

IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT WELLINGTON

I TE KOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
KI TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an appeal pursuant to clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 of
the Act in relation to the decision on the Proposed
Wairarapa Combined District Plan

BETWEEN **FEDERATED FARMERS OF NEW ZEALAND
INCORPORATED**

Appellant

AND **CARTERTON DISTRICT COUNCIL, MASTERTON
DISTRICT COUNCIL AND SOUTH WAIRARAPA
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Respondents

NOTICE OF APPEAL



Lambton Centre, Level 4
117 Lambton Quay
PO Box 715
Wellington 6140
Phone: 0800 327 646
Email: mbuddle@fedfarm.org.nz /
jcookmunro@fedfarm.org.nz
Contact: Meg Buddle / Jo-Anne Cook-Munro

FORM 7 NOTICE OF APPEAL TO ENVIRONMENT COURT AGAINST THE COUNCILS' DECISION ON THE PROPOSED WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 14(1) of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
WELLINGTON

1. Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated (**Federated Farmers**) appeals against the decision of the Carterton District Council, Masterton District Council and South Wairarapa District Council (the **Councils**) on the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (the **Proposed Plan**).
2. Federated Farmers is a primary sector organisation that represents the interests of farmers and rural communities.
3. Federated Farmers made a submission on the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan dated 19 December 2023 (submitter number S214).
4. Federated Farmers is not a trade competitor for the purpose of section 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**).
5. Federated Farmers received notice of the Councils' decision on the Proposed Plan on 8 October 2025.

The decision (or parts of the decision) that Federated Farmers is appealing:

6. The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that Federated Farmers are appealing are set out in the table attached as Appendix 1 to this appeal notice. The general reasons for the appeal are set out below.

The reasons for the appeal are as follows:

7. The general reasons for the appeal are that the decisions version of the Proposed Plan (**decisions version**):
 - (a) does not promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources as required by section 5 of the RMA, because certain provisions do not manage the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way which enable people and communities

to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety;

- (b) will potentially impose undue costs and consent requirements;
- (c) is contrary to best resource management practice;
- (d) does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Councils' statutory functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of other options under section 32 of the RMA;
- (e) does not achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, and development of land, in accordance with section 31 of the RMA;
- (f) does not appropriately give effect to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**); and
- (g) is inconsistent with the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (**Regional Plan**).

8. Without limiting the generality of the above, further specific grounds of appeal are set out in Appendix 1.

Federated Farmers seeks the following relief:

9. The relief sought is set out with respect to each provision in the table attached as Appendix 1. Where specific wording changes are sought as relief, Federated Farmers, in the alternative, seeks any wording that would adequately address the reasons for its appeal.
10. Federated Farmers also seek such consequential amendments or related relief as may be necessary to give effect to the concerns described in this notice of appeal, including consequential changes needed to policies or other provisions as a result of rules being amended.

ATTACHMENTS

11. The following documents are attached to this Notice:

- (a) Appendix 1: table of relief sought by provision with reasons provided.
- (b) Appendix 2: a copy of Federated Farmers' submissions.
- (c) Appendix 3: the decisions version of the Proposed Plan.
- (d) Appendix 4: a list of the names and contact details of persons who made submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Plan, to be served

with a copy of this notice within five working days.

Dated 21 November 2025

Signature of person authorised to sign on behalf of the appellant:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'MBuddle', is written over a horizontal line.

Meg Buddle

On behalf of Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated

Address for Service of Appellant:

PO Box 715

Wellington 6140

Phone: 0800 327 646

Email: mbuddle@fedfarm.org.nz / jcookmunro@fedfarm.org.nz

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of appeal

How to become a party to proceedings

You may be a party to the proceedings 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 Resource Management Act 1991.

You may apply to the Environment Court under section 281 of the Resource Management Act 1991 for a waiver of the above timing or service requirements (see form 38).

How to obtain copies of documents relating to appeal

The copy of this notice served on you does not attach a copy of the appellant's submission and the decision appealed. These documents may be obtained, on request, from the appellant.

Advice

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

Appendix 1: Table of relief sought by provision with reasons provided

In addition to the relief sought in the right-hand column below:

- Federated Farmers, in the alternative, seeks any wording that would adequately address the reasons for its appeal.
- Federated Farmers also seek such consequential amendments or related relief as may be necessary to give effect to the concerns described in this notice of appeal, including consequential changes needed to policies or other provisions as a result of rules being amended.
- The tracked changes in the *Relief Sought by Federated Farmers* column are against the decisions version.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions – Interpretation		
Definitions – New Definition: Ancillary rural earthworks	Activities ancillary to primary production, which support primary production and are 'day-to-day' farming activities, should not have to apply for resource consent. Under the general definition of 'earthworks' some day-to-day farm earthworks may trigger onerous and unnecessary requirements for resource consent for example in rules located in the CE, NFL, NATC, NH, SASM chapters. Federated Farmers seeks a new definition for these types of activities in order to facilitate their recognition in the plan's rule framework. Effects on natural environmental values, including freshwater values, are managed by regional plans, and do not need additional regulation by the Proposed Plan.	Add a new definition for 'Ancillary rural earthworks' that reads: <u><i>Ancillary rural earthworks means:</i></u> • <u><i>any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with cultivation, land preparation (including the establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of crops and pasture;</i></u> • <u><i>the harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming); and</i></u> • <u><i>removing trees and horticultural root ripping;</i></u> • <u><i>the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming activities. This includes (but is not limited to): farm tracks, roads, vehicle manoeuvring areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, the installation and maintenance of services such as water pipes and troughs, off-stream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads.</i></u>
Definitions – Potentially	Buildings associated with primary production that are non-habitable, and which do not pose a 'potential' level of risk to	Amend the definition for 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities' by removing the words 'Buildings associated with

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
hazard sensitive activity	people and communities should be allowed to exist within natural hazard areas, as these often have a functional or operational need to be in a certain location. If such buildings are captured within the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities', these buildings may require a resource consent. However, there is little risk of harm to these buildings from natural hazards, and therefore delays and costs experienced by farmers for such consent processes would be incommensurate with the minor environmental benefit. This additional layer of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' and the associated definition for these does not align with the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013 (RPS), which only covers 'hazard sensitive activities'. The RPS definition for 'hazard sensitive activity' has an exhaustive list of 12 activities. Buildings associated with primary production is not one of these 12.	primary production'.
Definitions – Special amenity landscapes	If Federated Farmers' below relief regarding deletion of NFL-O2 and NFL-P2 is accepted, delete this definition as a consequential change.	Delete the 'Special amenity landscapes' definition.
Definitions – Surface Waterbody	This definition is unnecessary alongside existing definitions in RMA (defines water body) and the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (Regional Plan) (defines surface water body) that already define similar terms. This additional definition creates unnecessary complexity and potentially unforeseen consequences in implementing the Proposed Plan, which may result in having to obtain resource consent (and associated delays and costs) for little or no environmental benefit.	Delete the 'Surface Waterbody' definition in its entirety.
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Strategic Direction		
Strategic Direction Objective RE-O4 Character and amenity values of the rural environment	The addition of "amenity values" in the decisions version may have perverse consequences for rural primary production activities from a <i>reverse sensitivity</i> perspective. Amenity values are defined in the RMA and the National Planning Standards to mean: "those natural or physical qualities and	Amend RE-O4 by deleting the words "and amenity values".

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes."³ It is possible that the requirement in RMA section 7(c) (to have particular regard to maintenance and enhancement of amenity values) could be applied in favour of existing rural lifestyle development in the General Rural Zone in a way that would trump ability of primary producers to function. This would be unfortunate for such primary producers, as the General Rural Zone is where primary production is intended to predominate and the application of RMA s7(c) could trigger an adverse effect on efficient use of the rural land resource.	
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Energy, Infrastructure and Transport – NU-Network Utilities		
Objective NU-O3 Adverse effects on network utilities	Existing network utilities (within Network Utility Corridors) and Designated Network Utility Land should be protected only within Network Utility Corridors. While the NES for Electricity Transmission requires existing access to transmission corridors to be protected, extending the protection of network utilities further beyond the established Network Utility Corridors is unnecessary and provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they can do on their own land. If network utility operators wish to negotiate additional 'protection' outside the Network Utility Corridors and Designated Network Utility land, then they are free to negotiate this with private landowners.	Amend Objective NU-O3 to read: <i>The safe function and operation of network utilities is protected from the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects of incompatible subdivision use and development <u>within existing network utility corridors or within designated network utility land.</u></i>
Objective NU-O4 National Grid	The National Grid should be protected only within the National Grid Corridor. While the NES for Electricity Transmission requires existing access to transmission corridors to be protected, extending the protection of network utilities further beyond these established areas is unnecessary and provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they can do on their own land. If network utility operators wish to negotiate additional 'protection' outside National Grid Corridors, then	Amend NU-O4 to read: <i>Subdivision, use and development <u>within the national grid corridor</u> is managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid and ensure that the operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised.</i>

³ RMA section 2 and National Planning Standards 2019, Definitions List at page 54.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	they are free to negotiate access arrangements with private landowners	
Policy NU-P7 Activities near the National Grid	As per above, protection for the National Grid should not extend beyond the National Grid Corridor and existing access thereto. Please note that Federated Farmers submitted on Policy NU-P6, which has been renumbered as Policy NU-P7 in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan.	Amend NU-P7 to read: <i>NU-P7 Activities near <u>within</u> the National Grid</i> <i>Manage subdivision, use and development near <u>within</u> the National Grid Corridor to:</i> <i>avoid the establishment or expansion of sensitive activities;</i> <i>Ensure that the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal, and development of the National Grid is not compromised; and</i> <i>Ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid are avoided.</i>
Rules NU-R3 to R6; NU-R9 to NU-R17.	Federated Farmers supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities (including their establishment, operation and upgrading) can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Council appears to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities. If network utilities require consent, the effects of the activity on surrounding land and land uses should be a relevant matter. The Council's s42A reporting planner recommended inserting restricted discretionary / discretionary activity criteria that would have satisfied Federated Farmers' original submission point. However, this recommendation was not adopted in the Council's decision and may have been overlooked. Rules NU-R16 and R17 have been renumbered in the decisions version and were notified as Rules NU- R17 and NU-R18. Federated Farmers originally submitted on R17 and	Add a new matter of discretion for restricted discretionary rules NU-R3 to R6 and NU-R9 to R17 that reads: <u><i>The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</i></u>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	R18.	
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Hazards and Risks – NH- Natural Hazards		
Objective NH-O2 Natural measures	The implementation of this objective is not clear. It could lead to unpredictable and onerous restrictions on the private use of land. 'Natural defences' and 'nature-based solutions' are not necessarily practical for mitigating natural hazard risks on existing development in all situations, and any objective aimed at requiring adoption of these methods is likely to be unachievable in such situations. Further, it is unreasonable to restrict use of private property merely because 'natural defences' or 'nature-based solutions' might benefit hazard risk mitigation/avoidance. Making these measures mandatory, as opposed to optional and only for appropriate situations: • creates uncertainty as to the scope of such restrictions; and • could hamper the practical management, adaptation and resilience of primary production activities.	Delete NH-O2 in its entirety.
Policy NH-P10 Natural hazard mitigation works	Federated Farmers seeks to ensure that mitigation works involving private land within natural hazard areas that are undertaken by a statutory agency, or their nominated contractors or agents, are undertaken in a manner that is compliant with section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002. Clause 2 of this policy has been added in the decisions version. Federated Farmers opposes this addition,	Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of Policy NH-P10 so that it reads: <i>Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works provided:</i> <i>1. Works are undertaken by a public authority or their nominated contractors or agents within hazard areas where these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people's safety and wellbeing, property, and infrastructure and comply with requirements in the <u>Local Government Act 2002 in relation to construction of works on private land</u>; or</i> <i>1A. Works are undertaken by the landowner or their agent are minor, and comply with the Regional Plan.</i> 2. The use of soft engineering or nature-based

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
		solutions is considered where appropriate.
Rule NH-R1 Flood mitigation or stream or river management works undertaken by a public authority or their nominated agent within any of the flood hazard areas	Federated Farmers supports the purpose of this rule however objects to the requirement that flood mitigation or stream, or river management works are only permitted when done by or on behalf of a statutory agency or their nominated agent. There are often extenuating circumstances such as extreme weather events that see members of the community such as farmers having to undertake flood mitigation (e.g. drainage works) into their own hands without permission from Council. This rule should be amended to better align with the Regional Plan. The Regional Plan has numerous permitted activity rules under which private landowners could do minor flood mitigation or waterway management works. Councils should avoid unnecessary duplication between regional and district plans, and district plans must not be inconsistent with a regional plan, on any matter that relates to a regional council's RMA functions under s 75(4) of the RMA.	Firstly, amend NH-R1 so that flood mitigation or stream or river management works ahead of extreme weather events is provided for as a permitted activity for landowners. Secondly, further amend NH-R1 to permit minor works to be undertaken by the relevant landowner that complies with the relevant rules in the Regional Plan.
Rule NH-R3 Any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within Moderate Hazard Areas and Low Hazard Areas	This rule will cover farm buildings if the definition for 'Potentially hazard sensitive activity', which currently includes 'buildings associated with primary production' is not amended. Federated Farmers considers that farm buildings, such as barns and implement sheds, that are non-habitable should be removed from the definition of 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities'. Such buildings are typically constructed with framing poles rammed into the ground and have bare earth foundations and therefore are not as prone to natural hazards. Many of these farm buildings will be larger than the 10m² floor area cap, which may have been set with urban buildings in mind. These farm buildings are likely to be situated within existing clusters of other farms buildings to allow practical management of day-to-day farm operations, and it adds unnecessary difficulty if replacement buildings have to be situated any considerable distance away. Therefore, classifying such farm buildings as 'potentially hazard	If relief for definition of 'Potentially hazard sensitive activity' is not accepted, amend NH-R3 to exclude: <u><i>buildings associated with primary production especially those made with rammed pole or bare earth construction methods.</i></u>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	sensitive' creates significant costs to farming operations, which are likely to outweigh any benefits.	
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Historical and Cultural Values – SASM – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori		
Objective SASM-O1 Recognising sites and areas of significance to Māori	The term 'Recognition' of sites and areas of significance to Māori (SASM) in this objective may result in new SASM areas being recognised outside of a district plan change or plan review Schedule 1 process. The Introduction to the SASM chapter seems to suggest the same approach where it says⁴: <i>However, the Councils acknowledge that there are a great number of sites that have not been identified. Further research, evaluation and engagement between Council and tangata whenua is necessary to accurately identify, understand, document and map this resource.</i> And:⁵ <i>It is important to note that there may be other sites known only to Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa that are not identified in the District Plan.... Therefore, effective engagement with tangata whenua is necessary to ensure the ongoing protection and security of sites of significance that are not listed in the District Plan.</i> The Proposed Plan should provide certainty to landowners over what can and cannot be done on their land. New mapping layers should only be introduced via the Schedule 1 process that allows the landowner and the community to participate. Any SASMs should be identified by the Proposed Plan and mapped on the Proposed Plan planning maps.	Firstly, amend SASM-O1 so that it reads: <i>Sites and areas of significance to Māori are recognised <u>identified, protected and maintained</u>;</i> Secondly, make consequential changes to the SASM Chapter Introduction to clarify that new SASMs will only be introduced via a Schedule 1 process.

⁴ SASM Chapter Introduction, page 1 at paragraph 6.

⁵ SASM Chapter Introduction, page 2 at paragraph 1.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
Objective SASM-O2 Providing for kaitiakitanga	It is unclear what tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga over SASMs will involve. Will it be limited to tangata whenua involvement in the Councils' functions? Or is it intended that tangata whenua will access the relevant land independently of the Councils? Private landowners are liable for certain activities done on their land by other parties, for instance because of health and safety legislation or biosecurity legislation. This objective should acknowledge that tangata whenua need landowner permission before accessing private land.	Amend SASM-O2 to read: <i><u>Tangata whenua can exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to sites and areas of significance to them in the Wairarapa. Where such sites and areas have been identified on private land, engagement with the relevant landowner should be encouraged to ensure access to the sites and areas is able to occur.</u></i>
Policy SASM-P2 Protect and maintain sites and areas of significance to Māori	The SASMs listed in Schedule 4 and mapped in the Proposed Plan Map Viewer are shown as either a point, small polygon or large polygon. The Introduction to the SASM Chapter says that "[i]f the site has a discrete spatial extent, it is identified and mapped as a point. If the site or area has a larger spatial extent, the site is identified and mapped as a polygon."⁶ The Map Viewer shows 65 point-mapped SASMs. Some of the point-mapped sites may not be readily visible on-site, and/or their extent may not be readily discernible. For example, the Map Viewer short descriptions of some of the point-mapped sites read: • <i>Pa site. Ploughed - no features visible. Scattered hangi stones noted in 1971 (TWs9)</i> • <i>Kainga. Various house sites, orchards and a urupa. (TWs13)</i> • <i>Originally recorded as a ditch, stone rows and midden, of Maori origin. Identified in 2006 as a ditch, of European origin (TWs24)</i> • <i>Kainga. Extent of site at least 200 x 50 m along sand dune. School site - native school closed no later than 1900. Ngati Porou urupa. Old Whare Tupuna site</i>	Amend SASM-P2(b) by deleting the words "in proximity to": <i><u>(b) Requiring activities on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori to maintain the site or area's cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua; and</u></i>

