Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S22.012	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	Objectives that recognise that primary production, activities that support primary production and activities that have a functional need to be located in the GRUZ acknowledge the importance of primary production and ancillary activities to the region.	Accept
FS48.013	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept
S22.013	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Retain policy and Insert: b. Provide for ancillary activities to primary production and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.	Seek to ensure that ancillary activities to primary production are recognised and provided for.	Accept in part
FS48.014	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept in part
S22.014	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified.	The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects	Accept in part
FS48.015	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S22.015	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	GRUZ-R6	GRUZ-R6	Support	Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified.	A rule providing for agricultural aviation activities in the GRUZ chapter provides clarity.	Accept
FS48.016	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept
S34.001	James Richardson	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-R8 provisions to enable more flexibility for minor dwellings up to 65m2 on rural properties.	The submitter supports more flexibility for secondary dwellings up to 65m2 within the Rural (Special) Zone. Note: This land is now rezoned to General Rural Zone, which provides for minor dwellings up to 80m2 in size.	Accept in part
S36.001	Jan Jessep	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-S3 to require side boundary setbacks of 25m.	A property was purchased in the General Rural Zone with assurance the dwelling setbacks were 25m for privacy and also that covenants placed on the forested areas around us would remain in place to protect the nature and topography of the site. To reduce minimum setbacks encourages further subdivision and contravenes the original planning appendices and covenants placed on the subdivision in which we live as well as encourage further subdivision in the future.	Reject
FS108.001	Richard Simpson			Support	Allow	Considers that reducing the distance that structures on rural properties may be placed from the boundary from 25m to 10m will have a negative effect on neighbouring properties, especially where those properties are zoned residential. For example, the construction of a workshop, where the noise could be significant.	Reject
S47.031	Rangitāne o Wairarapa	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P5: vii. The applicant has engaged with tangata whenua to understand the impacts of such activities"	Multiple quarries have impacted hugely on kai sovereignty and soil sovereignty of tangata whenua and have only engaged with tangata whenua after the fact.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					or alternative wording that provides similar relief.		
FS95.102	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Support	Allow	Support in full the submission of Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated	Reject
FS105.034	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Support the submission, as consider iwi work from a holistic base to protect Te Taiao, which aligns with the further submitter's views.	Reject
S48.003	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O1 as follows: " and other activities, including viticulture, which have a".	Given that the definition of primary production does not cover "viticulture" and viticulture is not "horticulture" (which is covered by the definition of primary production), viticulture should be specifically referred to in the objective.	Accept in part
S48.004	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support	Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified.	No reasoning provided.	Accept in part
S48.005	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-O7	GRUZ-07	Support	Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified.	Viticulture and associated activities around 'wine tourism' are essential to Martinborough's future economic and social wellbeing; and soils suitable for viticulture (i.e. "land with special characteristics") should be recognised (as intended by the Martinborough Soils Overlay) and protected.	Accept in part
S48.006	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P2(c) as follows: "activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production, viticulture and ancillary activities".	GRUZ-P2(c) should be amended to specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part
S48.007	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P3(c) and (d) as follows: " c. enabling primary production, viticulture, and ancillary activities; d. structures associated with primary production activities,	Both GRUZ-P3(c) and (d) should specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					including viticulture;		
S48.008	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P4(a) as follows: "ait does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities, including viticulture; and"	Amend to specifically include reference to viticulture.	Accept in part
S48.009	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-P7	GRUZ-P7	Support	Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified.	Support the specific reference to "including viticulture".	Accept
S48.010	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-P8	GRUZ-P8	Support	Retain GRUZ-P8 as notified.	Support the specific refence to "in particular viticulture".	Accept in part
S48.011	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support	Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified.	Protection of sites within the Martinborough Soils Overlay from intensive residential development is essential to the future viability of viticulture. There is sufficient appropriately zoned land for a full range of residential activities within the General Residential Zone and the Future Urban Zone.	Accept
S48.012	Aburn Popova Trust	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support	Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified.	The General Rural Zone should not be regarded as an opportunity for general and, in particular, intensive residential development, including retirement villages which are separately defined in Part 1 Interpretation - "Definitions".	Accept
S70.007	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as proposed.	Supports GRUZ-O1 as the word 'primarily' ensures recognition of non-primary production activities.	Accept
S70.008	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O2 as proposed.	Supports objective GRUZ-02 as the word 'predominant' recognises that the character of the General Rural zone as described is not exhaustive.	Accept in part
S70.009	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-06	GRUZ-O6	Amend	Amend Objective GRUZ-O6 as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision and	This submission supports proposed objective GRUZ-O6 but that it is amended to include the word 'highly' is inserted before 'productive' to ensure the objective	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					development is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation of highly productive land and its productive potential.	aligns with the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Soil (NPS-HPL).	
\$70.010	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P1 as proposed.	Supports Policy GRUZ-P1 as it confirms that rural lifestyle development is provided for in the General Rural zone. There is, however, no guidance on what an appropriate location is.	Accept
S70.011	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: 'GRUZ-P2 Incompatible Activities. Avoid activities and development that: a. Are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. Will result in the fragmentation of productive land and the productive potential of land; or c. Will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/ or conflict with permitted activities in the General Rural Zzone including primary production and ancillary activities.'	Amend Policy to ensure the focus is on avoiding fragmentation of productive land and not smaller non-productive blocks of land.	Reject
S70.012	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P4	This policy should be in the Subdivision Chapter given it directly addresses subdivision. This submission supports GRUZ-P4 with one amendment as shown above. 'Sites' is proposed over 'areas' as it focuses on the characteristics of a specific site rather than area which is a broader term that ought to relate somewhere identified on the district plan maps.	Reject
\$70.013	Dan Kellow	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P9 as proposed.	Supports GRUZ-P9 as it recognises the NPS-HPL has exceptions that allow development and subdivision of HPL. The	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						word subdivision is however unnecessary given the wording of SUB-P8.	
\$74.002	Jack Cameron			Amend	Insert provision in General Rural Zone for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation.	There is no provision in GRUZ for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation. Compliance is required through application of NOISE-R1 and specifically NOISE-S1 of 55dB LAeq (15min), which would severely limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft, especially if in an occasion, multiple aircraft were to visit a rural airstrip.	Reject
FS48.020	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Oppose	Disallow		Accept
S79.083	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Support	Retain Standard GRUZ-S3 as notified.	Supports Standard GRUZ-S3 as proposed.	Accept in part
S81.035	Genesis Energy Ltd	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the General Rural Zone - Introduction: The General Rural Zone consists of areas used predominantly for primary production activities, including intensive primary production. The Zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, renewable electricity generation activities and other activities that require a rural location	Considers that renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General Rural Zone, given: a. renewable electricity generation activities already occur within the Wairarapa; and b. the likelihood that further large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located within the General Rural Zone; and c. The need for development of renewable electricity generation activities in future as envisaged by the Strategic Direction in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject
S81.036	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O2: e. the presence of renewable electricity generation activities,	Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located within the	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					rural infrastructure, including rural roads, state highways and the national grid; and f. the on-site disposal of watewater, and a general lack of urban infrastructure, such as street lighting, solid fences, and footpaths.	General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General Rural Zone and that Objective GRUZ-O2 should be amended to include such activities alongside the other activities identified.	
FS81.035	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	While the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Generation directs that district plans should include objectives, policies and methods (including rules) to provide for development operation and maintenance/upgrading of new and existing renewable energy generation activities, there may nevertheless be potential adverse effects associated with some types of renewable energy generation activities that properly ought to be able to be determined on a case by case basis (rather than through generic rules that allow renewable energy generation activities in certain areas). Therefore, some level of discretion is at least required to reflect that detailed consideration may be needed to consider actual and potential adverse effects of specific proposals. Furthermore, detail is needed on the way in which renewable energy generation activities in general should be integrated with considerations of other important issues such as protection of Highly Productive Land, within the proposed plan resource management framework.	Reject
S81.037	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Oppose	Amend Objective GRUZ-O4: Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located	Concerned that while this objective provides for renewable electricity generation activities, such activities would be considered secondary to "primary production" activities. Considers that the	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities.	phrase "where they are not incompatible with primary production activities" should be deleted from the policy.	
FS81.036	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the relief sought by the submitter. "Where they are not incompatible with primary production activities" is an important phrase in the objective as it gives priority to primary production activities which have a functional need to occur in the General Rural Zone. This priority is consistent with the direction in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Accept
S81.038	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O5: Sensitive activities are designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, existing renewable electricity generation activities, other land uses activities and key transport corridors in the General Rural Zone.	Considers existing renewable electricity generation activities should also be appropriately protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject
S81.039	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Oppose in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P1: b. Enable renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone	Concerned that renewable electricity generation activities will be considered secondary to "primary production" activities. Considers that the phrase "that there are not incompatible with primary production" should not apply to renewable electricity generation activities and that "provide for" should be changed to "enable" with respect to these activities to recognise and provide for renewable electricity generation activities that presently exist and occur within the General Rural Zone.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS81.037	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept
S81.040	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P3: d. enabling renewable electricity generation activities	Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities will be located within the General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly enabled under this policy to recognise their likely presence within the General Rural Zone and the importance of such activities.	Accept in part
FS13.068	Horticulture New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	While renewable energy activities may locate in the rural zone, it would be an adverse outcome for local food security and the local economy should they displace food production.	Accept in part
S81.041	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P6: a. avoiding the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive primary production, primary production activities, waste management facilities, quarrying activities, renewable electricity generation activities and rural industry in circumstances where the new sensitive activity may compromise the operation of the existing activities	The protection of existing renewable electricity generation activities from reverse sensitivity effects should be explicitly provided for in Policy GRUZ-P6.	Reject
S81.042	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P9: Avoid subdivision, use and development of highly productive land, except as provided for or otherwise exempted in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Clause 3.9 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land provides for certain activities to occur where highly productive land is protected from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.10 provides for exemptions for highly productive land uses. Considers it likely that highly productive land will be suitable for development of renewable electricity generation activities	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						within the Wairarapa. To clarify that the matters provided for in the NPS as well as the exemptions recognised in clause 3.10, considers that policy GRUZ-P9 should be amended to include reference to exemptions under clause 3.10.	
S81.049	Genesis Energy Ltd	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O1: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, renewable electricity generation activities and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone.	Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located withi9n the General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General Rural Zone.	Reject
S82.001	Dublin Street Wines Ltd			Oppose	Amend the Martinborough Soils Overlay so it does not apply to 142 Dublin Street.	The submission notes that the site was not previously under the Rural (special) zoning for viticulture protection and that soil conditions in the area suggest the layer is inappropriate at this location.	Reject
S94.193	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend to include land-based primary production on highly productive land.	Amend to better give effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clauses 3.11 and 3.12. By clearly referring to highly productive land, this amendment also creates a stronger link to SUB-P6 which includes specific direction to avoid inappropriate subdivision of highly productive land.	Reject
FS109.014	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the proposed addition has the potential to incorrectly imply that all land in GRUZ is highly productive land or is currently used for land-based primary production.	Accept
S94.194	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend wording to align with NPS-HPL Clause 3.13(1)(a) by inserting: land-based primary production on highly productive land.	This objective goes some way toward giving effect to NPS-HPL Clause 3.13(1)(a) but does not include specific reference to "land-based primary production on highly productive land"; an amendment is sought	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						to reflect this wording and better link in with provisions GRUZ-P3 and SUB-P5.	
S94.195	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support	Retain as notified.	Support this objective	Accept
S94.196	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support in part	Amend as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and highly productive land is prioritised for use in land-based primary production, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production or land-based primary production activities.	Primary production is not synonymous with land-based primary production; the latter is reliant on the soil resource of the land, which has different implications for the productive capacity of land. In order to give full effect to the NPS-HPL, this objective should be amended to align with the wording in Clause 3.12(1)(a).	Reject
S94.197	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain as notified.	Gives effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.13(b).	Accept in part
S94.198	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Support in part	Amend Clause (a) as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation of highly productive land and its productive capacity or potential.	The submitter considers that the recommended amendment strengthens this objective in line with the clear direction in the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.8.	Accept in part
S94.199	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-O7	GRUZ-O7	Support	Retain as notified.	The submitter strongly supports this objective, which gives effect to the NPS-HPL and acknowledges the direction to protect land which may be mapped as highly productive due to characteristics other than soil type classification.	Accept
S94.200	Greater Wellington	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert new objective into GRUZ chapter as follows: Productive	The submitter considers a new objective is required in addition to GRUZ-O7 to give full	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Regional Council				capacity of highly productive land. Opportunities that maintain or increase the productive capacity of highly productive land are enabled, but only where those opportunities are not inconsistent with: a. any matter of national importance under section 6 of the Act; or b. any environmental outcomes identified in accordance with the NPS-FM 2020.	effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.12(1)(b).	
S94.201	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Amend as follows: Compatible activities: a. Enable primary production and land-based primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. c. Provide for rural lifestyle development in appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for.	In line with strong national direction on protecting highly productive land, the submitter considers that this policy should be amended due to the allowance for rural lifestyle development provided for in clause (c). They consider that a reference to land-based primary production (which is reliant on soil resource) adequately captures the need to protect highly productive land.	Reject
S94.202	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend as follows: Avoid activities and development that: a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. will result in fragmentation of highly productive land and loss	An amendment is sought to strengthen direction to protect highly productive land. In addition, the proposed new clause better gives effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically clause 3.13(1)(c) which requires consideration of the cumulative effects of activities on highly productive land, which is not provided for elsewhere.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					of the productive capacity potential of land; or c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production and ancillary activities; or d. have the potential to cause negative cumulative effects on the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land.		
S94.203	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend clause (c) as follows: enabling primary production, land-based primary production on highly productive land, and ancillary activities;	An amendment is necessary to link in with GRUZ-O2 and SUB-P5 and give better effect to NPS-HPL clause 13.3(a). Given other strong direction on protection of highly productive land and issues and threats to that land raised elsewhere in the proposed Plan, the submitter considers it valuable to explicitly include reference to highly productive land amongst the character and amenities of the General Rural Zone.	Reject
S94.204	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support	Retain as notified.	Support this policy as protection of highly productive land from inappropriate subdivision is adequately addressed in GRUZ-P9.	Accept in part
\$94.205	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Support in part	Insert new sub-clause to (b) as follows: x. any impact on the productive capacity or reduction in area of highly productive land is avoided.	The NPS-HPL implementation guidance provides for small-scale farm quarries to be enabled on highly productive land, but other quarrying activities must pass several tests to be carried out on highly productive land. The submitter seeks an amendment to provide strong direction to protect highly productive land from other quarrying activities.	Accept in part
FS89.004	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks an amendment to GRUZ-P5 to protect highly productive land from quarrying activities other than farm	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						quarries by 'avoiding any impact' on highly productive soils. This relief does not give effect to the NPS-HPL which does not contain a requirement for the avoidance of any impact, and instead provides a pathway for quarrying activities to occur on highly productive land.	
\$94.206	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy adequately addresses the direction from the NPS-HPL to protect highly productive land.	Accept
S94.207	Greater Wellington Regional Council	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert new policy into GRUZ chapter as follows: Existing activities on highly productive land Enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land and minimise any loss of highly productive land from those activities.	A new policy is required to give full effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.11(1)(a) and (b).	Reject
S94.208	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support in part	Amend clause (b) as follows: b. Where the site is located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or within highly productive land the number of residential units must not exceed: i. one residential unit per site; and ii. one minor residential unit that has a gross floor area iii. of no more than 80m2 per site; and the residential units must directly support land-based primary production.	The submitter notes that the reference in the section 32 report to managing activities over productive land mistakenly refers to GRUZ-R6 (agricultural aviation), where it presumably means to refer to GRUZ-R8 (residential activities). Although Clause 3.9(1) of the NPS-HPL includes strong direction to avoid the inappropriate use or development of highly productive land that is not land-based primary production, clause 3.9(2)(a) does provide for residential activities as supporting activities; these must pass the test of supporting land-based primary production, which neither GRUZ-S4 nor GRUZ-S7 refer to specifically. In order to give better effect to the NPS-HPL we seek amendments to GRUZ-S4 to reflect the prioritisation of using highly productive land for land-based primary production, as well	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						as to align with the proposed amendment to GRUZ-R8.	
S94.209	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Support in part	Insert highly productive land to the matters of discretion.	Amend in line with relief sought on GRUZ-P5.	Accept
S94.210	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-R13	GRUZ-R13	Support	Retain as notified.	Strongly support the provision for papakāinga.	Accept
S94.211	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support in part	Amend matters of discretion (1) as follows: Whether it can be demonstrated that the residential unit(s) provides ancillary accommodation for landowners and/or workers involved with primary production or land-based primary production on sites over 40 ha.	Amend in line with relief sought on GRUZ-R8 in order to give full effect to the NPS-HPL.	Reject
FS13.071	Horticulture New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	Primary production includes land-based primary production and encompasses other activities like non-soil based greenhouses.	Accept
S117.001	Geoffrey Roberts	GRUZ-S8	GRUZ-S8	Support in part	Amend Standard GRUZ-S8 as follows: "GRUZ-S8 Relocatable Buildings3. Previous Usea. Any relocatable building intended for use as a residential unit or for visitor accommodation must have previously been designed, built and used as a residential unit or for visitor accommodation"	If the provided performance measures are met, buildings should still be permitted to be relocated and used as residential dwellings regardless of prior use. Examples being churches, halls and other public buildings. Submitter states there is no clear reason for this blanket prohibition, and it arbitrarily restricts the ability to recycle and repurpose buildings that may otherwise be demolished.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS54.003	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Considers that any relocatable building can be repurposed to become a dwelling, as drainage details are required to be submitted to Council as part of a building consent for services.	Reject
S122.051	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-01	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified	Supports the explicit recognition of the role of primary production in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
\$122.052	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support	Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified.	Supports the recognition of the influence primary production (which includes quarrying activities) and ancillary activities has on rural character.	Accept in part
S122.053	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support	Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified	Supports the explicit recognition of the support for primary production and resource dependent activities in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S122.054	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support	Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified	Supports the explicit recognition of the support for primary production and resource dependent activities in the General Rural Zone, and activities that are not incompatible with primary production activities.	Accept in part
S122.055	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified	Supports an explicit objective regarding reverse sensitivity	Accept in part
S122.056	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified	Supports explicit recognition regarding the activities that are anticipated to occur in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S122.057	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P2 to remove reference to productive potential: b. will result in fragmentation of land and the productive potential of land; or	Considers the phrasing of GRUZ-P3 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision, use and development) by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production).	Accept in part
S122.058	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-P3 so it describes how subdivision, use and development will occur, so it does	Considers the wording of GRUZ-P3 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision, use and development)	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone and achieves GRUZ-O2.	by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production).	
S122.059	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P4 to use the term primary production where possible: b. recognizing the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential within for the General Rural Zone to be utilised for primary production activities.	Supports the intention of the policy to avoid inappropriate activities within the General Rural Zone. However, the submitter would prefer to see defined terms used where possible to avoid interpretive issues for plan users.	Accept in part
FS81.034	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose in part	Allow in part	Agrees that defined terms should be used in policies to avoid interpretative issues for plan users. However do not support the relief sought by the submitter as it is inconsistent with the direction in the National Policy Statement for Highly productive Land which seeks to avoid subdivision of highly productive land by avoiding if possible or otherwise mitigate any potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land. Believe that the term 'productive capacity' would be a better term to use than the amendment sought by the submitter.	Accept in part
S122.060	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P5 to recognise that vehicles on roads are exempt from noise rules and that roads anticipate a level of traffic consistent with where they sit within the road hierarchy for the district, and: b. providing for other quarrying activities where it can be demonstrated that:	Generally supports GRUZ-P5 but is concerned that GRUZ-P5(b)(iv) does not adequately consider the reading hierarchy, the purpose of roads within this hierarchy, and the exemptions within the noise rules for vehicles on the roads. Considers that GRUZ0P5(b)(i) suggests that quarrying activities do not contribute to the character of the General Rural Zone in line with GRUZ-O2. GRUZ-P5(b)(vi) directs quarries	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					scale of buildings, structures, machinery, stored material, quarried areas, cut faces, and visual screening maintains the character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone;iv. there are measures to mitigate any adverse effects on character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone from the movement of vehicles;	to internalise effects as far as practicable which addresses the potential effects on amenity values, while recognising that quarrying activities are an activity that necessarily occurs in the rural environment, it is anticipated to occur, and contributes to the overall character of the rural environment.	
S122.061	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Oppose	Amend Policy GRUZ-P6 to focus on reverse sensitivity effects only:e. ensuring adequate separation distances between existing sensitive activities and new intensive primary production activities, quarrying activities, and rural industry; andd. avoiding quarry, landfill, cleanfill area, and mining activities in proximity to urban areas where the amenity values of urban environments would be diminished.	Supports a policy addressing reverse sensitivity effects in rural zones, but notes Policy GRUZ-P6(b) and (c) relate to the direct effects of rural activities on sensitive activities, not reverse sensitivity effects. The policy should be amended to remove these direct effect elements.	Accept in part
S122.062	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P9 to make it clear that any reference within the NPS-HPL to aggregate extraction encompasses the activities defined by the term quarrying activity: Avoid subdivision, use, and development of highly productive land, except as provided for in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. When applying Clause 3.9(2)(i)(iv) of	Notes a recent resource consent application example has found that reference to 'aggregate extraction' in the NPS-HPL has created unintended consequences and therefore requests that this interpretation issue is addressed directly in GRUZ-P9.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, any reference to 'aggregate extraction' is to be interpreted as being reference to Quarrying Activity.		
S122.063	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Oppose in part	GRUZ-R12 Quarrying activities 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion: 5. Adverse effects on character and amenity values of the Zone from the movement of vehicles 3. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R12(2); orb. The activity includes the recovery and recycling of construction and demolition materials.	Supports the multi-tiered approach to the classification of quarrying activities proposed through GRUZ-R12(2) and (3) but considers GRUZ-R12 (2) (5) does not adequately consider the roading hierarchy, the purpose of roads within this hierarchy, and the exemptions within the noise rules for vehicles on the roads. The submitter also notes that the definition of quarrying activity includes rehabilitation rather than remediation as per GRUZ-R12(8) and the matters of discretion should be consistent with this defined terminology.	Accept in part
S122.064	Fulton Hogan Limited	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert a new GRUZ rule for depositing inert fill: GRUZ-RX Deposition of inert fill Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. The fill is inert and is deposited as part of quarry rehabilitation.	Notes the definition of quarrying activity does not include the deposition of non-virgin but inert fill. Supports the inclusion of a new rules that provides for the deposition of inert fill as part of quarry rehabilitation as a discretionary activity.	Accept in part
S122.065	Fulton Hogan Limited	GRUZ-R16	GRUZ-R16	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R16 to allow for some rural industry as a Permitted activity:1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. a maximum of five staff shall work on the site at any one time;b. the manufacture, processing or production of goods involve initial or further processing of commodities derived from primary production;c. the maximum GFA occupied for the rural industry shall be 250m2;d. the maximum GFA occupied for	Notes rural industries are critical to supporting primary production activities such as quarrying. Supports a permitted activity rule for Rural Industry activities where these are of a scale that is compatible with the character of the General Rural Zone, rather than a default discretionary activity.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					the rural industry within a SASM shall be 150m2;e. the maximum land area occupied for the rural industry shall be 500m2;f. any retail sales area shall be set back a minimum of 10m from the site boundary;g. the retail sale of goods on the site is restricted to those manufactured, produced, or processed on the site;h. the maximum NFA or land area occupied for retail sales shall be 50m2; andi. any buildings, yard storage, or parking areas associated with the activity shall not be located within 60m of any residential unit, or other sensitive activity located on a site other than where the rural industry is occurring.4—2. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. compliance is not achieved with Rule GRUZ-R16(1)		
S122.066	Fulton Hogan Limited			Not Stated	Amend the General Rural Zone to recognise that quarrying influences rural character and amenity, generates traffic, and occurs only where the suitable aggregate resources exist, and this should be anticipated and provided for as it is a Primary Productive activity.	Considers the plan needs to be explicit in how it addresses quarrying, along with other permitted Primary Production activities in the General Rural Zone.	Accept in part
\$122.068	Fulton Hogan Limited			Not Stated	Amend the Plan to recognise and consider the risk of adverse effects on primary production activities from competing land uses, subdivision, and incompatible activities that do not have a	Quarrying can only occur where the suitable aggregate resource is located. The resource is therefore susceptible to the impact of competing land uses, subdivision, and incompatible activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					functional or operational need to locate in a rural area.		
S125.002	Lynly Selby- Neal and Angus Laird	GRUZ-P7	GRUZ-P7	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-P7 to remove reference to "buffer areas".	Considers the application of a "buffer" is inconsistent, not appropriate, not necessary, and is in part outside SWDC jurisdiction as the buffer zone is not defined within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or Plan maps, there is no evidence alternative options were considered / or if a buffer is suitable to meet the outcomes sought. There is no buffer in areas neighbouring existing viticulture. Notes the SWDC stated "is it unlikely that there is any information to provide you" in response to a request for evidence of relevant complaints received from residents in the upper Shooting Butts Road area regarding viticulture and activities. Notes there are recently issued subdivision consents for the neighbouring properties require each title issued to include Consent Notices regarding Reverse Sensitivity to rural activities. Future housing or new builds are required to have double or triple glazing and good insulation, mitigating noise. Other reverse sensitivities toward viticulture e.g. spray drift or dust are not within District Council's jurisdictions, being a regional council function.	Reject
S131.001	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association NZ	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert new provision within GRUZ for the permitted use of rural airstrips for non-commercial general aviation: GRUZ-RX: Use of rural airstrips for non-commercial general aviation 1. Activity status: Permitted.	There is no provision within the General Rural Zone for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with Primary Production/Agricultural Aviation. Compliance is required through NOISE-R1 and NOISE-S1, which would severely limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft, especially were multiple aircraft were to visit a rural airstrip on a 'fly-in'. District Councils are required to uphold the	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						long standing and existing use of private airstrips pre-existing in the General Rural Zone, under Section 139A.	
FS48.017	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Oppose	Disallow		Accept
FS48.021	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Oppose	Disallow		Accept
S132.001	Simon Casey	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Amend	Amend GRUZ-S4 to delete the requirement for minor residential units to be located within 30m of the primary dwelling.	Considers the 30m distance rule can provide significant restriction and may not be practical on all sites. Factors such as topography, services, privacy, and access may limit available build areas.	Reject
FS49.003	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch			Support	Allow	Considers the 30m restriction is unjustified and does not relate to the purpose of a minor residential unit. Considers this unreasonably limits the ability to provide additional accommodation in a region that requires more housing supply.	Reject
FS54.002	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Supports deleting the requirement for minor dwelling to be within 30 meters of existing or primary dwelling. Other factors limit build platforms such as waterways, services, flood plains, and access. Considers the 30m setback would result in building closer to boundaries, which is not always desirable.	Reject
S136.002	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O1 as follows: "The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary priduction, activities that support primary	Given that the definition of primary production does not cover "viticulture" and viticulture is not "horticulture" (which is covered by the definition of primary production), viticulture should be	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					productio, and other activities, including viticulture, that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone."	specifically referred to in the objective.	
S136.003	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O2 clause (b) as follows " b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral, viticultural and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accomodation, and a small degree of rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accomodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains and schools);"	Supports the emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the predominant character and amenities of the GRUZ, which, for significant parts of the region, especially in and around the vicinity of Martinborough, and in the Te Muna Valley, are heavily reliant on the ongoing viability of viticulture; but requests an amendment to clause (b). to specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part
S136.004	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-07	GRUZ-O7	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O7 as notified.	Viticulture and associated activities around 'wine tourism' are essential to Martinborough's future 'sustainability'; and soils suitable for viticulture (i.e. "land with special characteristics") should be recognised (as intended by the Martinborough Soils Overlay) and protected.	Accept
S136.005	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: " c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted activities in the General	Supports avoiding activities and development that will result in a fragmentation of land, especially land suitable for viticulture. However, clause (c)	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					Rural Zone including primary production, viticulture , and ancillary activities.	should be amended to specifically reference viticulture.	
S136.006	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P3 as follows: " c. enabling primary production, viticulture, and ancillary activities; d. providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture;"	Supports policy, however, clauses (c) and (d) should be amended to specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part
S136.007	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P4 as follows: "Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, amenity values of the zone, by; a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to area where there is limited productive potential and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities, including viticulture; and"	Supports avoiding small-lot subdivision in the GRUZ, subdivision that would compromise the ability to use land within the Martinborough Soils Overlay for viticulture. However an amendment needs to be made to clause (a) to specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part
S136.008	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-P7	GRUZ-P7	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P7 as notified.	Supports the policy and the specific reference to "including viticulture" in clause b.	Accept in part
S136.009	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-P8	GRUZ-P8	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P8 as notified.	Supports the policy and the specific reference to "in particular viticulture" in clause a."	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S136.010	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Support in part	Amend Rule GRUZ-R4 as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for land based primary production activity, including viticulture; e. The seasonal worker accommodation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay, except where the accommodation is for seasonal workers associated with viticulture.	Supports Rule, however, it needs amendment to include specific reference to viticulture.	Accept in part
S136.011	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-R5	GRUZ-R5	Support in part	Amend Rule GRUZ-R5 as follows: "GRUZ-R5 Primary production, including viticulture (excluding quarrying activities, intensive primary production, and rural industry. 1. Activity status: Permitted"	Viticulture needs to be specifically referenced in GRUZ-R5. The National Planning Standard definition of "Primary Production" adopted by the WCDP, does not specifically include viticulture, and viticulture is not a 'subset' of horticulture which is included in the definition. Viticulture has very different characteristics and soil requirements.	Accept in part
S136.012	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support	Retain Rule GRUZ-R8 as notified.	Supports clause (b) restricting residential activities in the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Protection of sites within the Martinborough Soils Overlay from intensive residential development is essential to the future viability of viticulture. There is sufficient appropriately zoned land for a full range of residential activities within the General Residential Zone and the Future Urban Zone.	Accept
S136.013	Wairarapa Winegrowers'	GRUZ-R15	GRUZ-R15	Oppose in part	Amend Rule GRUZ-R15 as follows:	Considers that visitor accommodation under GRUZ-R15 should not be	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Association Inc				"GRUZ-R15 Visitor accommodation (excluding residential visitor accommodation) 1. Activity status: DiscretionaryWhere: a. the site is not located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay2. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. the site is located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay."	established (as a discretionary activity) within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers that there would be many suitable sites elsewhere, including the General Rural Zone not subject to the Martinborough Soils Overlay that would be suitable for visitor accommodation. Requests an additional rule that stipulates that visitor accommodation within the Martinborough Soils Overlay is a noncomplying activity.	
\$136.014	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Support in part	Amend Standard GRUZ-S3 as follows: " Matters of discretion: 1. The extent to which building design, sitting, including building setback from any front road boundary, and external appearance adversely impacts on rural character and amenity"	Consideration needs to be given to the location and visual amenity of seasonal worker accommodation buildings, especially on the principal 'gateway' roads leading into and around Martinborough. Such buildings should be positioned so that they do not dominate the viticulture landscape. Considers that the proposed 10m setback on a front road boundary of sealed roads may not always be sufficient to protect the visual amenity of Martinborough's gateways. Therefore, requests that an amendment be made in regard to Matters of discretion 1.	Accept in part
\$143.001	Penelope Jane Bargh	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert in GRUZ -Use of rural airstrips for non commercial general aviation Activity status: Permitted.	There is currently no provision for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation. Compliance is required through NOISE-R1 and NOISE-S1 of 55dB LAeq (15 mins) and would limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft.	Reject
S144.008	E McGruddy	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the introduction as follows: The Wairarapa is increasingly seen as an attractive place to reside. Rural lifestyle living provides a residential choice for people wanting a lifestyle on larger sites, with the opportunity to carry out small scale productive	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					activities in a rural setting. Rural lifestyle blocks are clustered in "peri-urban" areas around the main towns and transport corridors and make a significant contribution to the vibrancy and economic prosperity of the districts - "greening" the landscape, prototyping new crops, growing produce for local markets, providing resilience in the event of a major earthquake or other significant natural event impacting urban centers and supply lines, and enhancing the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of their communities. The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides opportunities for rural lifestyle living in the Wairarapa. The General Rural Zone provides for further opportunities for rural lifestyle living, in appropriate locations and to an appropriate scale, insofar as it does not risk the loss and fragmentation of the rural character, productive land, and productive potential of the land within the Wairarapa rural hinterland.		
S144.009	E McGruddy	GRUZ-01	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O1 as follows: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone, and smallholdings clustered in	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					peri-urban areas around the main towns.		
S144.010	E McGruddy	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O2 (b) as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools) and more closely settled peri-urban areas serving as a transition between urban areas and the rural hinterland;	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject
S144.011	E McGruddy	GRUZ-06	GRUZ-O6	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-06 (b) as follows: b. Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development in appropriate existing locations within the General Rural Zone is provided for enabled, insofar as GRUZ-06(a) is met.	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject
S144.012	E McGruddy	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: a. Enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					production. c. Provide for Enable rural lifestyle development in appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for.		
S144.013	E McGruddy	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone, by: e. managing the density and location of enabling residential development within existing small lot subdivisions and restricting the development of new small lot subdivisions; f. ensuring allotments can be self- serviced; g. retaining a clear delineation and contrast smaller lots in peri- urban areas as a buffer between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject
S144.014	E McGruddy	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support	Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows: GRUZ-P4 Avoid Discourage inappropriate subdivisionAvoid Discourage subdivision in the General	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject
S144.015	E McGruddy	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support	Amend GRUZ-S4 as follows: 1. For sites comprising less than 40 ha-8ha: a. ene up to three residential units per site subject to meeting the conditions set out in SUB- R4; and b. ene minor residential	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					unit per site, where the minor residential unit is located within 30m of the primary residential unit and has a gross floor area of no more than 80m2. 2. For sites comprising of 40 ha 8ha or more: Matters of discretion for sites of 8ha or more: 1. Whether it can be demonstrated that the residential unit(s) provides ancillary accommodation for landowners and/or workers involved with primary production on sites ever 40 ha	owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	
\$149.047	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-S4: 1. For sites comprising less than 40 ha and used primarily for rural productive purposes: a. One residential unit per site: and b. One minor residential unit per site, where the minor residential unit is located within 30m of the primary residential unit and has a gross floor area of no more than 80m2.2. For sites comprising less than 40 ha and used primarily for rural residential purposes: a. One residential unit per site.2-3. For sites comprising 40ha or more	Notes GRUZ-S4 provides for the number of residential units permitted on varying sizes of rural properties. This implies this is functionally focused on ensuring primary production activities have sufficient homes to support those who need to live on and work on the land, the standard does not link the number of permitted units to the underlying land use. The objectives and policies of the zone support the development of residential activities which are ancillary to rural productive activities. Notes the GRUZ contains multiple allotments used for rural residential purposes. The standard as currently drafted would permit intensification of these legacy rural residential allotments, which appears contrary to the purpose and directives of the GRUZ. Requests an additional subclause allowing the proposed intensification of residential units for sites less than 40ha used for rural productive purpose, while rural residential sites are limited to 1 permitted dwelling per site.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS49.002	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the councils have provided insufficient evidence to justify the proposed restrictions on land use for properties under 40ha. Considers there has been no evidence put forward by Waka Kotahi to impose further restrictions on how landowners not in primary production can use their properties. Considers this submission point is an unreasonable restriction on land uses in the rural zone.	Accept in part
S154.017	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P5 to require engagement with whānau and hapū for quarrying activities.	The submission states that hapu has see the desecration of our whenua and the loss of our soil and kai sovereignty in locations that have allowed quarrying as a permitted activity without understanding the full impacts of the location they are sitting on.	Reject
FS81.064	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose in part	Disallow	It is not clear whether this relief intends to capture farm quarries. Nevertheless, opposes any application of this relief to farm quarries. Farm quarries are located on private land and generally do not have adverse effects. Our members should not have to engage with whanau and hapū for this activity.	Accept in part
S172.086	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-O1 insofar as it allows for other activities to locate in the zone where they have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S172.087	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-P1 insofar as it provides for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S172.088	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R1	GRUZ-R1	Support	Retain GRUZ-R1 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-R1 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S172.089	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R3	GRUZ-R3	Support	Retain GRUZ-R3 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-R3 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept
S172.090	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R7	GRUZ-R7	Support	Retain GRUZ-R7 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-R7 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept in part
S172.091	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support	Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-R8 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept
S172.092	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R13	GRUZ-R13	Support	Retain GRUZ-R13 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-R13 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept
S172.093	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-R4 a. Compliance is achieved with: iv. GRUZ-S7; and	It is vital that any buildings to be used for accommodation purposes are appropriately serviced with a suitable water supply for firefighting purposes. Without a suitable firefighting water supply or installation of a sprinkler system, an acceptable risk is posed to residents of the buildings. Amend GRUZ-R4 to require compliance with GRUZ-S7.	Accept in part
S172.094	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert a new rule in the GRUZ - General Rural Zone chapter that provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the General Rural Zone.	Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						The permitted activity standards within the General Rural chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone.	
S172.095	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRUZ-S7	GRUZ-S7	Support	Retain GRUZ-S7 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-S7 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and includes a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options.	Accept
S174.005	Monique Leerschool	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert provisions to facilitate rezoning General Rural Zone land to Natural Open Space Zone.	Requests more future-proofed opportunities would be available by rezoning from a General Rural Zone to a Natural Open Space with its main function to regenerate indigenous biodiversity and support community recreation.	Reject
S181.003	Kath and David Tomlinson	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Not Stated	Amend GRUZ-S4 to be consistent with the Operative District Plan provisions.	The Operative District Plan provides for 2 residential dwellings on properties over 4ha, which is changed to 40ha in the Proposed District Plan. The approach in the Operative District Plan is better suited to reduce rural creep from lifestyle blocks.	Reject
FS49.004	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch			Support	Allow	Considers the operative plan rules regarding dwellings are not connected to the Councils' concerns regarding inappropriate rural subdivision and should be retained. Considers insufficient evidence has been provided by the Councils to justify why an additional dwelling on properties between 4 and 40ha is problematic or contributes negatively to the objectives of the proposed plan.	Reject
\$182.002	Aggregate and Quarry Association	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P5 to recognise the benefits of quarrying activities.	The provisions in GRUZ-P5(b) are reasonable when read individually, but as an overall package they fail to project a positive impression of quarrying.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS87.002	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ-P5 is a reasonable policy in order to manage adverse effects of quarrying activities, it still 'provides for' quarrying activities where it can be demonstrated that those effects can be managed.	Reject
FS95.002	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Definitions and policies are appropriate for the impact that the quarrying industry has on the whenua and whānau in turn. The removal of such stones affects Ātua Hineahuone, and through this whakapapa, affects Soil and Kai Sovereignty. The impacts of such kaupapa should be discussed with mana whenua (whānau, hapū and iwi) to understand the intergenerational impacts that these actions will have.	Reject
S182.003	Aggregate and Quarry Association	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-R12 to better provide for land-based quarrying and on-site processing activities.	Considers GRUZ-R12(2) currently discriminates against land-based quarrying where processing activities usually occur on site. Available supply of river-based aggregates is likely to reduce over time, requiring more land-based quarrying. With river extraction, gravel is usually transported away for processing elsewhere, which is not the case with land-based quarrying where processing occurs at the same site. This provision is a barrier to land-based quarrying as it becomes more necessary in the Wairarapa. Considers it is also inconsistent with the definition of quarrying and quarrying activities in the Proposed Plan, as well as the National Planning Standards. These nationally consistent definitions include ancillary activities associated with extraction including processing. Other instruments and court decisions also recognise processing as an ancillary activity with a functional and operational need to be located where the extraction	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						occurs (although recognises co-location is not appropriate in the case of river extraction). This needs to be remedied to avoid uncertainty and to allow land-based quarrying, particularly as the Wairarapa is likely to move towards land-based quarrying.	
FS95.003	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Definitions and policies are appropriate for the impact that the quarrying industry has on the whenua and whānau in turn. The removal of such stones affects Ātua Hineahuone, and through this whakapapa, affects Soil and Kai Sovereignty. The impacts of such kaupapa should be discussed with mana whenua (whānau, hapū and iwi) to understand the intergenerational impacts that these actions will have.	Accept in part
\$207.010	South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG)			Support	Retain provisions relating to the protection of highly productive land (inferred).	Reinforce specification of high value and low lying dairy category pastures as protected soils	Accept
S208.009	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain the objective GRUZ-O1	It is important to recognize the importance of primary production and ancillary activities to the region, and that activities that support primary production and have a functional need to be located in the GRUZ are provided for.	Accept
S208.010	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain the objective GRUZ-O5	It is important for primary production to be protected against the effects of reverse sensitivity.	Accept
S208.011	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P1 a. Enable primary production activities and ancillary activities to primary production, that are	It is important for ancillary activities that support primary production to be recognized.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone.		
FS29.014	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	The policy should provide for ancillary activities that support primary production.	Accept in part
\$208.012	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Retain the policy GRUZ-P6	The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part
S208.013	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	GRUZ-R6	GRUZ-R6	Support	Retain the rule GRUZ-R6	A rule providing for agricultural aviation activities in the GRUZ chapter provides clarity.	Accept
S212.067	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-01	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept
S212.241	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support	Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.242	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support	Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept
S212.243	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support	Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.244	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-05	Support	Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.245	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Support	Retain GRUZ-O6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S212.246	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-07	GRUZ-07	Support	Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.247	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.248	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support	Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.249	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support	Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.250	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support	Retain GRUZ-P4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.251	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Support	Retain GRUZ-P5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.252	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.253	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P7	GRUZ-P7	Support	Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.254	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P8	GRUZ-P8	Support	Retain GRUZ-P8 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.255	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support	Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.256	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-P10	GRUZ-P10	Support	Retain GRUZ-P10 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S212.257	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R1	GRUZ-R1	Support	Retain GRUZ-R1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.258	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R2	GRUZ-R2	Support	Retain GRUZ-R2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.259	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R3	GRUZ-R3	Support	Retain GRUZ-R3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.260	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Support	Retain GRUZ-R4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.261	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R5	GRUZ-R5	Support	Retain GRUZ-R5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.262	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R6	GRUZ-R6	Support	Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.263	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R7	GRUZ-R7	Support	Retain GRUZ-R7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.264	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support	Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.265	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R9	GRUZ-R9	Support	Retain GRUZ-R9 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.266	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R10	GRUZ-R10	Support	Retain GRUZ-R10 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.267	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R11	GRUZ-R11	Support	Retain GRUZ-R11 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S212.268	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Support	Retain GRUZ-R12 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.269	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R13	GRUZ-R13	Support	Retain GRUZ-R13 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.270	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R14	GRUZ-R14	Support	Retain GRUZ-R14 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.271	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R15	GRUZ-R15	Support	Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.272	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R16	GRUZ-R16	Support	Retain GRUZ-R16 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept in part
S212.273	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R17	GRUZ-R17	Support	Retain GRUZ-R17 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.274	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R18	GRUZ-R18	Support	Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.275	Māori Trustee	GRUZ-R19	GRUZ-R19	Support	Retain GRUZ-R19 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S214.100	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O3 as follows: The productive capacity of highly productive land and resources of the General Rural Zone is supported through enabling a range of primary production oriented and resource dependent activities that depend on the highly productive land resource, and avoiding activities that constrain productive capacity of highly	The submitter supports GRUZ-O3. However, this objective should give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land to ensure that the productive use of highly productive land and resources is supported.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					productive land.		
FS95.205	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part
S214.101	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified.	The submitter supports this objective. Primary production activities have a functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone and therefore should have priority protection from reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities.	Accept in part
FS95.206	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.102	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O6 as follows: a. Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation of highly	The submitter seeks a minor amendment to GRUZ-O6.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					productive land and its productive petential capacity. b. Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development in appropriate locations within the General rural Zone is provided for, insofar as GRUZO6(a) is met.		
FS95.207	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.103	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: a. Enable primary production activities and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone productive capacity of Highly Productive Land; b. Provide for allow, where appropriate, other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. c. Provide for Avoid rural lifestyle subdivision and development of Highly Productive Land in appropriate locations where	This policy needs to reflect the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). There needs to be a strong emphasis on enabling primary production activities that rely on the Highly Productive Land resource, and a strong and direct emphasis on avoiding rural lifestyle development on such land.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for.		
FS29.016	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	The policy should provide for ancillary activities that support primary production.	Accept in part
FS89.012	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks to amend GRUZ-P1 to reference productive capacity of highly productive land as opposed to the character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. This significantly narrows the focus of the policy to the point where it excludes a range of activities that necessarily and appropriately occur in rural areas.	Accept in part
FS95.208	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.104	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows:a. Enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation; b. Enabling and promoting a productive working landscape c. Enabling primary production and ancillary activities; d. Providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities;	This policy needs to reflect the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. 'Promoting openness and predominance of vegetation' is unnecessarily constraining on productive use of Highly Productive Land and should not be a policy requirement. There needs to be a strong emphasis on enabling primary production activities that rely on the Highly Productive Land resource, and a	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					e. Managing the density and location of avoiding residential development that does not have a functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone; f. Ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; g. Retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and h. Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	strong and direct emphasis on avoiding rural lifestyle development on such land.	
FS13.069	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	These amendments will better enable primary production activities on highly productive land.	Reject
FS95.209	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part
S214.105	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows: Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to enabling productive use of Highly Productive Land and the anticipated purpose, character,	This policy needs to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL).	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					and amenity values of the zone, by: a. Limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to areas where there is no Highly Productive Land, or limited productive potential and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and b. Recegnising avoiding the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential of Highly Productive Land within the General Rural Zone.		
FS13.070	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	These amendments will better enable primary production activities on highly productive land. It is worth noting that productive orchards often occur on LUC IV or V soils as well as I-III, so land not classed as highly productive but used for productive purpose should also be protected from subdivision.	Accept in part
FS95.210	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S214.106	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-R6	GRUZ-R6	Support	Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified.	The submitter supports GRUZ-R6 which permits agricultural aviation in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
FS95.211	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.107	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support	Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified.	The submitter supports that this standard does not apply to buildings used for seasonal worker accommodation. It is important that for very large sites, particularly sheep farms in remote hill country areas, to have additional seasonal worker accommodation.	Accept
FS95.212	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S218.082	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRUZ-01	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as notified. Replicate "and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the X Zone" or similar in the provisions for all other zones.	Supports Objective GRUZ-O1.	Accept
S218.083	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O2 as notified.	Supports Objective GRUZ-O2, and particularly the recognition that the National Grid forms part of the character of the General Rural Zone in clause (e).	Accept in part
S218.084	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O4 as follows: 'Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities.'	Generally supports the inclusion of an Objective that enabled compatible activities in the General Rural Zone but is concerned that Objective GRUZ-O4 inappropriately gives priority to primary production over other activities that have a functional need or operational need for their location in the General Rural Zone. Considers that, insofar as the Objective is relevant to the National Grid should be subject to (at least) the same priority in the General Rural Zone. Considers that the General Rural Zone is generally the most appropriate location for the National Grid. For this reason, seeks that the Objective is amended to remove any suggestion of primacy.	Reject
FS13.067	Horticulture New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	While renewable energy activities may locate in the rural zone, it would be an adverse outcome for local food security and the local economy should they displace food production.	Accept
S218.085	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P1 as follows: 'a. enable primary production activities that are compatible with	Generally supports GRUZ-P1 but is concerned that the Policy inappropriately gives priority to primary production over other activities that have a functional or	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone;x. Enable the operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of nationally significant infrastructure that has a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone; b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.'	operational need for their location in the General Rural Zone. Considers that, insofar as the Objective is relevant to the National Grid, the NPSET clearly establishes the importance of, and national significance of, the National Grid such that, the National Grid should be subject to (at least) the same priority in the General Rural Zone. Considers that the General Rural Zone is generally the most appropriate location for the National Grid. For this reason, seeks that the Policy is amended to remove any suggestion of primacy.	
S219.001	Nigel & Philippa Broom	GRUZ-R11	GRUZ-R11	Support in part	Amend rule GRUZ-R11 to add additional clauses relating to the scale of activities, number of visitors, etc. Any activity not complying with these new clauses (i.e. exceeding number of visitors) should trigger a resource consent when activities exceed a certain scale (which is not governed by building number/ size).	Submitter seeks to protect the amenity of existing residential activities in the General Rural Zone so that the enjoyment of existing residents is not eroded by the effects which rural retail activities might bring (e.g. noise, reduced privacy and disruption from traffic and large volumes of people which are inconsistent with the rural character and generally quiet lifestyle offered in the General Rural Zone).	Accept in part
\$219.003	Nigel & Philippa Broom	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Amend GRUZ chapter where necessary to include a requirement for a resource consent where non-primary production and non-residential activities (i.e. rural produce, retail) are proposed within a certain distance (e.g. within 100m) of a dwelling on a neighbouring property.	Submitter considers that the close proximity of proposed non-primary production and non-residential activities, including rural produce retail, to residential activities within the General Rural Zone should allow neighbouring residents to oppose these activities where they may have a significant impact on amenity and enjoyment.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S221.120	Horticulture New Zealand	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Retain GRUZ Introduction as notified.	Recognition of the NPS-HPL is supported. Recognition that some land outside of LUC I-III is still highly valued for primary production due to its climatic, soil and proximity to other rural activities is supported.	Accept in part
S221.121	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	The purpose is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards.	Accept
\$221.122	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: a. areas of viticulture, horticulture, crops, pasture, forestry (indigenous and plantation), and the presence of a large number of farmed animals; b. sparsely developed generally well-spaced landscape but includes areas with closer development; with open space between c. buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities, including indoor primary production (e.g. greenhouses, barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools); d	Horticulture should be specifically recognised in addition to crops. Cropping more commonly refers to arable crops and crops for animal feed. Recognition of seasonal worker accommodation and the seasonal nature of primary production is supported. Some areas of primary production have closer development, particularly where there are post-harvest facilities or greenhouses.	Accept in part
S221.123	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support	Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified.	The submitter supports this provision.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S221.124	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O4 as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are provided for enabled-where they are not incompatible with primary production activities.	The submitter supports enabling primary production activities. The approach should align with GRUZ-P1 to provide for other activities while primary production is enabled.	Reject
S221.125	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-O5 as follows: Sensitive activities are designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, other land uses activities and key transport corridors in the General Rural Zone. Potential for reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities is avoided by ensuring that sensitive activities do not inappropriately locate in the General Rural Zone. If they have a functional need to locate in the zone, potential reverse sensitivity effects are mitigated.	Sensitive activities shouldn't locate in the General Rural Zone unless there is a functional need for them to locate - such as rural schools. Where they do locate in the zone, they should avoid potential for reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject
FS96.002	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Acknowledges that some activities located in the General Rural Zone have the potential to result in reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities. Opposes the changes to objective GRUZ-05 as worded. In particular, the functional need test for other activities in the rural zone is not supported. Considers that the 'functional need' test would not enable educational facilities, as educational activities do not need to locate or operate only within a rural setting as they are also found within urban environments. That is,	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						they have an 'operational need' to locate in rural and remote areas to serve local populations of school age children. Requests that there is added flexibility in the amended objective by including an operational need test for educational facilities alongside the functional need test. Recognises that the PWCDP already defines the terms functional need and operational need.	
S221.126	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-O6 as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is managed in a way that avoid additional fragmentation of productive land and its productive potential avoids fragmentation of highly productive land and reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	Rural lifestyle should be directed to the Rural Lifestyle Zone consistent with the directions in the National Planning Standards. Rural lifestyle is to be avoided in the Rural Zone to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production and protect productive land. There is no specific policy for rural lifestyle, which should be implemented so the direction is clear. The second part of the objective is a policy, not an objective.	Reject
S221.127	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-07	GRUZ-O7	Support	Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified.	The submitter supports this direction.	Accept in part
S221.128	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: a. Enable primary production activities and associated ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary productionand the character of the General Rural Zone. c. Provide for rural lifestyle development in rural lifestyle zones appropriate locations	The purpose of the General Rural Zone is predominantly for primary production activities. There should not be a limitation of compatibility for primary production activities when the zone is designed for them. Rural lifestyle directions are set in GRUZ-O6, and the submitter does not support rural lifestyle scattered through the General Rural Zone.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for.		
FS29.015	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	The policy should provide for ancillary activities that support primary production.	Reject
FS90.093	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow in part	Considers that the relief sought improves clarity.	Reject
S221.129	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support	Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified.	Incompatible activities should be avoided.	Accept in part
S221.130	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support	Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified.	The listed activities and values are supported.	Accept in part
S221.131	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows:c. avoiding subdivision of highly productive land, fragmentation of primary production land, and reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities. d. seeking consistency with the purpose and character of the zone.	Highly productive land must be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, which is directly relevant to this policy.	Reject
S221.132	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Amend GRUZ-P6 as follows: b. managing potential reverse sensitivity effects caused by the establishment of new sensitive activities near other primary production activities, including through the use of setbacks and separation distances for the sensitive activity;	Avoiding establishment of new sensitive activities is the most appropriate mechanism for avoiding reverse sensitivity effects. The burden of preventing reverse sensitivity effects should be on the new sensitive use, not on existing users.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS22.013	NZ Pork			Support	Allow	Agrees that the burden of preventing reverse sensitivity effects should be on the new sensitive uses, not on existing users.	Reject
FS81.048	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support in part	Allow in part	Agrees that the current policy could read in a way that implies that in all cases the default position is that the existing activity would have use setbacks or separation distances to avoid or mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. However, the existing activity should not have to do more than is reasonable to internalise the effect giving rise to the reverse sensitivity. Federated Farmers seeks recognition of this in the policy.	Accept in part
S221.133	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P7	GRUZ-P7	Support	Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified.	There is significant land outside of LUC 1-3 that has unique characteristics that make it well suited to horticulture, including climate, soil and proximity to other primary production activities.	Accept
S221.134	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P8	GRUZ-P8	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P8 as follows: a. enabling and promoting primary production activities, in particular viticulture and horticulture; b. providing for the activities that are directly associated with primary production activities including viticulture and horticulture by	Horticulture is similar to viticulture and similarly high value. Orcharding, in particular, closely resembles viticulture.	Accept
S221.135	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support	Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified.	Recognition of the NPS-HPL is supported.	Accept
S221.136	Horticulture New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support in part	Insert a new rule for artificial crop protection structures: GRUZ-RX - Artificial Crop Protection Structures and Crop Protection Structures Activity Status: Permitted 1. The establishment of a new, or expansion of an	A separate rule for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures is needed since they have specific requirements. There is potential for horticulture to expand in Wairarapa, and artificial crop protection is likely to expand	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					existing artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure. Where: a. The height of the structure does not exceed 6m; andEither:b. Green or black cloth is used on any vertical faces within 30m of a property boundary, including a road boundary, except that a different colour may be used if written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property or the road controlling authority (in the case of a road) is obtained and provided to the Council; or c. the structure is setback 3m from the boundary Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary When compliance with GRUZ-RX 1) is not achieved: Matters of discretion: 1. Assessment of the potential glare on neighbouring properties (or road users) from the colour of the cloth.	in the future due to climate change pressures.	
S221.137	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-R4 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. GRUZ-S1; ii. GRUZ-S2; and iii. GRUZ-S3; and b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for land based primary production; c. Comprise of communal kitchen and eating area and separate sleeping and ablution facilities; d. The accommodation provides for no	Specific provisions for seasonal worker accommodation and permitted status for this activity are supported. Seasonal workers may be used for any type of primary production, not just "land-based". There is no reason why there should only be one seasonal worker accommodation building per site, and it is inappropriate that five seasonal worker accommodation buildings should be permitted in the MPZ while only one is permitted in the GRUZ. Seasonal worker accommodation is	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					more than 12 workers; and e. Compliance is achieved with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by the Department of Building and Housing 2008.e. There is no more than one seasonal worker accommedation building per site; d. The gross floor area of the seasonal worker accommedation building is no more than 150m2; e. The seasonal worker accommedation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay. 2. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. Compliance is achieved with GRUZ-R4(1)(a)-(d).; andb. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZR4(1)(e). Matters of control: 1. The siting and location of the seasonal worker accommedation building; and 2. Measures to avoid and minimise any potential loss of highly productive land. 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R4(1). or GRUZ-R4(2). Matters of discretion: 1. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 2. Number of workers accommodation required to enable the land-based primary production activity. 3. The effect of the intensity and	already tightly regulated by national rules to provide for the wellbeing of workers. More rules are not needed in the district plan to achieve this. Seasonal worker accommodation is a supporting activity for primary production and should be allowed to locate on highly productive land under clause 3.9 (2) (a) of the NPS-HPL.	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					scale of the activity. 4. The building design, siting, form, and external appearance is compatible with the General Rural Zone.5. Potential methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control. 6. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008.		
S221.138	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R5	GRUZ-R5	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-R5 to add ancillary rural earthworks.	The submitter specifically seeks that ancillary rural earthworks are provided as part of primary production activities.	Reject
S221.139	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R6	GRUZ-R6	Support	Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified.	Agricultural aviation is important for horticultural and biosecurity purposes.	Accept
S221.140	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R7	GRUZ-R7	Oppose	Delete GRUZ-R7.	Stays of 90 days are not 'visitor' accommodation, they are residential. The submitter seeks deletion of the definition and rule.	Accept in part
S221.141	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Support	Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified.	The submitter supports recognition of highly productive land and the Martinborough Soils Overlay.	Accept
S221.142	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R9	GRUZ-R9	Support in part	Retain GRUZ-R9, provided the definition of 'intensive primary production' is retained as notified.	The submitter supports a rule for intensive primary production that is consistent with the National Planning Standards, so long as the definition of intensive primary production remains as notified.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S221.143	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R11	GRUZ-R11	Support	Retain GRUZ-R11 but amend definition of 'rural produce retail'.	A permitted activity for small rural produce is supported.	Accept
S221.144	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R15	GRUZ-R15	Support	Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified.	A discretionary activity for visitor accommodation in the General Rural Zone is supported.	Accept
S221.145	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R16	GRUZ-R16	Oppose	Delete GRUZ-R16 and Insert a permitted activity status for small scale rural industry and a restricted discretionary activity status for larger scale rural industry.	A discretionary activity status is not supported for an activity that is anticipated to occur in the GRUZ. There should be provision for small-scale rural industry as permitted activity and an RDA for larger scale rural industry.	Accept in part
S221.146	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R18	GRUZ-R18	Support in part	Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified.	Commercial and industrial activities are not anticipated in the General Rural Zone, so it is appropriate that they are discretionary. However, rural industry should not require the same activity status. If rural industry is kept as discretionary, then GRUZ-18 should be non-complying.	Accept
S221.147	Horticulture New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert new rule: GRUZ-RX Greenhouses1. Activity status: Permitted Insert suggested supporting definition of Greenhouses.	Permitted activity status and a supporting definition for greenhouses is essential to ensure this efficient growing system, well suited for climate adaptation, is not caught by rules meant for other activities. Greenhouses are a primary production activity and should be enabled as such in the General Rural Zone.	Accept in part
S221.148	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-S1	GRUZ-S1	Support	Retain GRUZ-S1(1)(b) as notified.	15m height for frost fans is appropriate.	Accept
S221.149	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-S3 as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: a. 10m of any front road boundary of sealed roads; b. 10m of any other boundary; c. 25m of any front boundary of unsealed roads;	A building setback of 10m for any other boundary is not sufficient to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects. A larger boundary is sought for residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects are most likely to be generated. The submitter does not support the setback for surface waterbodies which includes artificial	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					d. 25-20m of any significant waterbody; and e. 10m of any surface waterbody wider than 3m. 2. Residential units must also not be located within: a. 40 m of the edge of a plantation forest under separate ownership; b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas; c. 300m of an effluent holding pond;—and d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity under separateownership.; ande. 30 m from any other boundary Retain GRUZ-S3 matters of discretion (7).	waterbodies. Any setback would be linked to the size of the waterbody.	
S221.150	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support in part	Retain the exemption for seasonal worker accommodation.	The submitter supports that the number of seasonal worker accommodation buildings is in addition to the number of residential units on a site.	Accept
S221.151	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-S5	GRUZ-S5	Support in part	Retain GRUZ-S5, provided the definition of 'intensive primary production' is retained as notified.	The submitter supports a rule for intensive primary production that is consistent with the National Planning Standards, so long as the definition of intensive primary production remains as notified.	Accept
S221.174	Horticulture New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert new GRUZ-PX as follows: Rural lifestyle1. Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is directed to the Rural Lifestyle zones.2. Rural lifestyle is avoided on highly productive land.	Rural lifestyle should be directed to the Rural Lifestyle Zone consistent with the directions in the National Planning Standards. Rural lifestyle is to be avoided in the Rural Zone to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production and protect productive land. There is no specific policy for rural lifestyle, which should be implemented so the direction is clear. The second part of the objective is a policy, not an objective.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
\$222.001	Jack Wass	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Amend	Amend GRUZ-O1 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-O1 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
\$222.002	Jack Wass	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Amend	Amend GRUZ-O2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-O2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
FS49.001	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch			Support	Allow	Considers it is important that flexibility and discretion are built into the plan rules, particular as there are many rural landowners whose land is not suitable, or not used, for primary production who shouldn't have restrictions put on their ability to subdivide or add dwellings to the land. Noting the broad policy objectives around preserving the capacity of rural land for primary production, considers there are many properties that are both rural and capable of holding additional dwellings/being subdivided but are not suitable for primary production.	Reject
S222.003	Jack Wass	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Amend	Amend GRUZ-O6 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					the amenity and productivity of rural land.	requirements. GRUZ-O6 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	
\$222.004	Jack Wass	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-P2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
S222.005	Jack Wass	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-P4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
S222.006	Jack Wass	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Amend	Amend GRUZ-S4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-S4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
S223.001	Helios Energy Ltd	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-Introduction: Activities and developments typically associated with urban areas are not provided for in the	Considers some commentary in the Introduction of the General Rural Zone to provide a linkage to Council's anticipation of the establishment of renewable energy	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					General Rural Zone. However, it is anticipated that the General Rural Zone will play a critical locational role for the establishment of new renewable energy activities (such as wind and solar) given this zone contains many key features that renewable energy activities require, including the key feature of adequate space and proximity to existing enabling electricity infrastructure such as substations or transmission / distribution lines.	activities in the General Rural Zone would be useful (such commentary is only found in the Energy Section 32 report).	
FS13.065	Horticulture New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	While renewable energy activities may locate in the rural zone, it would be an adverse outcome for local food security and the local economy should they displace food production.	Accept
FS74.086	Genesis Energy Limited			Support	Allow in part	The reasons for and relief sought in the submission generally aligns with the original submission made by Genesis and on this basis the submission points are supported.	Reject
\$223.002	Helios Energy Ltd	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-Introduction: Activities that are not land based primary production can be provided for in line with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land are-but need to be carefully managed where they are located on highly productive land to ensure there is no significant loss of or there is the ability to minimise or mitigate any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive	The discussion in the Introduction about the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL) would benefit from aligning/being consistent with the intent, policy direction, provisions and terminology found in the NPS-HPL regarding 'productive capacity' (particularly clause 3.9(3) of the NPS-HPL which requires territorial authorities to take measures to ensure that any use or development on highly productive land: (a) minimises or mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					capacity-is protected of highly productive land.	and productive capacity of highly productive land in their district.	
S223.003	Helios Energy Ltd	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P2: a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone unless the activity has a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone;	The submitter believes that it would be useful to iterate in this policy that there are activities that do not necessarily fit the absolute purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, but do have a functional or operational need to be in the General Rural Zone e.g. solar farms, wind farms, electricity transmission and distribution. This additional commentary would be useful to also provide a linkage to Policy GRUZ-O4 Enable compatible activities which does also identify that 'other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled'.	Reject
FS74.087	Genesis Energy Limited			Support	Allow in part	The reasons for and relief sought in the submission generally aligns with the original submission made by Genesis and on this basis the submission points are supported.	Reject
FS81.040	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ-P2 seeks to avoid activities and development that are incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity of the General Rural Zone. Activities that have a functional or operational need to be located in the GRUZ, but which are incompatible with primary production should not be allowed to establish as of right.	Accept
FS78.005	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Reject
S223.004	Helios Energy Ltd	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-S3: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: e. 10 5m of any surface waterbody.	Does not support the 10m minimum setback distance for buildings or structures from a surface waterbody, as this would constrain and reduce the available usable space for buildings and structures on a	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						GRZ site, particularly for a solar farm development. Notes the Section 32 report identifies feedback from the Water Races Committee but does not provide reasons as to how the proposed increase in minimum setback would be dealt with when inconsistent with the bylaw setback requirement of 5m would work for an applicant. Seeks a 5m setback from a surface waterbody. Regarding sediment entering the water race from 5m setback, it is noted that the water race water is primarily used for irrigation and therefore sedimentation is not a key issue, and there will be minimal earthworks associated with establishing structures or buildings with a solar farm activity. Considers concerns about sedimentation would be negligible from a solar farm (initial piling of solar arrays, then re-grass and then ongoing grazing) in comparison to other land-based primary production cropping, horticulture or other activities requiring seasonal/cyclical soil disturbance. Notes the Wellington Natural Resources Plan permits a new structure in, on or under the bed of a river or lake, including a pipe, duct, or cable which is located over or under the bed where no bed occupancy limits apply. Considers a 10m setback creates an inconsistent regulatory consenting regime between the Regional and District Council and the current water race bylaw. The submitter considers the bylaw approval process adequately addresses any requirements in relation to structures in proximity to water races.	
S229.025	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend GRUZ Introduction as follows: Character and amenity values of the zone include spaciousness,	Support the description of the rural zone as an area used predominantly for primary production, including intensive primary production.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					sparsely developed landscape, vegetation cover, and the presence of a productive farming environment and the visual, odour and noise effects associated with farming activities. Amend as follows: Activities undertaken in the General Rural Zone need to be managed in a way that preserves rural character, primary production capability and the productive capacity of land which is directed through this chapter.	Support recognition of the economic value of the primary production activities to the district and the contribution that this brings to the vitality of the urban environment of the district. Suggest amendment to description to explicitly reference the anticipated sights, sounds and smells that are associated a productive farming environment. The defined term of 'productive capacity' is relevant to HPL and should be used in that context in the plan noting that primary production can be land-based and nonland based.	
