In the Environment Court of New Zealand Wellington Registry

I Mua I Te Kooti Taiao O Aotearoa Te Whanganui-a-Tara Rohe

ENV-

Between New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association

Incorporated

Appellant

And Masterton District Council, Carterton

District Council, and South Wairarapa

District Council

Respondents

Notice of appeal to Environment Court against decision on proposed plan

Dated: 5 November 2025

Counsel:

Stuart Ryan, Barrister Ākarana Chambers Level 11, Southern Cross Building 59-67 High Street Auckland 1010

PO Box 1296, Shortland Street Auckland 1140

Telephone: 09 357 0599 Email: stuart@stuartryan.co.nz

To the Registrar Environment Court Wellington

- 1. The New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc ("NZHHA") appeals against a decision of Wairarapa District Council on the following proposed district plan ("PDP"):
 - Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan Decisions Version
 October 2025
- 2. NZHHA made a submission on the PDP (submission number S252).
- 3. NZHHA is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308D of the Act.
- 4. NZHHHA received notice of the decision on 8 October 2025.
- 5. The part of the decision that NZHHA is appealing against is:
 - (a) The prescriptive policies for relocatable buildings, including without limitation at GRZ-P9, and elsewhere. For the avoidance of doubt, NZHHA is appealing the policies for relocatable buildings for all zones;
 - (b) The imposition of performance bonds in the permitted activity standards for relocatable buildings in all zones;
 - (c) The threshold (\$10,000) and quantum (125% of reinstatement works) of performance bonds in the standards for relocatable buildings in all zones.
 - (d) The requirement to supply the transport route and any traffic management plans 10 days prior to the load movement.
- 6. The reasons for the appeal are as follows:
 - (a) In New Zealand, the large majority of territorial authorities do not impose performance bonds on resource management controls for the relocation of dwellings, and are able to adequately manage any adverse effects without the necessity of a performance bond.
 - (b) The adverse effects of relocatable buildings can be adequately managed within the Wairarapa districts by appropriate performance

standards (as prescribed in the proposed district plan which has standards for relocatable buildings providing for a building inspection report, a timeframe for placement on foundations, and a timeframe for exterior reinstatement, and other standards as prescribed at GRZ-S11(4) (relocatable buildings) and elsewhere) and without the need for performance bonds.

- (c) The imposition of performance bonds is unreasonable and places a disproportionate financial burden on persons wishing to choose relocatable buildings for residential dwellings.
- (d) The arbitrary quantum of the bond will act as a disincentive to the recycling of existing buildings as affordable housing and utility structures, with demolition and disposal in landfills as a potential outcome.
- (e) A performance bond for a residential dwelling is not reasonably justifiable by reference to the evaluation required by sections 32 32A RMA.
- (f) The requirement to provide a transport route so that the transport operator can be advised of temporary restrictions on the route is not necessary as a resource management matter.

7. NZHHA seeks the following relief:

- (a) That the permitted activity standards and policies for performance bonds on relocatable buildings in all zones be deleted (including without limitation GRZ-P9(1)-(4) and GRZ-S11(4) and elsewhere);
- (b) In relation to the policies for relocatable buildings provide a policy that encourages the relocation of buildings, including dwellings, while requiring the completion and external repair within a reasonable timeframe as provided for at GRZ-P9 and elsewhere, but otherwise delete any prescriptive policies which are in the nature of rules or methods.
- (c) The deletion of the requirement in all zones to provide a transport route and traffic management plans 10 days in advance of the building movement.

- (d) Any further or consequential changes to give effect to the above.
- 8. The following persons have been served with a copy of this appeal:
 - (a) Masterton District Council, Carterton District Council, and South Wairarapa District Council – Postal address: PO Box 9, Carterton 5743 – Contact person: Solitaire Robertson, solitaire@cdc.govt.nz
- 9. The following documents are attached to this notice:
 - 1. A copy of NZHHA's submission dated 19 December 2023.
 - 2. Extracts from hearing panel decision report 2;
 - 3. Extracts from Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan Decisions Version October 2025 GRZ General Residential Zone (the provisions of which are adopted elsewhere).

Date: 5 November 2025

S J Ryan

Counsel for the appellant

Address for service of appellant:

Telephone: 09 357 0599

Email: stuart@stuartryan.co.nz
Contact person: Stuart Ryan

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of appeal

How to become party to proceedings

You may be a party to the appeal if you made a submission or a further submission on the matter of this appeal.

To become a party to the appeal, you must,—

- within 15 working days after the period for lodging a notice of appeal ends, lodge a notice of your wish to be a party to the proceedings (in form 33) with the Environment Court and serve copies of your notice on the relevant local authority and the appellant; and
- within 20 working days after the period for lodging a notice of appeal ends, serve copies of your notice on all other parties.

Your right to be a party to the proceedings in the court may be limited by the trade competition provisions in section 274(1) and Part 11A of the Act. You may apply to the Environment Court under section 281 of the Act for a waiver of the above timing or service requirements (see form 38).

Advice

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington, or Christchurch.

Attachment 1 – A copy of NZHHA's submission dated 19 December 2023.



BARRISTER LLB, MSc (Hons)

P + 64 9 357 0599 **M** + 64 21 286 0230 **F** + 64 9 280 1110

www.stuartryan.co.nz

Level 11, Southern Cross Building 59-67 High Street, Auckland PO Box 1296, Shortland Street **E** stuart@stuartryan.co.nz Auckland 1140, New Zealand

Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils c/o Masterton District Council PO Box 444 Masterton 5840

19 December 2023

Attention: Planning team

By email: submissions@wairarapaplan.co.nz

Wairarapa Combined District Plan – Submission by New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association

- 1. The House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc (the "Association") represents firms and individuals engaged in building removal and relocation throughout New Zealand.
- 2. The Association wishes to ensure that regulatory controls through District Plans properly reflect the purpose and intentions of the Resource Management Act 1991 as expressed in the decision of the Environment Court in New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding).
- 3. In that decision the Environment Court held that there was no real difference in effect and amenity value terms between the in situ construction of a new dwelling and relocation of a second-hand dwelling, subject to appropriate permitted activity performance standards. In the Central Otago decision, the Environment Court:
 - rejected discretionary activity status for relocated dwellings.
 - upheld permitted activity status, subject to standards approved by the court. The standards were drafted to integrate Building Act and RMA processes.
 - Approved the control of relocated dwellings being comparable to the control of new and existing dwellings, saying (at paragraph 22):

"if in situ built housing is a permitted activity [i.e. existing and new dwellings], then so should be relocatable housing".