⁶ SASM Chapter Introduction, page 2 at paragraph 2.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	(TWs26) • <i>Findspot for canoe artefact (TWs19)</i> The SASM Chapter Introduction acknowledges that some sites are no longer visible when it says: “In some cases, the original features of a site may have been lost or damaged..... Even where these sites no longer exist physically, they still hold cultural significance to Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa.”⁷ The Proposed Plan Map Viewer also uses a disclaimer, that would apply to point-mapped (as well as polygon-mapped) SASMs. The disclaimer says:⁸ <i>Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils have made every reasonable effort to provide complete and accurate information in the map viewer. While the Councils try to make sure that the information in this map viewer is accurate and up to date, there may be errors and omissions. The Councils do not guarantee:</i> <i>That the information extracted when conducting a property search comprises all relevant information for the property (the Councils recommend users read the Proposed District Plan or talk to a Council planner);</i> <i>That the planning map information gives the exact location of features when viewed on the ground.</i> <i>The Council accepts no responsibility or liability for the public's subsequent use or misuse of any of the information in the map viewer.</i> These aspects of the Proposed Plan and mapping demonstrate the potential uncertainty associated with mapped SASMs. The phrase “in proximity to” in this policy adds uncertainty,	

⁷ SASM Chapter Introduction, page 2 at paragraph 3.

⁸ Wairarapa Combined District Plan Map Viewer – Decisions Version, Map Viewer Disclaimer
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/f28f02dcce1c41c694eea0427878f9b3> accessed on 18 November 2025.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	when applied to both point-mapped and polygon-mapped SASMs. This uncertainty is especially so combined with the uncertainty, demonstrated above, of location and extent of the mapped SASMs. What does “in proximity to” mean? Will it be within 5 metres for one SASM, and within 50 metres for another SASM? How will landowners and resource users be able to determine if a proposed activity sufficiently close to a SASM to trigger this policy? Will landowners and resource users need to engage with tangata whenua to understand if their activity is “in proximity to” a SASM? The SASM rules do not clarify or help with establishing what “in proximity to” means generally, and whether it will change depending on particular circumstances. Federated Farmers does not oppose scheduling and protecting SASMs, but seeks sufficient certainty for landowners to make decisions about their property and apply the Proposed Plan provisions on protecting SASMs. Therefore, the mapped location and extent of SASMs needs to, as far as practicable, be clear and certain.	
Policy SASM-P3 Allow limited earthworks within sites and areas of significance to Māori	For the same reasons as above against SASM-P2, the phrase ‘in proximity to’ creates uncertainty.	Amend SASM-P3 by deleting the words “in proximity to: <i>Allow for:</i> a. <i>Small-scale earthworks for burials within existing urupa; and</i> b. <i>Other earthworks on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori only where it can be demonstrated that the identified values will be protected, having regard to....</i>
Policy SASM-P4 Allow limited activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori	For the same reasons as above against SASM-P2, the phrase ‘in proximity to’ creates uncertainty.	Amend SASM-P4 by deleting the words “in proximity to: <i>Allow the following activities to occur on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori, while ensuring their design, scale, and intensity will not compromise cultural, spiritual, and historical values,</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
		<i>interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua:...</i>
Policy SASM-P5 Protect the values of sites and areas of significance to Māori from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development	For the same reasons as above against SASM-P2, the phrase 'in proximity to' creates uncertainty.	Amend SASM-P5 by deleting the words "in proximity to: <i>Only allow any other use and development on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area are protected and maintained, having regard to:...</i>
Policy SASM-P6 Manage removal or destruction of sites and areas of significance to Māori	As currently worded, this policy is confusing and could be interpreted as capturing offsite activities that may have an effect on the SASM.	Amend the chapeau of SASM-P6 to read: <i>Ensure the adverse effects of activities on within sites and areas of significance to Māori are managed by:....</i>
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Natural Environment Values – ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity		
Objective ECO-O1 Indigenous biodiversity	Federated Farmers considers that this objective should not dictate the way that the overall goal of at least 'no overall loss in indigenous biodiversity' will be achieved. Objectives should state "what" — the overall goal is that is to be achieved. The "how"— the way that the overall goal is achieved — should be left to the lower order provisions. In some situations, 'maintaining' indigenous biodiversity may be sufficient, and in other situations indigenous biodiversity may need to be enhanced or restored.	Amend ECO-O1 so that it reads: <i>Indigenous biodiversity within the Wairarapa is maintained, and enhanced, or restored where degraded so there is at least no overall loss in indigenous biodiversity.</i>
Policy ECO-P3 Identify areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant or habitats of indigenous fauna	This policy triggers a requirement for resource consent applicants to do an identification exercise for habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. However, the RPS directs that such identification should happen at the plan development stage, not during resource consent applications. If done on a case-by-case basis through the resource consents process, there is potential for 'gappy' or 'patchy' identification and analysis of habitats. Some activities on	Amend Policy ECO-P3 to read: <i>Identify with tangata whenua and landowners those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa, including through resource consent processes using the significance criteria in the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	adjacent properties may not need consent so the identification work will not need to be done. Ad-hoc identification and analysis risks poor or ineffective outcomes for indigenous biodiversity protection/enhancement. It also may present an unduly onerous burden for some individuals who happen to be consent holders or applicants. Cumulative adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity will be beyond the control of individual consent holders to manage via case-by-case identification of indigenous biodiversity habitats. It is not clear how the obligation on other individuals (who are not consent applicants or consent holders) will be implemented through ECO-P3.	
Policy ECO-P4 Protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant or habitats of indigenous fauna	The phrase “directly adjacent to” in clause (c) is uncertain and has not been written in a way that is specific, measurable, or achievable.	Amend ECO-P4(c) to read: <i>c. requiring activities within or directly adjacent to these areas to manage their adverse effects in accordance with ECO-P6 and ECO-P13; and</i>
Policy ECO-P5 Appropriate activities for areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant or habitats of indigenous fauna	This policy allows for a number of minor activities such as: <i>d. maintenance of existing access tracks, fencelines, and firebreaks and the construction of new fencelines and firebreaks.</i> A range of additional farm activities and structures should be included within the activities listed in this policy, because they are similarly routine and minor and would have little or no effect on indigenous biodiversity. For example, this policy could capture many day-to-day farming activities associated with pasture maintenance, such as: • pest plant control, • hay-making, • sowing/harvesting livestock fodder crops, and • periodic clearance of other vegetation species that may end up spreading onto pastureland. In some cases, existing farm access tracks and farm water	Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of Policy ECO-P5(e) to read as follows: <i>Enable the following activities relating to habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa where adverse effects are avoided where practicable or minimised:</i> ... <i>e. maintenance of existing <u>farm buildings, farm access tracks, farm drains, culverts, gates and fence lines, farm stock water supply dams, pipes and troughs and firebreaks and the construction of new fence lines, farm water supply pipelines, farm tracks and firebreaks;</u></i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	supply pipelines in particular, may need to be relocated to achieve better environmental outcomes. Any new replacement farm access tracks and pipelines may have to be wholly or partly within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (SNAs). Another example is before or after a storm event, farmers may need to access and maintain or repair a culvert that is within an SNA.	
Policy ECO-P8 Management of effects on other indigenous vegetation	This policy on modification of indigenous vegetation outside of SNAs could have perverse consequences for indigenous biodiversity. It may discourage people from voluntarily planting indigenous vegetation (e.g. for shelter belts) and choosing to plant exotic vegetation instead. It may also discourage landowners from allowing or aiding indigenous biodiversity to regenerate on their land. This could have a counterproductive impact on indigenous biodiversity. This policy, and the ECO chapter in general, does not align with the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB), which says that councils must allow maintenance of improved pasture, subject to specific conditions (set out in clause 3.17 of the NPS-IB). Currently the ECO chapter provisions in the Proposed Plan do not provide for this.	Delete Policy ECO-P8 in its entirety. Alternatively, if this relief is not accepted then it is sought that the policy is amended to read: <i>Manage the modification of indigenous vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure any adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, considering:</i> ... <i><u>e. regarding primary production activities:</u></i> <i><u>i. the functional or operational need for primary production to occur on rural land;</u></i> <i><u>ii. the need to avoid perverse consequences that could arise from discouraging landowners either planting indigenous biodiversity, or supporting regeneration of indigenous biodiversity on their property;</u></i> <i><u>iii. the need to allow maintenance of improved pasture;</u></i> <i><u>e. f.-to require adverse effects of activities other than renewable electricity generation activities, or any primary production activities related to clause (e), on biological diversity of indigenous species and habitats</u></i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
		<i>to be managed as follows:</i> "
Rule ECO-R1 Modification of indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area	Federated Farmers supports the permitted activity status in ECO-R1 for the modification of indigenous vegetation within an SNA. In particular, Federated Farmers supports paragraphs (1)(a)(v) and (vi) that permit the removal or trimming of vegetation branches as necessary to prevent interference with lawfully established structures, buildings, and fence lines. However, Federated Farmers seeks that the rule be expanded to encompass other lawfully established activities essential to the daily operations and maintenance of a farm, such as maintenance of pasture, drains and farm tracks. This inclusive approach ensures that the rule adequately addresses the practical needs of farmers while balancing the need to protect SNAs. Within the Proposed Plan's General Rural Zones, there are 192 medium or large property titles (above 5 ha in area) that intersect with an SNA. Therefore, this rule and other rules on SNAs will affect many farms and other rural properties.	Amend ECO-R1 to add: <i>vi. required to remove or trim branches of vegetation to the extent necessary to avoid them interfering with lawfully established <u>pasture, drains, farm tracks, structures, buildings, fencelines, network utilities, existing roads or access tracks;</u></i>
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes		
Objective NFL-O2	There are seven Special Amenity Landscapes (SALs) listed in Schedule 8 and mapped in the Proposed Plan Map Viewer. The largest of these (SAL1) covers almost the entire Wairarapa coastline. The aim for SALs is set out in Objective NFL-O2 and two NFL policies (NFL-P2 and NFL-P5), and mentioned in Policy NU-P6 about adverse effects of the National Grid. However, there are no specific rules on SALs in the Proposed Plan. This is acknowledged in the NFL Introduction⁹. Federated Farmer's original submission sought that this	Federated Farmers' seeks, as a first order of relief, deletion of any SALs that serve no regulatory purpose. This may entail deleting all references to Special Amenity Landscapes in the Proposed Plan, such as: • The definition of 'special amenity landscapes' • Policies NFL-P2 and NFL-P5 • References to 'special amenity landscapes' in the NFL Chapter Introduction • The mention of 'special amenity landscapes' from Policy NU-P6

⁹ NFL Chapter Introduction, page 1 at paragraph 5.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	Objective and other provisions on SALs be deleted. Federated Farmers maintains that SALs should be removed from the Proposed Plan, because: - it is uncertain how current manifestation of SALs provisions (i.e. objectives, policies and scheduled SALs but no rules) would be implemented. Will the SAL provisions be applied in discretionary or non-complying consent processes if the activity is within a SAL? - Specially for the coast, SAL1 for the Wairarapa coastline overlaps significantly with the coastal environment layer. Because of the overlap, the coastal provisions will apply to much of the land within SAL1. The coastal provisions seek to protect and maintain many of the same values that are relevant landscape values for SAL1. Therefore, Federated Farmers questions whether it is necessary to identify the area within SAL1 as a Special Amenity Landscape. Where there is a choice, regulatory frameworks should err on the side of a 'less restrictive regime' where the purposes of the RMA and the objectives of the plan can be met. If removing SALs altogether from the Proposed Plan is not accepted, Federated Farmers considers that this Objective, and consequentially the SAL policies NFL-P2 and NFL-P5 and the NFL Chapter Introduction, should be amended to clarify that the presence of a SAL will not inhibit primary production activities in the General Rural Zone.	Schedule 8. Alternatively, if the relief sought above is not accepted, Federated Farmers would accept a second order of relief of amending Schedule 8 by deleting SAL1 Wairarapa Coastline where this is also within a Coastal Environment overlay area. Alternatively, if either relief sought above is not accepted, Federated Farmers seeks, as a third order of relief, that NFL-O2 be amended to read: <i><u>Special Amenity Landscapes within the Wairarapa are maintained and where practicable enhanced, while allowing productive activities within these rural environments and redevelopment in urban environments to continue.</u></i> And that consequential amendments be made to the SAL policies NFL-P2 and NFL-P5 and the NFL Chapter Introduction, to clarify that the presence of a SAL will not inhibit primary production activities in the General Rural Zone.
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – NFL – Natural	Federated Farmers considers that this policy should be removed from the Proposed Plan, for the reasons above	Delete NFL-P2.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
Features and Landscapes – Policy – NFL-P2	against NFL-O2.	Alternatively, if the relief sought above is not accepted, amend NFL-P2 to read: <u>NFL-P2 Identify Special Amenity Landscapes <i>while recognising existing land use patterns</i></u> <i>Identify Special Amenity Landscapes that are distinctive, widely recognised, and highly valued by the community for their contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment of the Wairarapa, based on the following criteria:</i> <i>a. Natural science factors;</i> <i>b. Sensory factors; and</i> <i>c. Shared or recognised features.</i> <u><i>During identification and scheduling of Special Amenity Landscapes, recognise existing land use patterns.</i></u>
Policy NFL-P3 Subdivision, use, and development within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes outside the Coastal Environment	This Policy does not explicitly provide for primary production activities, which tend to fall within Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape boundaries.	Amend NFL-P3(b) by adding a new sub-clause as follows: <u><i>viii. enabling primary production activities to operate efficiently and to make effective use of the land resource of the rural zones.</i></u>
Policy NFL-P4 Subdivision, use, and development within Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment	This Policy does not explicitly provide for primary production activities, which tend to fall within Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape boundaries.	Firstly, amend NFL-P4(b) by inserting after sub-clause (ii): <u><i>iii. enabling primary production activities to operate efficiently and to make effective use of the land resource of the rural zones; and</i></u> Secondly, consequential renumbering of existing sub-clauses iii. and iv.
Standard NFL-S1 Earthworks	The thresholds for earthworks in this standard are inappropriate and will capture many day-to-day primary production activities within resource consent processes that will incur delays and costs for little or no environmental	Amend NFL-S1 by adding an exclusion to allow ‘ancillary rural earthworks’ as per Federated Farmers’ appeal point on the inclusion of a new definition for ‘ancillary rural

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	benefit. Day-to-day farming may include earthworks for cultivation, land preparation for planting, offal pits, digging post holes, to name only a few examples. A complete list of day-to-day farming activities is included above in the relief Federated Farmers seeks against a new definition for 'ancillary rural earthworks'. Added together, farm earthworks will often exceed 50m² per site in any one year, but these minor earthworks are likely to have little or no adverse environmental effects in the context of the rural working environment for primary production.	earthworks'.
Standard NFL-S2 Modification of indigenous vegetation	Farming activities may often involve clearing more than 50m² of indigenous vegetation within any one year, but then may not involve clearing any indigenous vegetation for the next several years. For instance, some tasks involving clearance may be delayed due to the farming calendar and instead be done biennially or triennially to mesh in with various other farm management tasks. Also, trimming shelter belts made from indigenous vegetation would also count towards the 50m² limit. Federated Farmers further seeks that firebreaks are included in the list of exemptions to this standard. In this regard, ECO-P5, which applies to SNAs, includes 'maintenance of... firebreaks' as an activity that should be enabled within SNAs, suggesting that maintenance of firebreaks would not be inappropriate in other areas as well as within SNAs.	Amend NFL-S2 to add the following exception: <i>This standard does not apply to modification of indigenous vegetation that is:</i> ... <u>d. associated with maintenance of:</u> i. <u>pasture.</u> ii. <u>existing farm tracks.</u> iii. <u>water supply pipelines.</u> iv. <u>farm water supply dams.</u> v. <u>farm drains, livestock mustering yards.</u> vi. <u>farm vehicle hard stand areas.</u> vii. <u>airstrips</u> viii. <u>silage pits.</u> ix. <u>fence lines or</u> x. <u>fire breaks.</u>
Standard NFL-S3 Buildings and structures	Farm buildings and structures are often larger than 50 m² and taller than 5m and may breach the other standards in NFL-S1. Federated Farmers consider that it would be inappropriate to apply this standard to those buildings/structures. To do so may result in inefficient and unnecessary costs and delays for	Amend NFL-S3 to exclude farm buildings and structures by adding: <u>This standard does not apply to:</u> <u>a. buildings and structures ancillary to rural production activities, such as fences and gates, storage barns.</u>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	little or no environmental benefit.	<u>farm implement sheds, livestock shelters for mustering areas, dairy sheds, shearing/wool sheds, and herd homes.</u>
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Natural Environment Values – PA-Public Access		
Objective PA-O1 Public access and enjoyment	The reference to 'water quality' in clause (a) has been added in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan. Preserving water quality is not a function of district councils under RMA s31, and is not a requirement on district councils under RPS.	Amend PA-O1 by removing the reference to water quality in clause (a).
Policy PA-P2 Compatible activities	This policy doesn't have a method that relates to anticipating future possible public access areas. The policy also does not recognise that new public access should be compatible with existing activities. Without such acknowledgments, the ability of farmers to utilise land for primary production could be disproportionately adversely impacted compared to adverse effects on public access, depending on the circumstances.	Replace PA-P2 with: <u>Ensure any new public access is compatible with existing lawfully established activities within the coastal environment, rivers, lakes and wetlands and their margins.</u>
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Subdivision -SUB-Subdivision		
Objective SUB-O2 Servicing	There is no practical way of ensuring rural subdivision 'is capable of connecting to a telecommunication network' other than ensuring every rural property owner has a mobile phone. Many rural areas do not have telephone network coverage and whether or not they do is beyond the control of any subdivision applicant. The absence of a local telephone network is not a reasonable ground for refusing rural subdivision, merely because a landowner may be unable to connect to a telecommunication network. Some rural subdivision may be needed for purposes that don't require connection to a telecommunication network — e.g. lots for cropping, grazing or standing off dairy cattle etc.	Amend SUB-O2(b) by removing the words added in the decisions version, in the following way: <i>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 telecommunication network.</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
Policy SUB-P2 Provide integrated infrastructure at subdivision	Federated Farmers opposes the new text in sub-clause (d)(iv) for the same reasons as above against SUB-O2.	Amend SUB-P2 by deleting clause (d)(iv).
Rule SUB-R5 Subdivision of a surplus residential unit	Federated Farmers considers that the threshold of 40 ha set out in clause (d) is too large and 20ha is more appropriate. A farmer should not be forced to dispose of or subdivide 40ha if they only need to dispose of or subdivide 20ha. The ability to subdivide lots at a 20ha minimum is unlikely to have an adverse effect on protection of highly productive land. Under the current operative district plan the minimum lot size is 4ha. There is evidence that lots between 20 and 40ha have been created since the current district plan became operative in 2011. Federated Farmers submits that such lots were predominantly created for, and are still used for, primary production purposes. Notwithstanding this, the proportion of lots created between 20ha and 40ha during this period only amounts to some 6 percent of the total number of rural lots created during this period. So, allowing lots with a 20ha minimum would be highly unlikely to have any significant adverse effect on protection of highly productive land, yet it would meet a demand for useful rural subdivision. Further, clause (e) is confusing and should be deleted because it is not necessary. Rural subdivision may be for purposes other than facilitating a residential dwelling.	Firstly, amend SUB-R5(d) to read: <i>The balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha <u>20ha</u></i> Secondly, delete clause (e).
SUB-Table 1 Minimum allotment sizes	Federated Farmers considers that the controlled subdivision threshold of 40ha is too large and 20ha is more appropriate. In Wairarapa, subdivision for farming lots has previously involved lots sized between 20 and 40ha. This is more appropriate for farmers who wish to buy (or sell) land for cropping or supplemental grazing (or dairy stand-off etc) that is smaller than 40ha — to make management of their farming operation more efficient — rather than being forced into less desirable/reliable lease arrangements if barriers to rural subdivision are too high.	Amend SUB-Table 1 to replace 40ha with 20 ha, in the General Rural Zone.

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – General District Wide Matters – CE-Coastal Environment		
Standard – CE-S1 Earthworks	This standard is too restrictive and not appropriate for the full range of rural production activities. CE-S1 risks capturing routine farm activities in a resource consent process resulting in costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. Therefore, more exceptions for rural earthworks are warranted.	Amend the exception in CE-S1 to read: <i>This standard does not apply to:</i> <i>a. Earthworks associated with maintaining existing farm tracks, roads, water supply infrastructure, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, sileage pits, fence lines and access ways are exempt from the above area standards but must comply with NFLS1(1)(a) and NFL-S1(2)(a).</i>
Standard CE-S2 Modification of indigenous vegetation	This standard is too restrictive and not appropriate for the full range of rural production activities. Day-to-day farming activities often require modification of indigenous vegetation that, in the aggregate, would exceed 50m² per site in any single specific year, but then not involve any vegetation removal for several years following. Federated Farmers considers that such indigenous vegetation removal activities will have little to no adverse environmental effect. If CE-S2 is not amended, many farming-related activities involving modification of indigenous vegetation will require a resource consent, adding undue delays and cost for little or no environmental benefit. Federated Farmers further seeks that firebreaks are included in the list of exemptions to this standard. In this regard, ECO-P5, which applies to SNAs, includes 'maintenance of... firebreaks' as an activity that should be enabled within SNAs, suggesting that maintenance of firebreaks would not be inappropriate in other areas as well as within SNAs.	Add a new exception to CE-S2 that reads: <i>This standard does not apply to modification of indigenous vegetation that is:</i> ... <i>d. associated with maintenance of pasture, existing farm tracks, water supply pipelines, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, sileage pits, fence lines or fire breaks.</i>
Standard CE-S3 Buildings and structures	Federated Farmers considers that this standard is urban centric, overly restrictive, and not appropriate for the full range of primary production buildings and structures. Primary production buildings are often located within the wide-open spaces of the rural areas, where considerably more	Amend CE-S2 by adding this exception: <i>This standard does not apply to buildings and structures within the coastal environment that are:</i> <i>a. associated with primary production such as fences</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
	development can be tolerated without having adverse effects on the environment. CE-S3 as currently worded risks requiring routine farm buildings and structures to get a resource consent. This could create undue regulatory compliance requirements, costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. An exception for rural production buildings and structures is preferred.	<u>and gates, storage barns, farm implement sheds, livestock shelters for mustering areas, dairy sheds, shearing/wool sheds, and herd homes.</u>
Part 2 – District Wide Matters – General District Wide Matters – NOISE-Noise		
Policy – NOISE-P1 Enable noise-generating activities in appropriate areas	Federated Farmers is concerned that this policy could be construed in rural areas as putting rural residential/lifestyle amenity values expectations above the need for primary production activities to emit noise. We suggest that this policy be amended to show that “amenity” is in the context of the predominant land uses in the relevant zone.	Amend NOISE-P1 to read: <i>Enable the generation of noise from activities that:</i> <i>f. <u>a. maintain the predominant land use(s) character and amenity values of the receiving zone(s) by appropriately controlling the types of activities and levels of noise permitted in each zone; and</u></i> <i><u>a-b. do not compromise the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u></i>
Policy NOISE-P2 Ensure noise effects from activities are compatible with the existing environment	Federated Farmers considers that the management of noise should reflect the predominant land use within each zone. It would be inappropriate for rural production activities that are normally noisy (such as operation of frost fans or bird-scaring devices) to be prevented from occurring in rural areas because of sensitive land uses such as rural lifestyle development where the occupants have chosen to live in rural areas.	Amend NOISE-P2 to read: <i>Provide for other activities that generate noise, where these avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects, having regard to:</i> <i>a. the extent to which it avoids conflict with existing noise sensitive activities;</i> <i>b. whether the level of effects is compatible with the character and amenity of <u>permitted activities in the relevant zone location and adjacent established activities and their operation;</u></i> <i>c. the compatibility of the noise with other noises generated from permitted zone activities, and other activities not controlled by the Plan, within the receiving zone;</i> <i>d. the degree to which the noise breaches the permitted</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
		noise standards for the receiving zone(s); e. whether adverse effects can be internalised to the site where the noise is generated and the extent to which they can be minimised at site boundaries; ... i. potential positive effects associated with the activity which is generating the noise; <u>and</u> <u>j. the functional need for the activity to occur in that location.</u>
Part 3 – Area Specific Matters – Rural Zones – GRUZ- General Rural Zone		
Objective GRUZ-O3 Provision for primary production	This objective should be consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, by ensuring that the productive capacity of rural land and resources is supported.	Amend GRUZ-O3 to read: <i>The productive <u>capacity of rural land and resources of the General Rural Zone support a range of primary production oriented and resource dependent activities that depend on the productive land resource and <u>avoiding activities that constrain the productive capacity of rural land.</u></u></i>
Policy GRUZ-P1 Compatible activities	This policy could be simplified so that each clause focuses only one on aspect, instead of trying to achieve potentially conflicting aims that have the potential to cause confusion when implemented. Federated Farmers considers that it is inappropriate to list the activities in clause (c) in this policy on compatible activities, as it implies that rural lifestyle development is compatible with the General Rural Zone, whereas in many situations this kind of development may not be compatible with existing or new permitted primary production activities.	Amend GRUZ-P1(a) and (b) to read: <i>a. Enable primary production activities <u>and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose of the General Rural Zone and productive capacity of rural land, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone.</u></i> <i>b. Provide for allowing, where appropriate, other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.</i> Regarding clause (c), either amend to read: <i>c. Provide for Avoid further rural lifestyle subdivision and development in the General Rural Zone where it impacts on the productive capacity of highly productive land. in</i>

Proposed District Plan provision	Reasons for Appeal	Relief Sought by Federated Farmers
		appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for. Or delete clause (c) in its entirety.
Policy GRUZ-P3 Rural character	This policy on rural character, as currently worded, could be interpreted in a way that conflicts with the overall purpose of the General Rural Zone. Clause (a) is potentially confusing as openness and predominance of vegetation are arguably conflicting aims and this would be inappropriate for this Zone. Clause (a) would be more at home in the Open Space Zone provisions. Regarding clause (e), Federated Farmers considers that residential development that does not have a functional need to be in the General Rural Zone should be avoided.	Amend GRUZ-P3 in the following way: Firstly, amend the chapeau of Policy GRUZ-P3 to read: Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, Support the character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone, by: Secondly, delete clause (a) in its entirety. Thirdly, amend clause (e) to read: e. Managing the density and location of avoiding residential development that does not have a functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone; Fourthly, amend clause (h) to read: h. Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.

Appendix 2: Federated Farmers' submission on the Proposed Plan

Appendix 2 is provided separately in the bundle of documents.

Appendix 3: The Proposed Plan Decisions Version

Appendix 3 is provided separately in the bundle of documents. An online version can be accessed here: <https://www.wairarapaplan.co.nz/wairarapa-proposed-district-plan>.

The decision reports can be accessed here: <https://www.wairarapaplan.co.nz/decisions>.

Appendix 4: Persons who made submissions on the Proposed Plan to be served with a copy of this appeal

List of Original Submitters in Alphabetical Order

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Aburn Popova Trust	S48	alistair@urbanp.co.nz
Adam Lee	S3	adam.lee.kiwi@gmail.com
Adamson Shaw Ltd	S152	lucym@adamsonshaw.co.nz
Adrian and Julie Denniston	S210	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Adrienne Young-Cooper	S147	adrienneyc@me.com
Aggregate and Quarry Association	S182	wayne@aga.org.nz
Aidan Ellims	S188	aidan.ellims@xtra.co.nz
Ainsley Kelly	S276	ainsley.kelly@bcdtravel.co.nz
Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association NZ	S131	john.evans@aopa.nz
Alan Flynn	S243	alan@flynn.co.nz
Alastair MacKenzie	S89	casahual@gmail.com
Alistair and Jenny Boyne	S67	jenny@torastation.co.nz
Allan Fahey	S200	allan.fahey@trgroup.co.nz
Amalgamated Helicopters NZ Ltd	S38	jd@ahnz.com
Andrew Duncan	S59	andy@eqo.org.nz
Anne Jessie Te Aroha Carter	S179	anne@teraaconsulting.nz
Anne-Marie and David Clements	S168	d.aclements@xtra.co.nz
Antilles Ltd	S148	geoff.wallace@plumbline.co.nz
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	S167	andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz
Arya Franklyn	S16	arya.franklyn@gmail.com
Audrey Rendle	S52	audrey.rendle@farmside.co.nz
Audrey Sebire	S257	audrey.sebire.nz@gmail.com
Aviation New Zealand – New Zealand Helicopter Association	S72	eonzhauavnz@aviationnz.co.nz
Ballance Agri-Nutrients	S208	dominic.adams@ballance.co.nz
Barbie Barton	S37	rogbar@xtra.co.nz
Ben Foreman	S291	Ben.foreman87@gmail.com
Beverley Clark	S133	217 Lake Ferry Road, Martinborough, Wellington 5781
Bob Tosswill	S217	tosswill@wise.net.nz
Bosch Property Management Co Ltd	S33	office@boschproperties.co.nz
bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	S238	thomas.trevilla@slrconsulting.com
Brian John McGuinness	S226	brian@mcguinness.co.nz
Brookside Developments – Featherston Limited	S95	ian@smallhome.nz
Bruce Sollitt	S118	bsollitt@xtra.co.nz
Bryon Mudgway	S195	bryonmudgway4@gmail.com

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	S91	info@kahuenviro.co.nz
Carolyn Mary Wait	S265	carolyn@hideaway.co.nz
Catrina Sue	S108	catrinasue@xtra.co.nz
CentrePort Limited	S232	william.woods@centreport.co.nz
Charlotte Gendall and Georgina Miller	S31	cgendall62@yahoo.co.nz
Charmaine Kura-o-Tahu Kawana	S254	chakawa53@gmail.com
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)	S189	tom@incite.co.nz
Chorus New Zealand Limited	S142	andrew.kantor@chorus.co.nz
Chris Peterson	S263	chrisp@wise.net.nz
Christopher Clarke	S12	jennychris.clarke@gmail.com
Clive Trott	S114	clive@trott.net.nz
Colin and Helen Southey	S248	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Colin Walter Baruch	S145	colin.baruch@icloud.com
Country Village Heaven	S92	greytown@greytownvillage.com
Craig Dowling	S163	chd@xtra.co.nz
Dan Kellow	S70	djkellow72@gmail.com
Dan Riddiford	S268	danriddiford@teawaitistation.co.nz
Dan Riddiford	S269	danriddiford@teawaitistation.co.nz
Daniel Bradley	S77	daniel-b61@live.com
David Ian McGuinness	S191	david@willisbond.co.nz
Denise Clements	S272	wrattgirl@gmail.com
Dewes Brothers Ltd	S185	tom@incite.co.nz
Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	S236	aching@doc.govt.nz
DMST Internationals Limited	S190	stephanie@scopeplanning.co.nz
Dublin Street Wines Ltd	S82	contact@dublinstreet.co.nz
E McGruddy	S144	46 Matapihi Road Masterton, Wellington 5886
East Leigh Limited ('ELL')	S239	jmarshall@gwlaw.co.nz
Edgar Vandendungen	S171	vandendungen@outlook.co.nz
Edward Henrard	S19	eddie.henrard@gmail.com
Elisabeth Jane Creevey	S227	elisabethcreevey@hotmail.com
Enviro NZ Services Ltd	S247	kaaren.rosser@enviroz.co.nz
Erina Te Whaiti	S76	etewhaiti@xtra.co.nz
ET Quests Limited	S139	lucym@adamsonshaw.co.nz
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S214	fcasey@fedfarm.org.nz
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	S172	fleur.rohleder@beca.com
Fran Wilde	S138	fran@franwilde.com
Francis Minehan	S157	frankminehan3@gmail.com
Frank and Lisa Cornelissen	S80	frank@martinboroughholidaypark.com

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Frank van Steensel	S282	ecodynamicsnz@gmail.com
Fred Waiker	S267	fred@agmar.co.nz
Fulton Hogan Limited	S122	tensor@tonkintaylor.co.nz
Garrick Robert and Pamela Orene Wells	S241	pow1@xtra.co.nz
Garry Daniell	S205	corinna@urbanedgeplanning.co.nz
Gaylene Leslie O'Connor	S253	remmies@farmside.co.nz
Genesis Energy Ltd	S81	alice.barnett@genesisenergy.co.nz
Geoffrey Lush	S11	geoff.lush@gmail.com
Geoffrey Roberts	S117	geoffreyroberts@hotmail.com
Gollins Commercial Limited	S97	chrisg@gollins.co.nz
Greater Wellington Regional Council	S94	sam.obrien@gw.govt.nz
Greytown Heritage Trust	S135	carmelf@xtra.co.nz
Haami Te Whaiti	S213	haami.tewhaiti@gmail.com
Hamish Qualtrough	S58	lazyqltd@outlook.co.nz
Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited	S32	michaelt@civilplan.co.nz
Helios Energy Ltd	S223	sbrooks@heliosenergy.co.nz
Henare Manaena	S264	arepaena@hotmail.com
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	S249	draymond@heritage.org.nz
Horticulture New Zealand	S221	emily.levenson@hortnz.co.nz
Hyslop Homes	S20	jacobhyslop94@gmail.com
Ingrid Ward	S277	ingridward@slingshot.co.nz
Jack Cameron	S74	dvf@xtra.co.nz
Jack Wass	S222	jack.wass@gmail.com
James Derek Gordon Milne	S126	milne.jamesderek@gmail.com
James Houston	S197	jnhxciv@outlook.com
James Richardson	S34	jamesmatthewrichardson@gmail.com
James Wallace, Leslie Wallace and Rosemary Laffey	S192	tom@incite.co.nz
Jamie Burns	S271	jrs@jrs.co.nz
Jan Jessep	S36	janjessep@hotmail.co.uk
Janette and John Dennis	S13	jaydees.wise@xtra.co.nz
Jason Paul Clements	S178	jcle41@gmail.com
Jeannie Hancock	S279	taraviewgreytown@gmail.com
Jennifer Jenkins	S93	jenny.jenkinj@gmail.com
Jennifer McKenzie	S39	63 Te Ore Ore Road Masterton, Wellington 5810
Jeremy Partridge	S43	jez.partridge@yahoo.co.nz
Jess Anniss	S196	bryonmudgway4@gmail.com
Jet Boating New Zealand	S42	brian.eccles@jbzn.co.nz
Jill Greathead and William Sloan	S287	jillgreathead@gmail.com
Jo Woodcock	S270	woodcock4@xtra.co.nz
Joanne Bosch	S166	bfjbosch@gmail.com
Jordan Pratt and Kyla Coulson	S14	jordan@equip2.co.nz
Joseph Frank Percy	S262	carole.percy@hotmail.com

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Josje Neerincx	S283	neerincxjosje@gmail.com
Judith and Rod Jay	S275	rodandjude@slingshot.co.nz
Kahutiaturangi Fahey	S199	kahutia.fahey@gmail.com
Karen Vincent	S83	karen_v@tra.co.nz
Kate Reedy	S105	kate.jason@xtra.co.nz
Kath and David Tomlinson	S181	kath.david@slingshot.co.nz
Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust	S184	kim@kiwa.org.nz
Keith Thorsen	S24	robynandkeith@gmail.com
Kirsten Browne	S266	duganbrowne@icloud.com
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	S79	environment@kiwirail.co.nz
Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman	S201	mariakohinetau@gmail.com
Lawrence Stephenson	S280	lawrenceofnz@gmail.com
Liza Phipps	S5	psmith@transnet.co.nz
Lucy Sanderson-Gammon	S51	lucysg2011@gmail.com
Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird	S125	lynlys@hotmail.com
Manu Te Whata	S99	mash1@xtra.co.nz
Māori Trustee	S212	resource.management@tetumupaeroa.co.nz
Marama Tuuta	S103	marama.eddie@xtra.co.nz
Maria Berry	S273	maria.b@orcon.net.nz
Maria Miller	S230	giddaygorgeous@hotmail.com
Mark Jerling	S46	mark@markjerling.com
Martinborough Community Board	S183	krobiz@xtra.co.nz
Martinborough Holdings Limited	S53	john@siewwrights.co.nz
Masterton Trust Lands Trust	S40	acroskery@ltm.org.nz
Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	S251	solitaire@cdc.govt.nz
Matthew Wenden	S175	wendenmatt@gmail.com
Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler	S231	james@urbanedgeplanning.co.nz
Meridian Energy Limited	S220	andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz
Michael David Walters Hodder	S244	michaelhodder@xtra.co.nz
Michael Philip Heald and Nicole Anne Preston	S134	nicolepreston86@gmail.com
Michelle Hight	S180	michellehight@yahoo.co.nz
Miles Sutherland	S88	miles.sutherland@police.govt.nz
Millicent Williams	S198	m.j.williams878@outlook.com
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	S245	zach.chisam@beca.com
Monique Leerschool	S174	moniquel@contact.net.nz
Murray Hemi	S21	murrayhemi@xtra.co.nz
Nelson Francis Rangi	S128	nelson.rangi@xtra.co.nz
New Zealand Defence Force	S225	rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz
New Zealand Frost Fans	S187	nzconsents@frostboss.com
New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	S252	stuart@stuartryan.co.nz
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	S229	hannah.ritchie@pork.co.nz
New Zealand Transport Agency	S149	kathryn.stamand@nzta.govt.nz
Ngaere Webb	S242	webb250@slingshot.co.nz

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Ngāi Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi i Mōtuwairaka Inc	S106	sue@ttcl.co.nz
Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust	S256	tia@kkwtmr.org.nz
Ngāti Te Ahuahu Hapū	S100	mash1@xtra.co.nz
Nigel and Philippa Broom	S219	nigel.broom@xtra.co.nz
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	S22	eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz
Panatahi Sue	S110	panatahi.sue3587@gmail.com
Panatahi Takarua	S193	panatahi.kr@gmail.com
Papawai Ahu whenua Trust	S112	marama.eddie@xtra.co.nz
Papawai Ahu whenua Trust	S235	marama.eddie@xtra.co.nz
Papawai and Kaikokirikiri Trusts	S68	office@pktrusts.nz
Patrick Ward	S18	homeward@outlook.co.nz
Paul Burgin	S2	pburgin@gmail.com
Paul Burgin	S127	pburgin@gmail.com
Paula Gillett and Jane Donald	S211	tairoafarm@gmail.com
Penelope Jane Bargh	S143	jp.bargh@xtra.co.nz
Peter Clark, Wayne Carmichael, and Dorreen Mackenzie	S250	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Peter Himona	S289	peterhimona@xtra.co.nz
Peter Stout	S101	pestout@xtra.co.nz
Peter William Gibbs	S224	peter.joy.gibbs@xtra.co.nz
Powerco Limited	S209	planning@powerco.co.nz
Rachael Hughes	S285	rachael.hughes@vectormetering.com
Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	S288	annabelle.lee@chapmantripp.com
Rangitāne o Wairarapa	S47	amber@rangitane.iwi.nz
Regan Potangaroa	S73	potangaroa.regan54@gmail.com
Richard Schofield	S281	rplum@sevil.co.nz
Richard Taylor	S206	richardtaylor@xtra.co.nz
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	S258	a.geary@forestandbird.org.nz
Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ)	S237	graeme.mathieson@mitchelldaysh.co.nz
Russell Hooper	S259	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Ryan and Nadine Smock	S27	mcnzltd@gmail.com
Ryan Malone	S240	ryanmalone007@gmail.com
Sally Whitehead	S61	sallylmcoffey@gmail.com
Sam Edridge	S69	sam@edridgeconstruction.co.nz
Sara Hiranni O'Donnell	S216	saraodonnell07@gmail.com
Sarah and John Monaghan	S137	monaghanfamily@xtra.co.nz
Scilla Askew	S35	askscilla@zoho.com
Scott Anstis	S233	scottanstis@hotmail.com
Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	S255	scott.summerfield@gmail.com
Shane Gray and David Allen	S246	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Shaun Draper	S63	shaun.draper@xtra.co.nz
Simon Byrne	S30	byrne.home2@gmail.com

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Simon Byrne	S119	byrne.home2@gmail.com
Simon Casey	S132	simoncas2407@gmail.com
Simon Coffey	S60	simonjohncoffey@gmail.com
South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG)	S207	swwagcontact@gmail.com
Spark, Connexa, One NZ and Forty South	S141	graeme.mccarrison@spark.co.nz
Stephen and Judith Brown	S261	stephen@mbbrown.co.nz
Stephen Franks	S96	franks.lawyer@gmail.com
Steve Hancock	S278	stevehancock007@gmail.com
Stewart Reid	S25	stewart.reid@reidbrothersdistilling.com
Storm Robertson	S151	storm0681@gmail.com
Stuart Macann	S71	stuart.macann@gmail.com
Summerset Group Holdings Limited	S203	mitch@bbplanning.co.nz
Susan Taylor	S102	sue@ttcl.co.nz
Suzanne Rauhina Cooper	S169	rauhinas@gmail.com
Te Pou Herenga o Hiwaru Māori Reserve	S111	sue@ttcl.co.nz
Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia	S154	amber@tahetoka.nz
Teoroi Trust	S140	teoroi@bigpond.com
The Gold Vault Ltd Lynnette McManaway	S7	farm@goldcreek.co.nz
Tim Williams	S177	tim@waihelicopters.com
Timothy Paul Druzianic	S146	druzt@xtra.co.nz
Toby Mills	S10	toby@np.co.nz
Toka Tū Ake EQC	S90	resilience@eqc.govt.nz
Toni Demetriou	S55	demetrioutoni@gmail.com
Tony Garstang	S260	tonygarstang@xtra.co.nz
Tracey McComb	S107	tracey@smallhome.nz
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S218	ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz
Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust	S87	malcolm@tmridevelopments.nz
Tupurupuru	S150	marama.eddie@xtra.co.nz
Tupurupuru Ahuwhenua Trust	S153	marama.eddie@xtra.co.nz
Vern and Jocelyn Brasell	S129	vernbrasell@gmail.com
Victoria Jane Stanbridge	S28	vjstanbridge@xtra.co.nz
Vida McDonald	S286	vida.mcdonald666@gmail.com
Waipoua Catchment Community Group	S123	sog@xtra.co.nz
Wairarapa and Norsewood Estate Limited	S15	hharvey@forestenterprises.co.nz
Wairarapa Eco Farm	S284	wairarapaecofarm@gmail.com
Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc	S136	wilco@ogs.nz
Warren Cooper	S194	warrencooper707a@gmail.com
Warren Reiri	S64	98 Te Whiti Road Masterton, Wellington 5810

Submitter name	Submission number	Address for service
Warren Woodgyer	S98	warren.woodgyer@swdc.govt.nz
Warren Woodgyer	S274	wwoodgyer@gmail.com
Wellington Fish and Game Council	S186	acoughlan@fishandgame.org.nz
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	S202	kay@formeplanning.co.nz
Xavier Warne	S130	xgwarne@gmail.com
Z Energy Limited	S215	thomas.trevilla@slrconsulting.com

List of Further Submitters in Alphabetical Order

Further Submitters Name	Further Submitter Number	Address for service
Abby & Hamish Ewen	FS47	hamishewen@hotmail.com
Abum Popova Trust	FS62	alistair@urbanp.co.nz
AdamsonShaw Ltd	FS80	lucym@adamsonshaw.co.nz
Adrian and Julie Denniston, as Trustees of the Riversdale Terraces Trust	FS23	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Allan Johnson	FS71	nzallan@gmail.com
Andrew Ryan	FS40	andrewjryan24@gmail.com
Anita Roberts and Mark Dougan	FS101	anitakathrynroberts@gmail.com
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	FS31	andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz
Arthi Amaravathisamy	FS6	kabson@gmail.com
Arthi Amaravathisamy	FS8	kabson@gmail.com
Aviation Industry Association for NZ Helicopter Association	FS48	eonzhauavnz@aviationnz.co.nz
Bob Rufford	FS99	bobrufford@gmail.com
Brian John McGuinness	FS86	brian@mcguinness.co.nz
Brookside Development - Featherston Limited	FS83	ian@smallhome.nz
Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	FS70	info@kahuenviro.co.nz
Chris Garland	FS44	cigar488@gmail.com
Cobblestones Trust	FS45	xk6050@xtra.co.nz
Colin and Helen Southey	FS42	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Collins Graham Brown	FS64	cq.ji.brown@xtra.co.nz
David Nathan	FS43	mel.dave@xtra.co.nz
Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	FS73	cschipper@doc.govt.nz
DMST Internationals Limited	FS98	stephanie@scopeplanning.co.nz
East Leigh Limited	FS109	jmarshall@gwlaw.co.nz
Edgar Vandendungen	FS58	vandendungen@outlook.co.nz
EQC Toka Tū Ake	FS77	resilience@eqc.govt.nz
Fulton Hogan Limited	FS89	tensor@tonkintaylor.co.nz

Further Submitters Name	Further Submitter Number	Address for service
Gavin Grey	FS102	gavin.grey@downer.co.nz
Genesis Energy Limited	FS74	mhairi.rademaker@genesisenergy.co.nz
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS90	sam.obrien@gw.govt.nz
Greytown District Trust Lands	FS53	manager@greytownlandstrust.org.nz
Greytown District Trust Lands Trust	FS88	manager@greytowntrustlands.org.nz
Heritage New Zealand	FS75	draymond@heritage.org.nz
Holly Hill	FS78	holly.hill@minterellison.co.nz
Horticulture New Zealand	FS4	emily.levenson@hortnz.co.nz
Horticulture New Zealand	FS13	emily.levenson@hortnz.co.nz
Ian and Marilyn Frowde	FS24	pettswood@xtra.co.nz
Ian Goodman	FS14	jo@hublegal.co.nz
Ian Gunn, Secretary, Sustainable Wairarapa Inc.	FS104	ian47g@gmail.com
Ian Gunn, Sustainable Wairarapa	FS105	ian47g@gmail.com
Isobel Ryan	FS41	isobel.ryan24@gmail.com
Jane Burr	FS17	jane.burr61@gmail.com
Jeannine Iwa Brown	FS65	shearex@xtra.co.nz
Jim Hedley	FS84	jim.paulhedley@xtra.co.nz
John and Vivienne Phipps	FS60	phipps@xtra.co.nz
Joy Durrant	FS66	joy@prosperity.co.nz
Karthik Soundararajan	FS5	kabson@gmail.com
Karthik soundararajan	FS7	kabson@gmail.com
Katrina Edmonds	FS59	treenedmonds13@gmail.com
Llana Wallis	FS56	llanawallis00@gmail.com
Manaia Farm Trust	FS92	megan@flynn.co.nz
Marilyn Parkin	FS36	lynnciurlionis@hotmail.com
Mark and Margaret Benseman	FS25	mwbense1960@gmail.com
Martinborough Community Board	FS79	storm.robertson@swdc.govt.nz
Martinborough Golf Club	FS72	amorison49@gmail.com
Matthew & Lana Timperley	FS9	thetimperleys@gmail.com
Meridian Energy Limited	FS67	andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz
Michael Parkin	FS35	kiwisusa99@gmail.com
Millie Blackwell	FS107	millie@thevillagebookshop.co.nz
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	FS96	zach.chisam@beca.com
New Zealand Defence Force	FS85	catherine.absil-couzins@nzdf.mil.nz
New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)	FS61	environmentalplanning@nzta.govt.nz
NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	FS29	eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz

Further Submitters Name	Further Submitter Number	Address for service
NZ Pork	FS22	hannah.ritchie@pork.co.nz
Peter Edward Ratner and Carol Suzanne Walters	FS38	ratner515@gmail.com
Peter Edward Ratner and Carol Suzanne Walters	FS63	ratner515@gmail.com
Phillip Gareth Spilhaus	FS12	phillip@mbw.co.nz
Porters Pinot Wines	FS15	john@sievwrights.co.nz
Powerco Limited	FS94	planning@powerco.co.nz
Radio New Zealand	FS106	annabelle.lee@chapmantripp.com
Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated	FS87	amber@rangitane.iwi.nz
Richard and Clare Toovey	FS103	rtoovey@xtra.co.nz
Richard Simpson	FS108	simples@outlook.co.nz
Robert Kinsela Workman on behalf of the Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust	FS37	kim@kiwa.org.nz
Rochelle McCarty	FS54	rochellemccarty@yahoo.com
Roger Southey	FS16	roger@southey.co.nz
Roger Southey	FS18	mark@markjerling.com
Roger Southey	FS19	sam@edridgeconstruction.co.nz
Roger Southey	FS20	karenv@tra.co.nz
Roland Griffiths	FS30	roandlyle@xtra.co.nz
Rudy van Baarle - Molesworth Homes	FS69	lucym@adamsonshaw.co.nz
Ryan and Nadine Smock	FS26	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Sarah Martin	FS28	sarahmmmartin@gmail.com
Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch	FS49	scott.summerfield@gmail.com
Shaun Hamilton	FS100	shaunhamilton69@gmail.com
South Wairarapa District Council, Partnerships and Operations Team	FS82	james.oconnor@swdc.govt.nz
South Wairarapa Working Men's Club	FS11	swwmc@wise.net.nz
Steve and Audrey Rendle	FS21	audrey.rendle@farmside.co.nz
Stuart Macann	FS39	stuart.macann@gmail.com
Summerset Group Holdings Ltd	FS76	mitch@bbplanning.co.nz
Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust	FS95	amber@tahetoka.nz
The Fuel Companies	FS91	thomas.trevilla@slrconsulting.com
Tim Barton	FS10	timbarts@hotmail.com
Tim Druzianic	FS93	druzt@xtra.co.nz
Tim Hart	FS27	russellhooperconsulting@gmail.com
Timothy Wallis	FS57	wallisbuilding@xtra.co.nz
Transpower New Zealand	FS97	ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz
Trevor and Jo Dewis	FS34	dewis@xtra.co.nz
Trevor Petersen	FS68	shags.pad@xtra.co.nz

Further Submitters Name	Further Submitter Number	Address for service
Tumu Developments Limited	FS50	peter.cooke@tumu.co.nz
Vern and Jocelyn Brasell	FS51	vernbrasell@gmail.com
Vern and Jocelyn Brasell	FS52	vernbrasell@gmail.com
Victoria Jane Stanbridge	FS55	vjstanbridge@xtra.co.nz
Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS81	fcasey@fedfarm.org.nz
Wendy Gray	FS46	wag@wise.net.nz
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	FS32	kay@formeplanning.co.nz
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	FS33	kay@formeplanning.co.nz