FS13.066	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Describing the associated visual, odour, and noise effects of primary production is important in the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects on horticulture.	Accept
S229.026	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	Support objective and particular recognition of functional and operational need of other activities in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
\$229.027	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows; b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral, intensive primary production and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g., farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools); d. interspersed existing rural industry facilities associated with the use of the land for intensive	Support descriptive objective. Support reference to worker accommodation, but this shouldn't be limited to seasonal workers, many farms provide accommodation for staff year-round. Point d suggests Intensive primary production is a Rural Industry which does not appear to align with the rule structure. The activity nests better in the elements described in point 2.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					primary production, quarrying, and cleanfills; and		
S229.028	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O3	GRUZ-O3	Support	Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified.	Support objective for the provision of rural production oriented and resource dependent activities within the GRZ.	Accept
S229.029	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support	Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified.	Support objective to enable primary production, ancillary activities and other activities that have a functional or operational need to be located within the GRZ.	Accept in part
S229.030	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified.	Support objective, however, note that there is no corresponding rule to AVOID the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive farming activity	Accept in part
S229.031	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-O6	GRUZ-O6	Support	Retain GRUZ-O6 as notified.	Support objective to manage rural lifestyle subdivision and development to avoid fragmentation of productive land development in appropriate locations.	Accept in part
S229.032	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-07	GRUZ-O7	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O7 as follows: Recognise and protect from inappropriate subdivision, use and development: a. highly productive land; and b. land that utilises the finite combination of climate and soil characteristics which make it suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives.	Support requirement to protect highly productive land and other land with special characteristics, but objective should state the aim of the protection more explicitly.	Accept
S229.033	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified.	Support policy to enable primary production activities and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the GRZ.	Accept
S229.034	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support	Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified.	Support policy to avoid incompatible activities, those that will cause fragmentation of productive land, or will	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						cause reverse sensitivity/conflict with primary production and ancillary activities.	
S229.035	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support	Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified.	Support policy to provide for subdivision, use and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone. Support clause to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects	Accept in part
S229.036	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support	Retain GRUZ-P4 as notified.	Support policy to avoid inappropriate subdivision in the GRZ	Accept in part
S229.037	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified.	Support policy, however, note that there is no corresponding rule to AVOID the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive farming activity.	Accept in part
S229.038	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-P9	GRUZ-P9	Support	Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified.	Support use of HPL as per the NPS-HPL provisions	Accept
S229.039	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R1	GRUZ-R1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-R1 to apply the minimum setback for residential units to buildings and structures associated with sensitive activities.	Support permitted activity status for buildings and structures that comply with required standards. The minimum setback set out in GRUZ-S3 (2) for residential units should apply buildings and structures associated with sensitive activities (not just residential units).	Accept
\$229.040	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Support in part	Amend as follows:-Seasonal wWorker Accommodation 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. GRUZ-S1; ii. GRUZ-S2; and iii. GRUZ-S3; and b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements forland based primary production;	Support permitted activity rule for worker accommodation, but this should not be limited to seasonal worker accommodation, nor to land-based primary production. Many farms provide accommodation for workers year-round. Oppose reference to land-based primary production activities within the rule. There is no rationale for only providing worker accommodation for land-based primary production. Many indoor pig farms require	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					c. There is no more than one seasonal worker accommodation building per site; d. The gross floor area of the seasonal worker accommodation building is no more than 150m2; e. The seasonal worker accommodation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay.	on-site worker accommodation. Oppose provision of worker accommodation on highly productive land as a controlled activity. Clause 3.9 (2)(a) of the NPS-HPL provides an exemption for supporting activities on HPL. Worker accommodation should be considered a supporting activity, as it is vital to the functioning of the farming activity. Therefore, this should be considered a permitted activity. Support GFA of 150m2.	
S229.041	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R5	GRUZ-R5	Support	Retain GRUZ-R5 as notified.	Note that without a separate definition and rule structure for Extensive Pig Farming, these activities will fall under this rule. Support this approach as effects of extensive pig farming are similar to other pastoral operations.	Accept
S229.042	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R7	GRUZ-R7	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R7 activity status to Restricted Discretionary OR Amend GRUZ-R7 to require compliance with GRUZ-S3. Amend Matters of Discretion to include proximity to any existing intensive primary production activities and methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Oppose permitted activity status for residential visitor accommodation. The definition provides for 90 days stays which is not a temporary activity. Visitor accommodation, even on a small scale, is a sensitive activity which could cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production operations. The suitability of any site in the general rural zone for visitor accommodation should be assessed via a consenting approach.	Reject
S229.043	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R9	GRUZ-R9	Support	Retain GRUZ-R9 as notified.	Support permitted activity status where standards can be met. Support restricted discretionary status where standards cannot be met.	Accept
S229.044	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R10	GRUZ-R10	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R10 activity status to Restricted Discretionary OR Amend GRUZ-R10 to require	Oppose the lack of clarity in the definition of 'Conservation Activities' might enable in the GRUZ and the permitted activity status	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					compliance with GRUZ-S3. Amend Matters of Discretion to include proximity to any existing intensive primary production activities and methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects.	with no standards or controls. The activity range is assumed to extend to training, education, organised events and conflict with primary production including reverse sensitivity may result.	
S229.045	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R15	GRUZ-R15	Support	Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified.	Support discretionary activity status for visitor accommodation.	Accept
S229.046	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R16	GRUZ-R16	Support	Retain GRUZ-R16 as notified.	Support discretionary activity status for rural industry.	Accept in part
S229.047	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-R18	GRUZ-R18	Support	Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified.	Support discretionary activity status for commercial and industrial activities not otherwise provided for.	Accept
S229.048	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-S1	GRUZ-S1	Support	Retain GRUZ-S1 as notified.	Support standard	Accept in part
S229.049	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-S2	GRUZ-S2	Support	Retain GRUZ-S2 as notified.	Support standard	Accept in part
S229.050	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-S3 as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: c. 25m of any front boundary of unsealed roads; d. 25m of any significant waterbody; ande. 10m of any surface waterbody. 2. Residential units Sensitive activities must also not be located within: b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas;	Oppose the requirement that all buildings and structures should be 25m from any front boundary of unsealed roads. In a largely rural environment, this will unnecessarily affect the practical location of ancillary primary production buildings and structures. Seek clearer rationale as to the purpose of setbacks to waterbodies. There are already national policy instruments that include or mange setbacks to waterways for various activities and structures with respect to managing water quality. Any setbacks to waterways in the district plan should not	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						duplicate controls that are in place elsewhere. GRUZ-S3 (2) should apply to all sensitive activities. Support proposed setback from effluent disposal areas, but this should apply to both treated and non-treated areas. Treatments can vary by type and duration, and not all treatments will achieve a reduction in odour sufficient to warrant the removal of any setback requirements.	
S229.051	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Support	Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified.	Support standard	Accept
S229.052	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	GRUZ-S5	GRUZ-S5	Support in part	Retain GRUZ-S5 as notified. Inferred that the submitter seeks to delete GRUZ-S5(c).	Support standard. The clear matter of discretion that requires the extent to which the activity, including any buildings, compounds, or part of a site used for housing animals are sufficiently designed and located or separated from sensitive activities, residential units, and boundaries of residential zones to avoid adverse effects on residents. Oppose the restriction of Intensive Primary Production within the Urban Water Supply Protection Areas. Risks to urban water supply from intensive farming operations would arise primarily from the storage and disposal of effluent associated with the activity, not the activity itself. For intensive outdoor operations, contaminants may be more diffuse in nature. The Wellington Natural Resources Plan prevents discharge of animal effluent and solid animal waste within a community drinking water supply protection area and therefore	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						the restriction is not necessary in the District Plan.	
S236.066	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R1	GRUZ-R1	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R1 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS81.020	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ - R1 permits building and structures, including construction, additions, and alterations where compliance is achieved with the relevant standards. Where these are not met, a restricted discretionary resource consent is required. The matters of discretion are restricted to the effects of non-compliance with any relevant standards. Federated Farmers does not agree that indigenous biodiversity is a relevant matter to the activity.	Accept
S236.067	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R12 to include a discretionary activity status for quarry activities within scheduled sites or overlays.	The submitter considers that quarrying, including a farm quarry, should be discretionary in any scheduled site or overlay.	Reject
FS81.021	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Does not consider it appropriate in the General Rural Zone for farmers to have to apply for a resource consent to carry out the activity of a farm quarry on their land. It is appropriate for the presumption to be that farm quarry is a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone and that other relevant chapters are appropriate to address any limitation on this presumption.	Accept in part
FS89.001	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is seeking to amend GRUZ-R12 to include a discretionary activity status for quarry activities within any scheduled sites or overlays. Oppose this relief on the basis that this does not consider the values these overlays or schedules identify and whether these	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						would potentially be compromised by quarrying activities in a manner that necessitates unlimited discretion.	
S236.105	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R3	GRUZ-R3	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R3 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS81.024	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ-R3 permits relocatable buildings (excluding any building that is not to be used as a residential unit) in the General Rural Zone. There is sufficient provision in the standards, particularly effects standard 3 to address the effects of indigenous biodiversity and Council's section 31 obligation.	Accept in part
FS90.041	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.106	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R4	GRUZ-R4	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R4 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter ofdiscretion and a matter of control.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion and matter of control to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS81.025	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ - R4 permits seasonal worker accommodation in the General Rural Zone where it complies with the standards set out in GRUZ-R4(1). Where any of these standards are not met it is a controlled activity. Federated Farmers does not consider indigenous biodiversity to be a relevant matter of control for this activity.	Accept in part
FS90.042	Greater Wellington			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Regional Council					Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	
\$236.107	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R7	GRUZ-R7	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R7 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter ofdiscretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS81.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the effects of indigenous biodiversity are too remote of an effect to be a relevant matter of discretion for this resource consent.	Accept in part
FS90.043	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.108	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R8 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter ofdiscretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS90.044	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.109	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R9	GRUZ-R9	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R9 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter ofdiscretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS81.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	GRUZ-R9 permits intensive primary production. If the permitted activity standards are not met, intensive primary production is a restricted discretionary activity. Do not consider indigenous biodiversity to be a relevant matter of discretion for this activity.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS90.045	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.110	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R12 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS90.046	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.111	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R13	GRUZ-R13	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R13 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS90.047	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
S236.112	-Director- General of Conservation Penny Nelson	GRUZ-R14	GRUZ-R14	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R14 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion.	The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met.	Reject
FS90.048	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers the relief sought is consistent with the direction in the Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change 1.	Reject
\$237.002	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as notified.	RCNZ supports Objective GRUZ-O1 on the basis that rural contractor depots are an activity that supports primary production and have a functional and operational need	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						to be located within the General Rural Zone.	
S237.003	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend Objective GRUZ-O2 as follows: "The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include d. interspersed existing rural industry facilities, associated with the use of land for intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills; and"	Objective GRUZ-O2 (d) only refers to "existing rural industry" so does not recognise the possibility of the establishment of "new rural industry" within the General Rural Zone. In addition, the way Objective GRUZ-O2 is worded implies that the only rural industry activities anticipated with the General Rural Zone are "intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills" which is incorrect. The Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan definition for "rural industry" refers to the National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry" which is "an industry or business undertaken in a rural environment that directly supports, services, or is dependent on primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills". In fact "intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills" are distinct activities from rural industry with their own respective rules.	Accept
S237.004	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O4 as notified.	Supports Objective GRUZ-O4 on the basis that rural contractor depots have a functional and operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone and are compatible with primary production activities.	Accept in part
S237.005	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain Objective GRUZ-O5 as notified.	Supports GRUZ-O5 on the basis that rural contractor depots are susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects as a result of sensitive activities (e.g. residential dwellings) establishing in close proximity.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S237.006	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P1 as notified.	Supports Policy GRUZ-P1 on the basis that rural contractor depots have a functional and operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone and are compatible with primary production activities.	Accept
\$237.007	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: "Avoid activities and development that: a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. will result in fragmentation of land and the productive potential of land; or c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted existing activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production and ancillary activities (and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone)".	In terms of Policy GRUZ-P2(c), it is not only permitted activities in the General Rural Zone that require protection from reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict. Some appropriate activities within the General Rural Zone may require resource consent but are still susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects from incompatible activities.	Reject
S237.008	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Retain Policy GRUZ-P6 as notified.	Supports Policy GRUZ-P6 on the basis that a rural contractor depot would fall within the ambit of National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry", and it is appropriate to ensure there are adequate separation distances between such activities and sensitive activities.	Accept in part
S237.009	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-R1	GRUZ-R1	Support	Retain Rule GRUZ-R1 as notified.	Supports that "buildings and structures, including construction, additions, and alterations" are provided for as a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone (subject to compliance with performance standards GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S7).	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S237.010	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-R16	GRUZ-R16	Oppose in part	Amend the heading of Rule GRUZ-R16 as follows: "GRUZ-R16 - Rural Industry (excluding rural contractor depots)"	A rural contractor depot would fall within the ambit of the National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry". RCNZ considers it is unreasonably restrictive for a rural contractor depot to be a discretionary activity throughout the General Rural Zone regardless of scale and location. Rural contractors are a long-established essential and appropriate supporting rural service for primary production activities, and rural contractor depots typically establish within rural areas to be in close proximity to their core market of primary production. This reduces travel time and associated costs (and decreases the frequency of the undesirable situation of large agricultural machinery needing to regularly travel through urban areas (e.g. if a rural contractor depot was established within an Industrial Zone within a town)).	Reject
S237.011	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert the following new permitted activity rule in the Rules section of the GRUZ - General Rural Zone chapter: "GRUZ-R13A - Rural Contractor Depots1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. GRUZ-S1; ii. GRUZ-S2; iii. GRUZ-S3(a), (c), (d), and (e). iv. GRUZ-S7; and v. GRUZ-S8. b. The rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas) must not be located within 50m of any side or rear boundary located within 100m of any existing residential unit on another property. c. The gross floor area of any rural	RCNZ is seeking the inclusion of a new rule permitting small-scale rural contractor depots throughout the General Rural Zone (in recognition of the functional need to locate in proximity to primary production activities as an essential and appropriate supporting rural service). Performance standards are proposed limiting the size of any building to 3000m2, the number of staff to 10 and requiring a 50m setback from any side or rear boundary and a 100m setback from any existing residential unit on another property (plus cross-referencing to other relevant performance standards). Given the importance of rural contractor services for the rural sector and the need to locate in rural areas of close proximity to primary production activities, a restricted discretionary activity status is proposed if	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					contractor depot building does not exceed 3000m2; and d. There are no more than 10 staff.2. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R13A(1).Matters of discretion:1. The effect of noncompliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met."	any of the permitted performance standards cannot be complied with. As a result we are seeking a consequential amendment to GRUZ-R16 (so it does not apply to rural contractor depots). To assist with implementation of the proposed new rules, we are seeking an additional definition for "rural contractor depot" (in the Definitions section).	
S237.012	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Support in part	Amend Standard GRUZ-S3(2) as follows: "Residential units must also not be located within: a. 40m of the edge of a plantation forest under separate ownership; b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas; c. 300m of an effluent holding pond; and d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity under separate ownership; and e. 100m of a rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas) under separate ownership."	RCNZ seek that Standard GRUZ-S3(2) is amended to require the same 100m setback requirement for any new residential unit that establishes in the vicinity of an existing rural contractor depot.	Reject
S244.002	Michael David Walters Hodder	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Amend	Amend GRUZ-S3: 6. For sites larger than 4,500m3 having side boundaries less than 150 meters apart, accessory buildings may be located up to 5 meters from the side boundaries.	Opposes 10m minimum setback from any boundary due to narrowness of some rural properties that are larger than 4,500m3, where a smaller setback of 1.5 m is permitted for accessory buildings.	Reject
S245.035	Ministry of Education Te	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Acknowledges that the primary purpose of the General Rural Zone is to provide for primary production and compatible	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga					activities. Supportive of the inclusion of Objective GRUZ-O1 as it provides for a range of activities, which includes educational facilities, which may have an operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone.	
S245.036	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of this policy as the Ministry may have an operational need to establish educational facilities in General Rural Zone to support existing rural communities.	Accept
S245.059	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: Rural character and amenity The predominant character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: 2. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, worker's cottages, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools educational facilities);	Request that the word 'schools' is replaced with 'educational facilities' to as educational facilities is defined under the PWCDP.	Accept
S245.060	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	GRUZ-R18	GRUZ-R18	Oppose	Delete GRUZ-R18 and replace with new provisions as follows: GRUZ-RX Educational Facility Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Activity Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home business).Matters of discretion:1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity2.	Educational facilities should be enabled in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure. Requests a new rule be inserted that specifically enable educational facilities as a restricted discretionary activity This will allow the submitter to better service the social and economic wellbeing within the rural areas of the district. Matters of	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					Scale, design, layout and setbacks3. Onsite landscaping and amenity4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network5. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and any proposed mitigation	discretion should be limited to matters of relevance.	
S247.019	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-01	GRUZ-O1	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O1 as follows: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, and other activities that have an functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone.	The proposed objective recognises those activities that are not primary production that have a need to be in the zone, however a functional need test is often too difficult for infrastructure providers (provided regional waste facilities are included in the definition) and needs to be deleted to ensure that essential infrastructure can be provided.	Reject
FS81.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Oppose this on the basis there is sufficient provision for other infrastructure via the operational need test. The General Rural Zone needs to first provide for farming activities that have a functional need to be located in the General Rural Zone. this is because they cannot locate anywhere else.	Accept in part
S247.020	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-O2	GRUZ-O2	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: a. areas of c. a range of noises, smells, light overspill, and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonal basis, generated from the production, manufacture, processing and/or transportation of raw materials predominantly derived from primary production and ancillary activities;	The proposed amendment is to acknowledge that not all noise, etc, effects are derived from primary production activities. Some of these effects result from rural industry and other activities which need to be allowed for.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					d		
S247.021	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O4 as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have an functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities.	This objective is supported with the proposed amendment which ensures that essential infrastructure can be provided.	Reject
S247.022	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-O5 as follows: Sensitive activities are restricted through designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, other land uses activities and key transport corridors in the General Rural Zone.	The proposed additional text will strengthen the objective to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on those rural land uses described, which need protection from encroaching subdivision and sensitive activities. These land uses include regional infrastructure.	Reject
S247.023	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Neutral	No decision requested.	No reason stated.	Accept in part
S247.024	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone, by: d. managing the location, scale and effects of other activities which have an operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone; ed. providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities:	The elements of rural character detailed in the policy do not include waste infrastructure as types of activities which have an operational need to be in the rural environment. None of the policies give clear direction on these activities apart from the reverse sensitivity policy. There is also concern that only 'managing' residential development will lead to cumulative impacts on working rural land uses.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					fe. controlling managing the density and location of residential development;		
					gf. ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; hg. retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and ih. avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.		
\$247.025	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-P5	GRUZ-P5	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P5 as follows: GRUZ-P5 Quarrying and cleanfill activities Manage quarrying activities and cleanfill activities within the General Rural Zoneby: a. enabling farm quarries; and b. providing for other quarrying activities and cleanfill activities where it can be demonstrated that:	The proposed policy is also suitable for cleanfill activities and should be expanded to include this activity.	Accept in part
FS89.002	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks relief to expand GRUZ-P5 to include clean fill activities. While supportive of providing for clean fill activities within the plan, it would prefer that this occurs through stand alone policy rather than through amendments to GRUZ-P5.	Reject
S247.026	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P6 as follows: Avoid or mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects by: c. ensuring adequate separation distances between existing	This policy leaves out the establishment of new waste management facilities and landfills apart from avoiding their establishment in proximity to urban areas. An important control for the managing effects of any fill or waste management activity are separation distances.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					sensitive activities and new intensive primary production activities, quarrying activities, landfills, cleanfills, waste management activities and rural industry; and		
S247.027	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-R18	GRUZ-R18	Support	Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified.	As the standard seeks to control the size of buildings, this rule is supported considering that most waste facilities do not require buildings larger than 2000m2.	Accept
S247.028	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	GRUZ-S3	GRUZ-S3	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-S3(2)(d) as follows: d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity or landfill or waste management activity under separate ownership	The proposed amendment should apply to new dwellings in close proximity to existing landfills and waste management activity (such as food waste composting) to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on these regional facilities do not occur.	Accept in part
S251.015	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Amend Policy GRUZ-P4, to align with the wording of Policy SUB-P6, as follows: "Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, and or amenity values of the zone, by: a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, strong> is not located on any highly productive land, and there is limited productive potential and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and b. recognising avoiding the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the	GRUZ-P4 and SUB-P6 are two 'inappropriate subdivision' policies relating to the General Rural Zone which were intended to be identical but are worded slightly differently. Policy SUB-P6 is the more directive policy and Policy GRUZ-P4 should be consistent with this.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					productive use and potential within the General Rural Zone"		
S252.001	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	GRUZ-S8	GRUZ-S8	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-S8: 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working das before relocating the building 4. Performance bonda. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard GRUZ-S8(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis).	Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building.	Reject
S252.018	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	GRUZ-P10	GRUZ-P10	Support in part	Amend GRUZ-P10 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of	Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					areas in relation to relocatable buildings.	the positive effects of relocated buildings and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings.	
\$255.001	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Amend	Amend GRUZ-P1 to provide for the development and cohesion of rural communities, including opportunities for additional housing and employment opportunities in appropriate areas.	The proposed rules and standards make it harder for people to live in the rural zone, harder for businesses to be established in the rural zone, and harder for alternative means of primary production to be established in the rural zone. Rural areas should foster rural communities, which includes a combination of smaller lot holders, education and business providers, dwellings, as well as larger rural properties.	Reject
\$255.004	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	GRUZ-R14	GRUZ-R14	Oppose	Amend GRUZ-R14 from restricted discretionary to non-complying activity (Inferred submission relates to GRUZ-R14 as discusses "motorised outdoor recreation activities", rather than relating to GRUZ-R13 as referred to Original Submission.	This activity should be non-complying if within 2km of three or more dwellings given its impact on the quiet enjoyment of others in the area, and discretionary if away from dwellings with clearly defined standards in the plan around hours of operation, frequency, noise, traffic and location set out. It's also a very specific activity to identify in the plan, and non-sensical to allow this as restricted discretionary ahead of other, less invasive and environmentally damaging activities that are treated as discretionary. Motorised outdoor recreation activities are in no way coherent with primary production as the purpose of the general rural zone.	Accept in part
\$255.005	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	GRUZ-S4	GRUZ-S4	Oppose	Amend SUB-R4 to revert to the existing rules allowing a second dwelling on properties of more than 4ha.	The existing provisions allow for an additional residential dwelling if on land between 4ha and 100ha, and the submitter can't see the case for why this needs to be so significantly increased. Most properties at 4ha or slightly larger can comfortably have two residential units including on-site services for each property. The new rules proposed will allow for a second dwelling on properties of more than 40ha, however	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						as noted above it is only at this land area that councils consider rural production is economically viable so there is no compelling reason as to why properties over 40ha are considered suitable for a second dwelling, but not those. Given housing shortages across the region (identified by the councils in their s32 report) it is counterintuitive to limit the ability of properties to have additional housing sites, particularly as there is no effect greater than minor on the productive capacity of most land from a second dwelling (and noting the uneconomic nature of sites less than 40ha for primary production). The councils have also not undertaken sufficient analysis of this particular rule to justify the proposed changes, or the need for this to have come into force with immediate effect on notification of the plan. The s32 reports for the rural zone and for subdivision, as well as the consultant report from AgFirst, application to the Environment Court and Environment Court decision itself, are all predominantly focused on the impact of rural small-lot subdivision on primary production and protection of productive land. Additional dwellings are not subdivision. The standards in the operative district plan regarding additional dwellings on rural properties help increase housing stock in a region where there is a shortage, provides desirable rural lifestyle opportunities while minimising the infrastructure demands of establishing new small-lot properties, and helps to maximise the value of rural property with minor impact on the	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						remaining land available for primary production.	
FS54.008	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Considers enabling two dwellings on a 3-4ha block is appropriate. Notes this can provide for workers accommodation or support multiple generations of families to live more affordably on a rural block and increases overall housing supply.	Reject
S255.007	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	GRUZ-P4	GRUZ-P4	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-P4 so properties less than 40 hectares should retain their ability under the operative district plan, as the analysis provided by the Councils' does not support this restriction on smaller rural properties.	These restrictions are imposed on landowners despite the councils' own advice showing that primary production on properties less than 46 hectares at a minimum should be considered uneconomic. While the councils place much emphasis on preventing fragmentation of primary production land, no focus is placed on the land already fragmented and why this should be subject to the same rural zone standards as viable primary production areas when advice to the councils show that this land is no longer economically viable for primary production.	Reject
S255.008	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert in General Rural Zone "eco- village activities" as a discretionary activity with defined standards.	The proposed district plan needs to provide a more accessible pathway for other shared community living that doesn't require subdivision or individual ownership models. Responses to housing crisis and need to support access of young people and families to safe, comfortable homes that meet their needs and facilitate community and connection to land, and nature shouldn't be an urban paradigm.	Reject
\$255.009	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert in the General Rural Zone for "hospitality and other secondary commercial businesses associated with primary	The district plan should provide for, as a controlled activity, hospitality and other secondary commercial businesses associated with primary production and subject to appropriate controls. This might	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					production" as a controlled activity subject to controls.	be providing for cellar doors, café and restaurant options, in addition to rural produce and other rural home business options.	
S257.004	Audrey Sebire	GRUZ-R8	GRUZ-R8	Amend	Amend GRUZ-R8 to limit dwelling size to 180m2.	Considers the rules need to better distinguish between rural residential use and small-block farms.	Reject
S257.005	Audrey Sebire	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert a new provision to limit pine plantation forestry in the district.	Considers pine plantations affect the visual character of the rural environment, adverse effects of monoculture.	Reject
S258.166	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc			Support in part	Amend GRUZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone.	It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone.	Reject
FS105.157	lan Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S258.181	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	GRUZ-R12	GRUZ-R12	Oppose in part	Amend GRUZ-R12 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Discretionary activity and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat.	Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones but does not deal with scale or effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production.	Accept in part
FS81.063	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Under GRUZ-12, farm quarry is permitted. A farm quarry does not include mining. GRUZ-R12 makes quarrying activities a restricted discretionary activity. Quarrying activities do not include mining. The matters of discretion already address the submitters concern.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS89.008	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks to amend GRUZ-R12 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities. GRUZ-R12 only addresses Quarrying Activities and therefore the relief sought is not required.	Accept in part
S260.031	Tony Garstang	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert provisions in the General Rural Zone to protect rivers.	The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area.	Reject
S268.001	Dan Riddiford			Oppose	Amend provisions in the General Rural Zone to enable future development of the site at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough	States opposition to all related provisions that may affect the future development of the church, shed, and land owned by the Catholic Church on Kitchener Street, Martinborough. (Assume this is the St Anthony's Catholic Church at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough).	Reject
S288.037	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)			Support in part	Insert:-Management of Avoiding potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses such as noise, odour, dust and visual effects, including reverse sensitivity effects relating to network utilities and significant hazardous facilities	The submitter supports a specific matter of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities. The submitter also considers that stronger direction is required in relation to reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities.	Reject
S288.038	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-O1	GRUZ-01	Support	Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified.	The submitter supports this objective, particularly the direction that provides for activities that have a functional or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S288.039	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-O4	GRUZ-O4	Support	Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified.	The submitter supports enablement of activities (such as its radiocommunication facilities) that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S288.040	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-O5	GRUZ-O5	Support	Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified.	The submitter supports the direction to locate sensitive activities in locations that avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects. This is particularly important in close proximity to RNZ's Facilities.	Accept in part
S288.041	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-P1	GRUZ-P1	Support	Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified.	The submitter supports provision for activities that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.	Accept
S288.042	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-P2	GRUZ-P2	Support	Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified.	The submitter supports the direction to avoid activities that will result in reverse sensitivity effects on permitted activities, as this includes network utilities.	Accept in part
S288.043	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-P3	GRUZ-P3	Support	Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified.	The submitter supports this policy, particularly the direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects that can arise from inappropriate land use.	Accept in part
S288.044	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-P6	GRUZ-P6	Support	Amend: a. avoiding the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive primary production, primary production activities, waste management facilities, quarrying activities, network utilities and rural industry in circumstances where the new sensitive activity may compromise the operation ofthe existing activities; b. managing potential reverse sensitivity effects caused by the establishment of new sensitive activities near other primary production activities and network utilities, including through the use of setbacks and separation distances	The submitter supports specific policy direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects in the General Rural Zone. Consistent with the submitter's preliminary feedback, it considers that there should be specific recognition of reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure, including network utilities, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
\$288.045	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	GRUZ-S1	GRUZ-S1	Support	Amend: The submitter seeks the following amendment: 6 Any potential electromagnetic effects caused by the structure where it within 1km of a radio transmission mast. 6. Electromagnetic safety risks for any structure higher than 47m within 1000m of Radio New Zealand's facilities at Waingawa. RNZ should be considered an affected person for the purposes of assessing safety risks.	The submitters concern is that the potential for safety risks arising from the construction of tall structures near RNZ's Facilities. This can be readily addressed with proper construction techniques and safety measures. The submitter supports GRUZ-S1, particularly matter of discretion (6) to address potential electromagnetic effects. However, the submitter notes that the wording proposed for GIZ-S1 differs from that proposed for GRUZ-S1. The submitter considers that more appropriate wording in GIZ-S1 is more appropriate as it will mean that only structures that are taller than 47m will trigger consideration of safety risks.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S94.212	Greater Wellington Regional Council	RLZ-R10	RLZ-R10	Support	Retain as notified.	Strongly support the provision for papakāinga.	Accept
S94.213	Greater Wellington Regional Council	RLZ-S5	RLZ-S5	Support	Retain as notified.	The standard provides appropriate direction for on-site services.	Accept
S149.048	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	RLZ-O1	RLZ-01	Support in part	Amend the RLZ chapter to restrict access from the RLZ area to SH2 via Fifth Street, until the Interregional Connector function of the transport corridor is changed.	The submitter is not opposed to the proposed rezoning. The proposed zoning is located close to a city centre and for the most part does not directly front the state highway network. The submitter would suggest no access onto Fifth Street is supported with higher density living until road hierarchy and function of the current Interregional Collector corridor is altered to better accommodate additional traffic. Like the residential rezoned land south of Fifth Street, an investment in the corridor is required to provide additional capacity and a different road function to support ongoing development.	Reject
S152.020	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Oppose	Amend for clarification and further investigations required.	The submitter has concerns around identification of Rural Lifestyle Zone in Masterton and in particular current and future capacity of storm/wastewater disposal. As well as lack of consistency with no such zones identified in Carterton and South Wairarapa.	Reject
S172.096	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-O3	RLZ-O3	Support in part	Amend: RLZ-O3 Enable compatible activities Residential activities, light primary production activities, and ancillary activities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for, and emergency service facilities where there is	Fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Locating fire stations where they have a functional and/or operational need can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently. Amend RLZ-O3 to provide for activities that may have an operational or functional need to locate within the zone.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					an operational and/or functional need to locate within the zone.		
S172.097	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-P1	RLZ-P1	Support in part	Amend: RLZ-P1 Compatible activities Enable residential activities, primary production, emergency service facilities, and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Amend RLZ-P1 to recognise that emergency service facilities may need to locate in the zone to meet the needs of rural communities.	Accept in part
S172.098	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R1	RLZ-R1	Support	Amend RLZ-R1: a. Compliance is achieved with: x. RLZ-S5, and	Amend RLZ-R1 to require compliance with RLZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject
S172.099	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R3	RLZ-R3	Support	Amend RLZ-R3: a. Compliance is achieved with: x. RLZ-S5, and	Amend RLZ-R3 to require compliance with RLZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject
\$172.100	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R4	RLZ-R4	Support in part	Retain RLZ-R4 as notified.	Supports RLZ-R4 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5.	Accept
\$172.101	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R9	RLZ-R9	Support	Retain RLZ-R9 as notified.	Supports RLZ-R9 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5.	Accept
\$172.102	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-R10	RLZ-R10	Support	Retain RLZ-R10 as notified.	Supports RLZ-R10 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5.	Accept
\$172.103	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert a new rule in RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone chapter that provides for emergency service	Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					facilities as a permitted activity within the zone.	situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. The permitted activity standards within the Rural Lifestyle chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone.	
S172.104	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	RLZ-S5	RLZ-S5	Support in part	Amend: RLZ-S5 On-site services 4. Where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available, an onsite A firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, must be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Matters of discretion: 1. The suitability of any alternative servicing options or infrastructure options.	Supports RLZ-S5 insofar as it requires an on-site firefighting water supply to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available. The Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regard to ensuring that and use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Amend RLZ-S5 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supple. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided. There are not matters of discretion when compliance is not achieved with RLZ-S5. The submitters seek the inclusion of a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options.	Accept in part
S221.152	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-O1	RLZ-O1	Support	Retain RLZ-O1 as notified.	RLZ-O1 is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S221.153	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-O3	RLZ-O3	Support in part	Amend RLZ-O3 as follows: Residential activities, light-primary production activities, and ancillary activities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for	It is unclear what 'light' primary production activities are. The National Planning Standards description does not differentiate primary production activities.	Accept
S221.154	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-P1	RLZ-P1	Support	Retain RLZ-P1 as notified.	RLZ-P1 is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards.	Accept in part
S221.155	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-P2	RLZ-P2	Support	Amend reference to Rural Production Zone with General Rural Zone.	Reference to Rural Production Zone should be to General Rural Zone.	Accept
S221.156	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-P3	RLZ-P3	Support in part	Retain RLZ-P3(e)(iv) and (f) as notified.	Consideration for reverse sensitivity and setbacks from primary production activities are supported. This will enable primary production to continue in the rural zones without risking social license to operate.	Accept
S221.157	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R5	RLZ-R5	Support	Retain RLZ-R5 as notified.	The submitter supports primary production being a permitted activity status.	Accept
S221.158	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R7	RLZ-R7	Support	Retain RLZ-R7 as notified.	The submitter supports rural produce retail being a permitted activity status.	Accept
S221.159	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R8	RLZ-R8	Support	Retain RLZ-R8 as notified.	The submitter supports shelterbelts being a permitted activity status.	Accept
S221.160	Horticulture New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert new rule: RLZ-RX Greenhouses 1. Activity status: Permitted Insert suggested supporting definition of 'Greenhouses'.	Permitted activity status and a supporting definition for greenhouses is essential to ensure this efficient growing system, well suited for climate adaptation, is not caught by rules meant for other activities. Greenhouses are a primary production activity and should be enabled as such in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject
S221.161	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-S3	RLZ-S3	Oppose in part	Amend RLZ-S3 as follows: 1. All buildings and structures must not be located within: a. 10m of any boundary; b. 25m of a significant waterbody;	The submitter seeks that there is a larger setback to the boundary with primary production activities. Setbacks are an important tool to avoid, or otherwise mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects from rural lifestyle development	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					and c. 5m of any surface waterbody; andd. 30m from a boundary with the General Rural Zone.	that could affect primary production, especially on highly productive land.	
S229.053	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-O1	RLZ-O1	Support	Retain RLZ-O1 as notified.	Support objective for the RLZ to be used primarily for residential lifestyle, while still providing for primary production to occur.	Accept
S229.054	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-O2	RLZ-O2	Support	Retain RLZ-O2 as notified.	Support objective to maintain the character and amenity values of the zone, and the description of those values.	Accept
S229.055	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-O3	RLZ-O3	Support	Retain RLZ-O3 as notified.	Support objective to enable compatible activities within the zone.	Accept in part
S229.056	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-P1	RLZ-P1	Support	Retain RLZ-P1 as notified.	Support policy to enable activities that are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone.	Accept in part
S229.057	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-P2	RLZ-P2	Support	Retain RLZ-P2 as notified.	Support policy to avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone.	Accept in part
S229.058	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-P3	RLZ-P3	Support	Retain RLZ-P3 as notified.	Support policy to provide for subdivision, use and development that supports the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone.	Accept
S229.059	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-R5	RLZ-R5	Support	Retain RLZ-R5 as notified.	Support permitted activity status for primary production excluding intensive farming in the RLZ.	Accept
S229.060	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	RLZ-R11	RLZ-R11	Support	Retain RLZ-R11 as notified.	Support discretionary activity status for Intensive primary production in the RLZ.	Accept
S243.002	Alan Flynn			Oppose	Delete the Rural Lifestyle Zone, enable rural lifestyle subdivision in the same manner as that proposed for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts.	Opposes Rural Lifestyle Zone in the Masterton District. Notes the location and size of the zone has fault lines, high natural water seepage, and is subject to liquefaction risk. Considers there are different areas around the Masterton urban boundary that are more suitable. Restricting rural	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						lifestyle subdivision to one zone limits Masterton's growth. Rural lifestyle sections under 4ha in size are desirable and an efficient way of creating a green belt buffer around the more densely populated urban areas, while still providing access to urban amenities to those wishing to live on a rural lifestyle section. The Masterton urban boundary is already fragmented and there is nothing to be gained from limiting further rural lifestyle subdivision to one zone. Considers there is no reason why rural lifestyle subdivision should be treated differently in Masterton compared to Carterton or South Wairarapa in a Combined District Plan.	
S245.062	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-O3	RLZ-O3	Support in part	Amend RLZ-O3 as follows: Enable compatible activities Residential activities, light primary production activities, and ancillary activities and educational facilities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for.	The submitter has an obligation to provide educational facilities to existing communities in both rural and residential zones. If there is a community large enough in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, educational facilities should be enabled to support those communities. Objective RLZ-O3 and Policy RLZ-P1 should be amended to reflect that. Should the relief sought be accepted in point S245.064, then the proposed amendments in this submission points and S245.063 are not necessary.	Accept in part
S245.063	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-P1	RLZ-P1	Support in part	Amend RLZ-P1 as follows: Appropriate activities Enable residential activities, primary production, and ancillaryactivities and educational facilities that are compatible with thepurpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	The submitter has an obligation to provide educational facilities to existing communities in both rural and residential zones. If there is a community large enough in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, educational facilities should be enabled to support those communities. Objective RLZ-O3 and Policy RLZ-P1 should be amended to reflect that. Should the relief sought be accepted in point S245.064, then the proposed amendments in this submission points and S245.062 are not necessary.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S245.064	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	RLZ-R16	RLZ-R16	Oppose	Delete RLZ-R16 and replace with a new provision as follows: RLZ-RX Educational Facility Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Activity Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home businesses). Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network 5. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and any proposed mitigation	Educational facilities should be enabled in this zone as they are considered essential social infrastructure. Requests a new rule be inserted that specifically enables educational facilities as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This will allow the submitter to better service the growth within the rural areas of the district and support the local communities' needs.	Reject
S252.007	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	RLZ-S8	RLZ-S8	Support in part	Amend RLZ-S8: 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working das before relocating the building 4. Performance bonda. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard RLZ-S8(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond	Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis).		
\$252.019	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	New provision request	New provision request	Support in part	Insert a relocatable buildings policy that does not refer to performance bonds, recognises positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintains and enhances amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings.	Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings.	Reject
S258.167	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc			Support in part	Amend RLZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone.	It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone.	Reject
FS105.158	lan Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S258.182	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	RLZ-R14	RLZ-R14	Oppose in part	Amend RLZ-R14 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Noncomplying activity, and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat.	Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones but does not deal with scale or effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production.	Accept in part
FS89.009	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks to amend RLZ-R14 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities. Quarrying Activities are a non-	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						complying activity in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and all relevant effects can be considered. Therefore, the relief sought is not required.	
S260.032	Tony Garstang	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert provisions in the Rural Lifestyle Zone to protect rivers.	The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S13.001	Janette and John Dennis	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose	Amend provision to enable subdivision of property of less than 4ha within General Rural Zone (Masterton).	None listed.	Accept
S22.007	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Retain SUB-P5 as notified.	The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities, and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects	Accept in part
FS78.021	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part
S25.001	Stewart Reid	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose	Amend SUB-Table 1 to change minimum allotment size of 40 hectares for rural properties to 4 hectares.	Minimum lot sizes limits ability to subdivide for small - medium size vineyards. Land is already too expensive, and this will force prices up further.	Reject
S48.013	Aburn Popova Trust	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support in part	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: " c. enabling primary production and ancillary activities, including viticulture; dstructures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture;"	Include specific reference to viticulture, and a clear delineation between rural and urban areas (SUB-P5(g)) is retained.	Accept in part
S48.014	Aburn Popova Trust	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support in part	Amend SUB-P6 as follows: "is not located on highly productive land, and it does not comprise the use of land for primary production activities including viticulture; and"	Subdivision of land suitable for viticulture (Martinborough Soils Overlay) into parcels too small to enable viable viticulture should be avoided.	Accept in part
S48.015	Aburn Popova Trust	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4(1) as notified.	Support the inclusion of SUB-R4(1)(b).	Accept in part
S48.016	Aburn Popova Trust	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4(4) as notified.	Supports SUB-R4(4).	Accept in part
S48.017	Aburn Popova Trust	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4(5) as notified.	Support SUB-R4(5).	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S51.001	Lucy Sanderson- Gammon	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support in part	Amend SUB-R4 (1) (e) as follows: "e. Either: i. one additional allotment is created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 1.5ha; or ii. two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 2.5ha 2ha;"	Reducing the remaining land required would provide more flexibility for those with land less than 4ha. If the remainder required after subdividing just one section is 1.5ha, it seems illogical to require 2.5ha after subdividing two sections. Having 2ha (or 1.5ha) remaining after two sections would not adversely affect the character of the Rural zone but would make a big difference to those wishing to subdivide two sections (and also help to free up more land for housing).	Accept in part
S70.004	Dan Kellow	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Amend	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to recognise subdivision of Highly Productive Land is potentially acceptable in certain circumstances, as is set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Submitter states that Policy SUB-P6 is not consistent with Policy SUB-P8 because SUB-P8 recognises there are circumstances set out in the NPS-HPL where subdivision of HPL is potentially acceptable.	Accept in part
FS81.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support in part	Disallow	The purpose of SUB-P6 is to protect the character of the General Rural Zone. It is important to our members that small lot subdivision does not interfere with the character of the General Rural Zone which is home to rural businesses that have a functional need to be located there.	Accept in part n
FS78.011	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part
S70.005	Dan Kellow	SUB-P8	SUB-P8	Support	Retain Policy SUB-P8 as proposed.	SUB-P8 is supported as it is directly addresses subdivision of HPL and confirms that there are exceptions in the NPS-HPL.	Accept
FS81.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Supports the current wording of SUB-P8	Accept
FS78.018	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
\$70.006	Dan Kellow	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose	Amend SUB-R4(4) to refer to NPS-HPL clause 3.10.	Considers that the NPS-HPL has not been appropriately given effect to in relation to highly fragmented HPL areas within the General Rural Zone. These sites have not been provided for which results in uncertainty and potentially restricts further development unnecessarily. Subdivision is a Discretionary Activity under rule SUB-R4 (4) if clause 3.8 of the NPS-HPL is met. The Discretionary Activity status should be amended to also include reference to clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL given the number of fragmented sites in the area. Clause 3.10 addresses HPL that is subject to permanent or long-term constraints. Nonreversible land fragmentation is an example of a long term constraint given in the NPS-HPL Guide to Implementation.	Accept
FS81.007	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Agrees with the reasons stated by the submitter. The relief sought by the submitter would ensure that SUB-R4(4) is consistent with SUB-P8.	Accept
FS78.025	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept
\$70.014	Dan Kellow	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Clarify SUB-R4 to make non-compliance with this SUB-R4(1)(e) a Discretionary activity.	An application to subdivide where SUB-R4(1)(e) is not met would be a Discretionary Activity (default for the subdivision activity which is not otherwise addressed). Notes the Draft District Plan (DDP) used a different approach, the equivalent Non-Complying rule stated that a non-compliance with SUB-R4 (1) (a), (b) and (c) would be a Non-Complying Activity. Suggests for clarity that the DDP approach of directly referencing the clauses of SUB-R4 (1) in the Discretionary and Non-Complying rules is the more easily understood approach. Submitter understands that council officers will address SUB-R4 (1) (e) not being referenced in SUB-R4 (2) - (5) in the s42 report by stating that the Non-Complying status was the intended activity status for subdivisions that cannot comply with the minimum section sizes set out in SUB-R4 (1)(e). It is also understood while there is no minimum Lot size	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						specified in SUB-R4 (e) (i) and (ii) that council officers will suggest a minimum 0.5ha Lot will be a requirement. Submitter requests that subdivision of Lots less than 4ha should always be a Discretionary Activity (where they are HPL), and not elevate to Non-Complying, irrespective of resultant Lot sizes. Considers this approach would provide recognition that there are HPL sites in the General Rural zone that are smaller than 4ha that may be suitable for subdivision due to the surrounding land uses, location, and existing activity on site, but cannot meet SUB-R4 (1)(e) due to being 2 hectares or smaller. Considers these factors, just as much as allotment size, are relevant when considering the acceptability of a proposal.	
S79.061	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R4 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R4 as proposed.	Accept in part
S79.062	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R5 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R5 as notified.	Accept in part
S89.001	Alastair MacKenzie	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Delete reference to highly productive land in SUB-R4(1)(b) as follows: "b. the allotment is not located on highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay;"	Submitter seeks to allow the subdivision of a 2-3ha block of land that contains a highly productive soil overlay, to be able to subdivide land into 2 lots and separate off the larger dwelling and build an appropriately sized dwelling and shed for own use. Submitter is opposed to the current proposal, specifically the Rule 4 variation, and believes that subdividing this property will not significantly enhance agricultural productivity. Instead, the submitter proposes that the rates generated from the subdivision would be more beneficial to the council and contribute to the overall development of the local area.	Reject
FS78.026	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S91.031	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-P8	SUB-P8	Neutral	Retain SUB-P8 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S94.136	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend to include reference to avoiding subdivision of highly productive land.	There is no reference to protecting highly productive land in the introduction to the subdivision chapter despite clear direction from the NPS-HPL to avoid subdivision of highly productive land, and the importance of protecting highly productive land being noted elsewhere in this plan.	Accept in part
FS13.052	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	The importance of the NPS-HPL and protecting highly productive land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development should be emphasised in the introduction.	Accept in part
FS109.012	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the proposed amendment to introduction is inappropriate and unjustified. The NPS-HPL does not require all subdivision of Highly Productive Land be avoided, only inappropriate subdivision. The NPS specifically provides for subdivision in certain circumstances	Accept in part
S94.143	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support in part	Amend clause (c) as follows: Enabling primary production, land- based primary production on highly productive land and ancillary activities;	Aligns with relief sought on GRUZ-O2 and GRUZ-P3.	Reject
S94.144	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to the NPS-HPL. The submitter considers that the reference to the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone provides strong justification for the proposed amendment sought to GRUZ-O1.	Accept in part
S94.145	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Retain as notified.	Support direct reference to NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
S94.174	Greater Wellington	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Support in part	Amend to increase the minimum allotment size for the Rural Lifestyle Zone or address the	The proposed minimum lot size of 0.5ha in the rural lifestyle zone does not provide for the low density of on-site wastewater systems required to mitigate the	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Regional Council				freshwater concerns through other mechanisms.	potential impacts of development on freshwater quality, as sought by NPS-FM clause 3.5. The minimum lot size does not provide for appropriate separation distances between on-site wastewater systems and drinking water wells. A 50m buffer is required from new bores where water is used for potable water supply, or 20m from bores drilled pre-2019 under the Natural Resource Plan.	
FS105.082	lan Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to wastewater infrastructure improvements.	Reject
S122.039	Fulton Hogan Limited	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Oppose	Redraft SUB-P5 so it clearly describes how subdivision will occur, so it does not comprimise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, and achieves SUB-O1.	Considers the phrasing of SUB-P5 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision) by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production).	Accept in part
S122.040	Fulton Hogan Limited	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-P6 to include a requirement to avoid all reverse sensitivity effects: a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities (including through reverse sensitivity effects); and	Supports clear direction with regard to avoiding the fragmentation of land, and the potential for subdivision, use and development of land to foreclose its use for primary production activities. Notes reverse sensitivity effects can be a significant issue for activities such as quarrying and therefore seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the policy.	Accept in part
FS81.033	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Supports the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept in part
FS106.005	Radio New Zealand			Support	Allow	Supports references to reverse sensitivity effects in relevant provisions in the Proposed Plan for the reasons set out in its original submission.	Accept in part
S136.015	Wairarapa Winegrowers'	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support in part	Amend Policy SUB-P5 as follows: "	Supports subdivision where it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Association Inc				b. enabling and promoting a productive working landscape; c. enabling primary production and ancillary activities, including viticulture; d. providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture;"	GRUZ, but requests an amendment to clause (c) and clause (d) to specifically reference viticulture.	
S136.016	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support in part	Amend Policy SUB-P6 as follows: " a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities including viticulture; and b. avoiding the cumulative"	Supports the intention to avoid subdivision of land suitable for viticulture (Martinborough Soils Overlay) into parcels too small to enable viable viticulture and requests an amendment to the policy to specifically reference viticulture.	Accept in part
S136.017	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R4 as notified.	Supports the specific reference to the Martinborough Soils Overlay in clause (b).	Accept in part
S136.018	Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB Table 1 - Minimum lot sizes by adding to the right hand column:4ha in the Martinborough Soils Overlay where the allotment will be used for viticulture activities.	Generally supportive of the 40ha minimum lot size to apply in the GRUZ; however, it nevertheless requests that within the Martinborough Soils Overlay provision should be made for a 4ha minimum allotment size where the subdivision is for viticulture activities. The reality is that for smaller 'boutique' vineyards, which are a strong feature of Martinborough's wine industry, 40ha is simply too large an area. The 4ha lot size requested is essentially a 'rollover' of the 4ha that applies under the Operative District Plan (Section 20.1.2) for subdivision in the Rural (Special) Zone.	Reject
S144.004	E McGruddy	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support in part	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: "Provide for subdivision, use and	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					development were it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by: a) enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation and development sympathetic to existing landforms; b) enabling and promoting a productive working landscape, providing for varying forms and scale for local and export markets; d) managing the density and location of residential development, providing for varying forms and scale for housing options; ensuring allotments can be self serviced; e) retaining a clear delineation and centrast peri-urban areas as buffers between the district's rural areas and urban areas;	notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	
\$144.005	E McGruddy	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-P6 as follows: "SUB-P6 Avoid inappropriate Subdivision in the General Rural ZoneAvoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, or amenity values of the zone. Allow subdivision and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, with lot sizes sufficient to accommodate intended land uses by: a) limiting enabling small lot subdivision within existing small holdings in the General Rural	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					Zone to only in areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and		
FS9.001	Matthew & Lana Timperley			Support	Allow	The submitter is a landowner in Carterton Rural zone with a property of 4.3 hectares which under the proposed plan is unable to be subdivided. Consider it is not of sufficient size or suitable terrain to be used for primary production. Notes other properties with 1km of their land that are subdivided into varying parcels with multiple dwellings.	Reject
FS78.012	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S144.006	E McGruddy	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R4 as follows: General Rural Zone: Subdivision of land less than 4ha-8ha in the General Rural Zone 1. Activity status: Centrolled Permitted Where: a. The allotment subject to subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District or Masterton District; b. The allotment is not located en highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or a mapped Hazard Overlay or a mapped Ecological or Landscape Overlay; c. The allotment subject to subdivision is less than 4ha-8ha in area; d. No provi	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	Accept in part
S144.007	E McGruddy	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete matters of control under SUB-R4 (1): Matters of control:1.	Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P5, and SUB-P6.2. The size, design, shape, location, and layout of lots.3. Efficient use of land and compatibility with the role, function, and predominant character of the zone. Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan4. The subdivision layout and accessibility from and connections to surrounding neighbourhoods.5. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, historic heritage, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and biodiversity, sites and areas of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites.6. The measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects on any cultural, spiritual and/or heritage values, interests, or associations of importance to Māori that are associated with the land being subdivided, including weed and pest control.7. The subdivision design and layout, and the design and location of building platforms and access to minimise earthworks and land disturbance and integrate built form into the natural landform.8. Provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including water supply (including firefighting water supply), wastewater systems, stormwater control and disposal, telecommunications and electricity in accordance with Council's engineering standards.9.	notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					Separation distances, barriers, acoustic treatment, and orientation of buildings.10. Fire rating of party/common walls.11. Energy efficiency and the ability for lots to use renewable energy.12. Effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and the matters set out in SUB-P4.13. Management of construction effects, including traffic movements, hours of operation, noise, earthworks, and erosion and sediment control.14. The staging of development and timing of works.15. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses such as noise, odour, dust, and visual effects, including reverse sensitivity effects relating to network utilities and significant hazardous facilities.16. Financial contributions.17. Bonds and other payments and guarantees. 18. The matters referred to in sections 108 and 220 of the Act.		
FS75.022	Heritage New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	HNZPT opposes the suggested amendments to SUB-R4 with regards to the measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects on any cultural, spiritual and/or heritage values, interests, or associations of importance to Māori.	Accept in part
S152.007	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Delete or Amend SUB-P6.	This policy is too broad - specifically (a). While the submitter supports the protection of highly productive land (particularly LUC 1 and 2) - there are areas in the GRUZ, with low productive capacity, that are not fragmented but that are appropriate for small lot subdivision.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS9.002	Matthew & Lana Timperley			Support	Allow	The submitter is a landowner in Carterton Rural zone with a property of 4.3 hectares which under the proposed plan is unable to be subdivided. Consider it is not of sufficient size or suitable terrain to be used for primary production. Notes other properties with 1km of their land that are subdivided into varying parcels with multiple dwellings	Reject
FS81.001	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support in part	Allow in part	Considers the Plan should include a policy on managing small lot subdivision in rural areas. Small lot subdivision and the associated cumulative effects can become a problem for existing land used for agriculture. SUB-P6 might be reasonable if the emphasis is instead on 'managing' (as opposed to 'avoiding') small lot subdivision, in particular locations, as there might be some areas where small lots are appropriate without further compromising highly productive land. However, seek that this policy be amended to give effect to the above rather than deleted as sought in the original submission.	Accept in part
FS78.013	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S152.010	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-S1	SUB-S1	Oppose in part	Delete or amend lot size standards.	The submitter does not support SUB-S1(b)(i) which references lot size standards for the GRUZ. The submitter does support the protection of highly productive land in line with the NPS-HPL (particularly LUC 1 and 2), however, there is no justification for 40ha minimum on land not HPL. 40ha is too small for conventional farm and too large for intensive horticultural development and use.	Reject
S152.011	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-S1	SUB-S1	Amend	Amend to include rules for small lot subdivision. This could be achieved by allowing a limited number of small-clustered lots per title (0.5ha for example with a date provision to also to limit subdivision of new titles) and setting a minimum lot	The submitter supports increased lot size, however there should be provision for smaller lots in the rural zone on non-HPL. Smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone supports the economic and social well-being of rural communities and is an integral part in the further development of	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					size for the balance lot to protect and maintain rural character and amenity.	farms providing capital, succession planning and housing family members.	
FS54.006	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Supports the original submission point.	Reject
FS80.012	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Clarification of original submission point - notes that support increased lot size - this references general residential not general rural.	Reject
FS78.030	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S152.012	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Oppose in part	Amend wording of SUB-R2(10) as follows: Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-S1; andb. Where the subdivision is located on highly productive land, the subdivision shall be directly related to land based primary production and evidence should be provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land; or c. Where the subdivision is not located on Highly Productive Land, two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha;	This rule should be re-worded so that it references highly productive land, and only triggers non-complying status where the land is highly productive and does not meet the requirements of the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
FS78.019	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. The plan provisions need to be clear that there are exceptions to the NPS-HPL that may apply, and that will reasonably justify the subdivision in the rural	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						zone. Consider that the use of the term 'directly related to' is unclear i.e., how does subdivision have to relate to land based primary production?	
S152.013	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Delete or amend. It is inferred that any amendment to this rule shall include Masterton District.	Masterton should be included in SUB-R4(1)(a) for consistency across the region and given the characteristics of the Masterton Rural Zone are no different than Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts. The exclusion of Masterton will have significant effect on property values.	Accept
S152.014	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose	Amend SUB-R5(1)(e) to clarify the meaning of vacant.	It is not clear what the term 'vacant' means in respect of SUB-R5(1)(e). Given this rule addresses surplus residential units, it is unclear whether a lot that contains any building is considered to meet this rule. Is the term vacant used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit? Further clarity is required.	Accept in part
S152.015	AdamsonSha w Ltd	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose	Insert a rule to subdivide an existing house from a farm even if the balance lot is vacant.	Many farms do not need a house, in which case the house is better utilized by someone else, releasing the capital and allowing it to be re-invested into the farm.	Accept in part
S181.001	Kath and David Tomlinson	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support in part	Amend SUB-P6 to allow subdivision in areas where there has already been existing subdivision and where further subdivision fits within the character of the area.	The submission states that in some areas subdivision has already occurred and remaining land under 8 hectares is not able to be subdivided. The submitter states that it would be sensible to allow further subdivision for such pockets of land in keeping with current 1-2 hectare lifestyle blocks surrounding them.	Reject
FS9.003	Matthew & Lana Timperley			Support	Allow	The submitter is a landowner in Carterton Rural zone with a property of 4.3 hectares which under the proposed plan is unable to be subdivided. Consider it is not of sufficient size or suitable terrain to be used for primary production. Notes other properties with 1km of their land that are subdivided into varying parcels with multiple dwellings	Reject
FS78.014	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S181.002	Kath and David Tomlinson	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Amend	Amend SUB-R4 to lots less than 8 hectares.	Concerns regarding land 'stuck' in the middle of 4ha and 8ha that will no longer be able to subdivide. These lots should be able to subdivide to create extra houses without detrimental effect.	Reject
S181.004	Kath and David Tomlinson	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Amend	Amend SUB-R4 to refer to all three districts, not just South Wairarapa and Carterton.	Plan provisions should include all three districts, not just South Wairarapa and Carterton. This is a 'combined' plan and should not have separate rules for different districts within the Wairarapa.	Accept in part
S181.005	Kath and David Tomlinson	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Amend	Amend SUB-R4 to allow balance lots of 1ha in areas where there is already subdivision and further subdivision will be consistent with the existing character.	1ha lots will allow lifestyle property owners to have enough space on their land without the loss of productive land.	Accept in part
FS80.005	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Agree that Masterton should be included in this rule.	Accept in part
S181.006	Kath and David Tomlinson	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose	Amend SUB-R4 to allow for in-fill rural subdivision in areas that have already been subdivided and the character of the area will be retained through a Discretionary activity status.	There are currently pockets of rural subdivisions throughout the Wairarapa. Allow in-fill subdivision in these areas, where Council can benefit from reserves contributions and infrastructure charges. Council does not have obligation to provide water, stormwater, septic, as the landowner is responsible.	Accept in part
S187.030	New Zealand Frost Fans	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support in part	Amend as follows: SUB-P5 Rural character and amenity values of subdivision in the General Rural Zone Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by: a. enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation;c. enabling prioritising primary production and ancillary activities; g. retaining a clear delineation including buffers, and contrast	The policy does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land in that land based primary production is not prioritised, merely enabled.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					between the district's rural areas and urban areas; h. and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects and land use conflicts arising from the establishment of new and expanded sensitive nonrural activities.		
S187.031	New Zealand Frost Fans	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support in part	Amend SUB-P6 as follows: Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location design and construction that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, or amenity values of the zone by: a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and b.and avoiding the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential within the General Rural Zone; and c. where appropriate, specifying subdivision design and construction requirements and consent notices, to avoid where possible, or otherwise minimise amenity conflicts between uses.	The design and construction of a subdivision and its consequent use can be a significant matter as to whether the overall proposal contributes to conflicts of uses and therefore inappropriate. For example, matters such as sealing driveways.	Reject
S187.033	New Zealand Frost Fans	SUB-P8	SUB-P8	Support	Retain as notified.	The policy gives effect to the NPSHPL.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S187.034	New Zealand Frost Fans	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain as notified.	The rule is appropriate and gives effect to the NPSHPL.	Accept
S208.005	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Retain the policy SUB-P5	The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities, and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects	Accept in part
FS29.010	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	It is important to protect primary production and ancillary activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part
\$214.079	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Oppose	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by: a. Enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation; b. Enabling and promoting a productive working landscape c. Enabling primary production and ancillary activities;d. Providing for varying forms, scale and separation of structures associated with primary production activities; e. Managing the density and location of residential development; f. Ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; g. Retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the district's rural areas and urban areas; and h. Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.	The submitter opposes SUB-P5. Amenity values should not be a consideration for subdivision in rural areas, lest it be used as an excuse to impose unreasonable reverse sensitivity restrictions against primary production activities. Similarly, 'predominance of vegetation' and provision for 'varying forms, scale and separation of structures associated with primary production activities' are not relevant considerations for subdivision in rural areas.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS13.057	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	Amenity values are not appropriate considerations for subdivision in the rural zone due to the potential negative consequences for the purpose of the zone, including primary production.	Accept in part
FS95.184	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part
S214.081	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose	Amend as follows: 1. Activity Status: Controlled Where: a. There is no more than one additional allotment created; b. The subdivision is of land around an existing lawfully established residential unit c. The additional allotment is no less than 0.5ha d. The balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha 20ha; e. No vacant allotments are created following the subdivision f. Compliance is achieved with: i. SUB-S1 ii. SUB-S2 iii. SUB-S3 iv. SUB-S4 v. SUB-S5 vi. SUB-S6 vii. SUB-S7 viii. SUB-S8 ix. SUB-S9	The submitter opposes SUB-R5. A farmer should not be forced to dispose of 40ha if they only need to dispose of 20ha. The requirement for 'no vacant lots to be created' is meaningless in a rural setting. It is highly efficient for new lots to be vacant so that they can be put to maximum productive potential. Direct access to state highways should not be intensified as a result of new subdivision. However, where an existing access is from a state highway, the effects of that are the same or similar as prior to subdivision and therefore the use of such existing access should be permitted to continue.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					g. The subdivision complies with or does not increase any existing or previously approved noncompliance with the underlying zone standards: h. There is no new direct access to State Highway 53, any Limited Access Road direct access to State Highway 2. i. There is no new direct access to State highway 2		
FS61.009	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	NZTA does not agree that the effects of the use of an existing access are necessarily the same before subdivision as they are after subdivision. Based on the experience of NZTA, land uses that follow subdivision typically intensify the use of any existing access. Accordingly, the use of existing accesses should be assessed for appropriateness and in particular safety effects.	Accept in part
FS80.008	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Agree that the requirement for 'no vacant lots to be created' is meaningless in a rural setting. It is highly efficient for new lots to be vacant so that they can be put to maximum productive potential.	Accept in part
FS95.186	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.083	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose	Amend as follows: GRUZ: General Rural Zone 40ha 20ha	The submitter considers that 40ha is too large an area for efficient rural property management. A farmer should not have to dispose of 40ha if they only need to dispose 20ha.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS80.015	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with the further submitter's original submission regarding rural lot size.	Reject
FS90.068	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the 40ha allotment size will appropriately prevent fragmentation of rural land.	Accept
FS95.188	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part
S221.094	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Retain SUB-P5(c) and (d) as notified. Amend SUB-P5(h) as follows: h. avoiding, remedying, or mitigating potential reverse sensitivity effects.	The submitter supports enabling primary production and ancillary activities through these provisions. A small change is suggested to align with the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
S221.095	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Retain SUB-P6 as notified.	The submitter supports protections for highly productive land and its use for primary production activities	Accept in part
S221.097	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P8	SUB-P8	Support	Retain SUB-P8 as notified.	Recognition of the NPS-HPL is strongly supported.	Accept
S221.098	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support in part	Retain SUB-R2(2)(15) as notified. Retain SUB-R2(10) as notified.	Managing reverse sensitivity effects is essential to a productive rural environment. The submitter supports subdivision when it directly enables primary production. Horticultural businesses are highly efficient and can be profitable on lot sizes much smaller than 40 ha.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS78.020	Holly Hill			Support in part	Disallow in part	Support lot sizes of less than 40ha in the rural zone.	Accept in part
S221.099	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support in part	Retain SUB-R5(3) as notified. Amend SUB-R5(3)(6) as follows: 6. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including primary production activities, network utilities, or significant hazardous facilities.	The submitter supports provisions that protect the General Rural Zone from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. It should be recognised that primary production activities, in particular, need protection from reverse sensitivity effects that could degrade the productive potential of the Rural Zone.	Accept
S221.100	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Support in part	Retain GRUZ minimum allotment size as notified.	40ha minimum allotments size for the GRUZ is supported to protect productive land from fragmentation. Limited exceptions for subdivision for the explicit purpose of primary production is supported. Horticultural businesses can be profitable on lot sizes far smaller than 40ha.	Accept
S222.007	Jack Wass	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Amend	Amend SUB-R2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. SUB-R2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Reject
S222.008	Jack Wass	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Amend	Amend SUB-R4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land.	The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. SUB-R4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land.	Accept in part
FS78.029	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S229.014	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Retain SUB-P5 as notified.	Support policy to enable primary production activities within the zone, to retain a clear	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						delineation between rural and urban areas to and to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects	
\$229.015	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Retain SUB-P6 as notified.	Support an 'avoid' policy approach that seeks to limit small lot subdivision to areas where it will not comprise the use of land for primary production activities.	Accept in part
S229.016	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Oppose	Insert new matter of discretion/control as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities.	Oppose controlled activity status. Prefer a restricted discretionary activity status that would enable a proposal that might conflict with primary production activity to be declined. A directive matter of discretion (or matter of control if the proposed activity status remains) would be required to address potential reverse sensitivity effects that may affect primary production activity. Matter of Control 15 appears directed at the effects of primary production on sensitive activities.	Accept in part
FS13.058	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	A matter of control is needed to address reverse sensitivity effects on primary production, which appear not to be covered by SUB-R2(2)(15).	Accept
FS81.051	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Supports the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept in part
S229.017	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose	Insert new matter of discretion/control as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities	Oppose controlled activity status. Prefer a restricted discretionary activity status that would enable a proposal that might conflict with primary production activity to be declined. A directive matter of discretion (or matter of control if the proposed activity status remains) would be required to address potential reverse sensitivity effects that may affect primary production activity. Matter of Control 15 appears directed at the effects of primary production on sensitive activities.	Accept in part
FS13.059	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	A matter of control is needed to address reverse sensitivity effects on primary production. Highly productive land as a matter of control is supported.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS81.052	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Supports the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept in part
S229.018	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-S2	SUB-S2	Support in part	Insert new matter of discretion as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities.	Support the requirement for a building platform to be identified on a rural lot. The matters of discretion should extend to reverse sensitivity consideration	Accept in part
FS13.060	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	A matter of discretion is needed to address reverse sensitivity effects on primary production.	Accept
S233.007	Scott Anstis	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Delete SUB-P6 or amend to enable small lot subdivision in the General Rural Zone in areas with low productive capacity.	Considers the policy is too broad, particularly point (a). Supports protection of highly productive land (particularly LUC 1 and 2), but notes there are areas in GRUZ that are not fragmented that are appropriate for small lot subdivision, particularly those areas with low productive capacity.	Accept in part
FS78.015	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part
\$233.010	Scott Anstis	SUB-S1	SUB-S1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-S1 (and SUB-Table 1) to provide for small lot subdivision in the General Rural Zone via SUB-R2(2).	Does not support lot size standard in the General Rural Zone. Supports protecting highly productive land but considers 40ha minimum lot size is too small for conventional farming but too large for intensive horticultural development and use. Considers there should be more provision for small lot subdivision on land not identified as highly productive. Considers using a 0.5ha minimum lot size with a date provision to limit subdivision of new titles and setting a minimum lot size for balance lots to protect and maintain rural character and amenity. Considers that enabling some smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone encourages economic and social well-being of rural communities. Considers small lot subdivision is integral to the further development of farms providing capital for the operative farms for development, succession planning, and housing family members while enabling individual family members to have the	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						security of a title without compromising the operation of the farm.	
FS80.013	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with the further submitter's original submission regarding rural lot size.	Reject
FS78.031	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S233.011	Scott Anstis	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R2(10): Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-S1; andb. The subdivision is directly related to land based primary production; andc. Evidence is provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Landb. Where the subdivision is located on highly productive land, the subdivision shall be directly related to land based primary production and evidence should be provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land; orc. Where the subdivision is not located on Highly Productive Land, two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha.	Considers rule should be worded to refer to highly productive land, and only trigger non-complying status where the land is highly productive and does not meet the provisions of the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
FS78.022	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS102.002	Gavin Grey			Support	Allow in part	Seeks that the land at 889 Chester Road be zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone, as the site is 10.4ha with two dwellings and is not highly productive land.	Accept in part
S233.012	Scott Anstis	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R4: a. The allotment subject to subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District;	The submission states that Masterton should be included in point (a) given the characteristics of rural zones are the same across all three districts, and therefore the approach should be the same. Notes the exclusion of Masterton from this rule means there is no provision for lots less than 40ha in Masterton. Considers this is overly restrictive and will affect property values for rural ratepayers.	Accept
S233.013	Scott Anstis	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose	Amend SUB-S5 to enable subdivision of a house from the rest of a farm and clarify the term 'vacant'.	Considers the term 'vacant' is not clear regarding point (e). Given the rule addresses surplus residential units, questions whether a lot that contains any building is considered to meet this rule, or whether the term 'vacant' is used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit. Considers there should be provision to subdivide an existing house from a farm even if the balance lot is vacant. Notes many farms do not need a house, and subdividing this of releases capital and allows it to be re-invested into the farm.	Accept in part
S239.020	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Amend Policy SUB-P6 as follows: SUB-P6 Avoid inappropriate subdivision in the General Rural Zone Avoid subdivision a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and"	This policy is too broad - specifically (a) which notes that small lot subdivision is only appropriate where the soil resource is fragmented, not located on highly productive land and does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities. While the submitter supports the protection of highly productive land - there are areas in the GRUZ that are not fragmented but that are appropriate for small lot subdivision. Particularly areas with low productive capacity.	Reject
FS80.004	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Policy is too broad	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS81.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	The purpose of SUB-P6 is to avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale or location that is contrary to the anticipate purpose, character or amenity values of the zones. The policy is intending to avoid cumulative effect of small lot subdivision.	Accept
FS78.016	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S239.024	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	SUB-S1	SUB-S1	Oppose in part	Delete and add rules for small lot subdivision.	The submitter does not support (b)(i) SUB-Table 1 and the protection of highly productive land in line with NPS-HPL. There is no justification for a Wairarapa wide 40ha minimum, particularly on land that isn't identified as Highly Productive Land. Supports the removal of the 4ha minimum lot size provided for in the Operative Plan as they consider this was too large for rural-residential development, yet not large enough to provide for productive use. There should be some provision for smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone that is not identified as productive land. This could be achieved by allowing a limited number of small lots per title (0.5ha for example with a date provision to also limit subdivision of new titles) and setting a minimum lot size for the balance lot to protect and maintain rural character and amenity. By allowing limited smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone the plan is encouraging/ supporting the economic and social well-being of rural communities.	Accept in part
FS70.017	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Support	Allow	A variety in development can be achieved through other mechanisms, such as urban design guidelines. Delete average lot size standards from SUB-S1.	Accept in part
FS80.014	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with the further submitter's original submission regarding rural lot size.	Accept in part
FS78.032	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S239.025	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Delete paragraph (1)(a) so that the rule applies to Masterton District.	Masterton should be included in (a) given the characteristics of the Masterton Rural Zone are no different than Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts. There should be a consistent approach across all three districts. Notes that with the exclusion of Masterton from this rule, there is no provision for any general rural lots less than the 40ha minimum in the Masterton District. This is overly restrictive and will have significant effects on property values for rural ratepayers.	Accept
FS80.006	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Agree that Masterton should be included in this rule.	Accept
S239.026	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose	Amend to clarify what allotments count as 'vacant'.	It is not clear what the term 'vacant' means in respect of (e). Given this rule addresses surplus residential units, is a lot that contains any building considered to meet this rule? Or is the term vacant used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit? Further clarification is needed.	Accept in part
S244.001	Michael David Walters Hodder	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Amend	Amend SUB-Table 1 to make the minimum lot size 4ha in the General Rural Zone	Notes there are many smaller lots than 40ha in the zone. Smaller holdings can produce high yield horticultural or pastoral activities. Considers more analysis should have been undertaken about land use in the Wairarapa and the size of rural properties rather than assuming larger sites are better. Notes clause 3.10(4) of NPS-HPL which states, "the side of the land holding in which the highly productive land occurs is not itself a determinant". Considers there is demand for smaller rural lots. Notes policies GRUZ-P1 to GRUZ-P10 provide helpful guidance for subdivision in the zone.	Reject
S248.001	Colin and Helen Southey	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB - Table 1 to reduce minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone from 40ha to 10ha.	The Proposed Plan takes a conservative approach to rural subdivision with a 40ha minimum lot size. The Rural Zone s32 Report notes that based on an assessment of subdivision lot sizes, the demand for rural lots is either for small lots under 8ha or larger farm lots. The 8ha is noted as aligning with the Operative District Plan minimum lot size - however, the minimum lot sizes are 4ha. It is possible that the	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						s32 report was actually referring to 4ha and not 8ha as there have been many 4ha allotments created. It is submitted that the 40ha minimum lot size is too restrictive. In some rural contexts 40ha is a large area of land. There will be circumstances where this restriction will become an impediment to productive land use (such as high value market gardens and orchards) which do not require 40ha of land. A discretionary activity consenting pathway to the approval of sub 40ha lots does not offer enough certainty to applicants. In the context of the Proposed Plan's 40ha minimum lot size, it would be difficult to overcome the overriding presumption in the NPS-HPL that fragmentation decreases production. (Please refer to original submission for the full list of reasons).	
\$248.002	Colin and Helen Southey	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R4 (1) (a) to include Masterton District.	The approach taken in Carterton and South Wairarapa where small lots (between 2 and 4ha), under certain circumstances, can be further subdivided is strongly preferred to the creation of a single "lifestyle zone" as is proposed in the Masterton District. These small lots have already had their productive potential compromised and are large enough to provide for additional rural housing. In many circumstances, existing rural lots are larger than their owners actually need them to be. This results in underutilised land and a lot of lawn mowing. It is submitted that Masterton is no different to Carterton and the South Wairarapa and providing for additional housing within the smaller rural sites in Masterton is the best way to utilise these sites and provide for rural housing.	Accept
FS80.007	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	Agree that Masterton should be included in this rule.	Accept
S251.002	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support in part	Amend SUB-R4 as follows: "1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. The allotment subject to	Rule SUB-R4(1) relates to subdivision of land less than 4ha in the General Rural Zone. There is no minimum allotment size specified in the controlled activity rule. In practice the balance requirements of	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	District Councils				subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District; b. The allotment is not located on highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay; c. The allotment subject to subdivision is less than 4ha in area as at 11 October 2023; d. No provision is used more than once, and no retention of rights occurs; e. Either: i. one additional allotment is created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 1.5ha; or ii. two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 2.5ha; f. The additional allotment is no less than 0.5ha 4. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(b); and b. Evidence is provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or clause 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. 5. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(a), (c), (d) or (e); or b. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(b) and is not otherwise provided for by SUB-R4(4)"	the rule may reasonably avoid the potential for very small allotments and the matters of control enable consideration of whether allotment size is sufficient for onsite servicing. Nevertheless, it would provide greater clarity and certainty if a minimum allotment size of 0.5ha were specified. A minimum lot size of 0.5ha is consistent with the minimum lot size in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Rule SUB-R4(4) provides for a discretionary activity pathway for subdivision that is over highly productive land, but meets all of the other controlled activity conditions, subject to meeting an exemption under Clause 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. There is a second exemption under the NPS-HPL that could also be met through Clause 3.10 which is provided for in other similar rules (e.g. SUB-R2(10)). For consistency, reference should also be provided to Clause 3.10. Rule SUB-R4 as drafted does not include a specific rule where there is non-compliance with SUB-R4(1) (a), (d) and (e). This would result in an activity that meets all provisions of SUB-R4(1), except clause (a), (d) or (e) to be a default discretionary activity in accordance with Section 87B of the RMA. To provide clarity on the activity status, changes are sought to apply a specific rule where clause (a), (d) or (e) is not met. This should be provided through SUB-R4(5). It should be made explicit that a site cannot be reduced in size below 4ha via a boundary adjustment under controlled activity Rule SUB-R1(1) to allow further subdivision as a controlled activity under Rule SUB-R4(1). Rule SUB-R4 should be amended by making it clear that (c) means that the allotment is less than 4ha as at the date of notification of the plan.	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
\$251.004	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support in part	Amend Rule SUB-R5 as follows: "1. Activity status: Controlled Where: e. No vacant allotments are ereated allotment vacant of a residential unit is created following the subdivision4. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R5(1)(e). Matters of discretion: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P3, SUB-P4, SUB-P5, and SUB-P6. 2. The ability to achieve on-site servicing in compliance with Council's engineering standards. 3. Integration with the character and amenity of the existing township. 4. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant Subdivision or Zone standard that is not met, and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 5. Management of construction effects, including traffic movements, hours of operation, noise, earthworks, and erosion and sediment control. 6. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities, or significant hazardous facilities. 7. Any effects to primary production and productive capacity, including any loss of highly productive land. 8. Infrastructure capacity to	Rule SUB-R5 is for subdivision of a surplus residential unit. The term "surplus" is not defined but condition (e) of the rule requires that no vacant allotments are created following the subdivision. The clarity of this rule could be improved by amending the wording to make it more explicit what is meant by vacant allotment. It has also been identified that there may be circumstances in which the creation of a vacant allotment may be consistent with the policy direction e.g. after subdivision the remaining property is used as a run-off block. In order to provide for this form of subdivision, a restricted discretionary activity pathway is sought which would still enable a case-by-case assessment but provides for a less onerous consenting process. Consequential amendments would also be needed to the non-complying activity rule.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					service the site, or where Council services are not available, the ability to provide for on-site servicing. 9. The matters referred to in sections 108 and 220 of the Act.45. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R5(1)(a), (b), (c), or (d), or (e)"		
FS42.001	Colin and Helen Southey			Support in part	Allow in part	Notes SUB-R5 provides for subdividing a dwelling from a farm if there are no vacant allotments created, but 'vacant allotment' is not defined. Considers that the Plan should provide for a dwelling to be subdivided from a farm regardless of whether or not the balance lot has a dwelling or not because farm blocks are often created for agricultural use with no intention for residential use, such as where the land is to be used in conjunction with another property such as a runoff block and is not large enough to be a viable economic unit by itself. Notes that farm blocks without dwellings make farmland more affordable. Considers that it is useful where a larger farm comprises multiple titles as they provide options and flexibility for land ownership. Notes that while farm may contain multiple dwellings, these are not necessarily located in a way which suits compliance with SUB-R5. Considers that requiring balance lots to contain dwellings will force existing titles to be combined to achieve compliance, which will remove the benefits that the existing titles provide.	Accept in part
FS61.0010	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)			Support in part	Allow in part	NZTA support this submission intent and requires a further amendment to require the scenario covered by this rule change to also include vehicle access as a specifically listed matter for discretion	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS80.009	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Agree that the rule needs further clarification. The proposed restricted discretionary pathway provides a pathway for consideration without having to be assessed as a non-complying activity, however, we consider a controlled activity status to be preferable.	Accept in part
S255.003	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-P6 so properties less than 40 hectares should retain their ability under the operative district plan to subdivide, and the number of dwellings provided for in the operative district plan, as the analysis provided by the councils' does not support this restriction on smaller rural properties.	These restrictions are imposed on landowners despite the councils' own advice showing that primary production on properties less than 40 hectares at a minimum should be considered uneconomic. While the councils place much emphasis on preventing fragmentation of primary production land, no focus is placed on the land already fragmented and why this should be subject to the same rural zone standards as viable primary production areas when advice to the councils show that this land is no longer economically viable for primary production.	Reject
FS54.004	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Seeks that smaller lot subdivisions are enabled in the General Rural Zone and considers 40ha is too large, as 4ha block can be productive for some uses, e.g. orchards and vineyards. Considers the analysis from the council does not support the restrictions on subdivision on smaller lots.	Reject
FS9.004	Matthew & Lana Timperley			Support	Allow	The submitter is a landowner in Carterton Rural zone with a property of 4.3 hectares which under the proposed plan is unable to be subdivided. Consider it is not of sufficient size or suitable terrain to be used for primary production. Notes other properties with 1km of their land that are subdivided into varying parcels with multiple dwellings	Reject
FS78.017	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S255.006	Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Oppose	Amend SUB-R4 to apply to lots no greater than 10ha.	It is counter-intuitive to have a plan which opposes small lots in rural areas, and then to facilitate the smallest lots in rural areas becoming even smaller. This seems to be an arbitrary limitation imposed with no sufficient evidence of why a 3.9ha property	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						should be treated differently to a 4.1ha property; what inherent characteristics related to land use on properties of this scale justify their different treatment; or the many factors that can be in play as to why a slightly larger land area may not be suitable for primary production and a good candidate for subdivision. As a theme of much of this submission, councils should be supporting opportunities for rural community development and establishment of good quality rural housing options, and this is an unnecessary and unreasonable limitation. Given that advice to councils from AgFirst considers properties less than 40ha to be uneconomic for primary production, there is no rationale for why councils are protecting lots sized 4-40ha from further subdivision but are prepared to allow further subdivision for lots less than 4ha.	
S257.002	Audrey Sebire	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-Table 1 to change the minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone to 3ha.	40ha blocks will only be affordable to existing, large-scale farmers and large corporations. Consequently, existing small blocks will become scarce and less affordable. The rules need to better distinguish between rural residential use and small-block farms, considering different productive uses are possible on smaller blocks such as gardens, horses, sheep, cattle, orchards, native nurseries. More research is needed to understand productivity of small blocks. Large lot size does not necessarily correlate with productivity. There are alternative ways to reduce land fragmentation other than a large minimum lot size. Notes smaller farms can contribute to food resilience and provide economic benefits, encourages diversity of productive land use, enable smaller-scale farmers equitable access to land, burden of rural land rates.	Reject
FS54.005	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Agrees minimum lot size should be 3ha. Considers 40ha is too large and 3-4ha block can be productive for uses like market gardens and lavender farms.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS78.033	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S257.003	Audrey Sebire	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R2 to make all subdivision in the General Rural Zone a Restricted Discretionary activity with matters of discretion relating to clauses 3.8 and 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Seeks to make rural subdivision a restricted discretionary activity in which discretion can be exercised and should be limited to satisfying clause 3.8 of NPS-HPL) and all subdivision applicants (under and over the minimum lot size) are required to demonstrate that the proposed lots and the remaining lot will retain the overall productive capacity of the subject land over the long term (satisfy clause 3.8/3.10 of the NPS-HPL). Considers other measures can avoid or discourage cumulative fragmentation and loss of productivity, such as limiting the number of lots in a single subdivision, only allowing frontage of new lots on existing roads, requiring all houses on new lots relocatable, restricting new hard infrastructure e.g. roads, footpaths, streets, and encouraging unsealed driveways.	Accept in part
FS81.002	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support in part	Allow in part	SUB-R2(10) is currently a discretionary activity where compliance is not achieved with SUB-S1, the subdivision is directly related to land based primary production; and evidence is provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status sought by the submitter but do not agree that the matters of discretion be restricted to clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Considers that matters including traffic generation, natural hazard management and reverse sensitivities should be included in the restricted matters of discretion.	Accept in part
FS78.024	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject
S262.001	Joseph Frank Percy			Oppose	Amend rural subdivision rules to protect the viability of existing farms and provide flexibility in rules and regulations that may	We oppose being forced to sell 40 hectares with a house from a viable farming operation to finance our retirement requirements.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					come into force in the future (inferred).		
S288.035	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Amend to ensure that reverse sensitivity is given an appropriate weight as a single item in the list of matters in SUB-P5	The submitter strongly supports the maintenance of rural character and amenity as rural activities are compatible with the operation of RNZ's Facilities. The direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects is supported. However, as outlined in the submitter's preliminary feedback, the submitter considers that reverse sensitivity is not given appropriate weight as a single item in the list of matters in SUB-P5. The submitter's preference is that the direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects be elevated to a separate policy, and/or included in SUB-P6 to provide stronger policy direction.	Accept in part
S288.036	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Insert direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	The submitter supports SUB-P6, particularly the direction to avoid subdivision that is contrary to the purpose of the GRUZ. However, this policy could also provide a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, which is relevant to protecting both primary production activities and network infrastructure.	Accept in part
S288.055	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support in part	Insert a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	The submitter supports this policy, particularly the direction to avoid subdivision that is contrary to the purpose of the General Rural Zone. However, the submitter considers this policy could also provide a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, which is relevant to protecting both primary production activities and network infrastructure.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S48.002	Aburn Popova Trust	General District-Wide Matters	General District- Wide Matters	Support	Retain the Martinborough Soils Overlay as it applies to the properties in Vintners Lane.	The Vintners Lane properties, which are proven to be suitable for viticulture, are appropriately included within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. The soils covered by the overlay are well suited to viticulture and should be protected - in particular from urban activities including residential activities other than those permitted under GRUZ-R8(1).	Accept
FS70.001	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Support	Allow	The protection of productive soils is in line with the National Policy Statement -Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). Retain the Martinborough Soils Overlay notified.	Accept
S63.002	Shaun Draper	General District-Wide Matters	General District- Wide Matters	Oppose	Amend mapping of highly productive land.	Oppose the mapping of highly productive land and the proposed regulation associated with this. Large portions of this proposal are steep inaccessible bush clad unproductive land. Associated with this is the proposal to limit areas of rural subdivision to be no less than 40 hectares. This proposal would only lead to unforeseen undesirable results for landowners and council alike.	Reject
S125.001	Lynly Selby- Neal and Angus Laird	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough Soils Overlay.	The site does not have unique soil and climate characteristics suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives. A soil scientist carried out a site visit and produced a report that recommends the area not be specifically protected for viticulture (full report attached to submission). This is supported by the AGFIRST report 'Assessment of rural production and rural subdivision in the Wairarapa" dated July 2023 which states olives and orchards preferring free-draining soil, and the "Interim Soil Map of the Wairarapa Valley" 1974 which identifies the site as "imperfectly drained soils".	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S125.003	Lynly Selby- Neal and Angus Laird	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose in part	Amend planning maps to reduce the extent of area subject to Martinborough Soils Overlay to match the extent of current viticulture use and land suitable for viticulture in response to additional evidence provided.	The S32 report lists the two workshops held with the Wairarapa Wine Growers Association regarding the Martinborough Solls Overlay. The report notes that the extent of area should be based on current land use (where existing viticulture is) and land that is suitable for viticulture and the spatial extent of the overlay may require further input from a suitably qualified individual. Considers that the investigation the submitter has carried out informs their submission assists to better define what land that is suitable for viticulture, and provides further input from a suitably qualified soil scientist to better define the spatial extent of the overlay.	Accept in part
S125.004	Lynly Selby- Neal and Angus Laird	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose in part	None requested (Amend planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough Soils Overlay (inferred)).	The rule GRUZ-R8 further restricts residential activities within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers the property at 101a Shooting Butts Road is not suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives, but they are subsequently subject to a further removal of property rights by the application of these rules.	Accept in part
S125.005	Lynly Selby- Neal and Angus Laird	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose in part	None requested (Amend planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough Soils Overlay (inferred)).	The rule GRUZ-R4 further restricts seasonal worker accommodation within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers the property at 101a Shooting Butts Road is not suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives, but they are subsequently subject to a further removal of property rights by the application of these rules.	Accept in part
S126.001	James Derek Gordon Milne	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Support in part	Amend the mapping of the Martinborough Soils Overlay, to remove the overlay from land between Hinakura Road and Shooting Butts Road and its extension to the South-East	Submitter has listed former experience in the soil science realm, having written a report on land at 101a Shooting Butts Road. It is concluded that land between Hinakura Road and Shooting Butts Road and its extension to the South-East does not have sufficient potential for viticulture to warrant protection.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					(centered on Cromarty Road) and land at 10 Nelsons Road.		
S126.002	James Derek Gordon Milne	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose	Amend the Martinborough Soils Overlay, to remove extent over "the old sawmill site in Nelsons Road".	The soils on this site have been highly disturbed and built on over the yeas, and timber has been treated with copper / chrome / arsenate type preservatives at the site, and therefore should not be designated as suitable for viticulture.	Accept
S148.002	Antilles Ltd	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to remove 34 Vintners Lane from the Martinborough Soils Overlay.	Submits that a recent soil analysis confirms the absence of any Class 3 soils at 24 Vintners Lane, and also found the soil type is not suitable for viticulture.	Reject
FS15.001	Porters Pinot Wines			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the General Rural Zoning and the Martinborough Soils Overlay are appropriate and necessary to protect the soils for rural activities, including viticulture. Considers 34 Vinters Lane is not suitable for residential development, including any form of intensive residential development. Considers changing the zoning of 34 Vinters Lane, which is suited to viticulture, from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone, or to Future Urban Zone, would create a precedent with the potential to adversely affect the long-term viability of Martinborough's viticulture industry.	Accept in part
FS62.002	Aburn Popova Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the removal of Martinborough Soils Overlay from 34 Vintners Lane and the surrounding Vintners Lane properties. The properties on Vinters Lane are appropriately included in the Martinborough Soils Overlay.	Accept in part
FS70.003	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Oppose	Disallow	The protection of productive soils is in line with the National Policy Statement -Highly Productive Land. Retain the Martinborough Soils Overlay notified.	Accept in part
FS102.004	Gavin Grey			Support	Allow in part	Seeks that the land at 889 Chester Road be zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone, as the site is	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						10.4ha with two dwellings, and is not highly productive land.	
S180.001	Michelle Hight	General District-Wide Matters	General District- Wide Matters	Oppose	Amend Highly Productive Land mapping in order to not restrict further development and growth.	This submission relates to the mapping of Highly Productive Land. The submitter argues that the blanket allocation of Highly Productive Land and not being able to develop rural lifestyle blocks that are deemed HPL without consultation from the land owners is unsustainable for future development.	Reject
S187.002	New Zealand Frost Fans	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Support	Retain Martinborough Soils overlay as notified.	The Martinborough Soils Overlay generally aligns with 'land with highly productive characteristics' including climate, soils and other factors which consistent with the criteria set out in 3.4(3) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Accept in part
S203.026	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Specific Controls	Specific Controls	Amend	Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from the land identified in Precinct 3.	The online mapping accompanying the PDP suggests that the Precinct 3 site is within the Highly Productive Land overlay. As a site zoned General Residential Zone, the submitter believes that the overlay does not need to be applied.	Reject
S205.003	Garry Daniell	General District-Wide Matters	General District- Wide Matters	Oppose	Amend the district plan provisions to be consistent with the NPS-HPL.	Site contains both LUC Class 6 and 3 soil, which is considered Highly Productive Land currently under the NPS-HPL. The NPS-HPL may be amended to exclude LUC Class 3 land. Should this change be implemented during the processing of the PDP, the submitter requests any consequential changes resulting from such an amendment to the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
S239.047	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	General District-Wide Matters	General District- Wide Matters	Support	Amend the NPS-HPL overlay to reflect Highly Productive Land as mapped in report of BakerAg attcached.	Overlay at Riversdale Beach doesn't reflect best available data on what is HPL under the NPS-HPL definition.	Reject
FS69.001	Rudy van Baarle -			Oppose	Disallow	Oppose the submission point. The site is currently zoned both Rural and Residential	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Molesworth Homes					under the Operative District Plan. The site is well positioned for residential development with a large Open Space Zone (Sparks Park) being located directly adjacent to the site. The site can be appropriately serviced in respect of the three waters (wastewater, water and stormwater). Any traffic effects can be managed through provisions.	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S22.001	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition - Agricultural Aviation	The definition covers the appropriate scope of agricultural aviation activities.	Accept
FS13.007	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Appropriate definition	Accept
FS48.002	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept
S22.002	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition - Conservation Activities	The definition covers the appropriate scope of conservation activities.	Accept
FS48.003	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept
S22.003	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition - Primary Production	Inclusion of the NPS definition is appropriate	Accept
FS48.004	Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association			Support	Allow		Accept
S22.004	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition - Rural Airstrip	The definition clearly defines the function that supports primary production	Accept
FS13.008	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Appropriate definition	Accept
FS48.005	Aviation Industry Association for			Support	Allow		Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	NZ Helicopter Association						
S47.032	Rangitāne o Wairarapa	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Amend definition of "Primary Production": a) any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying, or forestry activities; and	The definition of Primary Production includes quarrying then later excludes it. We recommend that quarrying is removed from the primary production definition for clarity.	Reject
FS89.005	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks to remove 'quarrying' from the definition of Primary Production. Primary Production is defined in the National Planning Standards definition standard and therefore cannot be amended through the plan development process.	Accept
FS95.103	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Support	Allow	Support in full the submission of Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated	Reject
FS105.035	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Support the submission, as consider iwi work from a holistic base to protect Te Taiao, which aligns with the further submitter's views.	Reject
\$72.001	Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association	Definitions	Definitions	Neutral	Insert a new definition for "Commercial Helicopter Aviation" (specific wording not provided).	Helicopter Aviation is often combined into one category, but this is better split into recreational and commercial. The submitter supports most of the provisions in this plan for recreational aviation. However, Commercial Helicopter Aviation has many positive benefits which if the single category is applied are restricted, substantially reducing their effectiveness and significantly reducing the ability to positively benefit the social, economic and culture of the public in the district. Commercial helicopter operations are used in a wide range of public good activities such as (but not limited to), aerial spotting, asset management, construction and maintenance (including powerlines and telecommunications), disaster relief work, flight training, frost protection, gravelling tracks, infrastructure repairs and development, science and research, search and rescue, surveillance,	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						survey operations, tourism, transportation of people, TV and film.	
FS13.009	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Commercial helicopter aviation supports frost protection for horticulture.	Reject
FS29.001	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	Commercial helicopter activities are critical for the security, establishment and maintenance of critical infrastructure and should be defined.	Reject
S81.001	Genesis Energy Ltd	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Amend the Farm Quarry: "Means the extraction of minerals taken for use ancillary to farming and horticulture or for renewable electricity generation activities where the minerals are, and only used within the property of extraction. It includes the extraction of material for farm and forestry tracks, accessways, and hardstand areas on the property of origin. It does not include the exportation or removal of extracted material (including any aggregate) from the property or origin or retail or other sales of such material."	Considers that this definition should be extended to include the extraction of minerals taken for other on-farm uses, such as use ancillary to farming, horticulture and development of renewable generation activities where the mineral extracted is only used within the property of extraction.	Reject
FS67.129	Meridian Energy Limited			Support	Allow	Agrees the text 'as it applies to network utilities' is inappropriate and does not reflect the use of the expression in the PDP (which includes upgrading of REG activities).	Reject
FS89.003	Fulton Hogan Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is seeking to expand the definition of 'Farm Quarry' to include the use of minerals for renewable electricity generation activities where the minerals are, only used within the property of extraction. This has the potential to significantly expand the scale of quarrying activity permitted by the corresponding rules (e.g. GRUZ-R12(1)(a)). Supportive of the multi-tiered approach to the classification of quarrying activities proposed through GRUZ-R12 (subject to the relief sought through its primary	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						submission) and is of the view that the relief sought by Genesis Energy Ltd would undermine this.	
S122.001	Fulton Hogan Limited	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition of Primary Production as notified.	Supports the recognition of quarrying activities as Primary Production activities, considers the definition recognises quarrying can only occur where aggregate resource is located and that it is most often located in rural areas.	Accept
S122.002	Fulton Hogan Limited	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Retain the definition of Quarrying Activity as notified.	Supports the definition of quarrying activity as it encompasses the range of activities associated with quarrying. Noting the definition is from the National Planning Standards, the definition presents challenges when applied to rules for quarrying activities, e.g. cleanfilling in the context of quarry rehabilitation (cleanfilling as defined by National Planning Standards relates to virgin material, limits the ability of quarry operators to rehabilitate quarries due to cost and lack of availability of this material), and waste minimisation (definition does not provide for resource recovery unless it is recycling aggregate - other products e.g. concrete from demolition are seldom processed prior to coming to a cleanfill site, which limits the benefits that recovering material at quarries could provide with regard to waste minimisation and waste levies). See further submission points for specific relief.	Accept
\$152.001	AdamsonSha w Ltd	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose in part	Delete or amend the definition of 'Highly Productive Land'.	This definition is internally inconsistent. What is "shown in planning maps" may be different to what is defined in the NPS-HPL. In a situation where land is within the mapped HPL overlay but doesn't meet the NPS-HPL definition, it would be ambiguous whether that land meets the definition.	Accept in part
FS102.001	Gavin Grey			Support	Allow in part	Seeks that the land at 889 Chester Road be zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone, as the site is 10.4ha with two dwellings and is not highly productive land.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS109.001	East Leigh Limited			Support	Allow	This submitters opposition to the definition of Highly Productive Land is consistent with ELL's primary submission	Accept in part
FS109.006	East Leigh Limited			Support	Allow	This submitters opposition to the definition of Highly Productive Land is consistent with ELL's primary submission	Accept in part
S182.007	Aggregate and Quarry Association	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition of "Primary Production" as notified.	Supports the definition of "primary production" as it aligns with the National Planning Standards and incorporates quarrying as a primary industry.	Accept
FS95.006	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Definitions and policies are appropriate for the impact that the quarrying industry has on the whenua and whānau in turn. The removal of such stones affects Ātua Hineahuone, and through this whakapapa, affects Soil and Kai Sovereignty. The impacts of such kaupapa should be discussed with mana whenua (whānau, hapū and iwi) to understand the intergenerational impacts that these actions will have.	Reject
S182.009	Aggregate and Quarry Association	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose in part	No specific relief sought.	The definition of 'highly productive land' comes from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land rather than the National Planning Standards. The NPS-HPL focuses on land-based agriculture and reliance on use of the soil resource. Land-based quarrying is also highly productive, considering the value and scarcity of aggregates relative to the value of agricultural commodities.	Reject
FS87.006	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The NPS-HPL recognises highly productive land for land-based primary production. Quarrying does not fall under this definition and has other activity-specific effects that must be managed accordingly.	Accept in part
FS95.008	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Definitions and policies are appropriate for the impact that the quarrying industry has on the whenua and whānau in turn. The removal of such stones affects Ātua Hineahuone, and through this whakapapa, affects Soil and Kai Sovereignty.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						The impacts of such kaupapa should be discussed with mana whenua (whānau, hapū and iwi) to understand the intergenerational impacts that these actions will have.	
S187.003	New Zealand Frost Fans	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition for Highly Productive Land as notified.	The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Accept in part
FS109.002	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	For the reasons set out in ELL's primary submission, considers this definition of HPL is inappropriate.	Accept in part
S187.004	New Zealand Frost Fans	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition for Land based primary production as notified.	The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly productive Land.	Accept
S187.006	New Zealand Frost Fans	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition for productive capacity as notified.	The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Accept
S187.007	New Zealand Frost Fans	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Insert new definition 'Frost Fan' as follows: Frost Fan - means a land-based device designed or adapted to mitigate frost damage by fanning warmer air over potentially frost affected surfaces and includes; a. Fan blades; b. Motive source; c. Support structure/tower d. Plinth e. Associated probes and communications and networking devices	More consistency is being sought nationally regarding definitions in regulatory documents. A number of Council's have adopted the term 'frost fan' with the same or similar definitions and is also the term used in the horticultural industry.	Accept
FS13.012	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	A definition is needed to support rules for frost fans in the plan. 'Frost fan' is the more commonly used term in the horticulture industry, as opposed to 'frost protection device'.	Accept
S187.008	New Zealand Frost Fans	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Insert new definition for 'Land with highly productive characteristics' as follows: Land with highly productive characteristics means land that has or has the	A definition of 'land with highly productive characteristics' to support the introduction of the Martinborough Soils Overlay that is consistent with the matters set out in cl3.4(3) of the National	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					potential to be highly productive for land based primary production with its combination of the following characteristics: a. Soil type, and b. Physical characteristics of the land and soil, and c. Climate	Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land is appropriate.	
FS67.134	Meridian Energy Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The definition should reflect the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
FS109.003	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the proposed definition does not make sense and is not required. The 'potential to be highly productive' is ambiguous and could apply to any land with the sufficient application of capital.	Accept in part
S208.001	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition for agricultural aviation	The definition covers the appropriate scope of agricultural aviation activities.	Accept
FS29.008	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	The definition is appropriate and provides clarity.	Accept
S208.002	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition of primary production	Ballance supports the use of the NPS definition of primary production.	Accept
S208.003	Ballance Agri- Nutrients	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the definition for rural airstrip.	The definition clearly defines rural airstrips and their use in support of primary production	Accept
FS29.009	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association			Support	Allow	The definition is appropriate and provides clarity.	Accept
S214.002	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Retain definitions for 'conservation activities', 'farm quarry', 'rural airstrip', 'hazard sensitive activities', 'seasonal worker accommodation', and 'significant hazardous facility'.	The submitter support, where possible and applicable, the use of RMA, National Planning Standards and National Policy Statement definitions. The submitter supports the proposed definitions for the following terms: - Conservation activities;	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						- Farm Quarry; - Rural airstrip; - Hazard sensitive activities; - Productive capacity; - Seasonal worker accommodation; and - Significant hazardous facility.	
FS95.107	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject
S214.003	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Insert new definition for 'ancillary rural earthworks' as follows:ANCILLARY RURAL EARTHWORKS means: - any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with cultivation, land preparation (including the establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of crops and pasture; - the harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and forests (forestry); and planting trees, removing trees and horticultural root ripping; - the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities. This includes (but is not limited to): farm/forestry tracks, roads,	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a definition for 'Ancillary rural earthworks' in the Combined District Plan. Activities ancillary to primary production, which support primary production, should not have to apply for resource consent. The definition should encompass the activities listed below along with any related definitions that are required: - The tilling or cultivation of soil for the establishment and maintenance of crops and pasture; - Harvesting of crops; - The planting and removal of trees (e.g. Pest Species, willows), and riparian planting; - The digging of offal pits; - Burying dead stock and plant waste; - Digging post holes and drilling bores; - Installing and maintaining services such as water pipes and troughs; and - Farm quarries where excavated material is not removed from the farm site.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					vehicle manoeuvring areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, the installation and maintenance of services such as water pipes and troughs, offstream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads; and - Farm quarries where quarry winnings are only used within the farm quarry; and		
FS13.013	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	A new definition for 'ancillary rural earthworks' is strongly supported. The definition should include burying infected material for biosecurity purposes.	Reject
FS22.001	NZ Pork			Support in part	Allow in part	Support including the definition of ancillary rural earthworks in the plan. Activities that support day-today primary production activities should not require a resource consent. Support the definition proposed but submit that the definition should also include the burial of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Reject
FS95.108	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	
\$214.004	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Amend 'agricultural aviation' definition as follows: Means intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for: • primary production, biosecurity, or conservation activities including stock management, lifting of fencing materials, pest control, the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, vertebrate toxic agents, frost management and associated refuelling —and other activities ancillary to primary production; and • Biosecurity activities; and • Conservation activities.	The submitter supports in part the proposed definition for 'Agricultural aviation'. Aviation is used in primary production for a variety of reasons including stock management, crop monitoring, aerial spraying etc. Aviation is also used for ancillary activities to primary production such as transporting fencing equipment to remote places on the farm etc. The submitter would like to see provision for ancillary activities to primary production in the definition for 'Agricultural aviation'.	Reject
FS95.109	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhit ia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part
S221.001	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Insert the following definition:Ancillary rural earthworks: Means the disturbance of soil, earth or substrate land surfaces ancillary to primary production that includes: - Land	The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards definition of 'earthworks' but seek that the plan includes a definition and activity for 'ancillary rural earthworks' to provide for day-to-day earthworks for primary production. This will support GRUZ-R5, NU-R20, SASM-P3, and NFL-S1.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					preparation and cultivation (including establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations and harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming)- Burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993	The 'ancillary rural earthworks' definition should also include the burial of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	
S221.008	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Highly productive land' as notified.	The submitter strongly supports the inclusion of a definition of 'highly productive land' and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction. Note that "Highly Productive Land" does not need the first letter of each word capitalised.	Accept in part
FS109.005	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	For the reasons set out in ELL's primary submission, considers the definition of highly productive land is inappropriate	Accept in part
S221.009	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Intensive primary production' as notified.	The submitter supports horticulture not being considered as intensive primary production, since it is an efficient land use.	Accept
S221.010	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Intensive indoor primary production' as notified.	The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards definition and that greenhouses are not considered intensive indoor primary production. Greenhouses are highly efficient systems with minimal environmental impacts.	Accept
S221.011	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Intensive outdoor primary production' as notified.	The submitter supports this definition, and that horticulture is not an intensive outdoor primary production activity. It is a highly efficient production system.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Land based primary production' as notified.	The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition of land based primary production and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction.	Accept
						Note that some greenhouses are land-based and plant directly into the soil, just under cover. These growing systems should be enabled on highly productive land alongside other soil-based production.	
S221.019	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'primary production' as notified.	The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards Definition of Primary Production.	Accept
\$221.020	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition for 'productive capacity' as notified.	The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition for productive capacity and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction.	Accept
FS78.001	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support the inclusion of a definition of 'productive capacity' that is consistent with the NPS-HPL. This definition recognises that for land to be highly productive, it must retain productive capacity (i.e., clause 3.8 of the NPS-HPL).	Accept
S221.021	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose in part	Delete the definition of 'residential visitor accommodation'.	Visitor accommodation should be a short-term stay. Ninety days is not short term. Such a length of stay should be regarded as a residential activity. The National Planning Standards definition of visitor accommodation should apply. Any limitation on the length of stay should be in the relevant rules.	Reject
S221.024	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Amend definition of 'Rural produce retail': Means the use of land and/or buildings on, or within which, rural produce grown or produced by the same operation on site, and products manufactured by them	The submitter states that the word 'operation' would be more appropriate than 'site'. Growers may have multiple sites where they grow (meaning land with different certificates of title). These sites could be in close proximity to each other but produce from multiple land parcels are brought together to be sold in one place.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					from it, are offered for sale. This includes the further processing of products manufactured by the same operation on site.		
S221.025	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Amend definition of 'Seasonal worker accommodation': Means the use of land and buildings for the sole purpose of accommodating the short-term labour requirement of a primary production activity, and-rural industry or post-harvest facility.	The submitter supports the definition of 'seasonal worker accommodation'. Seasonal workers also work at postharvest facilities such as packhouses to prepare produce for market. Work as packhouses follows the same seasonal patterns as other horticultural labour based on when produce is harvested.	Accept
S221.028	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'shelterbelts and small woodlots' as notified.	The submitter supports provisions for shelterbelts, which are important for horticulture.	Accept
S229.002	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Intensive Primary Production' as notified.	Support a definition which encompasses both indoor and outdoor intensive farming activities and support the separate definitions for each.	Accept
S229.003	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert definition for 'Workers Accommodation'.	Opposes lack of definition to provide specifically for workers accommodation as the activity is currently provided for as part of 'Minor Residential Unit'.	Reject
S229.004	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition of 'Primary Production' as notified.	Supports the National Planning Standards definition of Primary Production.	Accept
S229.005	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Amend definition 'Seasonal Work Accommodation' as follows: Seasonal wWorker Accommodation: Means the use of land and buildings for the sole purpose of accommodating the short-term labour requirement of a primary production activity and rural industry.	Support provisions for worker accommodation but oppose seasonal requirements. Many farming activities accommodate workers year round.	Reject
S233.001	Scott Anstis	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Delete definition of 'highly productive land' or amend it to	Considers definition is internally inconsistent as the highly productive land shown on the planning maps may be different to what is defined in the	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					align with the definition in the NPS-HPL.	NPS-HPL. Notes that it would create ambiguity where land is within the mapped extent of highly productive land but does not meet the NPS-HPL definition.	
S237.001	Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Insert new definition for "Rural contractor depot" as follows: "The land and buildings used for the purpose of storing or maintaining machinery, equipment and associated goods and supplies associated with a rural contracting business that directly supports, services or is dependent on primary production".	Consistent with other District Plans, RCNZ is seeking a new rule in the General Rural Zone permitting small-scale rural contractor depots (so is seeking a consequential amendment to Rule GRUZ-R16 so it does not apply to rural contractor depots). To assist with implementation of the proposed new rule, RCNZ seek a definition for "rural contractor depot".	Reject
\$239.004	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	Delete definition 'Highly productive land'.	This definition is internally inconsistent. What is "shown in planning maps" may be different to what is defined in the NPS-HPL. In a situation where land is within the mapped HPL overlay but doesn't meet the NPH-HPL definition, it would be ambiguous whether that land meets the definition. The term "planning maps" are not defined. It is not clear whether this means the HPL overlay in this plan or other planning maps in other (non-statutory) documents. Definition is not necessary in light of NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
FS80.001	AdamsonSha w Ltd			Support	Allow	The definition is not necessary in light of the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part
S258.198	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	Definitions	Definitions	Amend	Insert a new definition of 'rural character' that includes indigenous biodiversity within the rural environment.	There is no specific RMA requirement to maintain rural character. As drafted this objective could be read to conflict with protection of S6 matters. Forest & Bird considers this objective needs to be clarified in terms of managing land use activities to maintain rural character. In addition, the definition of rural character needs to include indigenous biodiversity with the rural environment (links to submission point on RE-O4)	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
FS105.169	lan Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject