


Please enter your details below:

1. Details of further submitter:

* Submitter Name: Full name, or Name of Organisation / Company	R P Mansell; A J Mansell; M R Mansell
Contact person for submission: (If different to above)	Chris Hansen
Telephone no: (Not required)	
* Address for service: (Email, or physical address) Please note, an <u>email address</u> is the preferred method	chris@rmaexpert.co.nz
* I wish to be heard in support of my submission at a hearing	Yes
* I would consider presenting a joint case at the hearing with others who make a similar submission	Yes


2. Criteria applicable to Further Submitter:

* Only certain people may make further submissions Please select the option that applies to you:	
A) I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or	Yes
B) I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or	Yes
C) I am the local authority for the relevant area.	No
* Specify the reasoning behind why you qualify for either of these above options:	We made a previous submission on this plan change and have a greenfield development that may be affected if the amendments proposed by some submitters are taken through into PC1 and then applied through a further plan change to the Kapiti District

3. For the further submitter to action

<p>Service of your further submission: Please note that any person making a further submission must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Greater Wellington. Each submitter has an address for service available at: NRP PC1 Address for Service</p> <p>If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.</p>	
--	--

4. Disclosures:

<p>If providing a submission on behalf of a company / organisation I confirm that I have authority to do so:</p>	
Date:	8-Mar-24

Public information:

Note that under the RMA all submissions and accompanying data must be made available for public inspection. To achieve that, Greater Wellington Regional Council will publish all Further Submissions and accompanying data on our website.

In providing a further submission on the Natural Resources Plan, Plan Change 1, you confirm that you have read and understood the below:

[Plan Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan Information Statement.](#)

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. Please contact us at privacy@gw.govt.nz.

5. Further Submission:

- The original submissions received have been summarised into submission points and collated into one summary table.

This document(s) is a Summary of Decisions Requested:

[NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested – By Submitter](#)

[NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested –By Provision](#)

- Further submitters can submit on multiple submission points (identified in the Summary of Decisions Requested above) within the following section. Please use additional pages if necessary.

- If you are providing suggested text amendments to a provision, please do so in the following format:

- Suggested added text, shown as **bolded text** format

- Suggested deleted text, shown as ~~striketrough~~ format

Please enter your Further Submission in the next worksheet. All of the original submitters and their associated submission points on the proposed change have been included so please place your comments in the corresponding cells.

If you have questions on how to use this submission form please email one of our friendly team at regionalplan@gw.govt.nz

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
Filter by the original submitter Name and associated Submitter Number	Unique identifying number allocated to each specific submission point	Support Oppose Support in part Oppose in part Not stated	Allow Disallow Allow in part Disallow in part	Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.	Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.015	Support	Allow	Delete or significantly amend hydrological controls for all development, which are going beyond hydraulic neutrality, as these are unclear and seem to be overly onerous	Request represents good planning practice and is pragmatic and reasonable
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.005	Support	Allow	Amend maps as requested in submission	Submission is consistent with the Mansell's own submission and the concern regarding the accuracy of the Maps at a property scale and using correct data
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.020	Support	Allow	Delete or amend the additional financial contributions relating to stormwater management	Submission raises key matter regarding lack of justification and an understanding of monitoring of these projects
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.009	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete or amend Rule WH.R6 to remove thresholds and financial contributions	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.104	Support	Allow	Delete Rule WH.R13 or amend significantly to change from prohibited and provide a consenting pathway for unplanned greenfield developments	Submission is consistent with the Mansell's own submission and the concern regarding prohibiting unplanned greenfield development which does not represent good planning practice and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.120	Support in part	Allow in part	Remove requirements to pay financial contributions from Schedule 30	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.020	Support	Allow	Retain financial contribution offsetting as optional	Request represents good planning practice as the PC1 provides for other forms of aquatic offsetting and aquatic compensation is enabled where aquatic offsetting cannot be achieved and retaining financial contribution offsetting as an option is appropriate
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.053	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete clause (b) from Rule WH.R11 regarding the need for financial contributions for greenfield development	Request represents good planning practice
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.081	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete clause (b) from Rule P.R10 regarding the need for financial contributions for greenfield development	Request represents good planning practice

