

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S70.002	Dan Kellow	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain Objective SUB-O1 as proposed.	This objective is supported as (b) recognises that a variety of housing types are provided for.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS78.009	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Accept in part	SUB
S70.003	Dan Kellow	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain Policy SUB-P1 as proposed.	Clause (a) is supported as it recognises 'existing' character of a zone.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S79.055	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain Objective SUB-O2 as notified.	Supports the proposed objective to require sites to connect to the public reticulated stormwater system where there is capacity or demonstrate there is an alternative means of on-site servicing.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S79.056	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support in part	Amend Objective SUB-O3 as follows: Subdivision and development are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned development of land, roads, and infrastructure, and avoid fragmentation or development that undermines the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure, rail and roads.	Supports the proposed objective to integrate subdivision and development with infrastructure to ensure it doesn't undermine the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure. Seeks amendment to specify rail as well as roads within this objective.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S79.058	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R1 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R1 as proposed.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S79.059	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R2 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R2 as proposed.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S79.060	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R3 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R3 as proposed.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S90.023	Toka Tū Ake EQC	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support in part	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: ...f. responds to avoid or minimise where appropriate the risks of natural hazards and is are resilient to climate change.	The phrase "respond to risks" is not specific and can be open to interpretation.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
FS90.128	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers that the relief sought is consistent with Policy 51 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Accept	SUB
S91.025	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain SUB-O1 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S91.026	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain SUB-O2 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S91.027	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support	Retain SUB-O3 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S91.028	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain SUB-P1 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S91.029	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain SUB-P2 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S91.032	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support	Retain SUB-R2 as notified.	Support in respect of standard applying to the residential zone and future urban zone (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone).	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S91.033	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-S1	SUB-S1	Support	Retain SUB-S1 as notified.	Support in respect of standard applying to the residential zone and future urban zone (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone)	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S91.054	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-S3	SUB-S3	Oppose	Amend SUB-S3 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires connection to Councils reticulated water supply systems at the allotment boundary in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S91.055	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-S4	SUB-S4	Oppose	Amend SUB-S4 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires connection to Councils reticulated wastewater systems at the allotment boundary in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.		
S91.056	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-S5	SUB-S5	Oppose	Amend SUB-S5 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires treatment of stormwater in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S91.057	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	SUB-S9	SUB-S9	Oppose	Amend SUB-S9 to refer to the financial contributions chapter.	The plan notes: "Note: This Draft District Plan does not contain financial contribution provisions. The Councils have been reviewing different approaches for financial contributions. Specific consultation on financial contributions is proposed in 2023 and will be considered during the next phase in preparing the Proposed District Plan." A Financial Contributions chapter has been provided in the Proposed District Plan. This standard needs to be re-drafted to include an appropriate standard for development contributions for subdivision (or the relief sought in the financial contributions chapter).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.137	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support in part	Insert: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: - Provide safe and convenient	It is appropriate to plan for subdivision design and development that responds to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					access for pedestrians and cyclists, including links to local amenities and public transport. - Avoid subdivision and development on highly productive land.	This objective could go further to address accessible streets and blocks to support more walking and cycling, and access/connection to public transport, consistent with RPS Change 1. This objective could also be strengthened to give effect to the NPS-HPL. As the submitter have pointed out elsewhere in their submission, there is an established pattern of land use and development occurring on LUC Class 1, 2, and 3 land in the Wairarapa which may prevent this land being mapped and notified as highly productive land. Given the strong national direction and regional and district incentives to protect highly productive land, the submitter considers that the proposed amendment to be both necessary and relevant in this objective.		
FS61.006	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)			Support in part	Allow in part	Support the submission to the extent it supports integrated planning outcomes between land uses (that eventuate from the subdivision of land) and the necessity for access and transport options. NZTA has no comment on those parts of the submission related to the NPS-HPL.	Reject	SUB
FS70.007	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Support	Allow	The Plan is required to give effect to the NPS-HPL. Amend Objective SUB-O1 as suggested.	Reject	SUB
S94.138	Greater Wellington	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support in part	Amend as follows: Subdivision and development are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned	RPS direction on land use and transport integration (in both the operative RPS and Change 1) includes integration with active and	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	Regional Council				development of land, public and active transport networks and services , roads, and infrastructure, and avoid fragmentation or development that undermines the productive capacity of land and the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure, public transport, and roads.	public transport and is not limited to roads. This objective is an opportunity to give effect to the NPS-HPL and provide much stronger direction around the preferred location of future development - close to existing public transport and town centres/local amenities - consistent with the outcomes sought by Policy 57 in the operative RPS and in Change 1.		
FS13.055	Horticulture New Zealand			Support in part	Allow in part	Protection of highly productive land is supported.	Accept in part	SUB
FS61.007	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)			Support in part	Allow in part	Support the submission to the extent it supports integrated planning outcomes between land uses (that eventuate from the subdivision of land) and the necessity for access and transport options. NZTA has no comment on those parts of the submission related to the NPS-HPL.	Accept in part	SUB
S94.139	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support in part	Amend as follows: Allow subdivision and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, provides for the needs of the community, and supports the policies of the District Plan for the applicable zones, where the design: a) reflects patterns of development that are consistent with, compatible, and reinforce the role, function, and existing or planned characteristics character and qualities of the zone as set out by	The NPS-UD Objective 4 recognises that amenity values develop and change over time in response to diverse and changing needs. The submitter considers that clause (a) of this policy as drafted places too much emphasis on the reinforcement of existing character and qualities, which the submitter considers to be unclear terms. As part of giving effect to the NPS-UD, the Combined District Plan must acknowledge that urban areas will change over time.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					the Objectives and Policies of the applicable zone;			
FS70.008	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Support	Allow	The Wairarapa is a fast-growing region. It is important the provisions in the District Plan support changes to urban form that will arise from urban growth and development. Amend Policy SUB-P1 as sought in submission.	Reject	SUB
S94.140	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain clauses a., b., c., and f. as notified	This policy provides direction on connection to or provision of three waters infrastructure. The submitter support clause f. in particular as it provides for multi-modal transport as part of new subdivision.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
FS105.080	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience.	Accept	SUB
S94.141	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-P3	SUB-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	The policy provides for the protection of waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.146	Greater Wellington Regional Council	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert new policy as follows: SUB-P9 Managing the effects of subdivision on freshwater Subdivision of land is managed in an integrated and sustainable way to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.	A new policy is needed to help manage adverse effects of subdivision and development on freshwater and give effect to the NPS-FM 2020.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S94.147	Greater Wellington	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support in part	Amend to include the following matter of control/discretion under	Matter of control/discretion provide direction for councils to consider	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	Regional Council				all controlled activity and restricted discretionary activities in SUB-R1 to read as follows: Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, historic heritage, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and biodiversity , sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites	provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and should be retained. The submitter considers that the matters included in this rule should be broader for consistency with RPS Change 1 (e.g. Policy FW.3 and 47).		
FS105.081	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience and conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Accept	SUB
S94.148	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain as notified; this relates to SUB-R1(1) and (2).	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R1(1) and SUB-R1(2) are considered appropriate as they include the matters set out in policies NH-P4 and SUB-P4, where proposal is located within a hazard area.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S94.150	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support in part	Amend Matters of control under SUB-R2(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4 . Amend Matters of control under SUB-R2(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, SUB-P6 and SUB-P8. Amend Matters of Control under SUB-R2(3) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 and SUB-P7.	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R2(1), SUB-R2(2) and SUB-R2(3) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and refer back to SUB-P4. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.151	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support	Retain SUB-R2(4), (5), and (6) as notified.	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R2(4), SUB-R2(5) and SUB-R2(6) are considered appropriate as they include reference back to the matters in Policy SUB-P4.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.152	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Support in part	Amend to Matters of control under SUB-R3(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4.	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R3(1)) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and refer back to SUB-P4. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.153	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R3(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4. 7. Effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards.	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R3(2) should include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. Reference the Policy SUB-P4 should also be included to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.154	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support in part	Amend SUB-R4(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6.	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R4(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)).		
S94.155	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4(2) as notified.	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they include reference back to the matters in Policy SUB-P4.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.156	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support in part	Amend Matters of control under SUB-R5(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, SUB-P6 and SUB-P8.	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R5(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.157	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R5(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6.	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R5(2) should include reference the Policy SUB-P4 within the list of other directly referenced policies. This would be consistent with the approach to Rules SUB-R4(2) and SUB-R2(6).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.158	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support in part	Amend SUB-R5(3) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P3, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, and SUB-P6.	It is unclear why this rule, which is for non-compliance with the condition related to direct access from State Highways (State Highway	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						53, State Highway 2, any Limited Access Road, Masterton Heavy Traffic Bypass, or the Wairarapa Railway) includes reference to SUB-P4, however other similar rules SUB-R2(7) and SUB-R4(3) do not include reference to Policy SUB-P4. It is considered that this is not a relevant matter for the purpose of this rule.		
S94.163	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R7	SUB-R7	Support in part	Amend as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6.	The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R7(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.164	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R8	SUB-R8	Support	Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R8.	Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.165	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R9	SUB-R9	Support	Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R9.	Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.166	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R10	SUB-R10	Support	Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R10.	Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.167	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R11	SUB-R11	Support	Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R11.	Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.168	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-R13	SUB-R13	Support	Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R13.	Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.169	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-S3	SUB-S3	Support	Retain as notified.	This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of drinking water infrastructure.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.170	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-S4	SUB-S4	Support	Retain as notified.	This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of drinking water infrastructure.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.171	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-S5	SUB-S5	Support	Retain as notified.	This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of stormwater infrastructure.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.172	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-S7	SUB-S7	Support	Retain as notified	The submitter notes that their previous request to add 'public transport' to sub clause 3 has been incorporated.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S94.173	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-S8	SUB-S8	Support in part	Insert a new matter of discretion as follows: 8. The extent to which the water quality of a surface waterbody will be adversely affected	While comprehensive, the matters of discretion do not account for the potential use of esplanade strips/reserves as a means of protecting water quality and thus do not reflect s229 of the RMA.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S122.036	Fulton Hogan Limited	Introduction	Introduction	Oppose	Amend SUB-Introduction to explicitly reference reverse sensitivity effects: ... Subdivision can also affect the	The introduction to the subdivision chapter hints at potential reverse sensitivity effects through the phrase '... any impacts on adjacent sites'.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					natural and physical environment and introduce long-term development patterns that cannot be easily changed and create reverse sensitivity effects...	However, given the significant issue reverse sensitivity effects can be for activities such as quarrying, this issue should be addressed much more directly.		
FS22.0010	NZ Pork			Support	Allow	Agree that the introduction would be improved by including explicit reference to potential reverse sensitivity from subdivision activities. Reverse sensitivity in the rural environment can adversely impact well established pig-farming operations, posing a significant risk to the industry. These issues typically start or are exacerbated by the subdivision of rural land.	Accept	SUB
FS13.053	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Reverse sensitivity effects from inappropriate subdivision create challenges for horticulture, which often locates on the urban-rural fringe.	Accept	SUB
FS106.002	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	SUB
S122.037	Fulton Hogan Limited	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Oppose	Amend SUB-O1 to requiring the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects. ... f. respond to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change; andg. avoids reverse sensitivity effects.	Considers reverse sensitivity effects can be a significant issue for activities such as quarrying. The submitter seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the objective.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
FS22.011	NZ Pork			Support	Allow	Agrees that SUB-O1 would be improved by including explicit reference to potential reverse sensitivity from subdivision activities. Reverse sensitivity in the rural	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						environment can adversely impact well-established pig farming operations, posing a significant risk to the industry. These issues typically start or are exacerbated by the subdivision of rural land.		
FS106.003	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	SUB - Subdivision
S122.038	Fulton Hogan Limited	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Oppose	Amend SUB-P1 to require avoidance of all reverse sensitivity effects: Allow subdivision, and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, provides for the needs of the community, avoids reverse sensitivity effects , and supports the policies of the District Plan for the applicable zones, where the design...	Seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the policy.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
FS22.012	NZ Pork			Support	Allow	Agrees that SUB-P1 would be improved by including explicit reference to potential reverse sensitivity from subdivision activities. Reverse sensitivity in the rural environment can adversely impact well-established pig farming operations, posing a significant risk to the industry. These issues typically start or are exacerbated by the subdivision of rural land.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS13.056	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Reverse sensitivity effects from inappropriate subdivision create challenges for horticulture, which often locates on the urban-rural fringe.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS106.004	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	SUB - Subdivision
S130.006	Xavier Warne	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Amend	Amend SUB Table 1 to remove minimum lot sizes, or significantly reduce minimum lot sizes.	Unclear why there is a minimum lot size given other rules account for building bulk and form, neighbourhood character, access to open space, financial contributions, and provision of infrastructure. Considers infrastructure capacity constraints are not a reason to have minimum lot sizes given SUB-P2 already requires consideration of existing and planned infrastructure. Considers having a minimum lot size does not provide certainty for landowners enquiring about subdivision given a consent process is always necessary.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S135.047	Greytown Heritage Trust	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain SUB-O1 as notified.	The submitter supports the objective, particularly SUB-O1(e).	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S141.001	Spark, Connexa, One NZ & FortySouth	SUB-S6	SUB-S6	Amend	Amend SUB-S6 in relation to Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zone, and Rural Zones: 1. Electricity and telecommunications services shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot where power lines and telecommunications lines pass within 200m of any boundary of any new lot. 2. Telecommunication connection in Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial	Supports a standard requiring new lots in the residential, commercial, mixed use, general industrial and rural zones to connect to a telecommunications network, as this is an essential service. Considers the standard should not be qualified on whether or not telecommunication lines pass within 200m of a site. Considers that there will be an expectation in urban areas to have access to both fixed line and wireless telecommunication networks. Considers it is reasonable to require open access fibre connections to each allotment	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					Zones a. to an open access fibre network shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot; and b. Applicant provides an assessment of what and how telecommunications will be provided to each allotment in the subdivision via confirmation in writing from telecommunication network operator/s. i. Contract to construct fibre connections; and ii. If any subdivision in any zone is creating 100 allotments or more shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision and potential development capacity. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision and potential development, work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.3. Rural zones telecommunication connection shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot. The applicant shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision. In the situation that the existing	because of the expensive and disruption to berms, footpaths, trees and other linear network services when laying fibre after development. Considers developers of large subdivisions should be responsible for providing an assessment from the wireless network operator/s to establish what wireless connectivity is available and should be responsible for providing for a site for a wireless facility in areas where wireless connectivity is difficult or not available. Residents in a new developments will expect to use wireless services in their dwelling, business premises, or outside. Considers rural zone subdivisions should be required to have telecommunication connectivity, either wireless or fixed line. Considers an assessment for how connectivity will be achieved and consultation with telecommunication network utility providers is appropriate.		

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision, the applicant shall work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.			
S142.001	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	SUB-S6	SUB-S6	Amend	Insert an additional subdivision standard specifically related to the provision of telecommunications services as follows:SUB-SX Telecommunications servicesResidential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Used Zones, General Industrial Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zones:1. Connection to an open-access fibre network must be provided to the useable area of each new allotmentGeneral Rural Zones:1. Connection to a telecommunications network (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) must be provided to the usable area of each new allotmentMatters of discretion:Alternative provision of telecommunications services	The intent of SUB-S6 to ensure that network utility services are provided for in the subdivision process is supported. However, the submitter believes that SUB-S6 should be amended, or an additional standard created to ensure that connection to an open-access fibre network is provided for at the time of subdivision. Connection to an open-access fibre network to the usable area of all new allotments should be required at the time of subdivision alongside other essential services. Not providing fibre at the time of subdivision can result in unnecessary and disruptive effects from retroactively installing fibre optic cables in newly created roads, footpaths and berms as well as increased costs to the end user. The relief sought will ensure that the subdivision standards are consistent with SUB-O3 and SUB-P2 while still providing a consenting pathway for instances where the applicant is able to demonstrate how an alternative	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						and satisfactory telecommunications connection can be provided.		
S142.002	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support in part	Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal), open-access fibre networks and power networks with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and b. subdivisions in Rural Zones are capable of being serviced via on-site water, wastewater, and stormwater measures when development occurs on the site, and are capable of connecting to a telecommunications network.	An objective about servicing is supported, however it is only focused on Council provided infrastructure, not all infrastructure. All infrastructure is necessary to give effect to the PDPs strategic objectives UFD-O4 and INF-O1, as well as SUB-P2 as notified. As such, amendments to SUB-O2 are sought.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S142.003	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support in part	Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by: a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at	SUB-P2 requires subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner. The specifics of what providing infrastructure in an integrated manner does not consider telecommunications. This should be included and as such an amendment is sought.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					the time of subdivision or development, and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure; b. requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the relevant Council; c. ensure allotments can connect to a telecommunications network; ed. ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape with appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes; de. ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access; ef. providing for transport network connections within and between communities; fg. where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to and infrastructure for public transport while recognising the role that efficient transport infrastructure and connectivity plays in reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and gh. achieving safe			

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					and efficient access onto and from state highways.			
S144.003	E McGruddy	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support in part	Amend SUB-O3 as follows: "subdivision and development within urban boundaries and within existing small lot subdivisions are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned...."	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	SUB - Subdivision
FS78.0010	Holly Hill			Support	Allow	Support this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter	Reject	SUB
S149.026	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support in part	Amend SUB-P2: ... g. achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highway in accordance with the roading hierarchy and meeting the TR-Transport objectives and policies.	The TR-Transport chapter also has a policy framework around integrating the transport network with subdivision development. With the changes requested above, the TR-Transport chapter has a strong framework that should be relied upon to assess the appropriateness or otherwise of subdivision development.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S149.031	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R1:1. Activity Status: Controlled Where... c. The boundary adjustment has legal and physical access to and from a road, including an up-to-date crossing place notice where the allotments rely on access to and from a Limited Access Road.... ... 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where... c. Compliance with SUB-R1(1)(c) is not met.	Considers that boundary adjustments can alter vehicle access and crossing requirements and can alter the legal status of an access if it is located on a state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road where the Crossing Place notice would be required to be updated. Amending boundaries can also give rise to increase in land use intensity whereby the new allotments are able to contain additional development meeting requirements of the zone rules. The controlled activity rule does not recognise these factors in	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						determining an appropriate activity status for changing access arrangements on state highway road frontages, which can deem an access to be unlawful unless the crossing place notice is updated by NZTA.		
S149.032	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Oppose in part	Amend SUB-R1(2) with an additional criteria as follows: 2. Activity Status: Controlled Where: c. The boundary adjustment has legal and physical access to and from a road, including an up-to-date crossing place notice where the allotments rely on access to and from a Limited Access Road ... 5. Activity status: Discretionary Where: c. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R1(2)(a) or SUB-R1(2)(c).	Boundary adjustments can alter vehicle access and crossing requirements and can alter the legal status of an access if it is located on a state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road where the Crossing Place notice would be required to be updated. Amending boundaries can also give rise to increase in land use intensity whereby the new allotments are able to contain additional development meeting requirements of the zone rules. The controlled activity rule does not recognise these factors in determining an appropriate activity status for changing access arrangements on state highway road frontages, which can deem an access to be unlawful unless the crossing place notice is updated by NZTA.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S149.037	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	SUB - Table 1	SUB - Table 1	Support in part	Retain SUB Table 1 provided the following amendments to other provisions and maps are made: - Require discretionary activity subdivision status for all residential subdivision relying the 100km/h sections of SH2 north of Masterton, including Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection with SH2 (note previous submission point requesting amendment of activity status of subdivision in PREC3 -	Supports minimum allotments sizes for all zones except for the residential zone accessed via State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection which is located on a 100km/hr speed zone; and the part of the residential zone with frontage and access to State Highway 2 north of Masterton within a 100km/h speed zone (includes the Hansels Factory site, the Arvida retirement village site, and	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct in Rule SUB-R2) - Accept the relief sought on TR-S10 - Correct the roading hierarchy shown on the planning maps as urban connector instead of Interregional Connector in these areas	properties on Opaki Meadows Drive along the eastern side of the state highway.) Considers that given the road's status of the state highway, it is not able to service the level of development for these residential areas at the densities proposed in SUB-Table 1 (noting the Cashmere Oaks Development Concept Plan had densities of 1,2000m2 at the time NZTA approved it).		
S152.008	AdamsonShaw Ltd	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Amend	Amend SUB-R1(2) ii-x to be separate list under i. Where: a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with: a. SUB-S2 b. SUB-S3 c. SUB-S4 d. SUB-S5 e. SUB-S6 f. SUB-S7 g. SUB-S8 h. SUB-S9; and i. SUB-S10; and b. The boundary adjustment complies with or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with the relevant standards of the underlying zone.	This rule needs to be re-formatted so that it is clear. Bullet points ii.-x. should be further bullet pointed separately under i.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S172.038	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain SUB-O2 as notified.	Supports SUB-O2 insofar as it promotes servicing subdivision and development for the likely or anticipated use of the land.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						Furthermore, it promotes connecting subdivision within the urban boundary to a reticulated service with sufficient capacity, and for subdivision in Rural Zones to be capable of being serviced by on-site means.		
S172.039	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support	Retain SUB-O3 as notified.	Supports SUB-O3 insofar as it promotes integrating subdivision and development with the existing and planned development of roads and infrastructure.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.040	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain SUB-P1 as notified.	Supports SUB-P1 insofar as it promotes allowing subdivision where the design has legal and physical access to each allotment created.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.041	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain SUB-P2 as notified.	Supports SUB-P2 insofar as it promotes subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available or provided in an integrated and comprehensive manner (such as allotments being of a sufficient size and shape to accommodate onsite water supply infrastructure including for firefighting purposes). Furthermore, SUB-P2 promotes ensuring roads and vehicle access to sites meet the minimum design standard to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.043	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain SUB-R1 as notified.	Supports SUB-R1 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-S7 and SUB-S10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Where compliance with the relevant subdivision standards is not achieved, the matters of discretion	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						extend to the matters of any standard that is not met, and the infrastructure capacity to service the site or the ability to provide for on-site servicing.		
S172.044	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support	Retain SUB-R2 as notified.	Supports SUB-R2 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-S7 and SUB-S10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Where compliance with the relevant subdivision standards is not achieved, the matters of discretion extend to the matters of any standard that is not met, and the infrastructure capacity to service the site or the ability to provide for on-site servicing.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.045	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4 as notified.	Supports SUB-R4 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-R7 and SUB-R10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Additionally, the matters of control include: - the provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including firefighting water supply. - fire rating of party/common walls.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.046	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support	Retain SUB-R5 as notified.	Supports SUB-R5 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-R7 and SUB-R10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Additionally, the matters of control include: - the provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						firefighting water supply. - fire rating of party/common walls.		
S172.047	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-S7	SUB-S7	Support	Retain SUB-S7 as notified.	Supports SUB-S7 insofar as it requires all new allotments created to have legal and physical access to a road in accordance with the relevant standards in TR-Transport, which includes a standard relating to firefighting access.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S172.048	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-S10	SUB-S10	Support in part	Amend SUB-S10 1. All new allotments accommodating existing or proposed dwellings must comply with the water supply requirements in the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Supports the inclusion of a standard which requires all new allotments accommodating existing or proposed dwellings to comply with the water supply requirements in the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Supports the matter of discretion which allows for consideration of alternative means of providing an adequate water supply for firefighting purposes. However, the submitter notes this only provides for residential dwellings. It is vital that all land use activities are provided with a suitable firefighting water supply, as there is a fire risk associated with all structures. The drafting of SUB-S10 would not ensure that commercial, industrial etc. allotments and buildings will be provided with a suitable firefighting water supply. Amend SUB-S10 and consider this will better provide for the protection of life and property across the Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa districts. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides a variety of options for providing a compliant firefighting water supply in	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						accordance with the FW rating of the associated building/activity.		
S186.045	Wellington Fish and Game Council	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S186.046	Wellington Fish and Game Council	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Neutral	No decision requested. Submitter notes Council staff will need to be resourced to monitor and manage for consent compliance regarding waste and stormwater consent conditions.	Further protection of the environment.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S186.047	Wellington Fish and Game Council	SUB-P3	SUB-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	Support policy.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S187.029	New Zealand Frost Fans	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support in part	Amend SUB-O1 to add:...g. protects the productive capacity of highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics; and, h. avoids where possible or otherwise minimises conflicts between land uses.	The objective would benefit by addressing additional matters set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. In particular the protection of the productive capacity of highly productive land and other land, and also address conflicts between land uses.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
FS13.054	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow in part	Protection of highly productive land is supported.	Reject	SUB
FS109.013	East Leigh Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Considers this addition to the objection is not necessary and not justified by higher policy documents.	Reject	SUB
S189.061	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support in part	Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated	An objective about servicing is supported, however it is only focused on Council provided infrastructure, not all infrastructure. All infrastructure is necessary to given effect to the PDPs strategic objectives UFD-O4 and INF-O1, as	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	(trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)				water, and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal), telecommunications networks and power networks with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and b. subdivisions in Rural Zones are capable of being serviced via on-site water, wastewater, and stormwater measures when development occurs on the site, and are capable of connecting to a telecommunications network. Note. In the submission received through Spoken a. above reads differently using the words ' open access fibre networks '	well as SUB-P2 as notified. As such, amendments to SUB-O2 are sought.		
S189.062	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support in part	Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by: a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at the time of subdivision or development, and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure; b. requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the	SUB-P2 requires subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner. The specifics of what providing infrastructure in an integrated manner does not consider telecommunications. This should be included and as such an amendment is sought.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					relevant Council;c. ensure allotments can connect to a telecommunications network ;ed; ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape with appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes and there is an ability to connect to telecommunications network ;de; ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access;ef; providing for transport network connections within and between communities;fg; where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to and infrastructure for public transport while recognising the role that efficient transport infrastructure and connectivity plays in reducing greenhouse gas emissions; andgh; achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highways.			
S189.063	Chorus New Zealand Limited	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain SUB-R1 as notified.	SUB-R1 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	(Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)							
S189.064	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)	SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Support in part	Amend SUB-R2 as follows: Matters of Control 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, except for telecommunications. 8.1 Provision of appropriate telecommunications, including their design and location shall be accordance with the telecommunication network operators' requirements subject to SUB-S6.	SUB-R2 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services and amendment of the requirement for telecommunications infrastructure to be designed in accordance with the Councils engineering standards. While this is relevant for Council controlled infrastructure, the telecommunications network operators should be responsible for determining the design on their network requirements.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S189.065	Chorus New Zealand Limited	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Support	Retain SUB-R3 as notified.	SUB-R3 is supported as it recognises that subdivisions for network utility purposes can	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	(Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)					have different characteristics and drivers compared to standard subdivision in any given zone.		
S189.066	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)	SUB-R4	SUB-R4	Support	Retain SUB-R4 as notified.	SUB-R4 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S189.067	Chorus New Zealand Limited	SUB-R5	SUB-R5	Support	Retain SUB-R5 as notified.	SUB-R5 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	(Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)							
S189.078	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)	SUB-S6	SUB-S6	Amend	Amend: Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zone, and Rural Zones 1. Electricity and telecommunications services shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot where power lines and telecommunications lines pass within 200m of any boundary of any new lot. 2. Telecommunication connection in Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zones. a. to an open access fibre network shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot; and b. Applicant provides an assessment of what and how telecommunications will be provided to each allotment in the subdivision via confirmation	A standard requiring new lots in the residential, commercial, mixed use, general industrial and rural zones to connect to a telecommunications network is supported. The standard should not be qualified on whether or not telecommunication lines pass within 200m of a site. In urban areas the submitter believe it is reasonable to require open access fibre connections to each allotment. Primarily due to expense, and disruption to berms, footpaths, trees and other linear network services in the road post the subdivision. For large subdivisions/developments the submitter believes the applicant should be responsible for providing an assessment from the wireless network operator/s to establish what wireless connectivity is available. The applicant should be responsible making provision for at least a site	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					in writing from telecommunication network operator/s.i. Contract to construct fibre connections: andii. If any subdivision in any zone is creating 100 allotments or more shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision and potential development capacity. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision and potential development, work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.3. Rural zones telecommunication connection shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot. The applicant shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision, the applicant shall work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications	for a wireless facility in areas where wireless connectivity is difficult or not available. Residents in a new subdivision or development will expect the ability to use wireless services in their dwelling or business premises or when outside. Rural zone subdivisions should be required to have telecommunication connectivity either wireless or fixed line. A requirement for assessment how connectivity will be achieved and consultation with telecommunication network utility providers is appropriate.		

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					network to serve the subdivision.			
FS81.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the relief sought by the submitter. An assessment of connectivity may not appropriate in all circumstances particularly in the rural areas where the reason for subdivision is not necessarily for a use that would require connectivity. The standard should provide an exception to recognise this.	Accept	SUB
S191.016	David Ian McGuinness	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain SUB-O1 as notified.	Support intention of objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS86.016	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	SUB
S191.017	David Ian McGuinness	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain SUB-P1 as notified.	Support intention of policy.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS86.017	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	SUB
S191.044	David Ian McGuinness	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain SUB-O2 as notified.	Supports intention of the objective	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
FS86.044	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept	SUB
S191.045	David Ian McGuinness	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support	Retain SUB-O3 as notified.	Supports intention of the objective	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS86.045	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	SUB
S191.046	David Ian McGuinness	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain SUB-P2 as notified.	Supports intention of policy	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS86.046	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	SUB

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S209.051	Powerco Limited	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Support	Retain as drafted.	Submitter supports the ability for network utilities to undertake subdivisions as a controlled activity.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.057	Māori Trustee	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain SUB-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.199	Māori Trustee	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain SUB-O2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S212.200	Māori Trustee	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support	Retain SUB-O3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.201	Māori Trustee	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain SUB-P1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.202	Māori Trustee	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain SUB-P2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.203	Māori Trustee	SUB-P3	SUB-P3	Support	Retain SUB-P3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S212.204	Māori Trustee	SUB-P4	SUB-P4	Support	Retain SUB-P4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S212.205	Māori Trustee	SUB-P5	SUB-P5	Support	Retain SUB-P5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S212.206	Māori Trustee	SUB-P6	SUB-P6	Support	Retain SUB-P6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S212.207	Māori Trustee	SUB-P7	SUB-P7	Support	Retain SUB-P7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S212.208	Māori Trustee	SUB-P8	SUB-P8	Support	Retain SUB-P8 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S214.076	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Oppose	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: a. Provide for the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity of each zone and the qualities and values of the site(s) including natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori; b. Provide for a variety of housing types that cater for the range of community needs, such as affordability, accessibility, and lifestyle; c. Are well functioning, accessible, integrated and connected with adjoining neighbourhoods; d. Provide accessible and well-designed open space areas; e. Protect cultural, heritage, and natural values; and respond to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change	The purpose of subdivision is not to create lots for natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, or SASMs (although lots may end up encompassing some such areas). This objective is heavily 'urban-centric' and it either needs to be more generic, or it needs to include a range of other considerations besides merely urban ones, or special area overlays.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
FS75.021	Heritage New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	HNZPT does not support the amendments suggested by Federated Farmers of New Zealand in relation to SUB-O1, in terms of providing for the qualities and special values of sites.	Accept	SUB
FS90.066	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the objective in the PDP provides useful, integrating direction which should not be deleted. It is not clear why the	Accept	SUB

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						submitter thinks these matters are urban centric because they can all apply to any subdivision; deleting these matters is therefore not justified.		
FS95.181	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia 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	SUB
S214.077	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Oppose	Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. Subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal) with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and b. Subdivisions in Rural Zones can be appropriately serviced via on-	The submitter opposes the draft wording of SUB-O2. Suggest wording that does not imply that 'servicing' is a ubiquitous requirement regardless of context.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					site measures.			
FS95.182	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia 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	SUB
S214.078	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Oppose	Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure for new subdivision is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by: a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at the time of subdivision or development and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure. b. Requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the relevant Council;	Infrastructure will not always be available for all types of subdivision (e.g. for rural lot subdivision in remote rural areas), nor will it always be appropriate to require all types of infrastructure for all types of subdivision.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					c. Ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape where appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes; d. Ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access; e. Providing for transport network connections within and between communities; f. Where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to public transport; and g. Achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highways.			
FS90.067	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the amendment is inconsistent with RPS direction which seeks coordination of subdivision with infrastructure. The wording does not exclude rural subdivision.	Accept	SUB
FS95.183	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o	Accept	SUB

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						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.		
FS84.001	Jim Hedley			Support	Allow	Considers provision of power and telecommunication services should not be required for rural subdivision given changes to greener energy and limitations for network in some areas.	Reject	SUB
S214.080	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support	Retain SUB-R1 as notified.	The submitter supports boundary adjustments enabled as a controlled activity. This allows rural landowners to efficiently reallocate ownership of farmland, according to changing circumstances. As no additional lots are being created in boundary adjustments, the overall intensity of land ownership and the cumulative effects of transport networks and services remains unchanged. Therefore, effects of boundary adjustments are minor.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
FS95.185	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia 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	Reject	SUB

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						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.		
S218.069	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the introductory text to the Subdivision chapter as follows: "This chapter contains rules and standards relating to subdivision of land within District-Wide Matters chapters, such as the Coastal Environment, Natural Hazards, Natural Environments and the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. The District-Wide Matters chapters contain the objectives and policies that also apply to any subdivision application."	Supports the clear direction given in the introductory text that the Subdivision chapter contains rules and standards relating to subdivision of land within District-Wide Matters chapters (with explicit mention of the National Grid Corridor) and that the District-Wide Matters chapters contain the objectives and policies that also apply to any subdivision application. Seeks a limited amendment to correct reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' (consistent with the definition included in the Proposed District Plan).	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S218.070	Transpower New Zealand Limited	SUB-R3	SUB-R3	Support	Retain Rule SUB-R3 as notified.	Supports Rule SUB-R3 because the Rule appropriately recognises the unique characteristics of network utilities by providing for subdivision to accommodate network utilities as a controlled activity in a manner than does not impose minimum requirements that would otherwise apply to subdivisions for other purposes.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S221.093	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support in part	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that... f. respond to the risks of natural	Amend small grammatical error.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					hazards and is are resilient to climate change.			
S226.013	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-P2	SUB-P2	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S226.014	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-P1	SUB-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S226.015	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-O3	SUB-O3	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S226.016	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-O2	SUB-O2	Support	Retain as notified	Support intention of Objective.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S226.017	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S226.027	Brian John McGuinness	SUB-S9	SUB-S9	Oppose	Amend Standard SUB-S9 to include a standard for development contributions within SUB-S9.	Whilst a Financial Contribution chapter has been provided in the Plan, SUB-S9 needs to be redrafted to include an appropriate standard for development contributions for subdivision.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S233.008	Scott Anstis	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Amend	Amend SUB-R1(2) so numbering is as follows: a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with:- a. SUB-S2 b. SUB-S3... ... i. SUB-S10; and b. The boundary adjustment complies with...	The submission notes the rule should be re-formatted for clarity and provides an example layout.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S236.055	-Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Oppose	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: 'SUB-O1 Subdivision and development designSubdivision will and developments create allotments and patterns of land	The submitter seeks amendments for certainty and to ensure the objective supports the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs as	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					use and development that: provide for the anticipated accord with the purpose, character, and amenity of each zone, b. -and maintain and enhance the qualities and values of the site(s) including natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous ... d. are be well-functioning, accessible, integrated, and connected with adjoining neighbourhoods; ... g. respond appropriately to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change.	required by the RMA, NPSIB and NZCPS. SUB-O1(f) does not give effect to Policy 3 or Policy 25 of the NZCPS and is not consistent with CCR-O1 of the District Plan.		
S236.056	-Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	SUB-P3	SUB-P3	Oppose	Delete SUB-P3 and rely on the objectives and policies in district-wide matters chapters OR if the policy is retained, amend to clarify and ensure consistency with the strategic directions and other objectives and policies in the district-wide matters chapters OR Amend SUB-P3 to include a clause seeking the protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features or sites or items with significant values.	The submission considers the policy is superfluous to the district wide policies.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S236.057	-Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Oppose	Amend SUB-R1 as follows: '1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control: 4. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or	The submitter seeks a consistent approach to indigenous biodiversity within the matters of discretion in all the relevant SUB rules.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					archaeological sites.' 2. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control: 4. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites.'			
FS87.037	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	Supported for the reasoning provided	Accept	SUB
FS95.039	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	This submission is supported for the reasoning provided.	Accept	SUB
S239.021	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	SUB-R1	SUB-R1	Support in part	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: "... General Rural Zone 2. Activity status: Controlled Where a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with:- a. SUB-S2iii. b. SUB-S3iv. c. SUB-S4v. d. SUB-S5vi. e. SUB-S6vii. f. SUB-S7viii. g. SUB-S8ix. h. SUB-S9; and i. SUB-S10; and b. The boundary adjustment complies with or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with the relevant standards of the underlying zone.	This rule needs to be reformatted so that it is clear. Bullet points ii. -x. should be further bullet pointed separately under 'i'.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S249.045	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	SUB-O1	SUB-O1	Support	Retain SUB-O1 as notified	Supports reference to providing for historic heritage values in the consideration of subdivision.	Accept in part	SUB - Subdivision
S249.046	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	SUB-P3	SUB-P3	Support	Retain SUB-P3 as notified	Supports the management of subdivision on scheduled sites to ensure the protection of historic heritage and SASM.	Accept	SUB - Subdivision
S260.013	Tony Garstang	New provision request	New provision request	Support in part	Insert a new provision in SUB - Subdivision chapter to require that subdivisions do not alter or disturb rivers in any way.	When considering subdivision applications, the awa should not be altered or polluted in any way. Even bulldozed spoil in streams can kill aquatic life with stream turbidity. If a developer cannot subdivide land because a significant waterbody is stopping it, then the awa should take precedence over developer profits.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
S268.002	Dan Riddiford			Oppose	Amend SUB-Subdivision chapter to enable future development of the site at 36 Kitchener Street, Martinborough (referring to subdivision of highly productive land in the General Rural Zone)	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	SUB - Subdivision
S233.014	Scott Anstis	SUB-R10	SUB-R10	Amend	Amend SUB-R10:	Considers that given appropriate performance standards are met and subject to matters of control, creating new vested roads should be a Controlled activity.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision
FS61.012	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)		SUB-R10	Support in part	Allow in part	NZTA supports changing the activity status of this rule from Restricted Discretionary to Controlled. This is on the basis that any subdivision requiring a new road intersection with SH2 or SH53 is excluded.	Reject	SUB - Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.021	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert a new definition as follows: Water sensitive urban design The integration of planning, engineering design and water management to mimic or restore natural hydrological processes in order to address the quantitative and qualitative impacts of land use and development on land, water and biodiversity, and the community's aesthetic and recreational enjoyment of waterways and the coast. Water sensitive urban design manages stormwater at its source as one of the tools to control runoff and water quality. The terms low impact design, low impact urban design and water sensitive design are often used synonymously with water sensitive urban design.	A definition of water sensitive urban design would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions. Recommend the Natural Resources Plan definition of the term.	Reject	Subdivision
FS87.039	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	A new definition of water sensitive design is supported for clarity	Reject	Subdivision
FS95.041	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	A new definition of water sensitive design is supported for clarity	Reject	Subdivision
FS105.058	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience.	Reject	Subdivision
S94.022	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert a new definition as follows: Hydraulic neutrality Managing stormwater runoff from subdivision, use and development through either on-site disposal or storage, so that peak stormwater flows and	A definition of hydraulic neutrality would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions.	Reject	Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					volumes are released from the site at a rate that does not exceed the modelled peak flows and volumes from the site in an undeveloped state.			
FS87.038	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	A new definition of hydraulic neutrality is supported for clarity and suggest there is a wider review to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is supported extensively.	Reject	Subdivision
FS95.040	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	A new definition of hydraulic neutrality is supported for clarity and ask for a wider review to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is supported extensively in this plan.	Reject	Subdivision
FS105.059	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience.	Reject	Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.021	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert a new definition as follows: Water sensitive urban design The integration of planning, engineering design and water management to mimic or restore natural hydrological processes in order to address the quantitative and qualitative impacts of land use and development on land, water and biodiversity, and the community's aesthetic and recreational enjoyment of waterways and the coast. Water sensitive urban design manages stormwater at its source as one of the tools to control runoff and water quality. The terms low impact design, low impact urban design and water sensitive design are often used synonymously with water sensitive urban design.	A definition of water sensitive urban design would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions. Recommend the Natural Resources Plan definition of the term.	Reject	Subdivision
FS87.039	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	A new definition of water sensitive design is supported for clarity	Reject	Subdivision
FS95.041	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	A new definition of water sensitive design is supported for clarity	Reject	Subdivision
FS105.058	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience.	Reject	Subdivision
S94.022	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert a new definition as follows: Hydraulic neutrality Managing stormwater runoff from subdivision, use and development through either on-site disposal or storage, so that peak stormwater flows and	A definition of hydraulic neutrality would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions.	Reject	Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					volumes are released from the site at a rate that does not exceed the modelled peak flows and volumes from the site in an undeveloped state.			
FS87.038	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	A new definition of hydraulic neutrality is supported for clarity and suggest there is a wider review to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is supported extensively.	Reject	Subdivision
FS95.040	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	A new definition of hydraulic neutrality is supported for clarity and ask for a wider review to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is supported extensively in this plan.	Reject	Subdivision
FS105.059	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to water resilience.	Reject	Subdivision

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S79.031	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Introduction	Introduction	Oppose in part	Amend introduction as follows: ... The Transport Chapter contains provisions that deal with on-site transport facilities and access, the operation, maintenance and repair of the transport network, and the effects of high traffic generating activities. Provisions addressing noise related reverse sensitivity effects on the State Highway, rail network and the Hood Aerodrome are in the Noise Chapter.	KiwiRail opposes paragraph 6 of the 'Transport' introduction as it fails to mention the rail corridor in relation to noise related reverse sensitivity effects. Therefore, KiwiRail seeks amendment to include reference to the rail network.	Reject
S79.032	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain Objective TR-O1 as notified.	Supports the objective for a safe, efficient and effective transport network.	Accept
S79.033	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain Objective TR-O2 as notified.	Supports Objective TR-O2 as proposed.	Accept
S79.034	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 - Effects of activities on the transport network as notified.	Supports Objective TR-O3 as proposed.	Accept
S79.035	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support	Retain TR-P5 - Transport network connections as notified.	Supports Policy TR-P5 as proposed.	Reject
S79.036	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-P6	TR-P6	Support	Retain TR-P6 - Managing effects of the transport network as notified.	Supports Policy TR-P6 as proposed.	Accept
S79.037	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-P8	TR-P8	Support in part	Amend TR-P8 - Rail corridor safety as follows: Provide safe visibility and appropriate infrastructure at road/rail level crossings. Ensure the safe and efficient operation of the rail network by: a. protecting sight lines at rail level	Supports policy which seeks to protect sightlines at level crossings. It is unclear what infrastructure the policy intends to capture and KiwiRail seeks amendment for clarity of the intent of the policy and what it specifically seeks to achieve.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					crossings by managing adjacent land use and development;b. controlling new or increased use of vehicle access to sites adjacent to level crossing; and c. avoiding new at-grade level crossings.		
S79.038	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support	Retain Rule TR-R2 as notified.	Supports Rule TR-R2 as proposed.	Accept
S79.039	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-R3	TR-R3	Support	Retain Rule TR-R3 as notified.	Supports Rule TR-R3 as proposed.	Accept
S79.040	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-R4	TR-R4	Oppose	Delete and Replace rule with the following: TR-R4 Sight lines at railway level crossings All zones Activity status: Permitted Where: Compliance is achieved with TR-SXActivity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. the potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the rail network.2. applications under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, evidence of engagement with KiwiRail.	KiwiRail generally supports this rule, however, seeks amendment for consistency with our model rule and standard which has been adopted in district plans throughout the country.	Accept
S79.094	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support	Retain Policy TR-P3 as notified.	Supports Policy TR-P3 as proposed.	Accept
S79.096	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	TR-R4	TR-R4	Oppose	Insert new standard: TR-SX: Sight lines at railway level crossingsRestart sight triangles at level crossings: On sites adjacent to all rail level crossings, no building, structure, planting or visual obstruction shall be located within the shaded areas shown in Figure 1. These are defined by a sight triangle taken 5 metres from the outside rail and	The submitter generally supports this rule, however, seeks amendment for consistency with our model rule and standard which has been adopted in district plans throughout the country	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					distance A along the railway track. Distance A depends on the type of control (Table 1).Figure 1: Restart sight triangles for all level crossings [see original submission for diagram]Table 1: Required restart sight distances for Figure 1 Required approach visibility along tracks A (m)Signs only: 677mAlarms only: 677mAlarms and barriers: 80m.Advice Note: The restart sight line triangles ensure that a road vehicle driver stopped at a level crossing can see far enough along the railway to be able to start off, cross and clear the level crossing safely before the arrival of any previously unseen train. Of particular concern are developments that include shelter belts, tree planting, or a series of building extensions. These conditions apply irrespective of whether any visual obstructions already exist.Approach sight triangles at level crossings with Give Way signs: On sites adjacent to rail level crossings controlled by Give Way Signs, no building, structure, planting or other visual obstruction shall be located within the shaded areas shown in Figure 2.Figure 2: Approach sight triangles for level crossings with "Give Way" signs [see original submission for diagram]Advice Note: The approach sight triangles ensure that clear visibility is achieved around rail level crossings with Give Way signs so that a driver approaching a rail level can either: • See a train and stop before the crossing; or • Continue at the approach speed and cross the level crossing safely. Of particular concern are developments that include shelter belts, tree planting, or a series		

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					of building extensions. These conditions apply irrespective of whether any visual obstructions already exist. No approach sight triangles apply for level crossings fitted with alarms and/or barrier arms. However, care should be taken to avoid developments that have the potential to obscure visibility of these alarm masts. This is particularly important where there is a curve in the road on the approach to the level crossing, or where the property boundary is close to the edge of the road surface and there is the potential for vegetation growth.		
S91.010	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain TR-O2 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept
S91.011	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept
S91.012	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P1	TR-P1	Support	Retain TR-P1 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S91.013	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support	Retain TR-P2 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S91.014	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support	Retain TR-P3 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S91.015	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P4	TR-P4	Support	Retain TR-P4 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S91.016	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support	Retain TR-P5 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S91.017	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support	Retain TR-P7 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept
S91.049	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-S1	TR-S1	Oppose	Amend TR-S1 to delete references to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires that roads are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject
S91.050	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-S5	TR-S5	Oppose	Amend TR-S5 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires that accessways are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject
S91.051	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-S8	TR-S8	Oppose	Amend TR-S8 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires that vehicle crossing points are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S91.052	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-S13	TR-S13	Oppose	Amend TR-S13 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'.	The standard requires that accessways include stormwater control in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status.	Reject
S91.053	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	TR-S16	TR-S16	Oppose	Amend TR-S16 to delete the minimum car parking requirements and Table TR-9.	Minimum parking requirement in the South Wairarapa District is unnecessary. The s32 report does not provide any evidence to demonstrate the need for minimum parking requirements. Land use for parking can be an inefficient use of land and discourages the use of alternative transport methods (i.e. walking, cycling, and public transport).	Reject
FS90.139	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	NPS-UD section 3.38 should be applied across the whole district plan consistently, minimum carparking requirements should be removed for all districts.	Reject
S94.055	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain as notified	The submitter supports this direction and the emphasis on safe accessible opportunities for low and zero carbon transport modes. Questions the extent to which the rule framework and standards, including those in the residential and centre zones, will contribute to achieving TR-O1.	Accept
S94.056	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-P1	TR-P1	Support in part	Amend as follows:Support Provide for a multi-modal transport system that promotes supports reductions in transport related greenhouse gas emissions and alternative means of safe, efficient and effective transport through, including cycling, and walking and public transport facilities to enable people of all ages to move within the district and reduce the	The submitter generally supports this direction; but seeks an amendment for consistency with RPS Change 1 direction, which is stronger than promoting access to multi-modal transport options. RPS Change 1 also includes direction regarding the location of development and greater densities to minimise travel distances and efficiently use transport infrastructure, so we	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					effects of vehicle-based transport systems by: a. maximising safe and accessible opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport use; b. requiring cycle parking as appropriate for the proposed use and end of trip cycle facilities where cycle parking is required to be provided; and c. seeking that development occurs in locations where safe and efficient use of transport infrastructure, including for active and sustainable transport modes, is best provided for.	seek that this is added. TR-P1 should also explicitly refer to reductions in transport related greenhouse gas emissions to reflect the Emissions Reduction Plan (2022) and RPS Change 1. Beyond RPS Change 1, the submitter notes that operative Policy 57 seeks 'the provision of safe and attractive environments for walking and cycling' and 'connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity, open spaces or recreational areas'. Objective 22 seeks an integrated, safe, and responsive transport network with efficient use of existing transport network infrastructure.	
S94.057	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support in part	Insert new sub-clause: 'Promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling through the provision of a safe, accessible and connected multimodal network'	This policy needs to be more direct about the need for the transport network to be improved to the use of public transport, walking, and cycling - consistent with Objective TR-O1 and consistent with national and regional policy direction in relation to travel choice, mode shift and emission reductions.	Accept
S94.058	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	The submitter is supportive of the application of the One Network Framework to identify and manage the classification of transport corridors within the Wairarapa - this will provide better national and regional consistency and will support more effective land use and transport integration by being clear about the role of a transport corridor within the wider transport network.	Accept
S94.059	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-P4	TR-P4	Support in part	Amend to separate out reference to pedestrian and cycle access and facilities into a second paragraph, with specific emphasis on requiring on site facilities to	The intent of this provision is supported but should be clearer about the need for on-site facilities to encourage and facilitate more trips to/from the site public transport, walking and cycling wherever possible.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					support the use of walking, cycling and public transport.		
S94.060	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support in part	Amend TR-P7 or equivalent relief to include requirement for a travel choice assessment, which includes consideration and incorporation of efforts to maximise access to public and active transport options, and support redistribution of demand from private cars to active and public transport modes.	The requirement for high traffic generating activities to complete an Integrated Transport Assessment which includes an 'assessment of travel demand management mechanisms' is broadly consistent with the direction in RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2. TR-P7 should be amended (or similar relief) to include consideration and incorporation of efforts to maximise access to public and active transport options for consistency with Policy CC.2. The Councils may determine that 'high trip generating thresholds' will be used for the thresholds required by RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2.	Accept
S94.061	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-S16	TR-S16	Oppose	Delete minimum carparking requirements for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts. Note with exception of mobility parking.	The submitter considers that the rule framework is complicated by separating carparking requirements by districts, which creates inconsistencies and undermines the intent of a combined district plan. Carterton and South Wairarapa would be the only two districts in the Wellington Region with minimum carparking requirements. Minimum car parking provision as part of new development can result in higher car ownership and incentivise more trips by private motor vehicle - contributing to growth in transport related greenhouse gas emissions. Removal of minimum car parking standards (except mobility parking) will allow flexibility for developers to consider how they best utilise site space, particularly where alternative forms of transport are available.	Reject
S94.062	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-S23	TR-S23	Support in part	Delete subclause:2.-Cycle parking demand.	The requirement for a minimum number of cycle parking spaces supports regional goals for a multi-modal transport network, travel choice, mode shift and emission reduction.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						The matters for discretion include 'Cycle parking demand' - this is problematic as cycle demand for any new activity will be difficult to gauge and there may be latent/untapped demand based on current lack of good cycle parking facilities at similar sites/activities.	
S94.063	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TR-S24	TR-S24	Support in part	Amend as follows: Cycle parking facilities shall: a. be easily accessible for users; b. not impede pedestrian thoroughfares including areas used by people whose mobility or vision is restricted; and c. be clear of vehicle parking or maneuvering areas; and d. be designed with consideration to best practice standards for cycle parking design and layout. Refer to: Cycling parking planning and design: Cycling Network Guidance technical note (Version 3, 9 December 2022) (nzta.govt.nz)	The requirement for cycle parking to be designed to meet certain secure, safe, and accessible standards is important to ensure these meet minimum standards and support the uptake of more trips by bike. These standards could go further to reference best practice standards - see link provided - relating to cycle parking (e.g. visible, close to entrances, sheltered, well-lit etc.) to ensure the facilities provide a level of service that encourages more trips by bike.	Reject
S122.013	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-P4	TR-P4	Support	Retain TR-P4 as notified.	Considers the policy TR-P4 takes a pragmatic approach to on-site facilities by allowing facilities to "ensure they are appropriate for the demands of the activities and development carried out on the site" as opposed to a rigid set of standards which often don't consider activities such as quarrying.	Accept
S122.014	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-P7	TR-P7	Oppose	Amend TR-P7 to remove reference to amenity values and the character of the road: ... b. effects on the amenity values and character of the road;	Roads are designed for transportation. If the character or amenity values of an area which to be preserved in some way, land use zoning, integration of transport networks and land use, modifications to the transport network itself (traffic management), road capacity, and appropriate access arrangements (i.e., to an appropriate road in the hierarchy) provide better tools. The requirements for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) do not include an	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						assessment of amenity or character, and this is not a matter of discretion for TR-R5.	
S122.015	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-R1	TR-R1	Oppose	Amend TR-R1 to include an exemption for quarrying activities from minimum on-site facility standards such as parking and loading in the relevant rule standards.	This submission relates to TR-R1(1), which references minimum parking numbers. The submitter states that minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use.	Reject
S122.016	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S16	TR-S16	Oppose	Amend TR-S16 and Table TR-9 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum number of parking bays	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.069	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S18	TR-S18	Oppose	Amend TR-S18 and Table TR-11 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum parking bay dimensions	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.070	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S19	TR-S19	Oppose	Amend TR-S19 to exempt quarrying activities from blind aisle standards	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.071	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S20	TR-S20	Oppose	Amend TR-S20 to exempt quarrying activities from parking bay gradients	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.072	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S21	TR-S21	Oppose	Amend TR-S21 to exempt quarrying activities from parking bay construction and formation	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	
S122.073	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S22	TR-S22	Oppose	Amend TR-S22 to exempt quarrying activities from reverse manoeuvring standard	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.074	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S23	TR-S23	Oppose	Amend TR-S23 and Table TR-12 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum number cycle parking spaces	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.075	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S24	TR-S24	Oppose	Amend TR-S24 to exempt quarrying activities from cycle parking design standards	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.076	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S25	TR-S25	Oppose	Amend TR-S25 and Table TR-13 to exempt quarrying activities from trip-end facilities standards	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.077	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S26	TR-S26	Oppose	Amend TR-S26 and Table TR-14 to exempt quarrying activities from loading space dimensions	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S122.078	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S27	TR-S27	Oppose	Amend TR-S27 and Table TR-15 to exempt quarrying activities from loading and standing space access standards	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	
S122.079	Fulton Hogan Limited	TR-S28	TR-S28	Oppose	Amend TR-S28 to exempt quarrying activities from loading space construction and formation standards	Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction.	Accept in part
S130.009	Xavier Warne	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the TR - Transport chapter to remove assumptions of travel by car and more consistently reflect stated objectives across rules and standards to encourage a mix of transport options.	Supports transport choice from an affordability and cost of living perspective and considers the Wairarapa should take the cost of infrastructure and private transport seriously.	Reject
S130.010	Xavier Warne	TR-S16	TR-S16	Amend	Amend TR-S16 to remove minimum car parking requirements for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts.	Considers removal of car parking requirements should be extended to all three districts to better align with the PDP's objective to greater coherence to how the plan is applied across the three districts. Considers the exclusion of Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts from needing to implement the National Policy Statement - Urban Development is poorly reasoned. Considers retaining minimum car parking requirements gives the implicit assumption that driving is and remains the principal transport option in the future, which conflicts with the intent for multi-modal transport choice set out in TR-O1 and TR-P1. Considers parking requirements are arbitrary.	Reject
S135.017	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-P11	TR-P11	Support	Retain Policy TR-P11 as notified.	The submitter supports the proposed Policy. They consider this initiative important for the health and vibrancy of the Greytown Town Centre. The proposed extension to the Greytown Centre to the north on Main Street will not tangibly under-pin this. The submitters proposal to extend the Greytown Town Centre westward to West Street would support this and mean that cyclists could	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						largely avoid travelling on a traffic-heavy Main Street.	
FS45.002	Cobblestone s Trust			Support	Allow	Agrees that TR-P11 will contribute to the health and vitality of South Wairarapa and Greytown, of which the Museum is an important part.	Accept
S135.018	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-R5	TR-R5	Support	Retain Rule TR-R5 as notified.	The submitter supports this rule and considers that it provides much better clarity for Plan users. Supports the requirement for an independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to undertake the assessment.	Accept
S135.019	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S9	TR-S9	Support in part	Retain Standard TR-S9 as notified and create a design panel to review such matters.	The submitter supports the compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts as a matter of discretion. Seeks clarification around the inclusion of a design panel. States that this needs to have members who are familiar with the granular detail required within each area - particularly the Historic Heritage Precincts. The submitter notes that in the past there has been a lack of identifiable background within the SWDC planning department.	Accept in part
S135.020	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S15	TR-S15	Support in part	Amend TR-S15 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts.	The submitter supports the Standard. They consider adding a matter of discretion regarding compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. This sensitivity ensures the retention of heritage values.	Reject
S135.021	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S16	TR-S16	Oppose	Amend TR-S16 to have no minimum requirement in Greytown's Town Centre. As a matter of discretion (for all other zones): Compatibility with and sensitivity for heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts.	A minimum requirement for parking bays in Greytown would be detrimental to the character and vibrancy of the Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5 Vibrant Town Centres. The submitter seeks for Greytown Town Centre to primarily be a foot and bicycle traffic environment, to retain and	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						enhance its heart. Parking detracts from the street view of heritage buildings.	
S135.022	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S17	TR-S17	Support in part	Amend TR-S17 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precinct.	While the submitter supports the Standard, they consider adding a matter of discretion with regards to compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. States that this is important in retaining heritage values.	Reject
S135.023	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S21	TR-S21	Support in part	Amend TR-S21 to include driveways in the matters of discretion.	The submitter supports compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts as a matter of discretion. Seeks for this to be extended to include driveways.	Reject
S135.024	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S22	TR-S22	Support in part	Amend TR-S16 to have no minimum requirement for carparking/driveway space in Greytown's Town Centre.	The submitter supports the requirement to ensure there is no reversing onto/ off a State Highway or Transit Corridor. However, with the requirements of TR-S16 this would require further carparking/ driveway space and would be detrimental to the character and vibrancy of Greytown's Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5. The submitter supports the matter of discretion - Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts.	Reject
S135.025	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S23	TR-S23	Support	Retain TR-S23 as notified.	The submitter supports this Standard. Considers it a great step forward - and important for Greytown and TR-P11. A safe cycling route is required also - could be along West Street, identifiably zoned and with access to the Town Centre (i.e. extending behind West Street).	Accept
S135.026	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S24	TR-S24	Support	Retain TR-S4 as notified.	The submitter supports the matter of discretion.	Accept
S135.027	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S26	TR-S26	Oppose	Amend TR-S26 to exclude requirement for Greytown Town Centre Zone and to add a matter of discretion: Compatibility with	The submitter considers that this Standard is not possible in the Greytown Town Centre and would be detrimental to the character	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts.	and vibrancy of Greytown's Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5.	
S135.028	Greytown Heritage Trust	TR-S27	TR-S27	Support in part	Amend TR-S27 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts.	The submitter considers that there is a need to recognise the desire for compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts, as a matter of discretion.	Reject
S149.009	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain TR-O1 subject to relief sought for TR-R1 and TR-R2.	The objectives together cover most if not all necessary transport network resource management issues requiring consideration, including touching on integrated planning in TR-O1(d). Plan administration could be improved by accepting the submitters submission points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter.	Accept
S149.010	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-P1	TR-P1	Support in part	Amend Policy TR-P1 as follows: ... a. Maximising safe and accessible opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport use by the creation of new and/or the extension of existing multi-modal connections in the transport network when subdividing and developing; b. Requiring multi-modal options to meet with any best practice guidance current at the time of consenting; and b. c. Requiring cycle parking as appropriate for the proposed use and end of trip cycle facilities where cycle parking is required to be provided.	Supports this policy which seeks to ensure a range of transport options are designed and delivered to support the transport network, recognising it is not just a vehicle network. There is a good design element to multi-modal facilities and connections which this policy could support. There are many design guidance documents available through NZTA, Austroads publications, Standards New Zealand, and Auckland Transport that could be relied upon for best practice guidance. The NZTA website lists a range of Multi-modal transport planning and design guidance.	Accept
FS90.141	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Supports consistency with Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1 that urban development is well connected through multi-modal transport networks. Considers the suggested wording could be finetuned to be more succinct, e.g. providing multimodal facilities and connections within new	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						subdivision and development that meet best practice standards.	
S149.011	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy TR-P2: ... a. Promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions and the roading hierarchy ; b. Roads and vehicle crossings meet minimum design standards to allow for safe, effective and efficient traffic movement and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended function of the road or crossing, without giving rise to cumulative effects on the road corridor ; ...	Recognising and protecting the role of transport corridors is vital to good design outcomes for the network. Policy linkages important to achieving TR-O1. This policy seeks good design outcomes that 'promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions;', which should be achieved through alignment with the roading hierarchy of the Plan. Issues that have the potential to undermine the roading hierarchy, and therefore the One Network Framework (ONF) are cumulative effects on roads or parts of roads. These occur when dispensations to standards are granted consecutively along a corridor, or when vehicle generation increases over time and the corridor can no longer adequately serve the needs of the land uses without upgrades. The layout of the Wairarapa state highway network makes it vulnerable to cumulative effects. The existing state highway environment in the Wairarapa already has established cumulative effects in places, mainly on rural lengths of state highway. These effects have not been recognised and an amendment to Policy TR-P2 could accommodate the issue of cumulative effects when considering design outcomes and maintaining the roading hierarchy. Addressing the matter here will mean that when a resource consent is required for an activity, a transport matter, or for subdivision with transport infrastructure, the matter of cumulative effects can be considered relative to the role of the transport corridor.	Reject
S149.012	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support in part	Amend TR-P5: Require development (new or changes to existing lawfully established activities) to meet minimum standards	Support intent of the policy requiring development to meet minimum standards for access and require assessment of effects	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					when connecting to road, cycling, pedestrian and public transport corridors, or where these are not met, ensure development avoids, remedies, or mitigates any adverse effects, including cumulative effects , on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the transport network and provides a safe, suitable, legal, and practicable access to and from a transport corridor.	when these standards are not met. The policy TR-P5 requires effects be avoided, remedied or mitigated when standards are not met, which works in conjunction with TR-P4 that requires effects on the safe, effective and efficient functioning of the transport network to be avoided, mitigated or remedied. However, remedying or mitigating adverse traffic safety effects will not always result in the network being maintained or improved, as set out in TR-P2. Cumulative effects can still evolve and can undermine the role of the transport corridors and compromise their function as set out in TR-P3. The Wairarapa state highway network is particularly susceptible to cumulative effects; therefore it is important to recognise the potential for cumulative effects in the policy framework as a resource management tool.	
S149.013	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support	Retain TR-P7 subject to the relief sought to insert a definition for the term 'traffic generation'.	High traffic generating activities can have significant effects on transport networks. The proposed policy adequately traverses these resource management issues and seeks to manage them. High traffic generating activities is not defined but is captured by standards related to vehicle movements. The calculation of vehicle movements or traffic generation, therefore, becomes pivotal. In an earlier submission point the submitter seeks the inclusion of a definition for the term 'traffic generation' which will assist with the application of the rules related to this policy.	Reject
S149.014	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R1	TR-R1	Oppose	Amend TR-R1(1) to require all activities to comply with or meet the requirements of TR-S1 - TR-S29.	TR-R1(1) does not specifically state that activities must meet TR-S1 - S28, only when changing an access point do these standards apply. If the access point is not proposed to be changed in any way, there is no provision to require the land use to be	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						assessed against and comply with the access standards TR-S1 - TR-S28. The requirement for subdivision to meet with TR-Transport chapter standards has been made under the SUB-Subdivision chapter via standard SUB-S7, but there is no similar rule or standard connection for land use, which appears to be an oversight.	
S149.015	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R1	TR-R1	Support in part	Amend TR-R1: 1. Activity status PermittedWhere: a. Compliance is achieved with TR-S1 - TR-S28; and i. There is no new, or reformation to an existing , vehicle crossing onto a State Highway; and ii. All sites, allotments and activities have legal and physical access to and from a road. Note 1: Any vehicle crossing onto a section of State Highway which has been declared a Limited Access Road, requires production of an up-to-date crossing place notice issued under the Government Roding Powers Act 1989 from NZTA, that relates directly to the activities on site. Note 2: Where a subdivision or land use change is proposed to rely on an existing vehicle crossing, that crossing must comply with all standards in TR-S1 - TR-S28 as if the crossing were a new crossing that was not in existence prior to these standards coming into effect.	Supports a permitted activity rule where a new vehicle crossing is proposed on a State Highway. However, does not consider a permitted activity status is appropriate where a modification to an existing vehicle crossing is required to support a change in land use or subdivision (such as an increase in scale of an existing lawfully established activity, a new activity related to an existing crossing, or subdivision of land related to an existing crossing). Changes in land use and/or subdivision can often be incompatible with the formation, location or standard of an existing vehicle crossing, resulting in adverse traffic safety effects including where cumulative effects exist or are triggered. The proposed rule and standards framework does not recognise the need to re-evaluate a crossing when land use or subdivision change occurs. Similarly, existing use rights can be claimed for the location or standard of an existing vehicle crossing even when it does not meet the standards in TR-S1 - TR-S28. Many vehicle crossings are long established, and traffic on the state highways grows and speed limits change, other nearby land uses change and subdivision patterns create land use change; this can all happen subsequent to the establishment of a vehicle access and all these changes have a bearing on whether the access design standards of TR-S1 - TR-S28 are or could be met, such as access	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						spacing or access geometry. Considers an advice note would also be useful to confirm that legal access, in relation to a Limited Access Road, requires an up to date crossing place notice pursuant to s91 of the Government Roading Powers Act 1989, which is the only way to confirm if an access onto or from a LAR is lawfully established.	
S149.016	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R1	TR-R1	Support in part	Amend TR-R1: Matters of Discretion: ... 7. The cumulative effects of the non-compliance with any one or more of the relevant standard(s) 8. The effect of the non-compliance with any one or more of the vehicle crossing design standard(s) on the role of the relevant transport corridor. ... Note 1: any access proposed onto a section of a State Highway which has been declared a Limited Access Road will also require an up-to-date crossing place notice issued under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 from NZTA, that relates directly to the activities on site. Licensed Crossing place approval from NZTA under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989. Note 2: If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a new, or the modification or change in use of an existing , crossing onto a State Highway, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.	Considers a Restricted Discretionary activity status is acceptable when permitted activity standards are not achieved. Notes the matters of discretion does not include cumulative effects which the Wairarapa state highway network is susceptible to, including where cumulative effects already exist because of land use access. Further notes the matters of discretion do not include the role of transport corridors, which is a cornerstone policy of the transport chapter enabling consideration of road classification and function, and several standards relate to this. Considers that the advice note could be modified to helpfully reinforce the need for an up-to-date CP notice to confirm legal access to a state highway limited access road. Supports the identification of NZTA as an affected party for any new vehicle access onto a state highway. Requests a change to reflect matters raised above with respect to changes to existing vehicle crossing points.	Reject
S149.017	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support in part	Amend TR-R2(1): ...b. there is no new road intersection transport network connection or intersection with a State Highway.	Considers the rule only limits activities with a new road intersection with a State Highway. Increasingly other aspects of the transport network may need to connect to a state highway such as a cycleway, footpath, or	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						bridleway. The submitter would like the opportunity to be involved in such proposals to assess their suitability and safety of connection.	
S149.018	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support in part	Amend TR-R2(2) as follows: Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a new intersection or transport network connection onto a State Highway, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.	Generally supports the rule but seeks amendment so the submitter is notified when there is any new transport connection with a state highway, as well as when there is a new road intersection.	Accept in part
S149.019	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-R5	TR-R5	Support in part	Amend TR-R5: 1. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Any activity generates an average daily traffic volume or peak hour traffic volume that exceeds the thresholds in Standards TR-S29., and b. Compliance is achieved with TR-S1 - S28 and where compliance is not achieved, a concurrent resource consent is sought. ... Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule and the required Integrated Transport Assessment identifies a state highway as part of the transport network, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.	Considers it is not clear that High Traffic Generating Activities are required to comply with rule TR-R1(1) permitted activity standards for vehicle access. Whether the thresholds are met or not, any High Traffic Generating Activity should meet these permitted activity standards, and where those standards are not met a concurrent resource consent sought (thus maintaining the restricted discretionary activity status). Considers that where an ITA is required for an RDA under this rule, and the ITA is required to take account of effects to a state highway, NZTA should be identified as an affected person.	Reject
FS91.002	The Fuel Companies			Oppose	Disallow	Several of the Fuel Companies' retail fuel outlets are adjacent to the state highway network (the SHN). The Fuel Companies recognise the importance of managing the adverse effects of activities and development on the SHN's safety and efficiency. TR-R5's matters of discretion are	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						broad, and the councils will already have sufficient scope to consider adverse effects on the SHN and determine if NZTA is an affected party. The Fuel Companies consider that NZTA's proposed mandatory affected party note is not necessary and therefore oppose NZTA's submission S149.019.	
S149.020	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-S2	TR-S2	Support in part	Amend TR-S2 (Table TR-2 Minimum intersection separation distances): Roading hierarchy identification or Posted speed limit (km/h) (Insert new row) Interregional connector: 500m (Insert note following the table) A road hierarchy takes precedence over a speed limit.	Considers separation distances should be greater for State Highway 2 as it is an Interregional Connector in the roading hierarchy. Greater separation distances will support the high movement function this road corridor performs in the network. A separation distance of 500m where a state highway is high volume or high speed. This supports TR-P2 and TR-P3.	Reject
S149.021	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-S6	TR-S6	Support in part	Amend TR-S6: Table TR-4: Reduce the maximum number of vehicle crossings per site on a state highway from two to one, regardless of frontage length. Figure TR-3, point 4: Point B: position the centreline of driveway where sight distance is measured (note - this is measured from the edge lane line and where there is no edge lane line, from the edge of seal) and is 3.5 from for residential houses in an urban area and 5m for all other activities and in rural locations. Table TR-6: Roading hierarchy identification or posted speed limit: (Add a new row) Interregional connector: 500m (Add note after table) A road hierarchy takes precedence over a speed limit.	Does not support that Table TR-4 permits two vehicle crossings per road frontage where the length of the frontage is greater than 200m because most locations on the rural sections of the state highway network are LAR where NZTA would not support more than one access per frontage. Additionally, some locations on the state highway network in the Wairarapa are Interregional Connector roads with a high movement function where the separation distances are required to be 500m, so two points of access 200m apart is considered unacceptable. Notes an apparent typo in Figure TR-3. There is a typo with the word 'from' instead of 'for'. In addition 5m would be required rather than 3m in a rural setting for rural residential access. Considers the minimum separation	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						distances in Table TR-6 are acceptable. Seeks an additional criteria for separation distances between accessways and intersections for roads classified in the roading hierarchy as Interregional Connector. A 10,000vpd threshold is used as a proxy to represent Interregional Connector roads which have a high movement function. Aligning access separation with the roading hierarchy however would allow a more consistent whole-network approach compared with the threshold of 10,000 vpd. This supports policies TR-P2 and TR-P3.	
S149.022	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-S10	TR-S10	Support in part	Amend TR-S10: Apply TR-S10 to all Interregional Connector roads by adding the roading classification 'Interregional Corridor' to the TR-S10 column after Future Urban zone TR-S10 Rural vehicle crossing accessway design 1. Any accessway vehicle crossing with a traffic generation daily volume of vehicle movements of less than 100 vehicles per day shall be formed in accordance with the requirement of Table TR-8. 2. Any accessway vehicle crossing with a daily volume of vehicle movements traffic generation with an average of 100 or more vehicles per day shall be formed as a road intersection in accordance with the relevant industry standards, including Austroads. ... Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on the safety of the accessway vehicle crossing and the adjacent transport network. ... Table TR-8 Rural accessway-vehicle access design Average volume of vehicle movements	Notes there are separate definitions for 'vehicle crossing' and 'accessway', and considers the standard better aligns with the definition for 'vehicle crossing' given it primarily relates to how to design the access within in the legal road to access a private property. Considers introducing a definition for 'traffic generation' will assist with implementing this standard. Notes this standard also requires the development of intersections but does not indicate which standard. Requests an access consistent with Figure TR-7 be required where a vehicle access is located on an Interregional Connector, irrespective of the volume of traffic using the access due to the movement function of these corridors being paramount. Considers TR-S10 should apply in the Future Urban and Urban Zone north of Masterton as this urban area is expanding, land uses are changing, and roading infrastructure has not kept up. However, the road corridor remains a rural Interregional Connector with a posted speed limit of	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					using access per day traffic generation (vpd) ... Figure TR-7 Low volume accessway. ... Figure TR-8 Low volume accessway.	100km/h and no footpaths or other multi-modal connections that an expanding urban area requires. NZTA therefore seeks that this section of road be treated as rural and that TR-S10 apply to all vehicle access until there is a plan for investment. Considers failure to address this issue would be at odds with the TR-O1, TR-P1, TR-P2, TR-P3, TR-P5, UFD-O1, and INF-O1. Considers that because the land to be rezoned fronts an Interregional Connector it would be more straight forward to add that roading category to the application of TR-S10, rather than have site-specific rules. This standard provides a trigger for requiring an access or an intersection, that trigger point of 100 vehicles per day is supported.	
S149.051	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain TR-O2 subject to relief sought on TR-R1 and TR-R2.	TR-O2 deals with effects from operating and maintaining transport infrastructure, in most cases infrastructure will operate and be maintained or developed within a designation and objective TR-O2 will not apply. Plan administration could be improved by accepting the submitters points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter.	Accept
S149.052	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 subject to relief sought on TR-R1 and TR-R2.	Considers the transport network is prioritised under TR-O3, ensuring it is not compromised or constrained by incompatible land use or subdivision. Some of the links between land use, subdivision and transport chapters rules and standards is tenuous, and integrated planning could easily be overlooked. Plan administration could be improved by accepting the submitters points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter.	
S149.053	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support in part	Retain TR-P3 subject to further submission points seeking corrections to the planning maps regarding the One Network Framework and road hierarchy, and insertion of a new appendix "Roading Hierarchy Descriptions and One Network Framework Street Categories".	Recognising and protecting the role of transport corridors is vital to good design outcomes for the network. Policy linkages important to achieving TR-O1. Policy TR-P3 appropriately relies on the One Network Framework (ONF) to establish the roading hierarchy, which applies to local roads and state highways alike. Policy TR-P3 aligns well with objective UFD-O4 Infrastructure Capacity and INF-O1 Infrastructure. Including the One Network Framework (ONF) in the Plan will align it with strategic transport planning in long term plans, Regional Land Transport Plans (RLTP's), Long Term Council Community Plans (LTCCP), and the National Land Transport Plan and the relevant funding mechanisms. However, considers the Plan does not provide sufficient information or context on the ONF to assist in the successful implementation of TR-P3, and some of the ONF roading hierarchy mapping is incorrect. Issues that have the potential to undermine the roading hierarchy, and therefore the One Network Framework (ONF) are cumulative effects on roads or parts of roads. These occur when dispensations to standards are granted consecutively along a corridor, or when vehicle generation increases over time and the corridor can no longer adequately serve the needs of the land uses without upgrades.	Accept
S149.055	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	New provision request	New provision request	Oppose in part	Insert new appendix, APPX - Roading Hierarchy Descriptions and One Network Framework Street Categories (see attachment to original submission for proposed appendix)	Insert new appendix to the Plan to provide sufficient information or context on the One Network Framework to assist in the successful implementation of Policy TR-P3	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S152.004	AdamsonShaw Ltd	TR-S8	TR-S8	Oppose	Amend TR-S8(2) and (4) from 30m to 10m .	These standards require a minimum distance of 30m of surfacing from the edge of the road carriageway. This adds unnecessary cost to the process. To reduce tracking from a metal accessway onto a public road the submitter suggests a 10m distance is sufficient to manage any adverse effects.	Accept in part
FS54.001	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Agrees 30m is too large and adds unnecessary cost.	Accept in part
FS109.0010	East Leigh Limited			Support	Allow	This submission is consistent with ELL's primary submission	Accept in part
S152.005	AdamsonShaw Ltd	TR-S10	TR-S10	Oppose	Amend TR-S10(1), Table TR-8 & Figures TR-7 and TR-8, to reduce width of vehicle crossing.	The submitter considers minimum 9.0m radius plus widening of 6m wide is large and excessive for a single crossing.	Accept in part
S152.006	AdamsonShaw Ltd	TR-S6	TR-S6	Oppose	Delete Table TR-5.	The transport chapter includes figures/diagrams that are inconsistent/conflict with similar diagrams in the Engineering Development Standards e.g. sight line measurements. The figures should be in one document, either the Plan or the Engineering Development Standards.	Reject
S172.018	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain TR-O1 as notified.	Supports TR-O1 insofar as it promotes a well-connected, integrated, safe, and accessible transport network that enables emergency service vehicles to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently.	Accept
S172.019	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 as notified.	Supports TR-O3 insofar as it discourages compromising the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the transport network through incompatible land use, subdivision, and development.	Accept
S172.020	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support	Retain TR-P2 as notified.	Supports TR-P2 insofar as it promotes good design outcomes for the transport network including roads and vehicle crossings which	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						meet the minimum design standards required by the PDP.	
S172.021	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support	Retain TR-P5 as notified.	Supports TR-P5 insofar as it requires development to meet minimum standards when connecting to road corridors and, where these are not met, adverse effects on the transport network must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated.	Accept
S172.022	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-R1	TR-R1	Support	Retain TR-R1 as notified.	Supports TR-R1 insofar as the construction or alteration of accessways, vehicle crossings, and roads must comply with TR-S1 and TR-S5.	Accept
S172.023	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support	Retain TR-R2 as notified.	Supports TR-R2 insofar as the construction or alteration of accessways, vehicle crossings, and roads must comply with TR-S1 and TR-S5.	Accept
S172.024	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-S1	TR-S1	Support	Retain TR-S1 as notified.	Supports TR-S1 insofar as the standard does not allow for roads with carriageway widths less than 6.5m or gradients greater than 12.5%.	Accept
S172.025	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-S5	TR-S5	Support	Retain TR-S5 as notified.	Supports TR-S5 insofar as it requires site accessways to be designed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard.	Accept
S172.026	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TR-S14	TR-S14	Support	Retain TR-S14 as notified.	Supports TR-S14 insofar as it requires accessways to be designed to provide firefighting access where a site is located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having an accessway length greater than 50m when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants. Access is particularly important in unreticulated areas where fire appliances need to enter a site to access the onsite firefighting water supply and the emergency	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						(i.e. structural fire). In areas that may be reticulated, if a dwelling is not located within 50m from a road with appropriate widths / gradients, there is a risk that the hose run distance between an accessible hydrant and site of a fire will be exceeded.	
S186.016	Wellington Fish and Game Council	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain as notified.	Support objective.	Accept
S186.017	Wellington Fish and Game Council	TR-P6	TR-P6	Support	Retain as notified.	Support Policy.	Accept
S187.024	New Zealand Frost Fans	New provision request	New provision request	Amend	Insert new rule as follows: TRAN-RSX Exemption Rural Zones1. the installation of fences, equipment and machinery for land based primary production complying with all other aspects of plan will not require upgrade of existing vehicle crossings to meet TR-S2, TR-S5 - TR-S15.	Transport chapter is extremely technical. To provide some clarity and to enable minor works on rural land for the purpose of land based primary production.	Reject
FS13.038	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow in part	Enable minor works on rural land for primary production purposes.	Reject
S189.035	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support in part	Amend TR-P3 as follows: Identify and manage a classification of roads and other transport corridors within the Wairarapa based on the One Network Framework to ensure that the function of each corridor is recognised and protected when managing subdivision and land use. Recognise that transport corridors are an appropriate space for other infrastructure.	The use of transport corridors for other infrastructure should also be recognised in this policy.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)						
S203.004	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-R5	TR-R5	Amend	Amend or delete matter (4) of the specified matters of discretion	The submission states that it is unclear what is meant by matter (4) in the specified matters of discretion -'strategic frameworks'.	Reject
S203.005	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-S16	TR-S16	Oppose	Delete standard TR-S16	The submission states that Policy 11 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development precludes the specification of minimum car parking requirements. The submitter acknowledges that the effects of parking provision remain a valid consideration.	Reject
FS90.140	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	NPS-UD section 3.38 should be applied across the whole district plan consistently, minimum carparking requirements should be removed for all districts	Reject
S203.006	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-S23	TR-S23	Amend	Amend to clarify the applicability of TR-S23 to a retirement village.	The submitter seeks clarification on how this standard would apply to a retirement village. TR-S23 specifies cycle parking requirements for certain activities. It is assumed that a retirement village would need to provide for cycle parking as per a healthcare facility, but this is unclear.	Reject
S203.007	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Support TR-O1. Retain as notified.	The submitter supports this objective as notified	Accept
S203.008	Summerset Group	TR-P1	TR-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support TR-P1.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Holdings Limited						
S203.027	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain TR-O2 as notified.	The submitter supports the objective as notified.	Accept
S203.028	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 as notified.	The submitter supports the objective as notified.	Accept
S203.029	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support	Retain TR-P2.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept
S203.030	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support	Retain TR-P3.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept
S203.031	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P4	TR-P4	Support	Retain TR-P4.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept
S203.032	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support	Retain TR-P5.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept
S203.033	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P6	TR-P6	Support	Retain TR-P6.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept
S203.034	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support	Retain TR-P7.	The submitter supports the policy as notified.	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S209.034	Powerco Limited	Introduction	Introduction	Support	retain as drafted	Submitter supports the following text included in the introduction to the TR Chapter - as the majority of Powerco assets are located within roads, it supports the clarification of zoning that will apply to roads.	Accept
S212.020	Māori Trustee	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain TR-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter.	Accept
S212.124	Māori Trustee	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain TR-O2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter.	Accept
S212.125	Māori Trustee	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain TR-O3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter.	Accept
S212.126	Māori Trustee	TR-P1	TR-P1	Support	Retain TR-P1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.127	Māori Trustee	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support	Retain TR-P2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.128	Māori Trustee	TR-P3	TR-P3	Support	Retain TR-P3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.129	Māori Trustee	TR-P4	TR-P4	Support	Retain TR-P4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.130	Māori Trustee	TR-P5	TR-P5	Support	Retain TR-P5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.131	Māori Trustee	TR-P6	TR-P6	Support	Retain TR-P6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.132	Māori Trustee	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support	Retain TR-P7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.133	Māori Trustee	TR-P8	TR-P8	Support	Retain TR-P8 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.134	Māori Trustee	TR-P9	TR-P9	Support	Retain TR-P9 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.135	Māori Trustee	TR-P10	TR-P10	Support	Retain TR-P10 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' 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
S212.136	Māori Trustee	TR-P11	TR-P11	Support	Retain TR-P11 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter.	Accept
S212.137	Māori Trustee	TR-R1	TR-R1	Support	Retain TR-R1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.138	Māori Trustee	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support	Retain TR-R2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.139	Māori Trustee	TR-R3	TR-R3	Support	Retain TR-R3 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.140	Māori Trustee	TR-R4	TR-R4	Support	Retain TR-R4 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.141	Māori Trustee	TR-R5	TR-R5	Support	Retain TR-R5 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.142	Māori Trustee	TR-R6	TR-R6	Support	Retain TR-R6 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S212.143	Māori Trustee	TR-R6	TR-R6	Support	Retain TR-R7 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter.	Accept
S214.027	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support	Retain TR-O2 as notified.	TR-O2 is supported by the submitter as it recognises and provides for adverse effects from transport to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated.	Accept
FS95.132	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia 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
S214.028	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	TR-P6	TR-P6	Support in part	Amend TR-P6 as follows: Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing avoiding, remedying, or mitigating the adverse effects of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities	The submitter supports TR-P6 as it provides for the management of adverse effects from transport on adjacent activities. However, the submitter proposes that the wording should encompass the effects management hierarchy similar to TR-O2.	Accept
FS95.133	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia 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
S221.054	Horticulture New Zealand	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain TR-O1(b) as notified.	Well-functioning roads are needed to facilitate the movement of fresh fruits and vegetables to market. Fresh produce is highly perishable, and its sale relies on an efficient transportation network.	Accept
S222.009	Jack Wass	TR-S5	TR-S5	Amend	Amend TR-S5 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S222.010	Jack Wass	TR-S10	TR-S10	Amend	Amend TR-S10 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S222.011	Jack Wass	TR-S11	TR-S11	Amend	Amend TR-S11 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S222.012	Jack Wass	TR-S12	TR-S12	Amend	Amend TR-S12 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S222.013	Jack Wass	TR-S13	TR-S13	Amend	Amend TR-S13 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S222.014	Jack Wass	TR-S14	TR-S14	Amend	Amend TR-S14 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S222.015	Jack Wass	TR-S15	TR-S15	Amend	Amend TR-S15 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways.	The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale.	Reject
S232.011	CentrePort Limited	TR-R1	TR-R1	Amend	Amend TR-R1 Construction or , alteration, maintenance, and repair of accessways, vehicle crossings, parking, and loading areas. AND Add a new rule: TR-RX Maintenance and repair of accessways, vehicle crossings, parking and loading areas. All Zones. 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. the form and function of the accessway, vehicle crossing, parking or loading area is not altered. Note: if the form and function of the accessway is altered, Rule TR-R1 applies.	Considers it should not be necessary to gain resource consent for the maintenance and repair of vehicle crossing. Proposes a separate rule to provide for maintenance or repair as a permitted activity where the form and function is not altered.	Reject
S233.004	Scott Anstis	TR-S8	TR-S8	Oppose	Amend TR-S8: ... 2. Any vehicle crossing to a sealed road shall be formed, surfaced with concrete, chip seal, or asphaltic concrete, and drained for a minimum distance of 10m 30m from the edge of the road carriageway. ... 4. All crossings to a state highway shall be sealed from the edge of the carriageway for a minimum distance of 10m 30m .	Considers a 10m minimum distance from the edge of the road carriageway is sufficient and reduces tracking from metal accessways onto public roads. Considers the proposed requirement of 30m is unnecessary and costly.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S233.005	Scott Anstis	TR-S10	TR-S10	Oppose	Amend TR-S10(1) to reduce the 9m radius plus 6m widening required for a single vehicle crossing (Figures TR-7 and TR-8 Low and Moderate Volume Accessways).	Considers a 9m radius plus 6m widening is excessive for a single vehicle crossing.	Reject
FS54.007	Rochelle McCarty			Support	Allow	Supports the original submission point.	Reject
S233.006	Scott Anstis			Oppose	Delete TR tables and figures from the District Plan OR Delete Engineering Development Standards document.	Notes Transport chapter contains figures and diagrams that are inconsistent with similar diagrams in the Engineering Development Standards (for example, Table TR-5 and Figure TR-3 sight line measurements). Considers all figures and tables should be in one document - either the Plan or the Engineering Development Standards to avoid inconsistencies.	Accept in part
S236.025	-Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	TR-P6	TR-P6	Oppose	Amend TR-P6 as follows: 'Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing the adverse effects of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities, and avoiding adverse effects on areas and values identified in Schedules including SNAs and applying the effects management hierarchy where adverse effects cannot be avoided. '	The submitter considers the policy does not provide sufficient direction.	Reject
S238.017	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	TR-O3	TR-O3	Support	Retain Objective TR-O3 as proposed.	Objective TR-O3 is supported	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S238.018	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	TR-P7	TR-P7	Support in part	Amend Policy TR-P7 as follows: TR-P7 High Traffic Generating Activities Require new high traffic generating activities, or expansions of existing high traffic generating activities that exceed traffic generation thresholds, which propose to access and utilise the districts' roads to be assessed in an integrated Transport Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified traffic specialist that demonstrates how any adverse effects on the road transport network will be avoided, remedied, mitigated, and assesses: a. the road's capacity and the likely effect of the proposed use on the road and its users; b. effects on the amenity values and the need for road maintenance agreements; c. the effect on ongoing maintenance of the road and the need for road maintenance agreements; d. whether opportunities for alternative access and/ or routes exist; e. appropriate traffic management and travel demand management mechanisms; f. whether it is appropriate to stage the activity and/or undertake improvements to the transport network; and g. cumulative effects.	Policy TR-P7 is supported in principle however, an amendment is sought to apply the Policy to new high traffic generation activities or existing high traffic generating activities exceeding the specified traffic generation thresholds. This is so the Policy does not curtail or require an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) for upgrades or development to existing high traffic generating activities, such as existing service stations, that does not change the overall character and intensity of use nor results in additional traffic volumes which the PDP seeks to manage. This submission relates to the submission on Rule TR-R5.	Reject
S238.019	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	TR-R5	TR-R5	Support in part	Amend Rule TR-R5 as follows: TR-R5 High Traffic Generating Activities All zones 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Any new activity or expansion of an exiting activity that generates an average daily traffic volume or peak hour traffic volume that exceeds the thresholds in	As it reads, Rule TR-R5 requires restricted discretionary activity resource consent for activities which exceed the thresholds in Table TR-16 of Standard TR-S29. This rule also requires the application to be supported by an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA), the comprehensiveness of which is determined by Table TR-18 based on the highest activity status of the resource consent application. The submitter supports	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	Fuel Companies')				Standard TR-S29. [...]	this approach in principle; however, they seek clarification that the thresholds (and therefore Rule TR-R5 and Standard TR-S29) only apply to a new activity or the expansion of an existing activity that increases its character and intensity. For example, the establishment of a new service station or the expansion of an existing service station where that expansion exceeds the thresholds of Table TR-16. The submitter seeks this to ensure that the rule and standard are not triggered by upgrades or development to existing service stations that does not change the overall character and intensity of use nor results in additional traffic volumes which the PDP seeks to manage.	
S239.009	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	TR-S1	TR-S1	Support in part	Amend - The 'Engineering Development Standard' referenced should apply to all three Districts for consistency.	There is no geographical reason for engineering standards to vary between the Districts.	Reject
S239.010	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	TR-S6	TR-S6	Support in part	Amend Note to read: "Sight distance measured in accordance with Figure TR-3".	Table TR-5 Minimum sight distance measured in accordance with "Figure TR-1". The correct Figure is "Figure TR-3"	Accept
S239.011	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	TR-S6	TR-S6	Oppose in part	Delete Figure TR-3 and reference Figure R04 of the Engineering Design Standard	Figure TR-3 and Figure R04 in the Engineering Development Standard are inconsistent.	Accept
S239.012	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	TR-S8	TR-S8	Oppose in part	Amend TR-S8 as follows: "TR-S8 Vehicle crossing information [...] 2. Any vehicle crossing to a sealed road shall be formed, surfaced with concrete, chip seal or asphaltic concrete, and drained for a minimum distance of 30m 10m from the edge of the road carriageway. [...]"	Sealing a vehicle accessway for a distance of 30m from the edge of a road carriageway is excessive and not justified.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					4. All crossing to a state highway shall be sealed from the edge of the carriageway for a minimum distance of 30m 10m. [...]"		
FS80.003	AdamsonShaw Ltd			Support	Allow	30m sealing requirement adds unnecessary cost.	Accept in part
S239.013	East Leigh Limited ("ELL")	TR-S10	TR-S10	Support in part	Amend diagram to show required extent of seal consistent as per TR-S8.	Figures TR-7 and TR-8 should be amended to be consistent with TR-S8.	Reject
S245.009	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	TR-O1	TR-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective as it will enable a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network around educational facilities.	Accept
S245.010	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy to encourage good design outcomes that will maximises opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport around educational facilities.	Accept
S245.011	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	TR-S23	TR-S23	Support	Retain as notified.	Support the requirements for minimum cycle parking spaces.	Accept
S245.055	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	TR-S16	TR-S16	Support in part	Amend TR-S16 to remove educational facilities and associated parking requirements from Table TR-9.	The NPS-UD requires Tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities to remove any minimum car parking requirement in their District Plans (see subpart 8 - section 3.38). An Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is often supplied through the Notice of Requirement process when a new school is established. The ITA can determine the appropriate need for parking on each school site.	Reject
S251.005	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa	TR-P2	TR-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy TR-P2 Good design outcomes as follows: "The transport network is maintained or improved in a way that: a. promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions;	Policy TR-P2 references "the Subdivision Design Guide". There is no specific subdivision design guide, and this reference should be to "the relevant Design Guide" (which would be the Centres Design Guide, the Industrial Design Guide, or the	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	District Councils				b. roads and vehicle crossings meet minimum design standards to allow for safe, effective, and efficient traffic movement and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or crossing; c. is consistent with the relevant Design Guide in Appendices APP3, APP4, or APP5 and Council's Engineering Development Standard Subdivision Design Guide and promotes good urban design, including connectivity, decreasing travel distances, and linking to existing transport networks; d. considers and responds to safety and accessibility, including Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles."	Residential Design Guide) and Council's Engineering Development Standard.	
S251.006	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	TR-S6	TR-S6	Support	Amend Standard TR-S6 to correct the Note below Table TR-5 as follows: Notes: Sight distance measured in accordance with Figure TR-4 TR-3 .	The Note below Table TR-5 Minimum sight distance requirements refer to sight distance being measured in accordance with Figure TR-1. This is an error, and the correct reference should be to Figure TR-3 Sight distance measurement which immediately follows the note.	Accept
S251.007	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	New provision request	New provision request	Support in part	Amend Appendix TR-APP2 Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface Specifications as per the amendments in Attachment 1 of the Original Submission.	Appendix TR-APP2 Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface Specifications describes the specifications for the Hood Aerodrome obstacle limitation surfaces. Some of these descriptions do not align with the existing and/or proposed runway configurations and should be updated.	Accept
FS98.001	DMST Internationals Limited			Oppose	Disallow	The scale of the map appended to the submission, it is unclear whether the proposed amendments to the aerodrome obstacle limitation surface extend further into the site owned by further submitter (42 and 64 millard avenue)	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S258.073	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-O2	TR-O2	Support in part	Amend Objective TR-O2 as follows: "TR-O2 Adverse effects of the transport network. Adverse effects on the environment from the construction, operation, maintenance, and development of the transport network are avoided, remedied, or mitigated." Furthermore, add: - policy direction to implement this objective or amend Policy TR-P6 as sought below. - measures to rules to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects on the environment.	The submitter is generally supportive of the objective but considers it should be clarified so that the adverse effects which are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated are those "on the environment". Concerned that there is no clear policy direction of measures within rules in this chapter implementing this objective. While the ECO chapter rules may be able to be relied on in terms of indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification associated with TR activities, this does not necessarily address effects on indigenous fauna from TR activities. Concerns with respect to provision for earthworks as discussed in key issues above.	Accept
FS105.114	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Accept
S258.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-P6	TR-P6	Oppose	Amend Policy TR-P6 as follows: 'TR-P6 Managing effects of the transport network Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing the avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment, in accordance with other district wide matters chapters. of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities.'	As worded the management of adverse effects is only to be considered in terms of effects on adjacent activities. To achieve Objective TR-O2 and for integrated management, adverse effects on the environment are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated. With respect to adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity this needs to be in accordance with the ECO chapter provisions.	Accept
FS105.115	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Accept
S258.075	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	TR-P11	TR-P11	Support in part	Amend Policy TR-P11 as follows: Enable and encourage the establishment and operation of the Wairarapa Five Towns Trail Network as shown on Map XX .	It is not clear what exactly is to be enabled. Particularly as information online indicates that some parts of the trail are only indicative at this stage. The policy direction to "enable" could conflict with ECO or CE chapter	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	New Zealand Inc				OR Enable Provide for and encourage the establishment and operation of the Wairarapa Five Towns Trail Network while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment, in accordance with other district wide matters chapters.	provisions. While this may be unlikely it would be helpful to provide greater certainty. This could be done by including planning maps of the network to which this provision applies or including direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects in accordance with other chapters of the plan.	
S258.076	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-R1	TR-R1	Oppose	Amend Rule TR-R1 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. compliance is achieved with...iii. a maximum of 50m2 earthworks, iv. removal of mature trees shall only be undertaken: 1. outside the bird breeding period (1 September until March 1); and 2. Shall any tree used or of potential use for bat roostv. no indigenous vegetation clearance within 100m of any SNA or NOSZ. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... Matters of discretion: 7. Effects of earthworks 8. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.	The submitter is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds.	Reject
FS105.116	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S258.077	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-R2	TR-R2	Support	Amend Rule TR-R2 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... c. a maximum of 50m2 earthwork d. removal of mature trees shall only be undertaken: 1. outside the bird breeding period (1 September until March 1); and 2. Shall any tree used or of potential use for bat roost. e. no indigenous vegetation clearance within 100m of any SNA or NOSZ. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... Matters of discretion:	The submitter is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					... 5. Effects of earthworks6. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.	lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds.	
FS105.117	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S258.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-R3	TR-R3	Support	Amend Rule TR-R3 as follows: Matters of discretion: ... 4. Effects of earthworks5. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.	The submitter is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds.	Reject
FS105.118	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports the submission, particularly relating to conservation for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S258.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	TR-R6	TR-R6	Oppose in part	Amend Rule TR-R6 to exclude the NOSZ so that trees within the NOSZ are not subject to any limitations in the Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface or limit any restriction on tree height to within 50m of the perimeter of the aerodrome.	Forest & Bird owns Fensham Reserve which is identified as NOSZ within the Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface. While it seems unlikely that trees within the reserve would be affected by the limits in TR-R6(1)a this is not clear. They also note that there is an NOSZ identified closer to the Aerodrome near the Waingawa River which presumably includes trees and should not be subject to TR-R6.	Reject
S258.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	New provision request	New provision request	Support in part	Amend Rule TR-R7 as follows: TR-R7 Any transport infrastructure activity not otherwise listed in this	It is not clear if "any activity" is limited to transport activities or would include buildings or other activities not directly associated with Transport Infrastructure.	Accept in part

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
	New Zealand Inc				addressed in the rules of the TR - Transport chapter	The submitter has some concern on the uncertainty of what Transport Infrastructure activities could be captured under rule as permitted activities and generally considers that identifiable activities should be specifically addressed. However, the submitter considers that this rule, if limited to "transport Infrastructure activities not otherwise specifically addressed in the rules of the TR chapter" is acceptable because all other rules in the plan also apply as relevant to activities addressed in the TR Chapter - as explained in the TR - Transport Chapter Introduction.	
FS61.005	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)			Oppose	Disallow	The submitter seeks this rule apply to 'transport infrastructure activities' only. The thrust of the NZTA submission is that all land use and subdivision activities should be integrated with transport; it is unnecessary to narrow the application of this rule where it simply requires all activities to meet the permitted activity standards.	Reject
S64.004	Warren Reiri	Designations	Designations	Amend	Amend the Plan to change the name of (Te Whiti Road) to Mangaakutu Road from 98 Te Whiti Road to Makoura Stream Bridge (inferred).	Address changed 3 times with no connection to the area. The area is named "mangaakuta". This should be the name of the road from the boundary to the Makoura Stream Bridge.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S79.011	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain definition for 'Transport network' as notified.	Supports the inclusion of a definition for 'Transport Network' that includes the rail network.	Accept
S149.001	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose in part	Amend the definition of Accessway: Means any area or part of private land where the primary purpose is to provide access, including vehicle access, between the body of any allotment(s) or site(s) and any public road, footpath, or cycling path. Accessway includes any rights of way, private way, access lot, access leg, or private road. (For the vehicle access to/from a legal road, see the definition for 'vehicle crossing').	There is no national planning standard for the definition of accessway. Accessway in the proposed plan is a term used to define an area for transport passage (of any kind) within a property; accessway is also a term used by NZTA standards connection between a road and a property. The NZTA definition for accessway aligns with the Proposed District Plan definition for 'vehicle crossing'. Where access to a state highway is concerned, the conflicting definitions between documents could be confusing, and there are many vehicle access or crossing points from the state highways within the Wairarapa.	Accept
S149.003	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	Insert the following definition for Crossing Place (CP): "A point on the boundary of a site with a Limited Access Road (LAR) State Highway at which the has authorised vehicles to proceed to and from the LAR State Highway under either section 90 or section 91 of the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989. A Crossing Place is also a 'vehicle crossing,' a term that is also defined in this Plan".	A crossing place is the location of an approved vehicle access from a state highway that has been gazetted as a Limited Access Road. State Highway 2 has limited access roads in the Wairarapa. The requirement for a crossing place is identified in the Plan standards so a definition would assist the interpretation and administration of the standards. A crossing place notice is the document which confirms legal access to a Limited Access Road. The requested wording is consistent with the Planning Policy Manual 2007.	Reject
S149.005	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	Insert a definition for the term Traffic Generation as follows -Means the calculation of vehicle movements to and from, and from and to any parcel of land or accessway and a road and relates to any single or group of land use activities using a vehicle crossing or crossings, or an intersection. Vehicle	There are several vehicle crossing or accessway standards that rely on the application of traffic generation, however there is no guidance in the plan on how to calculate this. A definition will assist with plan administration and ensure standards are applied in the same way across the districts.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
					movements shall be calculated using equivalent car movements in the following way: • 1 car to and from the property = 2 vehicle movements • 1 truck to and from the property = 6 vehicle movements • 1 truck and trailer to and from the property = 10 vehicle movement	Where larger or slower vehicles are involved (trucks, truck and trailers, towed trailers, camper vans, tractors, busses etc.), equivalent car movements ⁴ should be used to account for the different effects these vehicles have at an access or intersection. The vehicles need more room to manoeuvre and take longer to make turns and are associated with higher/different levels of safety risk requiring different access and intersection design responses.	
FS91.001	The Fuel Companies			Oppose	Disallow	The Fuel Companies' core business in the districts are retail fuel outlets (service stations and truck stops). The operation of these outlets inherently involves a range of vehicle movements including heavy vehicles (trucks and truck and trailers). These outlets are not destinations; they rely on existing traffic on the road network for their customers. Customers simply pause their journey for a short period of time at the outlet before resuming their journey. The Fuel Companies are not specifically opposed to a traffic generation definition; their concern lies with NZTA's proposed equivalent car movements for trucks and truck and trailers given the PDP's traffic generation rules. Under Table TR-16 of TR-S29 relating to high traffic generating thresholds, the implication of the proposed traffic generation definition is that the threshold at which heavy vehicle movements are considered a high traffic generating activity would essentially reduce as follows: - General Residential, Settlement, Open Space and Recreation Zones: Will reduce from 10 heavy vehicle movements to 1.6 movement for trucks and 1 movement for truck and trailers. - All other zones: Will reduce from 50	Accept

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						heavy vehicle movements to 8.3 movements for trucks and 5 movements for truck and trailers. The Fuel Companies consider that the combination of the PDP's traffic generation rules and a traffic generation definition would result in thresholds that are too restrictive on activities and therefore oppose NZTA's submission S149.005.	
S149.006	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	Insert the following definition for Limited Access Road: Any Road declared to be A Limited Access Road under section 88 GRPA, section 346A of the Local Government Act 1974, or the corresponding provisions of any former or later enactment.	As identified above, the Wairarapa has several sections of state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road for which there are specific requirements in law applying under the Government Roading Powers Act. Reference to Limited Access Roads is provided in the Plan standards, a definition would therefore assist the interpretation and administration of the standards. The requested wording is consistent with the Policy Manual 2007.	Reject
S149.008	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Amend the definition as follows: Means that part of the legal road area that has been or can be or is proposed to be formed, reformed , or otherwise constructed to enable vehicle access between a site and a formed public road or live traffic lane.	The proposed definition could be amended to assist in the application of proposed standards where they relate to a vehicle crossing that already exists but requires to be reformed to support a site. This also relates to submission point below on rule TR-R1(1). The words in the definition 'can be formed' may also indicate assurances that do not exist and the words 'proposed to be formed' would be more suitable.	Accept
S247.002	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	Definitions	Definitions	Support in part	Insert a definition for 'ancillary transport network infrastructure' as follows: "Ancillary transport network infrastructure means infrastructure located within the road reserve that supports the transport network and includes:... j. space for Council kerbside waste bins."	Refuse trucks need to have the appropriate space within road reserves to support collection of bins. With intensification, road reserves need to be carefully planned. While the placement of bins is temporary, the provision of space for their collection is paramount to allow efficient collection of bins and avoid injury to users of the road while refuse trucks are	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
						operating. Adding this clause to the definition will ensure that this element of the road reserve is considered.	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S149.054	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	Amend	Amend the roading hierarchy layer of the planning maps which has some errors compared to the published One Network Framework.	The Plan maps incorrectly identified the hierarchy of road sections in Masterton from the 50km/h threshold northwards.	Accept
S251.026	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	Support in part	Amend planning maps to correct the obstacle limitation surface as per the amendments in Attachment 1 to the Original Submission.	Some of these descriptions do not align with the existing and/or proposed runway configurations and should be updated.	Accept
S291.002	Ben Foreman	Zones	Zones	Amend	Amend the planning maps to correct the road alignment for Solway Crescent, Masterton.	There is an inconsistency between the maps showing a roundabout outside 75 Solway Crescent where none exists. The roundabout shown on the maps also cuts into the submitter's property.	Reject

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision
S149.036	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	SUB-S7	SUB-S7	Support in part	Amend SUB-S7: 1. All new allotments created must have legal and physical access to a road in accordance with TR-R1(1) and the relevant standards TR-S1 - TR-S28 in TR-Transport.	This standard is supported and generally requires legal and physical access to a road in accordance with transport chapter standards. The standard is generic because of the way the TR-Transport chapter is structured; subdivisions should be specifically required to meet with TR-S1-TR-S28 rather than just 'the relevant' standard which leaves matters open for interpretation.	Accept in part