk" Add guidance on what constitutes low, medium, and high natural hazard risk, to avoid inconsistent application of these terms in district plans	Reject
FS12.018	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora considers that a qualifier is required, such that only 'inappropriate' subdivision, use and development be avoided, in areas at high risk from natural hazards. Kāinga Ora agrees that additional guidance on what constitutes low, medium, and high natural hazard risk, would be useful within the RPS to avoid inconsistent application of these terms in district plans.	Disallow in part	Accept in part
FS17.027	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it does not appropriately provide for regionally significant infrastructure. Disallow the proposed amendment or for example clarify that it does not apply to regionally significant infrastructure	Disallow	Accept in part
S133.059	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at	Support	Supports these policies surrounding effective management and measures for climate change and climate change effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
		risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans					
FS20.406	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaupoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaupoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S134.012	Powerco Limited	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose	It will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme. For example, under the PNRP, all areas in the coastal marine area and the beds of lakes and rivers are considered high hazard risk areas. Under the Proposed Porirua District Plan, stream corridors and areas in the current coastal hazard inundation and erosion overlays are considered high risk. There is existing development in these areas, which will need to be maintained. Further, provision is made in both plans for certain new activities to occur in these locations. It is inappropriate to prevent any and all further development in high hazard areas. In the case of regionally significant infrastructure networks, there will be a need for infrastructure to cross areas identified as high or extreme hazard, such as stream and river corridors, in order to deliver services to communities on the other side.	Amend Policy 29 to recognise that it will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, and to ensure appropriate provision is made for regionally significant infrastructure to be maintained and to traverse such locations. This could be achieved by making following changes or to the same effect: "Regional and district plans shall: (a) identify areas affected by natural hazards; and (b) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over a 100 year planning horizon; (c) include objectives, policies and rules to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate; and (d) include objectives, policies and rules to avoid new subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					are assessed as high to extreme, and to appropriately manage risk to new and existing regionally significant infrastructure and to existing subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme. ..."	
S137.025	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve clarity and consistency, and to provide certainty that for the hazard provisions to be successful in district plans they need to be linked to hazard overlays.	Amend Clause (d) of Policy 29 as follows: ... (d) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to new or existing subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over a 100 year planning horizon;	Accept
FS12.003	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed inclusion of "existing" into Policy 29, particularly insofar as it relates to managing effects of natural hazards on existing uses and activities through District Plans. District plans can only address future use, development and subdivision and cannot require	Disallow	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				change to existing use or development.			
FS14.009	Masterton District Council		Support in part	Agree with: Amendments are required to improve clarity and consistency, and to provide certainty that for the hazard provisions to be successful in district plans they need to be linked to hazard overlays.	Not stated	Agree with relief sought: Amend Clause (d) of Policy 29 as follows: ... (d) use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to new or existing subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over a 100 year planning horizon;	Accept in part
S137.026	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve clarity and consistency, and to provide certainty that for the hazard provisions to be successful in district plans they need to be linked to hazard overlays.	Amend Clause (e) and (f) in Policy 29 to read: (e) include hazard overlays, objectives, policies and rules to manage subdivision, use and development in those areas where the hazards and risks are assessed as low to moderate; and (f) include hazard overlays, objectives, policies and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme.		Accept
FS12.004	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes mandatory use of hazard overlays. Kāinga Ora notes that hazards, such as flood hazards, are dynamic and change depending on the infrastructure and	Disallow		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>development in the area. Kāinga Ora supports flood hazard maps sitting outside the District Plan, in Council GIS mapping.</p> <p>To complement this, Kāinga Ora considers that definitions of differing hazard profiles should apply regionally, so as to provide an alternative tool in identifying hazards within District Plans.</p> <p>Further to this, Kāinga Ora considers that only 'inappropriate' use and development should be avoided. Kāinga Ora considers that the appropriate method for managing hazards is specific to the particular hazard and the local context.</p>		
FS13.023	Wellington City Council		Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow	Accept
S140.051	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support the intent of this policy. As some hazards recur with a frequency of less than 1 in 100 years (such as fault ruptures) it should be clarified that it does not preclude consideration of hazards beyond this time period.	Retain the amendments to Policy 29, but with the following change to clause (b): "use a risk-based approach to assess the consequences to subdivision, use and development from natural hazard and climate change impacts over at least a 100 year planning horizon;"	Accept
S144.028	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in	Support	See Policy 57 regarding sprawl. Generally, containing new development will minimize exposure to natural hazards.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans				
S148.047	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Many infrastructure providers have a functional or operational requirement to locate in a certain area, even if that area is subject to natural hazard risk. Wellington Airport is located near the coast for example. Such infrastructure providers natural hazard tolerance is therefore inherently different to those without the same operational and functional need to locate in such areas.	Delete this policy or amend as follows: (d) include objectives, polices and rules to avoid subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, unless there is a functional or operational need locate in such areas	Accept
S157.015	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose	It will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme. For example, under the PNRP, all areas in the coastal marine area and the beds of lakes and rivers are considered high hazard risk areas. There is existing development in these areas, for which provision needs to be made, at least, for its continued operation and maintenance. Of particular relevance are stormwater outfalls to the coast and stream corridors, and wharflines between port facilities in the CMA and bulk storage tanks, which traverse locations meeting the PNRP definition of 'high hazard risk areas'. Further, provision is made in both plans for certain new activities to occur in these locations. It is inappropriate to prevent any and all further development in high hazard areas. In the case of regionally significant infrastructure networks,	Amend Policy 29 to recognise that it will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, particularly where there is existing development or a need for infrastructure to locate in high hazard areas, such as stormwater outfalls to the coast or stream corridors. This could be achieved by making following changes or to the same effect: d) include objectives, polices and rules to avoid inappropriate subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				there will be a need for infrastructure to cross areas identified as high or extreme hazard, such as stream and river corridors, in order to deliver services to communities on the other side.	hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme,		
S158.025	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support	Supports the inclusion of a hazard and management hierarchy to manage the effects of hazards on subdivision, use and development.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S163.061	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose	Defer to full review of the RPS in 2024 This area was the subject of recent mediation in the pNRP hearings and the rationale for re-litigating in RPS Change One is not clear.	That the amendments to Policy 29 be deleted		Reject
FS7.104	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.			
FS20.226	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.077	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated		Accept in part
FS30.133	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full	Allow		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
S165.058	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Oppose	Oppose deletion of avoid as this is inconsistent with the NZCPS.	Retain "Avoid inappropriate" in the original policy to give effect to the NZCPS. Seek retention of original wording as the term 'manage' is not appropriate and fails to achieve NZCPS Objective 19.	Reject
FS17.028	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it does not appropriately provide for regionally significant infrastructure. Disallow the proposed amendment or for example clarify that it does not apply to regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow	Accept In part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S166.031	Masterton District Council	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support in principle but it has significant implications for development in the Masterton urban area (behind stop banks). The Wairarapa Combined District Plan will take a risk-based approach to hazard planning, as covered in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan review in the Natural Hazards Chapter (including GIS mapping, zones and appropriate overlays). But the extent of the policy is unclear, and questions remain. How are the objective and methods reconciled with the national direction for urban growth and intensification? What policies, rules and evidence will be necessary to avoid legal challenge?	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S167.090	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support with strong partnership with mana whenua. Taranaki Whānui is concerned that aspects of this policy will significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands. We understand the importance of avoiding risk and are keen to work in partnership with the regional council in determining areas that in particular fall under subclause (c) and any management thereof.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S170.039	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural	Support in part	It is positive to see a stronger wording of Policy 29 and the intent of the policy is supported as the new wording provides. It is unclear of the Policy that specifies 'manage subdivision, use and development where the risks are low and tolerable'. The management of low and tolerable risks suggests that we might deal with cumulative effects if development is allowed in such areas. It could also mean for those who	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		hazards - district and regional plans		interpret the Plans where these areas are not necessarily discouraged and that we have confidence the cumulative and unknown impacts can be managed. It is unclear in this policy what tools and management options we would have that would help managing the subdivision, use and development in those areas.		
FS29.153	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making - Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means mana whenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Mana whenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S168.0143	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 29: Managing subdivision, use and development in areas at risk from natural hazards - district and regional plans	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the 100-year planning horizon and risk-based approach proposed for the management of land development in areas at risk from natural hazards. Adopting this approach and using risk-based assessments as considerations in the decision-making process is also supported. We have whānau, hapū that are on the coastline that will be susceptible to hazards and will need management. There will need to be a tikanga and te ao Māori approach for how this happens as there are relationships to be established (Hapū moving into other Hapū whenua) as well as processes for relocating kōiwi (bones) or taonga.	Amend the policy to: Co-decide and engage with Tangata Whenua for these plans and support. Incorporate Mātauranga into the analysis.	Reject
FS31.072	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p> <p>Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>		
S16.072	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>We support the addition of subdivision and use to the policy, these would be welcome additions to regional plans to assist city and district councils in the avoidance of the effects arising from significant natural hazards.</p> <p>Council requests the policy be amended to reflect the responsibilities of regional and city and district councils under the RMA with respect to natural hazards.</p> <p>We also request the verbs used in the policy are consistent. As a consideration policy the wording of the rest of the policy should require consideration to the listed matters.</p>	Amend Policy 51 as follows: Policy 51: Minimising Avoiding or mitigating the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					and infrastructure shall be minimised, and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard consideration shall be given to: (a) ...	
S25.040	Carterton District Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	CDC supports the amendments to this policy, noting that the draft Wairarapa Combined District Plan has been developed in a way that will give effect to this policy.	Retain the policy.	Accept in part
S30.070	Porirua City Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Oppose	This policy should only apply to resource consents so it does not conflict and/or duplicate earlier regulatory policies that apply to the development of regional and district plans. Further, this policy would better be articulated as a transitional policy that falls away once Policy 29 is given effect to.	Amend policy to only apply to resource consents. Amend policy to include this statement, deeming provision, or advice note: This policy shall cease to have effect once Policy 29 is in place in an operative district or regional plan.	Reject
FS25.103	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
FS25.229	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is	Allow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
S32.028	Director-General of Conservation	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	Climate change and sea level rise can increase the frequency or magnitude of a hazard event, so this is a relevant matter to consider.	Retain as notified, except to retain the operative version of subclause (b): " the potential for climate change and sea level rise to increase in the frequency or magnitude of a hazard event "	Reject
FS17.029	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Support	WIAL support the relief sought as it is considered the impacts of climate change and sea level rise on natural hazard events are relevant matters to consider in order to minimise the risks and consequences associated with natural hazards.	Allow	Reject
FS20.019	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Support	Atiawa support including operative subclause (b), it is a relevant consideration to include climate change and sea level rise which will exacerbate natural hazards.	Allow	Reject
FS30.306	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S34.050	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>Council supports the provisions that recognise and seek to address issues relating to natural hazards.</p> <p>It is noted that under sections 6, 30 and 31 of the RMA it recognises the need to manage significant risk and avoid or mitigate effects. In this regard, Council wonder whether the policy is strong enough by using the term minimised. It is also unclear what 'minimises' means and what level of minimisation would be acceptable.</p>	<p>Retain provision a notified, except amend to read:</p> <p>"Policy 51: Minimising Addressing the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure shall be minimised, and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to: ... Policy 51 aims to address minimise the risk and consequences..."</p>	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S49.005	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	There is no need for regional or district plans to regulate the resilience of telecommunications infrastructure where it is located in natural hazard areas. In some instances, avoiding a natural hazard area is not possible for technical and operational reasons.	Remove the ability for regional and district plans to regulate the resilience of infrastructure to identified natural hazards.	Reject
FS17.030	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Support	WIAL support the relief sought, as it appropriately provides for regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Reject
S79.045	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	Generally SWDC support the improvements to the policy. There is concern regarding (f) in that the inclusion of the word 'may' adds unnecessary uncertainty. This should be deleted. It is critical that an additional method supporting this policy is included to address how residual risk is consistently assessed. This is more important where mitigation structures are proposed. Practical implementation of assessment of residual risk has been problematic without either hazard specific or general guidance.	Amend Policy 51 to remove the inclusion of 'may' in (f). Include a method that develops suitable guidance and methodology for persons assessing residual risk from hazard, particularly those affected by mitigation structures.	Reject
S113.042	Wellington Water	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	Clause (f) 'Minimise' is only appropriate if defined in accordance with the pNRP definition	Clause (f): Retain "minimising" only if defined in accordance with the pNRP.	Accept
S113.043	Wellington Water	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and	Support in part	Add a new clause, as clause (g) doesn't recognise that some regionally significant infrastructure must locate in high hazard locations	Insert new clause: (k) recognising that it may not always be practicable	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		consequences of natural hazards - consideration			for regionally significant infrastructure to avoid high to extreme hazard areas and providing appropriate management regimes	
FS17.031	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Support	WIAL support the relief sought, as it appropriately provides for the Airport as regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept in part
S115.073	Hutt City Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	Support the intent of this policy. However, we expect district plans will adequately provide for the situations where natural hazards should be considered and this does not need to be revisited in individual resource consents where the district plan has already assessed the level of risk.	Retain amended Policy 51 but modified so that it does not apply to resource consents once the relevant district or regional plan has given effect to Policy 51.	Reject
S128.046	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	Terms and language should be consistent throughout the RPS Change 1 document.	Amend as follows: g) avoiding inappropriate subdivision, inappropriate use or development, and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme	Reject
S131.097	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards -	Support in part	Ātiawa supports in part the proposed amendments to Policy 51. Ātiawa supports the intent of the policy to reduce the impact of natural hazards on the natural and physical environment, as well as anthropological values. Ātiawa is concerned that the policy does not adequately provide for mana whenua values. As it is drafted the policy is silent	Include new subclauses: (f) mana whenua values, including mana whenua relationship with their traditions, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		consideration		<p>on any values for mana whenua. Ātiawa seeks a new subclause be added to provide for this. Additionally, Ātiawa seeks to work together with Regional Council, to ensure that decision-making occurs under the principle of partnership to guarantee that mana whenua values are provided for and protected in regards to natural hazards. Ātiawa seeks an additional policy to provide this relief.</p>	<p>Insert new policy: Policy xx: Partner with mana whenua in decision-making and management processes for natural hazards, to recognise and provide for their relationship with water, land, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga that is susceptible to such events.</p>	
FS29.367	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in</p>	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S132.008	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	We support minimizing the risks from natural hazards by land use planning and regional policies.	No Change	Accept
S133.060	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	Supports these policies surrounding effective management and measures for climate change and climate change effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS20.407	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	Awaiting recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S134.017	Powerco Limited	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Oppose	<p>As with Policy 29, the direction in clause (g) to avoid subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme is opposed. It will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development such areas, particularly where maintenance or minor upgrade type work is required to existing activities in these areas, or where regionally significant infrastructure is required to traverse areas of high or extreme risk, such as stream and river corridors, to deliver services to communities on the other side.</p> <p>This is recognised in the PNRP and district plans where provision is made for certain activities to occur in areas where natural hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, such as stream corridors and areas in the current coastal hazard inundation and erosion overlays.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 51 to recognise that it will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, and to ensure appropriate provision is made for regionally significant infrastructure to be maintained and to traverse such locations. This could be achieved by making the following changes or to the same effect:</p> <p>"When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure shall be minimised, and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(g) avoiding new subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme,</p> <p>and appropriately managing risk to new and existing regionally significant infrastructure and to existing subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to</p>	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					extreme.; ..."	
FS11.021	Fulton Hogan Limited		Support	The direction in clause (g) of policy 51 to avoid all subdivision, use and development in areas where hazards are high to extreme is opposed. Low vulnerability structures/activities may be acceptable in certain circumstances and this should be based on a site specific consideration.	Allow	Accept in part
S139.005	Ian Gunn	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	How are the hazards defined as low to moderate eg for flooding, is there a specific standard for these terms	Define low to moderate hazards.	Accept in part
S139.006	Ian Gunn	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	With the focus on nature based solutions it is highly likely that the creation of wetlands/bunds/low dams will be used to minimise the impact of flooding ie slowing down runoff.	Recognise that nature based solutions are likely to be utilised.	Accept in part
S139.007	Ian Gunn	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support	Is the 1%AEP is calculated with the climate change factor added?	Clarify that 1% AEP calculations must factor in climate change.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
S140.074	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	As written, the policy would stop use and development that could actually reduce hazards and risk, for example relocation, protection structures, lot adjustments. It's not just "inappropriate" development affected by this policy anymore. Also, hazard sensitive activities are part of "use and development".	Amend with this text, or similar: (g) avoiding subdivision, use or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme; ensuring that subdivision, use or development in areas with high to extreme natural hazard risk can avoid, or mitigate to a moderate or low level, the natural hazard risk;		Reject
FS10.040	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)		Support	The Fuel Companies agree that as currently wording, Policy 51 is overly restrictive for certain use and development in area of high to extreme natural hazard risk and support the alternative wording suggested.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Policy 52 as sought.	Reject
FS19.059	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Support	It's important that regionally significant infrastructure can locate in high risk locations.	Allow		Reject
FS24.036	Powerco Limited		Support	Powerco agree that as currently wording, Policy 51 is overly restrictive for certain uses and development in area of high to extreme natural hazard risk and support the alternative wording suggested.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Policy 52 as sought.	Reject
S144.056	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>Important that knowledge of natural hazards is widespread.</p> <p>Clause (h): The submitter raised a question regarding how are the hazards defined as low to moderate eg for flooding, is their a specific standard for these terms.</p> <p>Clause (i): The submitter commented on "with the focus on nature based solutions it is highly likely that the creation of wetlands/bunds/low dams will be used to minimise the impact of flooding ie slowing down runoff."</p>	Retain as notified.		Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				Clause (j): The submitter raised a question of whether the calculation has the climate change factor included.		
S148.048	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Oppose in part	As above, WIAL submits that for certain activities, the risk to natural hazards is inherently different to those activities that do not have the same operational and functional need to locate in areas deemed to be high hazard locations. It would be inappropriate for this policy to constrain the development of the Airport for example on the basis of its proximity to the coast.	Delete this policy or amend to acknowledge that regionally significant infrastructure is not inappropriate development in certain high hazard locations.	Accept
FS8.022	Guardians of the Bays Inc		Oppose	Supports policies such as Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - surrounding effective management and measures for climate change and climate change effects especially for regionally significant infrastructure such as Wellington Airport. There could be a time when climate change adaptation and even retreat will be required by Wellington Airport buildings and even the airport itself.	Disallow	Reject
FS3.041	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)		Support	Waka Kotahi supports recognition that regionally significant infrastructure cannot always avoid high risk areas and often have a functional need to locate in such areas. For example, the transport network often provides a lifeline function to communities that cannot be relocated.	Allow	Accept
S157.045	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Oppose	As with Policy 29, the direction in clause (g) to avoid subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme is opposed. It will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development such areas, particularly where maintenance or minor upgrade type work is required to existing activities in these areas or where there is an operational or functional need for an activity to locate in or traverse an area at	Amend Policy 51 to recognise that it is will not be possible or necessary to entirely avoid all subdivision, use or development in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, and to ensure appropriate provision is made for regionally significant infrastructure to be maintained and to traverse such locations. This could be achieved by	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				risk from natural hazards. Further, the acceptability of risk for some activities will vary depending on the hazard involved e.g. flooding, coastal erosion, rockfall, earthquake etc. This is recognised in the PNRP and district plans where provision is made for certain activities to occur in areas where natural hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme, such as stream corridors and areas in the current coastal hazard inundation and erosion overlays.	making the following changes or to the same effect: (g) avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use, or development and hazard sensitive activities where the hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme;		
S163.075	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Oppose	To the extent Council concern relates principally to future-proofing urban developments (high density, high capital and often located alongside the coast or major rivers), then that should be specified in the policy. The default position should not be to avoid all subdivision use or development in areas subject to natural hazards as certain types of subdivision can still be appropriate. Refer to submission for more detail.	That the amendments to Policy 51 be deleted. To the extent amendments to Policy 51 are made, delete the FW icon.		Reject
FS7.118	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.240	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.		
FS29.091	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
FS30.147	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.075	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and	Oppose in part	The direction to "minimise" the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure" is inconsistent with NZCPS Policy 25. More	Amend the heading and chapeau to Policy 51 as follows: Policy 51: Minimising -Avoiding	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		consequences of natural hazards - consideration		broadly, it is an inappropriate management approach, as a risk may be minimised but still be very significant.	the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration "When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review to a district or regional plan, the risk and consequences of natural hazards on people, communities, their property and infrastructure shall be minimised avoided , and/or in determining whether an activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to:"	
FS4.1	CentrePort Limited		Oppose	Avoidance of natural hazard risk is not possible. NZCPS Policy 25 relates to avoidance of increased risk, not all risk. Minimising risk is a more appropriate concept.	Disallow	Accept in part
FS8.023	Guardians of the Bays Inc		Support	Support Policy 51 rewording proposed by Forest and Bird as this needs to be consistent with the NZCPS.	Allow	Accept in part
FS17.032	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it does not appropriately provide for regionally significant infrastructure, such as the Airport, which has a functional and operational need to be located by the coast.	Disallow	Accept in part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S166.036	Masterton District Council	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>The Wairarapa Combined District Plan will give effect to this Policy.</p> <p>See also response against Policy 29.</p> <p>[Note. This submission point reference S166.031, raising queries about How are the objective and methods reconciled with the national direction for urban growth and intensification? What policies, rules and evidence will be necessary to avoid legal challenge?]</p>	Retain as notified. However: Further clarity sought on impacts to consenting pathways for stop banks.	Accept in part
S170.059	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>It is important to support this policy as a consideration and appreciate the detail that it goes into covering all the potential issues we experience from natural hazards. It is noticeable there are water quality and overflow issues with our three-water network and flooding exacerbates these issues, and further making them more hazardous catalyzed by the floods. There are not any connections created in the Policy 51. Yet this is an important consideration for Tangata Whenua.</p> <p>Clause (i) includes moderate risks; it is not</p>	<p>Recognise in the provision water quality and overflow issues with our three-water network and flooding exacerbates hazard issues.</p> <p>Clause (i) should only allow subdivision, use and development with mitigation when the hazard risk is low. Clarify clause (ia) and the interaction with district plans.</p>	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>convincing, if the risk is moderate, the Policy should not automatically allow that subdivision, use and development. Only if the risk is low then this could justify a mitigation if the hazard occurred.</p> <p>Clause (ia) is not clear; District Plans are responsible to make rules, making sure that the developments do not block the overland flood paths; do we consider the RPS should mention this, too? What policy gap this is looking into addressing or is it doubling up?</p> <p>It is unclear whether the clause (j) was too conservative, taking into account 1 in a 100-year flood as we are seeing them more often in the face of worsening impacts of Climate Change and global warming.</p>		
FS29.173	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making - Support in principal</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means mana whenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Mana whenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>		
S167.0115	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 51: Minimising the risks and consequences of natural hazards - consideration	Support in part	<p>Given historical land confiscations and development barriers - there needs to be a specific protection in place to prevent further disadvantage to mana whenua.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 51 but want to see specific protections for Māori owned land.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept
S16.039	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation	Support in part	Regarding clause (b), it is unclear what the criteria would be for determining whether options being considered are a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution. How will the suitability of potential innovative solutions be determined? Who will determine whether an	Amend Policy 52 as follows: Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration (a) ... (b) whether non-structural, soft	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		measures - consideration		<p>option is more appropriate or suitably innovative under this clause? Council requests amendments to eliminate this uncertainty.</p> <p>We request the use of verbs in the policy is consistent. As a consideration policy it is not appropriate for decision makers to have particular regard to the policy. These terms have different meanings in RMA decision making. We request this inconsistency is addressed.</p>	<p>engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options would provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution the same or a greater degree of hazard mitigation; (c) ... Explanation Policy 52 recognises that the effects of hard protection structures can have adverse effects on the environment, increase the risks from natural hazards over time and transfer the risks to nearby areas. It provides direction to consider lower impact methods of hazard mitigation such as non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options, that may be as effective at hazard mitigation as structural protection works or hard engineering methods more appropriate providing</p>	

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					they can suitably mitigate the hazard.	
FS30.071	Porirua City Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Oppose	<p>The policy lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation and does not align with objectives. Issues of concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term/concept 'room for the river' needs better policy direction, or otherwise needs to be defined, explained, or deleted. It is currently unclear what this term means or how it should be implemented. • It is unclear why the following undefined terms were used rather than the defined term 'nature-based solution' (noting that Council opposes this definition): non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure. • The concept/term 'room for the river' could provide guidance to councils to enable them to make stronger arguments for taking appropriate land around rivers as an esplanade reserve under s.230 RMA. • The term 'sites and areas of significance to Māori' is more consistent with the National Planning Standards. Further, it is unclear what particular regard is to be given to, their protection? • There is no such thing as a 'city plan' under the RMA. • Amendment to (g) suggested so that it links better to the chapeau of the policy. • This policy should only apply to resource consents so it does not conflict and/or duplicate earlier regulatory policies that apply to the development of regional and district plans. • Further, this policy would better be articulated as a transitional policy that falls away once relevant policies are given effect to. 	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.</p> <p>Amend policy to only apply to resource consents.</p> <p>Amend policy to include this statement, deeming provision, or advice note:</p> <p>This policy shall cease to have effect once Policy [XXX] is in place in an operative district or regional plan.</p>	reject
FS25.104	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	<p>The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief</p>	Allow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
FS25.230	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S32.029	Director-General of Conservation	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	While the proposed changes are generally appropriate for most locations, they fail to give effect to NZCPS Policy 25, especially clauses a and b of that Policy which require avoiding increasing risk.	Add a new subclause as follows or words to like effect: "avoiding hazard mitigation measures within the coastal environment that would increase the risk of social, environmental and economic harm or other adverse effects from coastal hazards"	Reject
FS17.033	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it does not appropriately provide for the Airport as regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow	Accept
FS30.307	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S34.051	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	<p>Council queries the use of nature-based solutions vs. green infrastructure throughout RPSPC1, as noted on other provisions, and asks that there be consistency in terms.</p> <p>It is recognised that the green infrastructure is an appropriate method, but there will also be long-term maintenance and associated costs which should be recognised. It is also unclear of what the land requirements associated with "room for the river" means, as well an acceptable level if minimisation means in this context.</p>	<p>Provide clarity, recognise that there will be costs associated with non-hard engineered measures that territorial authorities do not have the resources to meet, and amend the policy to read:</p> <p>"Policy 52: Addressing Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration</p> <p>.... variation or review of a district or regional plan, for hazard mitigation measures, particular regard shall be given....</p> <p>.... Mātauranga Māori options provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution; ..."</p> <p>Amend for consistency between nature-based solutions and green infrastructure.</p>	Reject
S49.006	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation	Support	Clause(c) specifically allows structural protection or hard engineering methods to protect regionally significant infrastructure from hazards. Whilst this is not necessarily a preferred method of the telecommunications companies, provision	Retain as notified	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		measures - consideration		to allow such methods to be employed if necessary is supported.		
S79.046	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Generally support the amendments to the policy. However, the amendments at the foot of the policy which are now to 'minimise' the risk from natural hazards creates greater uncertainty. While SWDC understands the reasoning behind it, when undertaking protection works it is now unclear as to what standard of protection GWRC expects. For example, for flood protection work, does minimise mean for a 1%AEP event (with climate change) or does it mean a 0.1%AEP event (with climate change).	Amend the changes to the footer of Policy 52 to remove the changes to include the word 'minimise' and retain the existing words 'reduce'	Accept in part
S102.095	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Considers that Policy 52 should be a "Regulatory" option, rather than a "Consideration" option, to give this greater weight.	Amend Policy 52 to a regulatory policy.	Reject
S115.074	Hutt City Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Support the intent of this policy, but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suitably specific definition is needed for "room for the river" • The reference to innovation is redundant. Innovation is not a goal in and of itself, and whether a solution is innovative is independent of whether it is effective. 	Retain amended Policy 52 but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a definition for "room for the river", and • amend clause (b) as follows: "(b) whether non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution;" 	Accept in part
S124.008	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of	Support	KiwiRail supports Policy 52 which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering methods are necessary to protect regionally significant infrastructure from unacceptable risks	Retain as notified	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		hazard mitigation measures - consideration		from natural hazards. There are sections of the rail corridor which run parallel to the coastline and are vulnerable to storm surge and high tides. KiwiRail support policy direction which acknowledges risk of hazards, including coastal hazards, to infrastructure and the need to construct hard structures as a protective measure.		
FS3.042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)		Support	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point, as the policy recognises that in some instances, hard engineering methods are necessary to protect regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow	Accept
S128.047	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Highly productive land is a natural resource that will need to be carefully managed with a changing climate so this land can continue to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. With a changing climate we can expect the following impacts. Natural hazards pose a risk to food production and events can disrupt food supply - there may be situation where structural protection works or hard engineering methods are warranted.	Amend as follows: (c) avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development, highly productive land with food security values , regionally significant infrastructure or property from unacceptable risk and the works form part of a long-term hazard management strategy that represents the best practicable option for the future;	Reject
FS20.026	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the relief sought, the inclusion would provide for increased structural protection works and hard engineering in areas such as along the awa (i.e. stop-banks and works in the awa). Stop-banks limit the ability for streams to move naturally, and works in the awa have adverse effects for freshwater ecosystems, including mahinga kai and other mana whenua values (including sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga). These activities and the outcomes are	Disallow	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				contrary to Ātiawa are opposed to these works and seek the council avoid adopting a planning framework that provides for these activities to occur.		
S131.098	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support	<p>Ātiawa supports in part the proposed amendments to Policy 52. Ātiawa supports the overall intent of the policy. Ātiawa seeks further amendments to provide for mana whenua values. Ātiawa supports reference to mātauranga Māori options. Ātiawa is encouraged that mātauranga Māori is being recognised by Regional Council given it offers solutions to many resource management issues we face today. Ātiawa seeks that mana whenua lead and partner with Regional Council to develop such solutions. This includes tikanga to protect mātauranga Māori, including how it is used, access, stored and shared. Ātiawa supports the use soft engineering, green infrastructure solutions over hard structural and engineering solutions.</p>	Ātiawa inclusion of the following subclauses: (cd) adverse effects on Māori freshwater values, including mahinga kai(ce) adverse effects on mana whenua relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga	Reject
FS29.368	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the</p>	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S132.009	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support	When natural hazard mitigation measures are put into place, it is important that these measures to not increase the natural hazard risk in other areas or in the future.	No Change	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
S133.061	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support	Supports these policies surrounding effective management and measures for climate change and climate change effects.	Retain as notified.		Accept
FS20.408	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	Awaiting recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaupoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaupoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S137.027	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve clarity.	Amend Policy 52 as follows: ... (c) avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development; or regionally significant infrastructure or property from unacceptable risk and the works form part of a long-term hazard management strategy agreed to by relevant authorities , that represents the best practicable option for the future;	Accept
S139.008	Ian Gunn	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures -	Support	Term regionally significant doesn't appear to include stopbanks/flood retention structures. See p223	(c) avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development, regionally significant infrastructure (including stopbanks/flood retention structures) or property from unacceptable risk and the	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		consideration			works form part of a long-term hazard management strategy that represents the best practicable option for the future;	
S139.011	Ian Gunn	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support	Strongly support.	Retain clause (b) as notified.	Accept in part
S140.075	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Support the intent of this policy, but more research is needed before 'room for the river' policy can effectively be implemented in the Wellington region and should be removed until we have more information.	Amended Policy 52: (b) whether non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options provide a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution;	Accept in part
S144.057	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Important that knowledge of natural hazards is widespread. Nature-based solutions can provide ecosystem services. Structural protection works or hard engineering methods can damage the environment, be vulnerable to increased risks with climate change and have a shorter life. Nature-based solutions for flood control would help to improve water resilience by storing water for longer in the landscape.	To include stopbanks/flood retention structures in clause (c): (c) avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development, regionally significant infrastructure, stopbanks/flood retention structures or property from unacceptable risk and the works form part of a long-term hazard	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					management strategy that represents the best practicable option for the future;	
S147.070	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	Strongly support the proposed changes to Policy 52 and the incorporation of the concept of Te Mana o Te Wai in paragraph (e). However, hazard mitigation measures such as stop banks or weirs can interfere significantly with the habitat of indigenous freshwater species, trout, and salmon, and have significant impacts on the extent and values of both rivers and wetlands. This is not fully captured in paragraph (e) as drafted. The suggested amendments address this issue and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM Policies 6, 7, 9 and 10.	amend subclause: (e) adverse effects on Te Mana o te Wai, mahinga kai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, or the local indigenous ecosystem and biodiversity and habitats of indigenous freshwater species, trout, and salmon;	Reject
FS20.118	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the relief sought where it relates to protecting habitats of trout and salmon without any provision. Ātiawa refer to Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the NPS-FM to support this statement, which affords indigenous freshwater species greater protection than trout and salmon. Additionally, Ātiawa do not support the protection of trout and salmon which have adverse impacts on indigenous ecosystems. Generally the management and decision making in regards to trout and salmon species has not been undertaken within a Treaty Partnership with mana whenua. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the national resource management direction.	Disallow Disallow the relief sought in so far as it relates to the protection of trout and salmon.	Accept
FS19.134	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause	Disallow	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				<p>3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>			
FS30.239	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.</p>	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
S147.071	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	<p>Strongly support the proposed changes to Policy 52 and the incorporation of the concept of Te Mana o Te Wai in paragraph (e).</p> <p>However, hazard mitigation measures such as stop banks or weirs can interfere significantly with the habitat of indigenous freshwater species, trout, and salmon, and have significant impacts on the extent and values of both rivers and wetlands. This is not fully captured in paragraph (e) as drafted.</p> <p>The suggested amendments address this issue and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM Policies 6, 7, 9 and 10.</p>	new subclause: (ea) ensuring that there is no further loss of natural inland wetlands or river extent and their values are protected		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS20.123	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Support in part	Ātiawa support and encourage provisions that would result in protection of natural inland wetlands.	Allow in part	Allow in part the submission point in so far as it relates to the protection of natural inland wetlands. Ātiawa seek further clarification of what values are sought to be protected by this submission point, until this is clarified Ātiawa do not support reference to other values.	Reject
FS19.135	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow		Accept
FS30.240	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S148.049	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	<p>WIAL generally supports Policy 52(c) in that it recognises that structural protection works and/or hard engineering methods may be necessary to protect regionally significant infrastructure from hazard risk. This is relevant to the seawall which currently exists to protect existing infrastructure from the effects of coastal erosion and storm surges. It is noted however that the first preference in the RPS is to avoid such structures. With respect to the sea wall avoidance cannot practicably be the first preference in such a location. It is also not clear how such requirements as the "long term viability of maintaining the structural protection works" will be measured in the context of this policy.</p> <p>Does it mean that ongoing maintenance has to be avoided? Or does it require that the structure is able to withstand changes as a result of climate change and therefore should be maximised in terms of its engineering and construction.</p> <p>Reference is made to adverse effects on Te Mana o te Wai which is a concept of the NPS FW and not be applicable to the CMA and Te Rito o te Harakeke which as defined is overly broad.</p>	Delete this policy and explanation, or make it clear that in some situations hard engineering methods can be preferred in order to protect existing regionally significant infrastructure assets and limit reference to Mana o te Wai and Te Rito o te Harakeke	Accept in part
FS8.024	Guardians of the Bays Inc		Oppose	<p>Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures. We support the first preference should always be to avoid hard structures in the coastal environment. In Lyall Bay the sand dunes are the first protection in stopping sea surges and storm events. Hard infrastructure is always going to be a poor second defense to raisings sea levels and storm events.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
S163.076	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Oppose	Defer to full RPS review in 2024	That the amendments to Policy 52 be deleted Delete the FW icon.		Reject
FS7.119	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.241	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.092	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana	Not stated		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.</p>		
FS30.148	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.076	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	<p>Support the recognition of green infrastructure and "room for the river" options when considering resource consents, a notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, for hazard mitigation measures.</p> <p>However, Forest & Bird seeks:</p> <p>a. Prioritisation of green infrastructure, room for river over structural protection works or hard engineering methods;</p> <p>b. The inclusion of "nature-based solutions" as a solution in clause (b) - as this is supported by Te Mana o te Taiao Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020</p> <p>Prioritisation of these options ensures consistency with:</p> <p>a. Section 6(a) of the RMA ("the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands,</p>	Amend as follows: Policy 52: Minimising Avoiding adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, for hazard mitigation measures, particular regard shall be	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>and lakes and rivers and their margins and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development");</p> <p>b. NPSFM Policy 7 and clause 2.24;</p> <p>c. NZCPS Policies 25, 26, and 27.</p> <p>Forest & Bird considers "minimise" is a low bar unsupported by higher order documents. The direction should be to "avoid the risks from natural hazards" or otherwise reinstate "reduce and do not increase".</p>	<p>given to:(a) the need for structural protection works or hard engineering methods;</p> <p>(b)whether prioritising non-structural, soft engineering, green infrastructure, room for the river or Mātauranga Māori options or nature-based solutions provide as a more appropriate or suitably innovative solution;</p> <p>...</p> <p>(e) avoiding adverse effects on Te Mana o te Wai, mahinga kai, Te Rito o te Harakeke, natural processes, or the local indigenous ecosystem and biodiversity;</p> <p>...</p> <p>so that they minimise avoid the risks from of natural hazards.</p>	
FS4.2	CentrePort Limited		Oppose in part	Avoiding natural hazard risk is not possible. Minimising risk is a more appropriate concept.	Disallow	Reject
FS17.034	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")		Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS19.035	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	As we can't achieve 'avoid' in either title or clause(e) the policy framework needs to allow for progressive improvement.	Disallow	Reject
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S166.037	Masterton District Council	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	We understand the Policy has been reworded since limited release to reflect that it does not restrict river protection works (structural) from happening, rather it is a consideration to understanding their potential effect on the environment.	Retain as notified. However: Further clarity required regarding the extent to which we need to consider effects.	Accept
S170.060	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures	Support in part	Some of the new additions to the policy are encouraging, such as the long-term viability; no increase in risk to adjacent properties, and adverse effects on Te Mana o Te Wai, Te Mana o te Taiao, and that they are considered as part of the consent applications. However, the impacts of hazard mitigation measures to be	Strengthen the wording of this provision, e.g. use more directive words in place of 'justifiable' and 'minimise'.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		- consideration		<p>minimised: these mitigations do alter the site and change the environment in ways that we cannot bring it back.</p> <p>The wording of the first clause (a) 'justifiable', for instance is a subjective word and all flood hazard structures are justifiable at some point in time and that this may not be able to be evaluated from an objective perspective. Policy 52 does not elaborate how consent planner will make their assessment. Same with the cumulated effects, how these are assessed are important and may be made on some judgement and value points.</p> <p>The word 'minimise' still leaves policy door open for those who are inclined to think bringing hard engineering structures to the scene is the ultimate answer.</p>		
FS29.174	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making - Support in principal</p>	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means mana whenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Mana whenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>		
S167.0116	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 52.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0127	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa also seek that policy CC.12 is cross-referenced with Policy 52 to reflect the priority of soft engineering over hard engineering solutions in achieving nature-based solutions.	Provide a cross-reference to Policy 52 in policy CC.12, to reflect the priority that soft engineering solutions should be given over hard engineering solutions, in order to provide for and protect nature-based solutions.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		- consideration				
FS31.054	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p> <p>Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>	Not stated	Reject
S168.0144	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the 100-year planning horizon and risk-based approach proposed for the management of land development in areas at risk from natural hazards. Adopting this approach and using risk-	Amend the policy to: Co-decide and engage with Tangata Whenua for these plans and support. Incorporate Mātauranga into the analysis.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		mitigation measures - consideration		based assessments as considerations in the decision-making process is also supported. We have whānau, hapū that are on the coastline that will be susceptible to hazards and will need management. There will need to be a tikanga and te ao Māori approach for how this happens as there are relationships to be established (Hapū moving into other Hapū whenua) as well as processes for relocating kōiwi (bones) or taonga.		
FS31.073	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.	Not stated	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S168.0145	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 52: Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures - consideration	Support in part	<p>Rangitāne o Wairarapa support Policy 52 in part, where it seeks to determine whether soft engineering is more appropriate and to avoid hard engineering methods unless it is necessary. However, we consider that the words 'suitably innovative' could be subjective and therefore problematic to assess when considering this policy.</p> <p>Rangitāne o Wairarapa support reference in sub-clause (f) to give particular regard to sites of significance to mana/tangata whenua. However, we are concerned that as currently worded, this clause is inappropriately restricted only to those sites 'identified in a planning document'. Many sites will not be documented or identified until the resource consent or notice of requirement stage, and such sites should not be excluded from consideration through those processes.</p> <p>In addition, we request the inclusion of 'taonga species' in sub-clause (e), to be consistent with and give effect to the NPS IB.</p>	<p>Amend the policy to: Delete the text 'or suitably innovative solution'; Include reference to 'taonga species' in sub-clause (e); To make clause (f) inclusive of other sites of significance which may not be 'identified in a planning document'; Use terminology consistent with the NPS IB, i.e. 'indigenous biodiversity', rather than "local indigenous ecosystem and biodiversity".</p>	Accept in part
FS31.074	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S11.019	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support in part	Too passive	Amend as such: "Regional city and district Councils will should under Local Government Act 2002..."	Reject
S11.020	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support in part	Take out last sentence of explanation as it cancels what has just been said. Too passive.	Amend Explanation as such: "... but this is not expected to be a requirement "	Reject
S16.028	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy CC.16: Climate	Support	We support reference to dynamic adaptive planning pathways or similar adaptive planning	Retain	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory		approaches, and the other matters listed in the policy.		
S30.080	Porirua City Council	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Oppose	Council oppose this policy and seek its deletion. The RPS should not direct when and how territorial authorities will use their powers under the Local Government Act. These are matters for councils to determine at their discretion and in response to the concerns and issues for their communities. There is no such thing as a city plan under the RMA.	Delete policy, or amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.	Accept in part
FS25.113	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
FS25.239	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S34.022	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation	Support in part	Council supports the intent of the policy, but it states it is non regulatory policy and then requires action under the Local Government Act, and for regulatory actions to be taken in district plans under clause (c).	Amend to make it non regulatory measures only and delete clause c).	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		ation programmes - non-regulatory				
S102.028	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support in part	Generally supports the non-regulatory policies in the 'Climate Change' chapter. However, Māori landowners should also be included in the decision-making process. This will allow for a collaborative approach, ensuring that Māori landowners have an equitable stake when it comes to outcomes of adaptation, managed retreat or re- location.	Amend Policy CC.16 as follows: Regional, city and district councils should, under the Local Government Act 2002, partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua, landowners and engage local communities in a decision-making process to develop and implement strategic climate change adaptation plans that map out management options over short, medium and long term timeframes, using a range of tools and methods.	Reject
S115.083	Hutt City Council	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Amend Policy CC.16 to make it clear it does not apply to city and district councils.	Reject
S128.051	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implement	Support in part	Support development of strategic climate change adaptation plans, seek some amendments to provide for water storage.	Add a subclause: (h) options for water storage to promote resilience for rural and urban communities.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		ation programmes - non-regulatory				
S140.084	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support in part	WCC supports the intent of the Policy but is concerned that if done on a city or district wide scale, the benefits will be limited and not achieve integrated management throughout the region.	Amend so it is led and guided by Greater Wellington Regional Council.	Reject
S144.033	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support		Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S163.081	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Oppose	Defer to full review of the RPS in 2024	That the amendments to Policy CC.16 be deleted.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS7.124	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
FS20.246	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
FS29.097	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Oppose	<p>Section 18, page 4: General Comments - OPPOSE</p> <p>Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward - OPPOSE</p> <p>It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Mana whenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.</p> <p>Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of mana whenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements</p>	Not stated		Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.			
FS30.153	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
S165.083	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy CC. 16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support		Retain		Accept in part
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and	Disallow		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S131.0108	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa note that care should be taken where policies lump together partnering with mana whenua and engaging the community, this relationship should be managed under a Tiriti framework to ensure the principles are upheld. Only mana whenua can identify te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori approaches, and Te Mana o te Wai and Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p>	Ātiawa supports Policy CC.16 and are supportive of partnering with the Regional Council to prepare strategic climate change adaptation plans, mana whenua involvement will be enabled through subclause (g) of this policy. Ātiawa seek that the community is provided for in a separate policy.	Accept in part
FS29.223	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S167.0126	Taranaki Whānui	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and implementation programmes - non-regulatory	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the new Policy CC.16	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.0132	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy CC.16: Climate change adaptation strategies, plans and	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support in part the wording to partner with mana whenua in the decision-making process. However, we request that sub-clause (e) requires a range of tools and methods that 'give effect' to Te Mana o te Wai and Te Rito o te Harekeke, in order to be consistent with the relevant national policy	Amend the policy to include wording that will 'give effect' to Te Mana o te Wai and Te Rito o te Harekeke, as required by the relevant national policy statements.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		implementation programmes - non-regulatory		statements. It is not sufficient to 'consider' these concepts.		
FS31.060	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p> <p>Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>	Not stated	No recommendation
S30.081	Porirua City Council	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate	Support	Council recognises that iwi/Māori communities are particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including low lying	Retain as notified.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		change adaptation plans - non-regulatory		settlements such as Takapuwahia and Hongoeka in Porirua.		
FS25.114	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
FS25.240	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S34.023	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support	Council supports mana whenua being supported to develop iwi climate change adaptation plans, to manage the impacts of climate change.	Retain provision as notified.	Accept
S102.029	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support in part	This policy should be "considered" at implementation as climate change will disproportionately affect Māori.	Amend policy as follows: Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory considered.	Reject
S133.050	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans -	Support	Supports the inclusion of additional policy that addresses climate change and climate change impacts across the region.	Retain as notified. OR Alternative relief that maybe necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko's connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
		non-regulatory					
FS20.397	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.			
S147.077	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept
FS19.141	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow		Reject
FS30.246	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S165.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support		Retain	Accept
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S131.0109	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans -	Support	Ātiawa supports Policy CC.17, Ātiawa want to ensure that iwi climate change adaptation plans are provided equal consideration and implementation as part of the wider adaptation action/frameworks to plan for climate change.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		non-regulatory				
FS29.224	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S167.0127	Taranaki Whānui	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support in part	<p>The success of this policy will rest on implementation and ability of Councils to work with iwi.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui supports the principle of new Policy CC.17.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui recommend this policy is updated to reflect opportunities to be involved in long-term planning process.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui would like to ensure the funding of these plans and see them as part of the long-term planning process.</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0133	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy CC.17: Iwi climate change adaptation plans - non-regulatory	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support wording to assist tangata whenua in the development of iwi-led climate change adaptation plans.	Retain as notified.	Accept
FS31.061	Sustainable Wairarapa inc		Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p> <p>Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>		
S11.011	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support in part	Let community be part of the solutions.	Method 14 Implementation: Wellington Regional Council and city and district Councils and community	Reject
S34.017	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Oppose in part	<p>It is unclear who is undertaking the research required by this method. We would support the approach, on the basis that it is a regional council responsibility.</p> <p>This method seems to now require territorial authorities to undertake research rather than prepare and disseminate, which presents a resourcing issue.</p>	Amend to make responsibilities clear and ensure that this is practical and feasible with the organisations/councils impacted by this provision.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S78.021	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that the amendments to operative Method 14 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
FS20.329	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
S102.071	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	Generally supports the methods to implement for the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S115.094	Hutt City Council	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S132.011	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	We support increased research into natural hazards and the effects of climate change. Resilience of communities to hazards is reliant on the community understanding of the hazards. As such we encourage increasing public education and awareness of this research.	No Change	Accept in part
S137.028	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support in part	Amendments are required to reflect the intent of the method.	Amend Clause (b) in Method 14 to read: (b) raise awareness and understanding of natural hazards and climate change.	Accept
S140.096	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S144.054	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	Important that developments are sited in areas with minimal hazards.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S166.065	Masterton District Council	Method 14: Information on natural	Support	District resilience is included as part of our Climate Action Plan so the information would be useful for our staff and our communities. We are supportive of this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		hazards and climate change				
S131.0121	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa support the intent of Method 14. Ātiawa seek to partner with Regional Council to undertake research, prepare and disseminate information about natural hazards and climate change. Mana whenua (including our ancestral land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga) are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and natural hazards, naturally mana whenua should be actively involved in this method. Ātiawa seek that the Regional Council provide for this partnership through adequate funding and resourcing.</p>	<p>In partnership with mana whenua, undertake research, prepare and disseminate information about natural hazards and climate change effects in order to:</p> <p>(a) guide local authority planning and decision-making; and</p> <p>(b) raise awareness and understanding of natural hazards. Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing</p>	Reject
FS29.238	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S165.0102	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support		Retain	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S167.0146	Taranaki Whānui	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this method and seek to partner with the regional council in this research, planning and decision-making process.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.0187	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 14: Information on natural hazards and climate change	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa seek that reference to 'undertaking research' is more explicit about the potential for the application of Mātauranga Māori (or research tools based on this) to inform natural hazard decision making and understanding.	Amend the method to include reference to Mātauranga Māori based research/monitoring tools: 'Undertake research (including use of Mātauranga Maori based research/monitoring methods), prepare and disseminate information	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					about natural hazards and climate change effects in order to:'	
FS31.117	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc		Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission.</p> <p>Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>	Not stated	No recommendation
S115.095	Hutt City Council	Method 23: Informatio	Support	No reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		n about natural features to protect property from natural hazards				
S140.097	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 23: Information about natural features to protect property from natural hazards	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S158.034	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Method 23: Information about natural features to protect property from natural hazards	Support	Supports the deletion of these method.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S167.0147	Taranaki Whānui	Method 23: Information about natural features to protect property from natural hazards	Support	[Note. No reason given in this submission point.]	Retain as notified.	Accept

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S34.080	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support in part	Supports consistency across the region but Council is concerned that a proposed non-regulatory method, appears to require a regulatory response.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted. If the method is retained, amend method to delete clause (b) to ensure that method can be fully achieved using non regulatory methods.	Reject
S102.072	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support	Generally supports the methods to implement for the 'Natural Hazards' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S132.012	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support in part	It is important that policies to increase resilience to natural hazards and the effects of climate change are consistently applied throughout the region. As such we recommend that the Regional Council provide guidance on identification of high risk areas and application of the policies in this RPS.	Re-instate the phrase: "Prepare and disseminate information about how to identify areas at high risk from natural hazards, as relevant to the development of hazard management strategies to guide decision- making"	Accept in part
FS12.019	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports there being a consistent approach to the identification and management of natural hazards across the region, particularly in relation to high risk natural hazards.	Allow	Reject this will be achieved through direction to P29

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS14.041	Masterton District Council		Support in part	Agree with It is important that policies to increase resilience to natural hazards and the effects of climate change are consistently applied throughout the region. As such we recommend that the Regional Council provide guidance on identification of high risk areas and application of the policies in this RPS	Not stated	Agree with relief sought: Re-instate the phrase:" Prepare and disseminate information about how to identify areas at high risk from natural hazards, as relevant to the development of hazard management strategies to guide decision- making"	Reject
S144.055	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support	identifying the new or increased hazards of climate change is very important.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S166.067	Masterton District Council	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support	Disaster risk reduction/hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning should already be occurring together. We are supportive of an integrated approach.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S115.0101	Hutt City Council	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities	Amend Method 22 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
		adaptation planning				
S131.0126	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support	Ātiawa support Method 22.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
FS29.243	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function -</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S140.0104	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support in part	For integrated management across the region, the integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning should be led by Regional Council.	Amend Method 22 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.	Reject
S165.0107	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support		Retain	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd		Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S167.0154	Taranaki Whānui	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support in part	<p>Amended Method 22 is usefully updated. To ensure integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning in the Wellington region is successfully implemented will be based on the ability to partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua. Taranaki Whānui recommend stronger wording to reflect this.</p> <p>For example, new Method 32 provides for language around 'partnering' so this method could similarly reference that direction.</p> <p>[Note. the submitter would like to note that] Taranaki Whānui currently have applications (in progress) for coastal marine permit applications and have sought specific advice from GWRC officers. At the writing of this submission, there are no clear protections for mana whenua / tangata whenua holding coastal permits and where relevant triggers are located. Further advice has been sought from GWRC officers.</p>	Amend clause (c) to read: (c) partner where practicable assisting with mana whenua / tangata whenua in the development of iwi climate change adaptation plans.	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
FS6.041	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Support	We support this submission as iwi climate change adaptation plans are a way for iwi to uphold their aspirations and values in the face of this major environmental issue. These plans should also be recognised by councils and supported.	Allow		Reject
S168.0189	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 22: Integrated hazard risk management and climate change adaptation planning	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the integration of hazard risk management and climate change adaptation across the region.	Retain as notified		Accept in part
FS31.119	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc		Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practice your management of the further submissions fails the good practice model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitāne. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this	Not stated		No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun			
S78.038	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Natural hazards Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that AERs 1 to 5 for Objective 19 are required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified		Accept in part
FS20.346	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust		Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	No recommendation
S131.0156	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Natural hazards Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	Ātiawa support the proposed AER for Natural Hazards. Ātiawa seek further AER be included to ensure that mana whenua involvement in resource management is assessed and therefore those AER action is taken to achieve those AER.	Include the following AER to the kaupapa 'Natural Hazards': Mana whenua and Regional Council work in partnership in the management of natural hazards in the Wellington region. This partnership provides for governance		Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					and operational input into all aspects of resource management to address natural hazards, including decision-making. Mana whenua values including their relationship with their culture, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga are protected and provided for. Mātauranga Māori is applied where appropriate, in accordance with tikanga and kawa, as guided by mana whenua.	
FS2.70	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the AERs proposed by Ātiawa.	Allow	reject
FS29.276	Ngā Hapu o Otaki		Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside mana whenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and collaborative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of mātauranga māori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
				<p>whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness mana whenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function - Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawa's concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as mana whenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other mana whenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S167.0191	Taranaki Whānui	Natural hazards Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Support in partnership (resourcing/funding) with mana whenua.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the process to establish the AERs. What input has come from mana whenua?</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that AERs need to be developed and monitored in partnership with mana whenua and include mātauranga Māori. (State of Environment Reports).</p>	Amend anticipated environmental results in partnership with mana whenua	Reject

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S128.065	Horticulture New Zealand	Hazard sensitive activity	Support in part	It is not clear what scale of activity might be inadvertently captured by 'hazardous facilities', whereas major hazardous facilities is a term defined through regulations e.g. Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016.	Amend as follows: Means any building that..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities 	Accept
S157.046	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Hazard sensitive activity	Oppose	The terms 'hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities' are not defined. It is, therefore, uncertain what types of facilities will be considered 'hazard sensitive activities' and subject to the proposed policy framework, which as currently drafted, requires complete avoidance of such activities in areas identified as at high or extreme risk of natural hazard. An avoidance approach is not appropriate, particularly where: - the acceptability of risk will vary depending on the hazard involved e.g. flooding, coastal erosion, rockfall, earthquake etc; - there is a need to continue to operate, maintain or upgrade existing facilities; or - there is an operational or functional need for an activity to locate in or traverse an area at risk from natural hazards. Many District Council's within the region have now removed provisions relating to hazardous facilities from their district plans, consistent with RLLA 2017, which removed the control of hazardous substances as an explicit function for councils. This reflects the high degree of control already in place in relation to these activities under other legislation, including under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act, the Health and Safety and Work Act and WorkSafe regulations. This includes with respect to managing natural hazard risk. Underground fuel storage tanks, for example, are not generally at risk during a flood event and compliance with industry best practice would, in any case, require the design of service station or truck stop facilities to maintain their integrity and	Amend the definition of hazard sensitive activity to remove 'hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities', on the basis that these terms are not defined and it is uncertain what types of facilities will be considered 'hazard sensitive activities' and that the policy framework as currently drafted, requires complete avoidance of such activities and does not make appropriate provision for existing facilities, or activities that may have an operational or functional need to locate in a hazard sensitive area, Hazard sensitive activity Means any building that contains one or more of the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities 	Accept in part

Greater Wellington RPS Change 1 – s42A - Natural hazards

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested		Summary Recommendation
				function during natural hazard events. Further, the resilience of these facilities through the 2010 and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes, with no simultaneous compartment failures and no significant product losses, demonstrates the resilience of these structures to earthquake risk.			
FS2.3	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc		Oppose in part	Hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities have potential to have significant adverse impacts on the environment and communities if impacted by natural hazards. Allowing such activities in areas subject to high or extreme risk of natural hazard should be avoided. The definitions could be amended to provide more certainty as to the type of facilities that would be included.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS19.049	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")		Support	Improved clarity of definitions is always helpful	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.094	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	As stated, 'hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities', on the basis that these terms are not defined which leaves ambiguity	Allow	Allow relief	Accept in part