4. Since the decision in Central Otago, most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.

Provisions in the Proposed District Plan – Relocated Buildings

5. Relocatable buildings are provided for with a specific activity rule, policy and standard in all zones with permitted activity status. The relevant provisions state (for example in the General Residential Zone):



GRZ-P9 Relocatable buildings

Provide for relocation of buildings while requiring the completion and renovation within a reasonable timeframe by:

- 0. Requiring pre-inspection reports to be prepared that identify any reinstatement work required to the exterior of the building following the building relocation;
- 1. Ensuring that relocatable buildings have the same use as what they were previously designed, built, and used for;
- 2. Requiring a performance bond as a security measure that reinstatement works will be appropriately completed in a timely manner; and
- 3. Maintaining and enhancing amenity values of areas by ensuring the adverse effects of *relocatable buildings* are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

GRZ-R3	Relocatable	buildings (excluding accessory buildings)	
		itus: Permitted	
		itus. 1 emitteu	
	Where:		
		pliance is achieved with:	
	i.	GRZ-S1;	
	ii.	GRZ-S2;	
	iii.	GRZ-S3;	
	iv.	GRZ-S4;	
	v.	GRZ-S5;	
	vi.	GRZ-S6;	
	vii.	GRZ-S7;	
	viii.	GRZ-S8;	
	ix.	GRZ-S9;	
	x.	GRZ-S10;	
	xi.	GRZ-S11; and	
	xii.	GRZ-S12.	
	2. Activity sta	atus: Restricted discretionary	
	Where:		
	a. Comp	oliance is not achieved with GRZ-R3(1).	
	Matters of dis	scretion:	
	1. The r	natters set out in GRZ-P9.	
	2. The e	The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that	
	and t	he matters of discretion of any standard that is not met.	



GRZ-S12 Relocatable buildings

- 1. Building inspection report:
 - a. Prior to the building being relocated onto a site, a building consent(s) shall be obtained that covers all matters listed below; and
 - A building inspection report prepared by a Council Building Officer or other Licenced Building Practitioner shall accompany the building consent application. The report shall identify all reinstatement work required to the exterior of the building and provide an estimate of the cost for the external refurbishment works after relocation; and
 - The building shall be placed on permanent foundations approved by the building consent no later than two months from the date the building is moved to the site; and

Matters of discretion:

- Whether the building is structurally sound, the condition of the building, and the work needed to bring the exterior of the building up to an external visual appearance that is tidy, of an appropriate standard, and is compatible with the other buildings in the vicinity.
- 2. The requirement for any screening and landscape treatment.
- The bulk, design, and location of the building in relation to the requirements of the zone.
- The need for structural repairs and reinstatement of the building and the length of time for completion of that work.
- The imposition of a performance bond to ensure compliance with the consent conditions.



- d. All other work required to reinstate the exterior of the building, including painting if required, shall be completed within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. Reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations; and
- e. The owner of the site on which the relocated building is placed shall certify that the reinstatement work will be completed within the 12month period. The site owner shall be responsible for ensuring this work is completed.
- The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council within 10 working days prior to relocating the building.
- 3, Previous use:
 - Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling or for visitor accommodation must have previously been designed, built, and used as a dwelling or visitor accommodation.
- 4. Performance bond:
 - A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the building inspection report under performance standard GRZ-S12(2) in cash shall be lodged with the Council along with the application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.
 - The bond shall be lodged in the form of a Deed annexed Appendix 6 to the District Plan.
 - Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements.

Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e., on a proportional basis).

6. The following table provides an overview of the relevant policies, rules and standards for each zone:



Zone	Zone name	Policy	Rule	Standard	Status
abr.					
GRUZ	General Rural Zone	P10	R3	S8	Permitted
GRZ	General Residential Zone	P9	R3	S12	Permitted
MUZ	Mixed Use Zone	P6	R3	S11	Permitted
FUZ	Future Urban Zone	P5	R3	S8	Permitted
GIZ	General Industrial Zone	P7	R3	S11	Permitted
NCZ	Neighbourhood Centre Zone	P6	R3	S10	Permitted
NOSZ	Natural Open Space Zone	P5	R3	S9	Permitted
OSZ	Open Space Zone	P5	R3	S9	Permitted
RLZ	Rural Lifestyle Zone	-	R3	S8	Permitted
SARZ	Sport and Active Recreation	P5	R3	S9	Permitted
	Zone				
SETZ	Settlement Zone	P3	R3	S12	Permitted
TCZ	Town Centre Zone	P12	R3	S11	Permitted

- 7. If compliance with standards is not achieved, then the activity status becomes restricted discretionary.
- 8. The standards require that prior to a building being relocated onto a site, a building consent shall be obtained, and a building pre-inspection report accompany the building consent application.
- 9. The building shall be placed on permanent foundations no later than two months from the date the building is moved to the site, with reinstatement works to be completed within 12 months.
- 10. The Association supports in general the provisions in relation to relocated buildings, but opposes the provisions as they relate to requiring a performance bond. The overwhelming majority of councils in a New Zealand context have been able to adequately manage any adverse effects of relocated buildings without the necessity for a performance bond, which has a direct financial cost on the intended owner of the relocated building. A performance bond is not necessary or appropriate, including in terms of section 32 RMA (or the equivalent provision in the NBEA).

Relief Sought

- 11. The Association **supports**:
 - a. The provisions in the Proposed District Plan relating to relocated buildings, excepting those provisions relating to performance bonds;
 - b. Amend the objectives and policies in relation to relocatable buildings, to delete any requirement for a performance bond. Amend relevant objectives and policies to (or to same or similar effect):
 - i. Recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings;



- ii. Maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings;
- c. For all relocatable building standards, inclusion of a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in the **attached Schedule 1**;
- d. For all relocatable building standards, the removal of the requirement that the transport route and any traffic management plans be provided to Council within 10 working days prior to relocating the building;
- e. For all relocatable building standards, the removal of the requirement for a performance bond.
- 12. Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to the submission above.
- 13. The Association **does wish** to be heard in support of this submission.

Yours faithfully

Stuart Ryan Barrister

Address for Service:

Stuart Ryan barrister

By email: stuart@stuartryan.co.nz / jonathan@hha.org.nz

Phone (021) 286 0230

Cc:

Jonathan Bhana-Thomson Chief Executive of NZHHA Email: jonathan@hha.org.nz

Schedule 1 - Building Pre-Inspection Report







Building Pre-Inspection Report for Relocation

New Location Address Region

For: Council Name

Date of report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	GENERAL INFORMATION	3
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Applicants Contact Details	3
1.3	Building details	
1.4	Reporting Conditions	5
1.5	Exclusions	5
1.6	Definitions	5
1.7	Areas Accessed	6
2.0	REINSTATEMENT CONDITIONS	7
3.0	BUILDING ACT REQUIREMENTS	9
4.0	SAFE AND SANITARY	9
5.0	ESTIMATED COST OF WORKS	11
6.0	BUILDING SURVEYORS SIGNATURE	11
7.0	OWNER CERTIFICATE AND DECLARATION	11

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - PHOTOGRAPHS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

This Building Pre-Inspection report accurately records the external condition of the *dwelling house/garage/ancillary building* to be relocated and to establish all reinstatement works required to the exterior of the building after relocation to a workmanlike standard and to achieve a tidy appearance to meet requirements of the District Plan .

Limited inspection of the interior has been undertaken for the purpose of the Report.

The Report confirms whether the building is considered Safe and Sanitary.

The Report also identifies site-specific requirements including but not limited to the requirement for; the construction of the new foundations, new retaining walls, service connections, water and sewerage treatment (if applicable).

The Report also provides photographs of the surroundings of the destination site. These photos provide context for the standard to be achieved in reinstating the relocated building.

The Report must be read in conjunction with the condition table and photographs provided, which assist in providing a representation of the condition of the premises prior to the commencement of the relocation.

The Report has been prepared by *Name* of *Company Name* as per our instruction/agreement dated on behalf of our clients *Name*

1.2 Applicants Contact Details

Applicant:	Applicant (clients) name
Contact address:	Contact address
Telephone:	
Email:	
Any Additional information:	

Agent:	Authorised agent
Contact address:	Contact address
Telephone:	
Email:	
Any Additional information:	

1.3 Building details

Type of building	Dwelling house, garage, ancillary building	
Approximate age of building:	Provide date range i.e. 1940-1950	
Brief Description:	Number of storeys, approximate size, roof, walls, floor construction, additional features	
Proposed site address:	Address of the intended site of the relocated building	
Site address where the building was inspected:	Address	
Proposed Use of Building	Dwelling house, residential garage, ancillary	
Previous Use of the Building	Relocated building must have been previously designed, built and used as a dwelling (Except previously used garage and ancillary buildings)	
Inspection Dates & Weather:	Date and weather at the time of inspection	
Inspection by:	Name of inspector	
Other persons present:	Name of other parties present	
Building Consent Status	Has Building Consent documentation been prepared for the relocation works.	

1.4 Reporting Conditions

This Report has been prepared under the following conditions of engagement:

- The survey is based on a visual inspection only; therefore it is not possible to guarantee that all concealed areas containing defects will be accessible (floor voids, roof voids, etc). No intrusive investigation will therefore be undertaken.
- Signs of water ingress will be searched for during the completion of the survey, however
 the Report cannot warrant that the building is free from water penetration, from defective
 roofing, cladding, rainwater goods, rising damp or the like unless evident at the time of
 our visual survey.
- Only areas where safe access is possible have been inspected.
- The Report is provided for the use of the client identified in section 1.1 and the council and may not be used by others without written permission. The writer of this report accepts no liability to third parties who may act on the report.
- This Report must be read in conjunction with photograph and condition tables provided.
- This Report is for the purposes of the District Plan. The Report also requires a safe and sanitary declaration for the purposes of the Building Act 2004.

1.5 Exclusions

This report **does not** include comment about the following:

- a) The structure of the building unless otherwise commented upon;
- b) The surrounding neighbourhood;
- c) The value of the property;
- d) Illegal Works: and
- e) Internal condition of the building unless otherwise commented upon.

Additionally, no search has been made of:

- f) Local Authority rates;
- g) Government Valuation; or
- h) LIM or PIM reports.

1.6 Definitions

The following defines the condition comments of the elements surveyed:

Good: Items that have suffered minimal weathering, wear or decay and are free from

any visual defects.

Reasonable: Items that have worn through 'normal' use and weathering, and is in

commensurate condition to the building age and use.

Poor: Items that are worn, decayed or weathered either due to the age, abnormal

use or lack of maintenance.

1.7 Areas Accessed

Example:

The external envelope of the subject building viewed from ground floor level and where safely accessed by ladder from ground level.

Internally, our inspection was limited to those parts of the buildings that could be safely accessed and a head and shoulders inspection of the roof space.

Access was gained into the subfloor space....

2.0 MANDATORY CONDITION TABLE

	RMA 1991 – Mandatory External Reinstatement				
Item	Construction Element	Description	Condition	Required Upgrades & Comments	Photograph
1	Roof	Corrugated iron/fibre cement sheet, concrete tile, metal tile, butynol membrane, other	Good/Reasonable/ Poor	None/ Repaint/ Re-roof etc	Insert multiple photographs if/as required under any of the below sub-headings.
2	Spouting and Downpipes	PVC, metal, butynol membrane, other	Good/Reasonable/ Poor	None/ Repaint/ Replace etc Example: Repair all timber fascias, barges as well as rainwater goods to ensure surface moisture discharges into new Council approved outlet at new site location.	

2.0 MANDATORY CONDITION TABLE

	RMA 1991 – Mandatory External Reinstatement				
Item	Construction Element	Description	Condition	Required Upgrades & Comments	Photograph
3	Wall Cladding	Fibre cement weatherboard/sheet, timber weatherboard, Board and batten, metal sidings, other	Good/Reasonable/ Poor	None/ Repaint/ Replace etc	DAN TRADE
4	Foundation cladding	NA	NA	Foundation cladding is to be installed as specified in the Building Consent	
5	Window and Door Joinery	Powder coated aluminium, timber, steel, single glazed, double glazed	Good/Reasonable/ Poor	None/ Install new joinery/Repair and redecorate existing joinery Example: Repair and repaint window and door joinery. Replace all broken glass immediately after relocation.	

3.0 BUILDING ACT REQUIREMENTS

This Report is for purposes required by the District Plan. It is not a report to address matters required by the Building Act.

A building consent is required for the relocation of this building and all subsequent works as a consequence. The building work must be designed and undertaken by Licensed Building Practitioners with the appropriate category of licence (certain homeowner exemptions <u>may</u> apply). This Pre-inspection Report must be submitted to council with an application for building consent.

The building consent documents must be provided to council along with the appropriate fees and proof of ownership (Certificate of Title less than 3 months old or sale and purchase agreement for the proposed site).

The site specifics must be appropriately designed to include foundations, considering, layout, sizing, position, bracing, ventilation, access etc.

4.1 SAFE AND SANITARY

Comment is required.

Building Surveyor <u>MUST</u> give a declaration regarding whether the building is/isn't Safe and Sanitary.

Note:

If the building is not considered safe and sanitary then give reasons. (example: evidence of leaky building)

4.2 HEALTH & SAFETY

Set out below is a description of the health and safety concerns identified.

Example:

Building materials identified are suspected to contain asbestos. This includes, but not limited to fibre cement claddings, vinyl flooring and soffit linings. Asbestos is relatively safe when encapsulated, but is dangerous to health when fibres become air borne. This can occur when the building materials are damaged or become degraded.

No specialist laboratory testing has been carried out to confirm the presence or absence of asbestos or any other material hazardous to health. All comments are based upon a visual inspection only.

It is recommended that a specialist asbestos surveyor be instructed to identify the risks present.

5.0 ESTIMATE OF COSTS OF EXTERNAL REINSTATEMENT WORKS

The estimate of costs of external reinstatement works is the sum of [to insert]

Note:

Allow a contingency sum for any damage in transit

"Reinstatement Works" means the extent of the work required to the exterior of the Relocated Building as specified in the Building Pre-Inspection Report for the purposes of the District Plan. The exterior reinstatement works will not include matters regulated by the building legislation or connection to foundations; but may include matters required by the District Plan for work to be undertaken and completed to the exterior of the building to a workmanlike standard and to achieve a tidy appearance, including, without limitation:

- (a) Repair of broken windows and window frames;
- (b) Repair of rotten weatherboards or other damaged wall cladding;
- (c) Necessary replacement or repair of roof materials;
- (d) Cleaning and/or painting of the exterior where necessary e.g. roof, walls, window frames etc;
- (e) Repair of transit damage; and/or
- (f) Replacement and painting of baseboards or other foundation cladding.

6.0 BUILDING SURVEYORS SIGNATURE

Author

I, certify that the information provided is true and correct and that the building described above appears to have applied with the relevant Building Regulations at the time of its construction, and (if a dwelling) the building has been previously designed, built and used as a dwelling (Except previously used garage and ancillary buildings).

Peer Reviewer

	Signed:	If undertaken/available		
	Qualifications LBP Category, BC RICS, NZIBS, ANZIA etc For and On Behalf of Company Name			
	Address	Inspectors business address		
	Telephone Email	Telephone business number Email business address		
7.0	OWNER CERTIFICATE AND DECLAR	ATION		
delivere		ensure that within 12 months from the building being nent, infrastructure, closing in, ventilation of		
Table' r under th	acknowledge that failure to complete any mandatory work identified in 2.0 'Mandatory Condition 'able' relating to the reinstatement of the building may lead to council taking enforcement action nder the Building Act 2004, or Resource Management Act 1991, including by way of a notice to fix, infringement notice, abatement notice, enforcement order, or prosecution.			
Signed: Owner	(PF	RINT)		
Signed: Owner	(PF	RINT)		
Signed:	(PF	RINT)		
Owner				

Elevation description i.e. Front Elevation	Elevation description i.e. Rear Elevation	Elevation description
Elevation description	Elevation description	Elevation description

Elevation description	Elevation description	Elevation description
Elevation description	Elevation description	Elevation description

Destination Site Photographs

	T

Additional Comments and Notes

Attachment 2 – Extracts from hearing panel decision report 2

Evaluation and decisions on key issues remaining in contention

3.5 As noted above, the key issue raised in submissions that remained contested during the hearings was Heavy Haulage's opposition to zone standards imposing requirements on the relocation of buildings relating to traffic management and payment of performance bonds. The submitter also sought the removal of references to performance bonds from the applicable zone policies and amendment of those policies to recognise the positive effects that relocated buildings can have on amenity values. It was Heavy Haulage's position that these requirements were overly onerous, would place unnecessary costs on intended owners and were not adequately justified in s32, RMA terms.

Traffic management and payment of performance bonds

- 3.6 These matters were addressed as a 'key issue' in the s42A Report on the General Residential Zone prepared by Ms Erica Wheatley²³. The commentary and position that Ms Wheatley took there was also echoed in the s42A Reports on:
 - a. the Settlement Zone, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones, Future Urban Zone and General Industrial Zone, in the context of Hearing Stream 2²⁴; and
 - b. the Rural Zones, in the context of Hearing Stream 3²⁵; and
 - c. the Māori Purpose Zone, in the context of Hearing Stream 4^{26} .
- 3.7 Essentially, the s42A Reports all reached the same conclusions which can be summarised as follows:
 - a. the performance bond requirement ensures that, where necessary, Councils can undertake remedial works in a situation where this is not otherwise done by the intended owner;
 - b. this addresses the issue of relocated buildings detracting from the visual amenity of the area concerned, where they are left unfinished for long periods of time;
 - c. while it is acknowledged that NZTA approval is required for the transport of buildings on state highways and the movement of 'over-dimension' vehicles on all public roads, the requirement to provide transport route and any traffic management plans to the relevant Council prior to relocation ensures that the (un)suitability of local roads for this purpose is given sufficient consideration; and
 - d. the PDP provisions are sufficiently enabling of building relocation, such that no reference to 'positive effects' in policy is warranted.
- 3.8 The s42A Reports also referenced a 'recent' Environment Court decision ('the *South Taranaki* case'²⁷) that the Reporting Officers imply settled the matter.
- 3.9 For the reasons above, the s42A Reports collectively recommended no changes to the relevant policies, rules and standards relating to building relocation in the relevant zones. To be fair, these recommendations were formulated in the s42A Reports for the purposes

²³ Section 6.10, Officer's Section 42A Report – General Residential Topic, 29 July 2024

²⁴ Prepared by Alice Falloon, Becca Adams and Solitaire Robertson, respectively, and all dated 29 July 2024

²⁵ Prepared by Charles Horrell, 16 September 2024

²⁶ Prepared by Hamish Wesney, 14 October 2024

²⁷ New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association v South Taranaki District Council [2018] NZ EnvC80, Thompson EJ presiding

of Hearing Stream 2 without Reporting Officers having the benefit of hearing expert evidence presented on behalf of the submitter. This submitter evidence was not presented until the hearing on the rural zones (Hearing Stream 3). It is for that reason that we deal substantively with the matter in this Decision Report, and not (again) in **Decision Report 3.**

- 3.10 Having said that, we, together with the Reporting Officers, did have the opportunity during Hearing Stream 2 to hear corporate evidence presented by the CEO of Heavy Haulage, Mr Jonathan Bhana-Thomson²⁸. Mr Bhana-Thompson provided a helpful perspective on the rigorous and stepwise approach the Association's members take to relocating buildings, inclusive of the prior obtaining of building consents, compliance with NZTA road transport requirements and foundation and reinstatement work.
- 3.11 Mr Bhana-Thomson set out what he considered to be the onerous impact of the performance bond on a building purchaser's relocation budget. He considered the *South Taranaki* case to be an 'outlier' with the circumstances unique to that area and misapplied to Wairarapa jurisdictions. It was his view that traffic management considerations appropriately fell within NZTA's responsibilities and did not warrant a form of duplication under the PDP.
- 3.12 We appreciated Mr Bhana-Thomson's perspective on the care and responsibility that the Association's members take, although we do note his estimate that the Association's members are responsible for about 80% of building relocations nationally. We would just observe that rules, such as those proposed, are often formulated to catch and restrain 'bad actors' who may not be members of reputable business associations. That said, clearly such rules need to be designed in such a way not to compromise the viability of legitimate proposals or duplicate existing requirements, and that is something we have borne in mind in evaluating this issue.
- 3.13 As mentioned above, it was during Hearing Stream 3 that we heard expert planning evidence on behalf of the submitter. Mr Russell Hooper presented this evidence²⁹. Mr Hooper noted that, in comparison with the approach proposed with respect to the relocation of existing buildings, the PDP did not require traffic management plans for (new) relocatable buildings or performance bonds for new build construction projects when, in his view, the risks and effects were similar or the same. In this regard, Mr Hooper referred us to another Environment Court case³⁰ in which, he said, the Court "held that there was no real difference in effect and amenity value terms between the in situ construction of a new dwelling and relocation of a second-hand dwelling, subject to appropriate permitted activity performance standards".³¹
- 3.14 Mr Hooper's position was that traffic considerations were sufficiently addressed under NZTA 'over-dimension' approvals and that other PDP standards (not at issue) relating to reinstatement, in combination with prospective enforcement action, provided sufficient incentive for the necessary works to occur.
- 3.15 During Hearing Stream 3, we heard from Ms Rebecca Howatson from Brittons House Movers³² who presented various examples of relocatable buildings, where repair works had been completed in a timely manner, without the payment of performance bonds.

²⁸ Statement of Evidence of Jonathan Bhana-Thomson (CEO, House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc), 21 August 2024

²⁹ Statement of Evidence of Russell Hooper on behalf of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association - Submission Point 252, 30 September 2024

³⁰ New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding)

³¹ Ibid, para 9

³²Statement of Evidence of Rebecca Howatson on behalf of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association - Submission Point 252, 30 September 2024

- 3.16 Having heard from the parties concerned, we took the opportunity³³ to direct Mr Horrell, the Reporting Officer for Hearing Stream 3, to address a number of questions relevant to the issue of performance bonding across the zones as a whole, as follows:
 - a. Are the relocated building rules and standards in the GRUZ the same as recommended for the urban zones? Are the same issues applicable in the rural environment as the urban environment?
 - b. Consider further the Environment Court cases (Central Otago and South Taranaki) on relocated buildings and whether there is a demonstratable issue in the Wairarapa of relocated buildings being left unfinished or not reinstated within a reasonable period.
 - c. Have bonds been taken for recent relocated buildings for the purpose of managing effects on visual amenity? If so, what was the amount and purpose of these bonds?
 - d. When bonds have been taken, have the Councils used the bond to undertake reinstatement and finishing works?
 - e. Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the submitters' suggestions that a bond is only required when the 12-month timeframe is exceeded. Consider implementation issues of this approach.
- 3.17 Mr Horrell addressed these questions in his Reply Statement³⁴. In sum, his response was that:
 - a. issues relating to the timeliness of necessary building repairs and adverse effects on visual amenity apply across the zones and warrant a consistent approach;
 - b. the cases referred to have confirmed that a relocatable building can (and should) be provided for as a permitted activity, and that amenity effects caused by unfinished building work <u>can</u> be managed by a performance bond;
 - c. in the Wairarapa there is a high demand for relocatable buildings, observed issues relating to the timeliness of repairs and reinstatement work, and resourcing issues associated with enforcement action;
 - d. The Councils regularly take bonds to cover transportation damage and reinstatement works, but the approach and quantum varies significantly and, to date, the Councils have not utilised bonds to undertake such works; and
 - e. the alternative of requiring reinstatement works to be undertaken within a defined period presents enforcement challenges.
- 3.18 While Mr Horrell indicated that he did not support the suggested alternative, he did agree that it was not reasonable or necessary to require a performance bond in all circumstances. Having conferred with the other Reporting Officers, his recommendation was to amend all relevant standards to only require a performance bond where the value of the reinstatement works exceeds that associated with a 'low-risk' relocatable building, as follows (using the GRUZ Standard wording):

³³ per Minute 6, 21 October 2024

paras 72 to 86, Officer's Reply Statement – General Residential Topic [sic], undated

- 4. Where the cost of the reinstatement works identified in accordance with Performance Standard GRUZ-S8(1)(b) is greater than \$5,000 (excluding GST), a Performance Bond is required that meets the following:
 - a. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard GRUZS8(12)(b) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.
- 3.19 The rationale behind the recommended amendment as we understand it is to equate building condition with relative risk and the value of reinstatement works e.g., that buildings in 'good' condition require a minimal level of reinstatement and therefore pose a low risk in terms of that work not occurring; the converse also applying.
- 3.20 We are minded to adopt Mr Horrell's recommendation to alter the relevant standards, as they relate to all zones, together with his s32AA assessment³⁵. In that respect, we tentatively accept his conclusion that the recommended amendments are efficient and effective in reserving the requirement for a bond to 'higher-risk' situations and, as such, represent the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in comparison with the provisions in the notified version of the PDP.
- 3.21 We say that we are 'minded' to adopt the recommended approach because at this point we retain some reservations.
- 3.22 Our first reservation relates to the relatively low quantum of the \$5,000 'exception' to performance bonding and the extent to which this will inevitably devalue during the life of the District Plan as a result of inflation. This would make an <u>increasing</u> proportion of relocation projects subject to bonding over time, as the inflation-adjusted cost of that reinstatement work rises.
- 3.23 Our second reservation relates to the application of a common approach (inclusive of the recommended amendments) across all zones. The policy, rule and standards packages (and particularly the bonding requirements) relating to relocatable buildings are explicitly intended to maintain and enhance amenity values in the areas concerned. It is apparent to us that 'amenity values' vary significantly in environments across the districts. For example, the amenity of residential environments are generally highly valued by their residents; whereas amenity values are generally less sensitive in industrial environments. As a result, you might reasonably expect standards to be less stringent in the latter.
- 3.24 While we see the advantages of a consistent approach in administrative terms, it begs the question as to why there is no differentiation in approach between zones to account for different amenity levels. The unvarying approach between the sets of provisions does not reflect that.
- 3.25 Mr Horrell indicated in his Reply Statement that the other Reporting Officers were supportive of his proposal and would be recommending similar changes through the 'Integration' hearing (Hearing Stream 14).
- 3.26 Notwithstanding that, we asked the Reporting Officers to address our reservations as outlined above³⁶. Specifically, we asked them to consider the following questions:

³⁵ paras 83 to 86, Officer's Reply Statement – General Residential Topic [sic], undated

³⁶ Via Minute 12, 12 December 2024

- a. Can the recommended 'exception' to performance bonding be future-proofed in some way so that it remains effective and efficient throughout the life of the District Plan?
- b. To what extent, if any, does the imposition of standards relating to the relocation of buildings need to be adjusted to reflect the variable significance of amenity values in the Districts' environments?
- 3.27 Having heard evidence from Mr Hooper (as summarised in paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14 above), we continued to harbour doubts about the utility of the standards that, as worded, "require transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building." In our preliminary view, the standards are not worded in a manner that provides Councils with an ability to influence the contents of plans, and merely require their 'provision'. Further, the plans would have already been presumably approved by NZTA under legislation separate to the RMA, and in that context, the roading agency should have accounted for the appropriateness of over-dimension movements on all roads, not limited to the State Highway network. Therefore, we also took the opportunity in the context of our posthearing deliberations to ask Reporting Officers to address the question as to what purpose standards requiring the submission of transportation route and transport plans to the Councils really serve given they require pre-approval from the NZTA³⁷.
- 3.28 Mr Horrell's subsequent response³⁸ to the three questions we posed above can be summarised as follows:
 - a. Reporting Officers acknowledged that as inflation over the life of the District Plan reduces the effective value of the threshold for performance bonding it will in turn reduce the proportion of reinstatement works exempt from that requirement. However, they considered this risk to be low and 'unlikely' to impinge on relocatable buildings that are 'generally in good condition'. In the experience of Council staff, calculated bonds have 'not changed significantly' over the last ten years and the status of the activity remains permitted under the PDP. Reporting Officers considered that, overall, the recommended \$5,000 threshold remains appropriate and propose no feasible alternative.
 - b. Reporting Officers acknowledged that amenity values in the Rural Zones are less sensitive than in Urban Zones; a fact that could be recognised via a more enabling approach in the former. On balance, they considered that in the interests of implementing an administratively simple District Plan a differentiated approach is not warranted. If, however, the Panel is minded to adopt a variable approach, they suggested adjusting the threshold value for Rural Zones to \$10,000.
 - c. With respect to the standards requiring the provision of transportation route and traffic management plans to the relevant Council, Reporting Officers clarified that the purpose of this is to provide the Council with an opportunity to advise the persons relocating buildings of any closures, events or access constraints they may wish to avoid; no authorisations from the Councils concerned being intended or implied.
- 3.29 On the first point, it is evident from our reading of the relevant standards as notified, that in the absence of a definition for 'reinstatement works', they include reconnections to all infrastructure services, closing in and ventilation of foundations and (potentially) repainting of exterior walls, trim and roofs. These are all works that even the owner of a

³⁷ Also via Minute 12, 12 December 2024

³⁸ Supplementary Reply Statement – Minute 12: Further Directions Associated with Hearing 2 (Urban and Open Space Zones) and 3 (Rural Zones), 17 January 2025

building in 'good condition' is likely to undertake and we find it hard to imagine this being done for less than \$5,000. Consequently, it would appear to us that a majority of proposals would be subject to the bonding requirement and that this proportion would only increase in time in response to inflationary pressures.

- 3.30 We have to accept on the basis of evidence presented that the PDP drafters are attempting to address a legitimate issue in relation to uncompleted works. With respect to viable alternatives, we note that while Mr Horrell indicated he did not support Heavy Haulage's proposal for a standard requiring works to be completed within a defined period, given likely enforcement challenges, this is in fact what the standards as notified already do³⁹.
- 3.31 On face value, adding a performance bond requirement might be seen as an over-reaction to the issue, given the existence of these other requirements, although we accept that, where a permitted activity is concerned, there are inevitable difficulties in retrospectively addressing non-compliance with timeframes. This leads us to a somewhat reluctant conclusion that performance bonding is a necessity, and we adopt the general wording of the standards proposed by Reporting Officers accordingly.
- 3.32 However, we remain unconvinced that the proposed value of the threshold is set at an appropriate level. We prefer and adopt a value of \$10,000, which better accounts for the quantum of works likely required and the erosive effects of inflation over time, and aligns with the 'mid-range' \$10,000 threshold that is currently imposed by Carterton District Council, as reported by Mr Horrell⁴⁰.
- 3.33 In s32AA terms, we consider this further amendment strikes a suitable balance in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.
- 3.34 On the second point, and with due respect to the position of the Reporting Officers, we do not see that amenity values can be cast in binary terms between Rural Zones (lesser) and Urban Zones (greater). It is a fair observation given our reading of the PDP provisions relating to the zones that amenity values in the Rural Lifestyle Zone are valued more than in the General Industrial Zone, for example. However, we accept that in the interests of implementing an administratively simple District Plan a differentiated approach is not warranted. Our adoption of a higher threshold for reinstatement works will, in any case, rationalise the circumstances in which performance bonding is proposed.
- 3.35 Finally, we accept the reasoning of Reporting Officers as to the purpose and operation of clauses requiring the supply of transportation information to the relevant Council and adopt their notified wording in this respect.

³⁹ e.g., GRUZ-S8(1)(c): The building shall be placed on permanent foundations approved by the building consent, **no later than two months** from the date the building is moved to the site; and (d) All other work required to reinstate the exterior of any relocatable building, including painting if required, shall be completed **within twelve months** of the building being delivered to the site ...; and e. The owner of the site on which the relocatable building is placed shall certify that the reinstatement work will be completed within the **twelve-month period** ... [our **emphasis**]

⁴⁰ para 77, Officer's Reply Statement – General Residential Topic [sic], undated

Attachment 3 – Extracts from Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan –
Decisions Version October 2025 – GRZ – General Residential Zone

- 4. *building height*, bulk, and location that maintains a reasonable level of sunlight access and privacy and to minimise visual dominance effects to the adjoining sites:
- 5. development that achieves attractive and safe streets and public open spaces where reliance on private vehicles is reduced, including by:
 - i. providing for passive surveillance;
 - ii. optimising front yard landscaping;
 - iii. minimising visual dominance of garage doors; and
 - iv. providing safe and accessible walking, cycling, and public transport service links to town centres, services, and open space;
- a good standard of internal amenity within sites including useable and accessible outdoor living areas for residents and access to shared public amenity and open space;
- 7. development designed to meet the day to day needs of residents by:
 - i. providing privacy and outlook;
 - ii. providing access to daylight and sunlight and providing the amenities necessary for those residents; and
 - iii. providing sufficient on-site capacity for individual or communal residential waste management that is visually screened and accessible.
- 8. a peaceful residential environment, in particular minimising the adverse effects of night-time noise and outdoor lighting, and limited signs; and
- 9. small-scale commercial or community activities that service the local community.

GRZ-P7 Avoidance of residential development where there is insufficient infrastructure

Avoid residential development where there is insufficient capacity in existing reticulated *infrastructure* or where residential development would occur prior to planned reticulated *infrastructure* installation.

GRZ-P8 Rainwater collection and use

Ensure new residential development provides on-site rainwater storage tanks for non-potable use to contribute to water availability and efficiency in the Wairarapa.

GRZ-P9 Relocatable buildings

Provide for relocation of buildings while requiring the completion and renovation within a reasonable timeframe by:

- 1. Requiring pre-inspection reports to be prepared that identify any reinstatement work required to the exterior of the building following the building relocation;
- 2. Ensuring that *relocatable buildings* have the same use as what they were previously designed, built, and used for;

Page 7 of 31 As of 8 October 2025

- 3. Requiring a performance bond as a security measure that reinstatement works will be appropriately completed in a timely manner; and
- 4. Maintaining and enhancing amenity values of areas by ensuring the adverse effects of *relocatable buildings* are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

Rules

Refer to General Residential Zone Precincts for additional rules relating to The Orchards Retirement Village Development Precinct, Greytown Development Precinct, and Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct.

GRZ-R1	Buildings and structures, including construction, additions, and alterations	
	1. Activity status: Permitted	
	Where:	
	a. Compliance is achieved with:	
	i. GRZ-S1;	
	ii. GRZ-S2;	
	iii. GRZ-S3;	
	iv. GRZ-S4;	
	v. GRZ-S5;	
	vi. GRZ-S6;	
	vii. GRZ-S7;	
	viii. GRZ-S8;	
	ix. GRZ-S9;	
	x. GRZ-S10;	
	xi. GRZ-S12.	
	Note: Refer to TEMP-R1 for permitted activity standards for activities ancillary to or incidental to construction and demolition.	
	2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary	
	Where:	
	a. Compliance is not achieved with GRZ-R1(1).	
	Matters of discretion:	
	The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met.	

Page 8 of 31 As of 8 October 2025

	2.	The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design
		Guide.

GRZ-R2		Demolition and removal of buildings and structures	
		Activity status: Permitted	
		Note: Refer to TEMP-R1 for permitted activity standards for activities ancillary to or incidental to construction and demolition.	

GRZ-R3	Relocatable buildings (excluding accessory buildings)	
	Activity status: Permitted	
	Where:	
	a. Compliance is achieved with:	
	i. GRZ-S1;	
	ii. GRZ-S2;	
	iii. GRZ-S3;	
	iv. GRZ-S4;	
	v. GRZ-S5;	
	vi. GRZ-S6;	
	vii. GRZ-S7;	
	viii. GRZ-S8;	
	ix. GRZ-S9;	
	x. GRZ-S10;	
	xi. GRZ-S11; and	
	xii. GRZ-S12.	
	2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary	
	Where:	
	a. Compliance is not achieved with GRZ-R3(1).	
	Matters of discretion:	
	 The matters set out in GRZ-P9. The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 	

Page 9 of 31 As of 8 October 2025

GRZ-S9 Wastewater disposal

 All buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated wastewater systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Development Standards 2023.

Matters of discretion:

- 1. The suitability of any alternative servicing and infrastructure options.
- The relevant standards of Council's water bylaws, Council Engineering Development Standard 2023, and/or Wellington Water standards as applicable.

GRZ-S10

Stormwater management

- 1. All buildings and activities must provide the means for treatment, catchment, and disposal of stormwater from all impervious or potentially impervious surfaces, including, but not limited, to structures, compacted soils, and sealed surfaces, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Development Standard 2023.
- 2. Where a connection to Council's stormwater management systems is available, all allotments must be provided with a connection at the allotment boundary, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Development Standard 2023.
- 3. Where the means of stormwater disposal is to ground, that area must be able and suitable to accommodate the stormwater discharge, and shall not be subject to instability, slippage, or inundation, or used for the disposal of wastewater.

Matters of discretion:

- 1. The suitability of any alternative servicing and infrastructure options.
- The relevant standards of Council's water bylaws, Council Engineering Development Standard 2023, and/or Wellington Water standards as applicable.

GRZ-S11

Relocatable buildings

- 1. Building inspection report:
 - a. Prior to the building being relocated onto a site, a building consent(s) shall be obtained that covers all matters listed below; and

Matters of discretion:

 Whether the building is structurally sound, the condition of the building, and the work needed to bring the exterior of the building up to an external visual appearance that is

Page 27 of 31 As of 8 October 2025

- A building inspection report prepared by a Council Building Officer or other Licenced Building Practitioner shall accompany the building consent application. The report shall identify all reinstatement work required to the exterior of the building and provide an estimate of the cost for the external refurbishment works after relocation; and
- The building shall be placed on permanent foundations approved by the building consent no later than two months from the date the building is moved to the site; and
- d. All other work required to reinstate the exterior of the building, including painting if required, shall be completed within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. Reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations; and
- e. The owner of the site on which the relocated building is placed shall certify that the reinstatement work will be completed within the 12-month period. The site owner shall be responsible for ensuring this work is completed.
- 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council within 10 working days prior to relocating the building.
- 3. Previous use:
 - Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling or for visitor accommodation must have previously been designed, built, and

- tidy, of an appropriate standard, and is compatible with the other buildings in the vicinity.
- 2. The requirement for any screening and landscape treatment.
- 3. The bulk, design, and location of the building in relation to the requirements of the zone.
- 4. The need for structural repairs and reinstatement of the building and the length of time for completion of that work.
- The imposition of a performance bond to ensure compliance with the consent conditions.

Page 28 of 31 As of 8 October 2025

used as a dwelling or visitor accommodation.

- 4. Where the cost of the reinstatement works identified in accordance with Performance Standard GRZ-S12(1)(b) is greater than \$10,000 (excluding GST), a Performance bond is required that meets the following:
 - a. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the building inspection report under performance standard GRZ-S12(1)(b) in cash shall be lodged with the Council along with the application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.
 - b. The bond shall be lodged in the form of a Deed annexed Appendix 6 to the District Plan.
 - c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements.

Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e., on a proportional basis).

GRZ-S12

Waste storage areas

For residential activities at a density equal to or exceeding one residential unit per 200m² of net site area:

 Where individual bins are used for household waste, a minimum storage space of 1.4m² per dwelling must be provided on the site. Matters of discretion:

 The location, accessibility, security, size, screening, and integration with site design of waste storage and collection areas for each residential unit.

Page 29 of 31 As of 8 October 2025