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S177 - Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.007	Support	Allow	Remove mandatory requirement for financial contributions as a condition of rules relating to stormwater management	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S188 - Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	S188.012	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the intent and wording of Policies WH.P10 and P.P10 as notified	The need to demonstrate functional need is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S188 - Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	S188.013	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the current approach in the objectives and policies and not add the requirement to demonstrate functional need	The need to demonstrate functional need is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.002	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain Target Attribute States as per notified PC1	The need for the additional TAS relating to 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.049	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O1 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.050	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O2 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.060	Oppose	Disallow	Retain wording of Objective WH.O9 as notified	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.062	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P1 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.063	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P2 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need to prohibit and avoid adverse effects of unplanned greenfield development; include ephemeral watercourses; and prohibiting land use intensification that individually or collectively may lead to a decline in water quality is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.067	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P5 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need to amend the policy to apply to all discharges is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.090	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P29 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM already addresses this matter
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.099	Oppose	Disallow	Retain permitted activity status of Rule WH.R5 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to controlled is not necessary as the permitted activity conditions are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.100	Oppose	Disallow	Retain controlled activity status of Rule WH.R6 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of control are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.116	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Rule WH.R23 as notified	The additional standards sought by the submitter include matters already addressed in the NPS-FM and are not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NES-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA; including reference to ephemeral watercourses is unnecessary and inappropriate
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.117	Oppose	Disallow	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule WH.R24 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.133	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective P.O1 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.134	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective P.O2 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.139	Oppose	Disallow	Retain wording of Objective P.O6 as notified	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.141	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Policy P.P1 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.142	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy P.P2 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need to prohibit and avoid adverse effects of unplanned greenfield development; include ephemeral watercourses; and prohibiting land use intensification that individually or collectively may lead to a decline in water quality is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.147	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy P.P5 as notified	The need to amend the policy to apply to all discharges is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.169	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy P.P27 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM already addresses this matter
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.176	Oppose	Disallow	Retain permitted activity status of Rule P.R5 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to controlled is not necessary as the permitted activity conditions are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.177	Oppose	Disallow	Retain controlled activity status of Rule P.R6 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of control are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.193	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Rule P.R22 as notified	The additional standards sought by the submitter include matters already addressed in the NPS-FM and are not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NES-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA; including reference to ephemeral watercourses is unnecessary and inappropriate
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.194	Oppose	Disallow	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule P.R23 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.006	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete clause (a) from Policy WH.P2 regarding the need for financial contributions for greenfield development	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.007	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy WH.P10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.008	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy WH.P15	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.013	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R5	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.014	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R6	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.016	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.021	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete clause (a) from Policy P.P2 regarding the need for financial contributions for greenfield development	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.022	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy P.P10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.023	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy P.P14	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.028	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule P.R5	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.029	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule P.R6	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.031	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.036	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.023	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O2 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.032	Oppose	Disallow	Retain wording of Objective WH.O9 as notified	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.034	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P1 (b) as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.035	Oppose	Disallow	Amend Policy WH.P2 as requested by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need to avoid (and not manage) adverse effects from earthworks and vegetation clearance activities is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.049	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P29 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM already addresses this matter
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.063	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Rule WH.R23 as notified	The greater setback sought by the submitter is not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.064	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule WH.R24 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.076	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective P.O2 as notified	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.080	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Policy P.P1 (b) as notified, subject to the amendment sought by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.081	Oppose	Disallow	Amend Policy P.P2 as requested by the Mansell's in their original submission	The need to avoid (and not manage) adverse effects from earthworks and vegetation clearance activities is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.092	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy P.P27 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM already addresses this matter
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.105	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Rule P.R22 as notified	The greater setback sought by the submitter is not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.106	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule P.R23 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.008	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete definition of 'unplanned greenfield development'	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as the unplanned greenfield development definition is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.009	Support	Allow	Amend Policy WH.P2 by deleting Clause (a) with reference to prohibiting unplanned greenfield development	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.011	Support	Allow	Delete Policy WH.P16	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.012	Support	Allow	Delete Policy WH.P31	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.019	Support	Allow	Delete prohibited activity status of Rule WH.R13 and change activity status of stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development to discretionary activity	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting stormwater from unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.020	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) of Rule WH.R24 regarding the winter shut down period to manage earthworks	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (a) from Policy P.P2 regarding prohibiting unplanned greenfield development	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.025	Support	Allow	Delete Policy P.P29	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S243 - Land Matters Limited	S243.030	Support	Allow	Delete Rule WH.R13	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting stormwater from unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S243 - Land Matters Limited	S243.029	Support	Allow	Delete Rule P.R12	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting stormwater from unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S243 - Land Matters Limited	S243.032	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.008	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete definition of 'unplanned greenfield development'	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as the unplanned greenfield development definition is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.009	Support	Allow	Amend Policy WH.P2 by deleting Clause (a) with reference to prohibiting unplanned greenfield development	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.011	Support	Allow	Delete Policy WH.P16	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.012	Support	Allow	Delete Policy WH.P31	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.018	Support	Allow	Delete prohibited activity status of Rule WH.R13 and change activity status of stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development to discretionary activity	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting stormwater from unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.019	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) of Rule WH.R24 regarding the winter shut down period to manage earthworks	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.020	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (a) from Policy P.P2 regarding prohibiting unplanned greenfield development	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as prohibiting unplanned greenfield development is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.023	Support	Allow	Delete Policy P.P29	The request is consistent with the Mansell's submission and represents good planning practice as winter shut down period to manage earthworks is inappropriate and does not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S161 - GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S161 - GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.036	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S161 - GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S165 - PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S165 - PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.036	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S165 - PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S173 - ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	S173.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S173 - ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	S173.036	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S173 - ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	S173.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S207 - Firth Industries Limited	S207.018	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S207 - Firth Industries Limited	S207.030	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S236 - Parkvale Road Limited	S236.009	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S236 - Parkvale Road Limited	S236.011	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S251 - Peka Peka Farm Limited	S251.008	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S251 - Peka Peka Farm Limited	S251.013	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule P.R10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S251 - Peka Peka Farm Limited	S236.015	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S43 - Fulton Hogan Ltd	S43.013	Oppose	Disallow	Delete the winter shut down requirements from Policy WH.P31, as sought by the Mansell's in their submission	The additional provisions sought to Policy WH.P31 regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S43 - Fulton Hogan Ltd	S43.017	Oppose	Disallow	Delete clause (b) from Rule WH.R24 regarding the earthworks winter shut down period	The additional provisions sought to Clause (b) regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S190 - David McKevitt	S190.002	Oppose	Disallow	Delete the winter shut down requirements from Policy WH.P31, as sought by the Mansell's in their submission	The additional provisions sought to Policy WH.P31 regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S190 - David McKevitt	S190.004	Oppose	Disallow	Delete clause (b) from Rule WH.R24 regarding the earthworks winter shut down period	The additional provisions sought to Clause (b) regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S241 - Pukerua Property Group Ltd	S241.038	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA