

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S30.001	Porirua City Council			S30.001	Porirua City Council	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	<p>Resource management issue 1 is titled 'adverse impacts on natural environments and communities', however unlike adverse effects on natural resources, adverse effects on communities are not identified. The issue is framed very negatively. For instance, not all ecosystems have been destroyed, but certainly some have, and many have been degraded. Some ecosystems are still intact.</p> <p>This creates an unbalanced issue statement and associated Objective A which fails to identify the benefits of urban development as identified by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</p>	<p>Amend reason 1 to identify adverse effects on communities and the benefits of urban development, and relocate effects of climate change into a separate issue; and/or reword as follows:</p> <p>1. Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities Inappropriate and poorly managed use and development of <b>natural and physical resources</b> the environment, including both urban and rural activities, have damaged and continue to impact the natural environment, <b>and to contribute to an increase in</b> greenhouse gas emissions,. <b>It has also resulted in destroying degraded</b> ecosystems, <del>degrading</del> <b>and</b> water <b>quality</b>, adversely impacting the relationship between mana whenua and the taiao., <del>and leaving communities and nature increasingly exposed to the impacts of climate change.</del></p> <p>2. Increasing pressure on housing <b>supply and choice</b> and infrastructure capacity Population growth is putting pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity. To meet the needs of current and future populations, <b>poorly managed</b> development will place additional pressure on the natural and built environments.</p>		Accept in part
S30.001	Porirua City Council	FS25.005	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.005	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Accept in part
S30.001	Porirua City Council	FS13.005	Wellington City Council	FS13.005	Wellington City Council	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and	Not Stated / Neutral	Consistent with Wellington City Council's position on the matter.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
						communities					
<b>S31.002</b>	Robert Anker			<b>S31.002</b>	Robert Anker	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Not Stated / Neutral	Communities and nature have always been and will always be exposed to the impacts of climate. Nothing within the RPS will reduce that impact and the focus should be on putting measures in place that will deal with the consequences that will arise. We should be using this time between waves to shore up our protections, not abolish them.	GWRC to focus on positive measures that can mitigate climate generated impacts.		No recommendation
<b>S34.001</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.001</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose in part	<p>The issue is negatively worded and this sets the tone for the rest of the plan change. As a result, the proposed provisions do not appear to support or acknowledge the population growth that is forecast and subsequent development that is necessary/enabled for the Wellington Region.</p> <p>For issue one, whilst Council recognises that adverse environmental effects need to be managed, this appears to insinuate that the listed effects are attributable solely to poorly managed land use and development activities when other external factors have also played an important part, for example, funding availability to comprehensively address mode shift and transport related emissions or to deliver networked biodiversity projects.</p> <p>In following links in the Section 32 report to technical reports supporting the provisions, it appears as if some of the evidence base relies on state of the environment monitoring reports that are now over ten years old, and so responses via proposed provisions to issues that were identified some time ago may no longer be relevant or appropriate.</p> <p>Fundamentally, issue one appears to state that growth within the region is an inherently negative outcome which is contrary to the intention and direction of the NPS- UD. Council notes that well managed and integrated growth and infrastructure can be and is good for the region - socially and economically and environmentally.</p>	<p>Amend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>include more neutral language and address balance between environmental protection and enabling the significant development necessary to accommodate forecast growth in for the region.</li> <li>source and reference more relevant and up to date evidence base and data to support statements and review and amend provisions based on this evidence</li> </ul>		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S94.002	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.002	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified		Accept in part
S128.001	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.001	Horticulture New Zealand	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support in part	Highly productive land is a finite resource that is impacted and lost through 'inappropriate and poorly managed use and development' - this reflected in parts of the operative RPS and should be carried through into/reflected in the overarching resource management issues for the Wellington Region.	Amend paragraph 1 (p. 4)  1. Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities Inappropriate and poorly managed use and development of the environment, including both urban and rural activities, have damaged and continue to impact the natural environment, increase greenhouse gas emissions, destroying ecosystems, degrading water, <b>result in loss, fragmentation or reverse sensitivity effects on highly productive land</b> , adversely impacting the relationship between mana whenua and the taiao, and leaving communities and nature increasingly exposed to the impacts of climate change.		Reject
S128.001	Horticulture New Zealand	FS2.6	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.6	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose in part	Urban expansion has resulted in environmental degradation (loss of mauri) and adversely affected our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Loss of soil fertility and fragmentation of land should be identified as an issue but Rangitāne has concerns about the sustainability of many current forms of land based primary production.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S128.001	Horticulture New Zealand	FS11.001	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.001	Fulton Hogan Limited	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	Urban development can prevent access to suitable quarry sites for aggregate extraction. Also, reverse sensitivity effects resulting from urban growth can be significant for activities such as quarrying. Therefore, Fulton Hogan supports the identification of land loss and fragmentation and reverse sensitivity effects as overarching resource management issues.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S128.001</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS30.035</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.035</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support in part	B+LNZ support the recognition that highly productive land as a finite resource needs to be reflected in resource management issues and decisions. Sheep and beef farming occurs on land outside of LUC 1 - 3 and therefore land that has significance to food production should be recognised despite LUC rating.	Allow	That this submission be allowed, and additional relief is provided to recognise food producing land that occurs on LUC classes outside 1-3.	Reject
<b>S131.010</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.010</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	Ātiawa supports Overarching Issue 1. Ātiawa are pleased that the issue references the impact on mana whenua and their relationship with te taiao.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S131.010</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS2.46</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.46</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	Rangitāne support Ātiawa in welcoming that the Issue references the impact on mana whenua and their relationship with te taiao.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S131.010	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.214	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.214	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	<p>A review of Chapter 3 should be deferred to the full review of the RPS in 2024. Disagree with the content and scope of the issues in Chapter 3 for the reasons set out in the submission.</p> <p>If the review of Chapter 3 is not deferred, alternative content for issues is required, which speak to the importance of people and strengthening the connections between people and place, integrated catchment management and climate change. This includes the creation of an issue that addresses the challenge of "giving back to the wai, while we utilise her waters to sustain our people" and an issue that addresses the implications for farmers - and the wider regional economy - of unreliable and uncertain access to water to sustain their enterprises and livelihoods. Further detail provided in the submission.</p>	<p>Delete Overarching Issue 1</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect:</p> <p><b>sustain and accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms for empowering catchment communities for collective action and mutual support to address the twin challenges of improving environmental outcomes and sustaining thriving economies and connected communities.</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect: <b>accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms to address the looming water supply-demand gap, ie, giving back to the wai, while sustaining the people.</b></p>		Reject
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS2.28	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.28	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	<p>Rangitāne strongly support the Overarching Issues as notified. Rangitāne does not support the proposed deferral of reviewing Chapter 3 or the proposed new overarching issue. The alternative issues proposed by the submitter are not issues as such, but refer to particular aspects of the issues and potential ways to address the overarching issues identified in RPS Change 1. Rangitāne acknowledges however that strengthening connections between people and place and integrated catchment management are important matters (climate change is addressed in the review). Reference to "giving back to the wai, while we utilise her waters to sustain our people" appears to be an interpretation of Te Mana o Te Wai which does not accurately reflect the hierarchy of obligations in the NPS FM.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.033	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.033	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.155	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.155	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.006	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.006	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.  Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
S163.004	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.062	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.062	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S167.004	Taranaki Whānui			S167.004	Taranaki Whānui	Overarching Issue 1: Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities	Support in part	This provides for consistency across RPS1.	Amend the provision to read:  1. Adverse impacts on natural environments and communities  .....destroying ecosystems, degrading water, adversely impacting the relationship between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the taiao, and leaving communities and nature increasingly exposed to the impacts of climate change.		Accept
S34.002	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.002	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose in part	The issue statement is negatively worded, and this sets the tone for the rest of the plan change. As a result, the issue statement does not appear to support or acknowledge the population growth that is forecast and subsequent development that is necessary/enabled for the Wellington Region.  Issue two appears to be incomplete and to make two separate points for which there is no supporting explanatory text.	Amend to complete and provide further explanation for issue two and include more detail on the problems that this pressure is causing, that the proposed provisions are seeking to address, including providing the framework for possible infrastructure growth/delivery provisions within the RPS.		Accept in part
S78.003	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.003	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that Issue 2 is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provision.	Retain as notified		Accept in part
S78.003	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.311	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.311	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S94.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified		Accept in part
S115.004	Hutt City Council			S115.004	Hutt City Council	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	We note that GWRC has addressed concerns raised in the draft by adding an additional issue around the urban environment. However, it still considers only the pressures that the urban environment places on the natural environment, rather than the social and economic needs for a well-functioning urban environment.	Delete the issue statement (along with other issues), or if issue statements are retained amend Issue 2 as follows:  "Population growth is putting pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity. To meet the needs of current and future populations, development will place additional pressure on the natural and built environments. <b>At the same time, there is a need to increase housing supply across the region and ensure that future communities have good access to key services and employment opportunities. Planning decisions will need to consider a range of factors that contribute to a well- functioning urban environment and how the natural and built environment can work together to achieve this.</b> "		Accept in part
S115.004	Hutt City Council	FS12.005	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	FS12.005	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	Kāinga Ora agrees that Issue 2 could be amended to recognise greater emphasis on achieving a well-functioning urban environment	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S125.001	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell			S125.001	R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	Recognises increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity in the Wellington Region.  Consistent with the intent and requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S131.011	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.011	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support in part	Ātiawa supports in part Overarching Issue 2. Ātiawa considers that population growth requires additional development capacity, but also exacerbates existing pressures on all aspects of te taiao and its limited resources.	Amend to:  2. Population growth is putting pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity <b>and exacerbates existing pressures on te taiao.</b> To meet the needs of current and future populations, development will place additional pressure on the natural and built environments.		Reject
S131.011	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.49	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.49	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	Rangitāne support the proposed amendment to the wording of the Issue.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S131.011	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.225	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.225	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S140.004	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.004	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support in part	Issue 2 focuses on adverse effects on the natural environment, and only references housing and infrastructure capacity as a negative pressure on the environment. RMA section 59 requires the RPS to look at integrated management of natural and physical resources for the region, not just protecting natural processes. It also ignores the NPS-UD objectives.	Amend Issue 2 with the underlined text, or similar:  <b>"Increasing need for housing and infrastructure capacity. The supply of housing and infrastructure capacity in the Wellington Region has been insufficient to meet population growth, household needs, and creation of well-functioning urban environments."</b>		Accept in part
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	<p>A review of Chapter 3 should be deferred to the full review of the RPS in 2024. Disagree with the content and scope of the issues in Chapter 3 for the reasons set out in the submission.</p> <p>If the review of Chapter 3 is not deferred, alternative content for issues is required, which speak to the importance of people and strengthening the connections between people and place, integrated catchment management and climate change. This includes the creation of an issue that addresses the challenge of "giving back to the wai, while we utilise her waters to sustain our people" and an issue that addresses the implications for farmers - and the wider regional economy - of unreliable and uncertain access to water to sustain their enterprises and livelihoods. Further detail provided in the submission.</p>	<p>Delete Overarching Issue 2</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect: <b>sustain and accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms for empowering catchment communities for collective action and mutual support to address the twin challenges of improving environmental outcomes and sustaining thriving economies and connected communities.</b></p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect: <b>accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms to address the looming water supply-demand gap, ie, giving back to the wai, while sustaining the people.</b></p>		Reject
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS2.29	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.29	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	Rangitāne strongly support the Overarching Issues as notified. Rangitāne does not support the proposed deferral of reviewing Chapter 3 or the proposed new overarching issue. The alternative issues proposed by the submitter are not issues as such, but refer to particular aspects of the issues and potential ways to address the overarching issues identified in RPS Change 1. Rangitāne acknowledges however that strengthening connections between people and place and integrated catchment management are important matters. Reference to "giving back to the wai, while we utilise her waters to sustain our people" appears to be an interpretation of Te Mana o Te Wai which does not accurately reflect the hierarchy of obligations in the NPS FM.	Disallow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.034	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.034	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.156	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.156	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.007	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.007	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.  Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.005	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.063	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.063	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
S167.005	Taranaki Whānui			S167.005	Taranaki Whānui	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support in part	Strengthening these provisions with reference to Sections, 6, 7, 8 of the RMA and NPS-UD Policy 9.	Amend last sentence to read:  To meet the needs of current and future populations, development will place additional pressure on the natural and built environments, <b>and relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua to their ancestral lands, whenua.</b>		Reject
S167.006	Taranaki Whānui			S167.006	Taranaki Whānui	Overarching Issue 2: Increasing pressure on housing and infrastructure capacity	Support in part	Strengthening these provisions with reference to Sections, 6, 7, 8 of the RMA and NPS-UD Policy 9.	Amendment to include meeting the needs of mana whenua specifically.		Reject
S31.003	Robert Anker			S31.003	Robert Anker	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Not Stated / Neutral	This raises the question as to what equals sufficient weight. It is not appropriate to address a perceived imbalance by setting about creating another and larger imbalance. Throughout the document there is focus on consulting the Maori portion of the community, but the same emphasis is not being given to consulting the remainder and numerically larger section of the community. GWRC has an obligation to represent and take care of all population groups of the Region and not to deliberately disenfranchise one or more groups of people.	Address the lack of consultation across all sectors of the community and not favour one to the exclusion of others.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S34.003	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.003	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose in part	The issue statement is negatively worded, and this sets the tone for the rest of the plan change.	Clarification		Reject
S94.004	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.004	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified		Accept
S131.012	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.012	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	<p>Ātiawa supports Overarching Issue 3. Ātiawa are pleased that this resource management decision making issue has been set out in the regional policy statement. It informs the reasoning for objective, policy, and rule setting within the planning framework.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek that explicit reference to the matters included in Part 2, s(e) of the RMA are included to ensure they are recognised and provided for in this planning framework.</p>	Amend to:  Mana whenua / tangata whenua values, Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori have not been given sufficient weight in decision-making, including from governance level through to the implementation. As a result, mana whenua / tangata whenua values, <b>including our relationship with our ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga</b> have not been adequately provided for in resource management, causing disconnection between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the environment.		Accept in part
S131.012	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.50	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.50	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	Rangitāne support the proposed amendment to the wording of the Issue.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S131.012	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.236	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.236	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose	<p>A review of Chapter 3 should be deferred to the full review of the RPS in 2024. Disagree with the content and scope of the issues in Chapter 3 for the reasons set out in the submission.</p> <p>If the review of Chapter 3 is not deferred, alternative content for issues is required, which speak to the importance of people and strengthening the connections between people and place, integrated catchment management and climate change. This includes the creation of an issue that addresses the challenge of "giving back to the wai, while we utilise her waters to sustain our people" and an issue that addresses the implications for farmers - and the wider regional economy - of unreliable and uncertain access to water to sustain their enterprises and livelihoods. Further detail provided in the submission.</p>	<p>Delete Overarching Issue 3</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect: <b>sustain and accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms for empowering catchment communities for collective action and mutual support to address the twin challenges of improving environmental outcomes and sustaining thriving economies and connected communities.</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new overarching issue to the following or similar effect: <b>accelerate the multi-agency delivery platforms to address the looming water supply-demand gap, ie, giving back to the wai, while sustaining the people.</b></p>		Reject
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS2.30	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.30	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose	Rangitāne strongly support the Overarching Issues identified. Rangitāne strongly opposes the proposed deferral of reviewing Chapter 3 or the proposed new overarching objective. The alternative issues proposed by the submitter are not issues in themselves, but refer to particular aspects of the issues and potential ways to address the overarching issues identified in RPS Change 1. Rangitāne acknowledges that strengthening connections between people and place and integrated catchment management are important matters (climate change is addressed in the review).	Disallow		Accept in part
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.035	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.035	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.157	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.157	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.008	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.008	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.  Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
S163.006	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.064	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.064	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
S167.007	Taranaki Whānui			S167.007	Taranaki Whānui	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement	Support	Agree with description of this overarching issue.	Retain as notified.		Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
						nt in decision making					
S170.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support in part	<p>There are issues clause 3 of the Chapter 3 changes: Firstly, lack of Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua involvement in decision making and lack of Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori in making resource management decisions are two different matters. First generation plans do lack both of these components as the former one is about iwi engagement and transfer of powers and allowing iwi as the decision maker; the other one is about how to use the knowledge systems of iwi and Māori in giving decisions regarding resource management.</p> <p>We (the submitter) believe the wording of Objective 3 can be strengthened even further; 'sufficient weight' suggests that, to date, Tangata Whenua / Mana Whenua had established processes and clear decision-making powers over the matters of Regional Policy Statement. However, iwi does not have such relationship with the Regional Policy Statement or the RPS acknowledges transfer of powers to Ngāti Toa Rangatira in the governance matters of Regional Policy Statement.</p>	Re-draft to read:  Mana whenua / tangata whenua values, Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori have not been <b>involved</b> given sufficient weight in decision-making, including from governance level through to the implementation. As a result, mana whenua / tangata whenua values have not been adequately provided for in resource management, causing disconnection between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the environment. <b>This caused major disruption Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua not being able to connect with Taiaio, but also put them into a position where they were not able to perform their kaiatakitanga.</b>		Reject
S170.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS2.85	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.85	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Overarching Issue 1 proposed by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.002	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.116	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.116	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S168.01 91	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.01 91	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of the overarching resource management issues, in particular Issue 3, which addresses the lack of tangata whenua involvement in decision making. However we consider this issue statement could be stronger and reflect the language is s6(e) of the RMA.	Amend the introductory text as follows:  As a result, mana whenua / tangata whenua values <b>and the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, air, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga</b> have not been adequately provided for in resource management, causing disconnection between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the environment.  or by alternative wording that provides similar relief.		Reject
S168.01 91	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.12 2	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	FS31.12 2	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Overarching Issue 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated		No recommendation
S30.002	Porirua City Council			S30.002	Porirua City Council	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	It is unclear what this objective is seeking to achieve and could be better worded.	Amend objective A so that the outcomes sought are achievable within the scope of an RPS including clarifying what is meant by "development" in (f).  Include a wider selection of objectives to demonstrate a more holistic and		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
									interconnected approach to resource management in the region, including regional form.		
S30.002	Porirua City Council	FS17.03 5	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")	FS17.03 5	Wellington International Airport Limited ("WIAL")	Overarching Objective A	Oppose in part	WIAL oppose the relief sort as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission. WIAL seeks that the amendments be disallowed or for example amended to exclude regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow		Accept in part
S30.002	Porirua City Council	FS25.00 7	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.00 7	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		
S32.002	Director-General of Conservation			S32.002	Director-General of Conservation	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	It is unclear in clause (c) whether the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems is to be protected and enhanced in its own right, or only as part of mana whenua / tangata whenua values. S5(b) of the Act requires that it be safeguarded in its own right, so this should be made clear.	Amendas follows, or words to like effect:  "(c)protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particularmahinga kai; <b>and(d) protects and enhances</b> the life-supporting capacity of the environment; and..."		Accept
S32.002	Director-General of Conservation	FS14.00 6	Masteron District Council	FS14.00 6	Masterton District Council	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Agree with the following:  Amend as follows, or words to like effect: "(c)protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular Mahinga kai; and(d) protects and enhances the life-supporting capacity of the environment; and..."	Not stated	Further clarity is needed to explain what this looks like in practice, and what guidance will be provided to district councils.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S32.002	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.280	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.280	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Reject
S34.004	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.004	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Whilst the proposed overarching objective is supported, Council is concerned that clause (f) with regards to population growth and development is unclear and could be difficult to achieve within the context of the provisions proposed within RPSPC1.	Retain objective largely as notified but amend provisions that Council seeks changes to within this submission, and amend clause (f) of the overarching objective to read:  (f) responds effectively to <del>the current and future pressures of</del> <b>environmental issues such as climate change and water quality whilst providing for future population growth, required infrastructure delivery and development</b>		Reject
S94.005	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.005	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Overarching Objective A	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S100.002	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.002	Meridian Energy Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	The expression 'Te Ao Māori' is not defined for the purposes of Objective A and it is not clear what guidance it will provide (or require). Clauses (a) to (f) emphasise the importance of, and need to protect, the natural environment. The RPS needs to do more than just 'recognise' the dependence of humans on the natural environment. The RPS needs to provide guidance for the development of natural resources where development is necessary to sustain communities and support community resilience. In particular, the RPS should provide clear guidance on the importance of maintaining, upgrading and adapting or relocating regionally significant infrastructure where this is necessary to support community resilience. There is a gap in Objective A in this respect. There is also potential duplication between the requirements in clauses (a) to (c) and the reference to Te Ao Māori.	Insert into proposed Objective A an additional consideration (e) as follows (or words that have similar effect) and re-number the following considerations sequentially:  Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori and:  (a) incorporates mātauranga Māori; and (b) recognises ki uta ki tai - the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment; and (c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai, and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and (d) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment; and (e) <b>enables use and development of natural and physical resources to support the infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) necessary to strengthen the resilience of communities to meet the future challenges associated with climate change; and</b> (f) recognises the role of both natural and physical resources in providing for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments; and (g) responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.		Reject
S100.002	Meridian Energy Limited	FS10.029	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.029	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Overarching Objective A	Support	The Fuel Companies agree that the RPS should provide clear guidance on the importance of maintaining, upgrading and adapting or relocating regionally significant infrastructure where this is necessary to support community resilience.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Objective A as sought by Meridian.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S100.002	Meridian Energy Limited	FS24.025	Powerco Limited	FS24.025	Powerco Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support	Powerco agrees that the RPS should provide clear guidance on the importance of maintaining, upgrading and adapting or relocating regionally significant infrastructure where this is necessary to support community resilience.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Objective A as sought by Meridian.	Reject
S102.001	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.001	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Generally supports Objective A. However, Te Mana o te Wai needs to be given effect to in Objective A. This will ensure that the overarching resource management objective is appropriately addressing issues raised, particularly issue 1 and 3.	Insert new subclause into Objective A to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai as follows:  Objective A  Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by TeAo Māori and:  <b>(a) Gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai;...</b>		Reject
S102.001	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	FS2.96	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.96	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to Overarching Objective A proposed by Te Tumu Paeroa. Giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai should be an essential element of integrated management of the environment.	Allow		Reject
S102.002	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.002	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Generally supports Objective A. However, ki uta ki tai should be recognised and provided for within Objective A. This will ensure that mana whenua/ tangata whenua values and mātauranga Māori is appropriately recognised and provided for in decision making.	Amend Objective A(b) as follows:  ..... (b) recognise <b>and provides for</b> ki uta ki tai - the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment.  .....		Reject
S102.002	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	FS2.97	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.97	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to Overarching Objective A proposed by Te Tumu Paeroa. The proposed amendment would strengthen the objective.	Allow		Reject
S106.007	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.007	Patricia (Dr) Laing	Overarching Objective A	Not Stated / Neutral	Objective A seems to be an isolated mention of the importance of ensuring food security in the region. This topic could easily be missed, but needs to be highlighted especially in relationship to NPS-UD, NPS-IB, and extreme weather as well as in mitigation relating to Climate Change. Pollinating bees are crucial to successful food security in the Wellington region, as is increasing appropriate farming opportunities to protect food security including beekeeping.	Amend or add provisions to increase appropriate farming opportunities to protect food security including beekeeping.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S106.007	Patricia (Dr) Laing	FS28.006	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.006	Horticulture New Zealand	Overarching Objective A	Support	HortNZ support recognition of the importance of food security in the region - this aligns with key themes of HortNZ's submission,	Allow	Allow amendment to refer to food security.	Reject
S113.002	Wellington Water			S113.002	Wellington Water	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>The notified version of Objective A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments</li> <li>• Fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure</li> <li>• Has some unclear drafting</li> <li>• Establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting objectives, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, clauses (a) to (f) emphasise the importance of, and need to protect, the natural environment. The RPS needs to do more than just 'recognise' the dependence of humans on the natural environment. The RPS needs to provide guidance for the development of natural resources where development is necessary to sustain communities and support community resilience.</p>	<p>Amend Objective A as follows:</p> <p>Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments <del>is guided by Te Ao Māori</del> and:</p> <p><b>(a) is guided by Te Ao Māori and incorporates mātauranga Māori;</b> and</p> <p><b>(b) recognises ki uta ki tai - the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment; and</b></p> <p><b>(c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</b></p> <p><b>(d) protects and enhances the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</b></p> <p><del>(e) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment</del></p> <p><del>(f) recognises the role of natural and physical resources in providing for the</del> <b>provides for and enhances</b> the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, <b>which are supported by both natural and physical resources, including regionally significant infrastructure; and(g) enables use and development of natural and physical resources to support the infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) necessary to strengthen the resilience of communities to meet the future challenges associated with climate change; and(h) responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p>amend Objective A as follows:</p> <p>Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori</p>		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
									<p>and by:</p> <p>(a) incorporates mātauranga Māori; and</p> <p>(b) recognises ki uta ki tai - the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment; and</p> <p>(c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai and the life supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</p> <p><b>(d) protects and enhancing the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</b></p> <p><del>(e) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment</del></p> <p><del>(f) recognises the role of natural and physical resources in provided for the</del> provides for and enhances the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments, <b>which are supported by both natural and physical resources, including regionally significant infrastructure;</b> and</p> <p><b>(g) enabling use and development of natural and physical resources to support the infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure) necessary to strengthen the resilience of communities to meet the future challenges associated with climate change; and</b></p> <p>(h) responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.</p>		

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S113.002</b>	Wellington Water	<b>FS26.002</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.002</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	WWL seeks amendment to overcome non-provision for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments and regionally significant infrastructure, unclear drafting, and absence of guidance on how to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai.  Meridian agrees the objective does not provide clear guidance and needs to be re-written.	Allow in part	Allow to the extent any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
<b>S113.002</b>	Wellington Water	<b>FS10.009</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	<b>FS10.009</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Overarching Objective A	Support	The Fuel Companies agree with the concerns raised by Wellington Water around the drafting of Objective A, in particular that it fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure, for the characteristics & qualities of well-functioning urban environments and has some unclear drafting.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Objective A as sought.	Accept in part
<b>S113.002</b>	Wellington Water	<b>FS24.005</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS24.005</b>	Powerco Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support	Powerco agrees with the concerns raised by Wellington Water around the drafting of Objective A, in particular that it fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure, for the characteristics & qualities of well-functioning urban environments and has some unclear drafting.	Allow	Allow the submission and amend Objective A as sought.	Accept in part
<b>S115.005</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.005</b>	Hutt City Council	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	To aid in navigating the RPS, the objective should not be located within a chapter introduction, but stand alone.	Relocate proposed Objective A out of the chapter introduction and treat consistently with how other objectives in the RPS are presented.		Reject
<b>S128.002</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.002</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Overarching Objective A	Support	Integrated management is a key theme of national direction, such as the NPSFM 2020 and supports this.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S128.002</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS30.006</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.006</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Support	B+LNZ support policy amendments that reflect integrated management.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S131.013</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.013</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa supports the inclusion of Objective A. Objective A strengthens the position of te ao Māori, including mana whenua and mātauranga Māori in resource management. Ātiawa recognises the importance of this provision as it sets out what is to be achieved in the region and demonstrates to plan users that at the highest level te ao Māori must be embraced and provided for.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek reference the connection between mana whenua and te taiao. This relationship is inextricable and of the utmost importance to Ātiawa. There should be explicit reference in this Objective to ensure that the relationship is provided for in the RPS.</p> <p>In addition, mātauranga Māori should also guide the "Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments." Finally Ātiawa note that natural and physical resources are taonga. s6 of the RMA requires that those matters are not only recognised but also provided for.</p>	<p>Insert new subclause:(aa) <b>support the connection between mana whenua and te taiao</b></p> <p>Insert the words:</p> <p>Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori <b>and mātauranga Māori</b> and:</p> <p>Amend subclause (e):</p> <p>(e) recognises <b>and provides for</b> the role of both natural and physical resources in providing for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments; and</p>		Reject
<b>S131.013</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS26.003</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.003</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of (p. 6) an additional clause (aa) '<b>support the connection between mana whenua and te taiao</b>'.</p> <p>Also seeks insertion of words '<b>...guided by Te Ao Maori and maatauranga Maori</b>'.</p> <p>The proposed wording (or similar wording) may address the issue that Meridian has itself raised with Objective A.</p>	Allow in part	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S131.013	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.247	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.247	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S134.001	Powerco Limited			S134.001	Powerco Limited	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>Objective A fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments and fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. The life supporting capacity of ecosystems is considered to be a stand-alone consideration, rather than a subset of mana whenua values. In addition, the objective establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting methods, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</p> <p>There is a broader concern that Objective A does not fully reflect the diversity of resource management issues and objectives currently provided for in the operative RPS and presented under the following topic headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Coastal environment, including public access</li> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and waste</li> <li>• Fresh water, including public access</li> <li>• Historic heritage</li> <li>• Indigenous ecosystems</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Natural hazards</li> <li>• Regional form, design and function</li> <li>• Resource management with tangata whenua</li> <li>• Soils and minerals</li> </ul> <p>The objective, therefore, potentially prioritises some issues over others that are not referenced in the wording of Objective A, or the three new overarching resource management issues proposed by Proposed Change 1 and appears to pre-empt upcoming legislative change including gazettal of the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity. At a minimum, the changes sought should be made.</p>	<p>Amend Objective A to clearly provide for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments and to provide for regionally significant infrastructure, as follows: Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori and:</p> <p>(a) <b>is guided by Te Ao Māori and</b> incorporates mātauranga Māori; and</p> <p>(b) recognises ki uta ki tai - the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment; and</p> <p>(c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai, and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and (d) <b>protects and enhances the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems;</b> and (e) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment; and</p> <p>(f) recognises the role of both natural and physical resources in providing for the <b>provides for and enhances</b> characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments <b>which are supported by both natural and physical resources, including regionally significant infrastructure;</b> and</p> <p>(g) responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.</p>		Accept in part
S134.001	Powerco Limited	FS26.004	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.004	Meridian Energy Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>Powerco requests amendment to clearly provide for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments and to provide for regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Meridian agrees that the objective needs amendment to provide for regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	Allow in part	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Reject
S140.005	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.005	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	To aid in navigating the RPS, the objective should not be located within a chapter introduction, instead it should be located in a stand alone chapter.	Relocate proposed Objective A out of the chapter introduction and treat consistently with how other objectives in the RPS are presented.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S142.002	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)			S142.002	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)	Overarching Objective A	Support	Supports the integrated management approach of Change 1 generally and request that care is taken to maintain the integrity of this approach.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S147.002	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.002	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Overarching Objective A	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S147.002	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.104	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.104	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Ātiawa are generally supportive of the proposed changes by GWRC, provided that the suggested amendments by Ātiawa (in our original submission) are accepted. Ātiawa in principle support the changes necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Allow in part	Allow in part, Ātiawa seek the relief sought as stated in our original submission. We support the overall intent of these changes to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Accept in part
S147.002	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.066	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.066	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S147.002</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.172</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.172</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S148.013</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.013</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Overarching Objective A	Oppose in part	The expression 'Te Ao Māori' is not defined for the purposes of Objective A and it is not clear what guidance it will provide (or require).	Either define and provide sufficient methodologies to support the intent of this objective or delete		Reject
<b>S148.013</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS6.011</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangitira	<b>FS6.011</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangitira	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	We oppose this submission as this objective should not be deleted.	Disallow		Accept
<b>S148.013</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS26.005</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.005</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	WIAL considers that the expression 'Te Ao Maori' is not defined for the purposes of Objective A and it is not clear what guidance it will provide (or require). WIAL requests a definition for the expression or provision of sufficient methodologies to support the intent of this objective or deletion of the objective.	Allow in part	Allow to the extent any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S157.00 1</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			<b>S157.00 1</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>Objective A fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments and fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. The life supporting capacity of ecosystems is considered to be a stand-alone consideration, rather than a subset of mana whenua values. In addition, the objective establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting methods, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</p> <p>There is a broader concern that Objective A does not fully reflect the diversity of resource management issues and objectives currently provided for in the operative RPS and presented under the following topic headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Coastal environment, including public access</li> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and waste</li> <li>• Fresh water, including public access</li> <li>• Historic heritage</li> <li>• Indigenous ecosystems</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Natural hazards</li> <li>• Regional form, design and function</li> <li>• Resource management with tangata whenua</li> <li>• Soils and minerals</li> </ul> <p>The objective, therefore, potentially prioritises some issues over others that are not referenced in the wording of Objective A, or the three new overarching resource management issues proposed by Proposed Change 1 and appears to pre-empt upcoming legislative change including gazettal of the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity. At a minimum, the changes sought should be made.</p>	<p>Amend Objective A to clearly provide for the characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments and to provide for regionally significant infrastructure, as follows:</p> <p>Objective A: Integrated management of the region's natural and built environments is guided by Te Ao Māori and:</p> <p><b>(a) is guided by Te Ao Māori and</b> incorporates mātauranga Māori; and</p>		Accept in part
<b>S157.00 1</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	<b>FS2.109</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.109</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Rangitāne opposes the amendment proposed by BP Oil, Mobil Oil and Z Energy. This would have the effect of demoting our world view.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S157.00 2</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z			<b>S157.00 2</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Objective A fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments and fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. The life supporting capacity of ecosystems is considered to be a stand-alone consideration, rather than a subset of mana whenua values. In addition, the	<p>Split subclause, introduce new standalone subclause, as follows:</p> <p>(c) protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai, and the life-supporting</p>		Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
	Energy Ltd				Energy Ltd			<p>objective establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting methods, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</p> <p>There is a broader concern that Objective A does not fully reflect the diversity of resource management issues and objectives currently provided for in the operative RPS and presented under the following topic headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Coastal environment, including public access</li> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and waste</li> <li>• Fresh water, including public access</li> <li>• Historic heritage</li> <li>• Indigenous ecosystems</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Natural hazards</li> <li>• Regional form, design and function</li> <li>• Resource management with tangata whenua</li> <li>• Soils and minerals</li> </ul> <p>The objective, therefore, potentially prioritises some issues over others that are not referenced in the wording of Objective A, or the three new overarching resource management issues proposed by Proposed Change 1 and appears to pre-empt upcoming legislative change including gazettal of the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity. At a minimum, the changes sought should be made.</p>	capacity of ecosystems; and(d) <b>protects and enhances the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and</b>		
<b>S157.003</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			<b>S157.003</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>Objective A fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments and fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. The life supporting capacity of ecosystems is considered to be a stand-alone consideration, rather than a subset of mana whenua values. In addition, the objective establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting methods, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</p> <p>There is a broader concern that Objective A does not fully reflect the diversity of resource management issues and objectives currently provided for in the operative RPS and presented under the following topic headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Coastal environment, including public access</li> </ul>	Amend subclause (e) as follows:  (e) <del>recognises the role of both natural and physical resources in providing for the</del> <b>provides for and enhances</b> characteristics and qualities of well-functioning urban environments <b>which are supported by both natural and physical resources, including regionally significant infrastructure;</b> and		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and waste</li> <li>• Fresh water, including public access</li> <li>• Historic heritage</li> <li>• Indigenous ecosystems</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Natural hazards</li> <li>• Regional form, design and function</li> <li>• Resource management with tangata whenua</li> <li>• Soils and minerals</li> </ul> <p>The objective, therefore, potentially prioritises some issues over others that are not referenced in the wording of Objective A, or the three new overarching resource management issues proposed by Proposed Change 1 and appears to pre-empt upcoming legislative change including gazettal of the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity. At a minimum, the changes sought should be made.</p>			
<b>S157.003</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	<b>FS3.007</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.007</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point in that it recognises the role of regionally significant infrastructure in supporting well-functioning urban environments.	Not stated	Waka Kotahi seeks that the role of regionally significant infrastructure is recognised.	Reject
<b>S157.005</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			<b>S157.005</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>Objective A fails to provide for the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments and fails to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. The life supporting capacity of ecosystems is considered to be a stand-alone consideration, rather than a subset of mana whenua values. In addition, the objective establishes Te Ao Māori as the pre-eminent concept for delivering integrated management with no guidance on how to achieve it. There are no supporting methods, policies or methods about what integrated management guided by Te Ao Māori is.</p> <p>There is a broader concern that Objective A does not fully reflect the diversity of resource management issues and objectives currently provided for in the operative RPS and presented under the following topic headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Coastal environment, including public access</li> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and waste</li> <li>• Fresh water, including public access</li> <li>• Historic heritage</li> </ul>	Delete subclause (d) as follows: <del>(d) recognises the dependence of humans on a healthy natural environment; and</del>		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indigenous ecosystems</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Natural hazards</li> <li>• Regional form, design and function</li> <li>• Resource management with tangata whenua</li> <li>• Soils and minerals</li> </ul> <p>The objective, therefore, potentially prioritises some issues over others that are not referenced in the wording of Objective A, or the three new overarching resource management issues proposed by Proposed Change 1 and appears to pre-empt upcoming legislative change including gazettal of the NPS- Indigenous Biodiversity. At a minimum, the changes sought should be made.</p>			
<b>S158.003</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.003</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Seeks clarity on sub point (f) of this objective to either expand on what the future pressures on climate change are or whether this sub-point can be redrafted to be more directive as per the relief sought.	Amend sub-point (f) as follows: (f) <del>responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.</del> <b>(f) is resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.</b>		Accept in part
<b>S158.003</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.015</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.015</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	We oppose this part of the submission as the suggested amendment uses weak language and disadvantage Tangata Whenua interests in the RPS by doing so.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S158.003</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS3.008</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.008</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Overarching Objective A	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point that more clarity is needed on the provisions relating to future pressures of climate change.	Allow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be allowed and would like to be involved in redrafting	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S163.007</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.007</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Propose new objectives for the reasons set out in relation to the issues (more detail provided in the submission). The key outcome sought is a delay in changes to Chapter 3 and the suggested objectives only included if Plan Change 1 is to proceed with the same scope as notified.	That Objective A be deleted  Alternatively, insert an overarching objective to the following or similar effect to emphasise strengthening the connections between people and place, hapu and community, matauranga and data, putaiao and innovation: <b>Objective A: catchment communities are enabled and empowered to collaborate in working together to support the mana of the land and the water and the people who live and work within.</b>  And/or a new objective to the following or similar effect to address the looming water supply-demand gap:  <b>Objective B: catchment communities are enabled and empowered to develop and prototype weaving together nature-based and built solutions for respecting and sharing water.</b>  Suggestions for possible content for consequential policies and methods is included in the submission.		Reject
<b>S163.007</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS28.007</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.007</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	HortNZ support the proposed amendment in respect of enabling collaboration.	Allow in part	Allow amendment to overarching objective A to emphasise strengthening the connections between people and place, hapu and community	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S163.007	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.036	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.036	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.007	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.158	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.158	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.007	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.009	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.009	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE  Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE  It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.  Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
S163.007	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.065	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.065	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>Objective A is not clear enough that as part of integrated management, the natural environment will need to be protected. A directive statement to that effect is required. While paragraph (c) provides: protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values, in particular mahinga kai, and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems; and there needs to be a broader requirement to protect the natural environment, not necessarily linked to mana whenua/tangata whenua values.</p> <p>The coastal environment needs to be referred to in this objective. Freshwater needs to be referred to in this objective. We are also unsure what the effect of the pōtai will be with respect to the listed considerations. We seek clarity on the relationship between 'guided by Te Ao Māori' and the listed considerations.</p> <p>The s32report states that this objective is intended to provide greater clarity, however the overarching consideration of Te Ao Māori introduces a potentially significant shift from current resource management thinking. While this may be desirable, further clarity is needed on what this would mean, and how this would flow down into interpretation of later RPS provisions and lower order plans.</p>	<p>Include the following (or similar): <b>(x) maintains and protects indigenous biodiversity, natural landscapes, and the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems (y) protects the coastal environment (z) protects freshwater [Note: end of amendments]</b></p> <p>Consider amending the pōtai to clarify how Te AoMāori will interact the listed items. Ensure that protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity is paramount.</p>		Accept in part
<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS22.006</b>	Director-General of Conservation / Tumuaki Ahurei	<b>FS22.006</b>	Director-General of Conservation / Tumuaki Ahurei	Overarching Objective A	Support	Adding more directive statements to protect the natural environment is appropriate under the RMA and higher order documents.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.052</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.052</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM.	Disallow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.			
<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS3.009</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.009</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Waka Kotahi has concerns with overarching use of the word 'protects' rather than 'manage' and how this wording may be implemented.	Disallow	Waka Kotahi seeks that the submission point be disallowed. If allowed Waka Kotahi would like to be involved in any redrafting.	Reject
<b>S165.001</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS20.057</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.057</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	Ātiawaki note that the submitters admission regarding their lack of understanding on what an integrated management approach that is guided by Te Ao Māori would mean, Ātiawaki note that this understanding is held by mana whenua, and as Treaty Partners we are committed to ensuring these provisions are upheld and interpreted as intended.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S166.001</b>	Masterton District Council			<b>S166.001</b>	Masterton District Council	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	We support the need for a better integrated system informed by te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori.  More detail is required as to how the regional and district councils will undertake this work.	Retain as notified.  However  Further clarity is needed to explain what this looks like in practice, and what guidance will be provided to district councils.		Accept in part
<b>S167.008</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.008</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of the overarching Objective A including that integrated management is guided by Te Ao Māori.  Both the NPS-UD and NPS-FM bring in partnership to aspects of their implementation. By including partnership in the overarching objective, it supports	Insert a new clause: <b>(a) works in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua.</b>		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								this theme and empowers Taranaki Whānui as Treaty partners.			
<b>S167.008</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS2.80</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.80</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the overarching objective proposed by Taranaki Whānui.	Allow		Reject
<b>S167.008</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS6.020</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.020</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Support	We support this submission as supporting partnership with tangata whenua in an overarching objective will strengthen provisions for partnership.	Allow		Reject
<b>S170.003</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.003</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Objective 3 (2) uses the phrase 'Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori' have not been given sufficient weight in decision-making'.  It is encouraging to see the value of mātauranga Māori being recognised in the Objective 3 A (a). It seems this objective only recognises mātauranga as a knowledge system with evidence. The Objective 3 A (a) can be improved to recognise the resource management methodologies within mātauranga.	Amend Objective 3 (2) to say: 'Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori' have been given limited and in some cases no weight from the governance level through the implementation".		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.003	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.117	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.117	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S170.004</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.004</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	<p>We recommend that there is more recognition of the significant role that Māori have of kaitiakitanga, the obligation of care and protection for the environment, and the importance for Māori to have the ability to carry out this role.</p> <p>Objective A mentions 'integrated and respectful environmental stewardship'. Does the reference to stewardship is written to mean the Crown? If this means to say kaitiakitanga, the text needs to be clear separating these. Objectives from (a) to (e) do not mention how Objective A will be implemented with Mana Whenua; an additional clause (f) could be inserted and could mean to say: co-designs with Mana Whenua and iwi how Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga will be used, and responds to Mana Whenua and iwi principles and values and aspirations delivering environmental outcomes.</p>	<p>Recommend that there is more recognition of the significant role that Māori have of kaitiakitanga, the obligation of care and protection for the environment, and the importance for Māori to have the ability to carry out this role.</p> <p>Specify how objective A will be implemented with mana whenua by adding an additional clause "<b>(g) co-designs with Mana Whenua and iwi how Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga will be used, and responds to Mana Whenua and iwi principles and values and aspirations delivering environmental outcomes.</b>"</p> <p>Clarify that environmental stewardship is different to kaitiakitanga.</p>		Reject
<b>S170.004</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS2.86</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.86</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Overarching Issue 1 proposed by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.004	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.118	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.118	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S170.005</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.005</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Support	Objective A(e) aims to respond effectively to pressures such as, climate change. However, these are not only future pressures but pressures we currently experience.	We recommend rewording this objective as to read 'responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.'		Accept in part
<b>S170.005</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.119</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.119</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								<p>Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiranga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>			

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.006	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.006	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Objective A mentions 'integrated and respectful environmental stewardship'. Does the reference to stewardship is written to mean the Crown? If this means to say kaitiakitanga, the text needs to be clear separating these. Objectives from (a) to (e) do not mention how Objective A will be implemented with Mana Whenua;	Insert a new clause that mean to say:(g) <b>co-designs with Mana Whenua and iwi how Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga will be used, and responds to Mana Whenua and iwi principles and values and aspirations delivering environmental outcomes.</b>		Reject
S170.006	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS2.87	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.87	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the Overarching Objective A proposed by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow		Reject
S170.006	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.120	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.120	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Overarching Objective A	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.			
<b>S168.01 92</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.01 92</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the objective, particularly the reference to integrated management being guided by Te Ao Māori and incorporating mātauranga Māori. However, we consider tangata whenua relationships with the natural environment should also be included in clause (c) and that the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems should be a separate clause.	- amend clause (c) of the objective to states: protects and enhances mana whenua / tangata whenua values and <b>relationships with the taiao</b> , in particular mahinga kai, or by alternative wording that provides similar relief and that addresses the full range of relevant matters in s6(e) of the RMA; To separate out the 'life-supporting capacity of ecosystems' so this becomes a separate clause and an additional matter to protect and enhance;		Reject
<b>S168.01 92</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.12 3</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.12 3</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun			
<b>S168.01 93</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>S168.01 93</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>S168.01 93</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	This objective should be amended to acknowledge that mātauranga Māori will only be incorporated where this is led and undertaken by mana whenua/tangata whenua.	Amend objective to include that mātauranga Māori will be led and undertaken by mana whenua and tangata whenua		Reject
<b>FS31.12 4</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.12 4</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.12 4</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is lan Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S168.01 94</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.01 94</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	How does this overarching objective interact with other objectives in the plan, particularly if there is a conflict in terms of outcomes?	Clarify the status of the objective in relation to other objectives of the plan and include a policy or some other mechanism to explain how the overarching objective should be applied alongside the other objectives of the RPS.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S168.0194</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.125</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.125</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Overarching Objective A	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S16.029</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.029</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Although Council supports the general intent of the policy, it is noted the terms consideration and particular regard shall be given requires decision makers to carry out two different actions. These terms have different meanings. Councils considers it is not appropriate to have a policy titled with consideration, when the policy itself requires decision makers to have particular regard to the matters listed in the policy. Council requests this is amended to align with how the RPS describes district plan requirements for RPS policies that must be considered by city and district councils.	Amend as follows:  Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration  When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan <b>consideration</b> particular regard shall be given to:  (a) ...		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S30.056</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.056</b>	Porirua City Council	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	<p>While this policy will have less or greater weight, and relevance with consents, saying that an application for a height to boundary infringement needs to have particular regard to these matters is too onerous. There should be some level of scale built in.</p> <p>In regard to clause (a), the requirement to partner with mana whenua in the development of district plans is broader than what this policy addresses. It is already a requirement of s8 of the RMA, if it is to be repeated in the RPS it should be a separate overarching policy.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by 'upholding Māori data sovereignty' - this term needs to be explained or defined.</p>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users inline with objectives, including being specific about what scale of consents it should apply to.</p> <p>Amend RPS to provide a definition or explanation of 'Māori data sovereignty'.</p>		Accept in part
<b>S30.056</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.089</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.089</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S34.012</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.012</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	<p>Council supports the need to develop closer working relationships with mana whenua and the need to give effect to section 31 of the RMA in respect of integrated management, but it is difficult to achieve some of these matters at resource consent or notice of requirement level.</p> <p>Clause g) does not work for a consent or a notice of requirement so should be deleted or constrained only to plan changes.</p> <p>Council supports clause c) but there needs to be a clear relationship with practical and workable methods to achieve this.</p> <p>Support in particular d) and e), in that Council believes that it requires going to mana whenua to obtain information on what they think is important to them and for mana whenua to determine the information they choose to release.</p>	<p>Amend to define 'Data sovereignty'</p> <p>Delete clause g) or amend to exclude resource consents and notice of requirements.</p> <p>Amend to ensure methods of implementation are achievable.</p>		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S86.004	Irrigation New Zealand (IrrigationNZ)			S86.004	Irrigation New Zealand (IrrigationNZ)	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Ambiguity arises within the provision of Policy IM.1 (and others), for example the use of instruction words such as 'recognising' throughout these provisions. Change 1 should define these instruction words to avoid any interpretative asymmetry between regional councils. There is a need for consultation of a Crown and iwi partnership to ensure these instruction words are universally interpreted and adhered to by councils. This will ensure that councils uphold their obligations under the RPS Change 1 and other requirements such as the NPS- FM.	Amend Policy IM.1 to define the instructional words that relate to giving effect to tangata whenua and Te Ao Māori. This should be done in consultation with iwi/Crown Treaty partners.		Accept in part
S86.004	Irrigation New Zealand (IrrigationNZ)	FS2.15	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.15	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne support a holistic and integrated approach to resource management and protecting the environment, seeing this as crucial to positive outcomes for the environment, mana whenua, communities and businesses.  Rangitāne supports Policy IM.1. and welcomes that the policy recognises and supports several key concepts that are fundamental to te ao Māori approach to resource management, including working in partnership with local government, ki uta ki tai/integrated management, mātauranga Māori. Rangitāne does not consider it is necessary to further define the instructional words of the policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
S86.004	Irrigation New Zealand (IrrigationNZ)	FS20.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submission point to the extent that Ātiawa do not think there is any ambiguity with these provisions. The provisions enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga in resource management decision-making. This is provided for under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the RMA and recent national policy statements (including NPS-FM, NPS-HPL, NPS-UD).  Ātiawa acknowledge that kupu Māori/Māori words and concepts may be foreign to plan users and perhaps the Council themselves. As a Treaty Partner, Ātiawa are committed to holding to account the regional council and resource users the intent and application of concepts and words.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point, noting that there is already an obligation for the Crown to partner with mana whenua.	Accept in part
S102.026	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.026	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Policy IM.1 be changed to a regulatory policy to align with the changes sought in Objective A.	Policy IM.1 to be changed to a regulatory policy.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S102.026	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	FS2.98	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.98	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Rangitāne support the proposal by Te Tumu Paeroa that Policy IM.1 to be changed to a regulatory policy.	Allow		Reject
S102.088	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.088	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Generally supports the content of IM.1 for 'Integrated Management'. However, Policy IM.1 should be changed to 'regulatory'. This will ensure that recognising and providing for Ki uta ki tai is paramount to resource management decisions. Furthermore, mana whenua/tangata whenua should be actively involved in resource management and decision-making to directly address Issue 3 in the 'Proposed Amendment to Chapter 3'.	Amend Policy IM.3 clause (a) as follows:  (a) partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua <b>active</b> involvement in resource management and decision making.		Reject
S115.056	Hutt City Council			S115.056	Hutt City Council	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	<p>While we support the general intent of the policy, these are high level considerations and do not specify the situations where particular action should be taken. This is inevitable given the scale of a Regional Policy Statement and the wide range of situations it must cover.</p> <p>Other than clause (e), which we comment on below, we support the policy in its application to notices of requirement and district plans. District plans are the appropriate place to set policies and rules that provide thresholds for different matters to be considered in resource consents.</p> <p>In relation to clause (e), which covers Māori data sovereignty, while we appreciate the importance of this issue it was not included in the draft proposal on which officers provided feedback. We are not equipped in the time available to make meaningful input on how policy relating to Māori data could work.</p> <p>Hutt City Council is currently doing internal work on a data ethics policy, but it is too soon to include this in a regulatory method in the RPS. Council seeks further engagement with the regional council, tangata whenua/mana whenua, and the community on this matter.</p> <p>Accordingly we oppose clause (e) and seek its deletion, and this matter be pursued through a separate RPS change at a later date if found necessary after meaningful engagement.</p>	<p>Amend Policy IM.1 as follows:</p> <p>"Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, a notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional or district plan particular regard shall be given to:</p> <p>(a) partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in resource management and decision making; and  (b) recognising the interconnectedness between air, freshwater, land, coastal marine areas, ecosystems and all living things - ki uta ki tai; and  (c) recognising the interrelationship between natural resources and the built environments; and  (d) making decisions based on the best available information, improvements in technology and science, and mātauranga Māori; and <del>(e) upholding Māori data sovereignty;</del> and  (f) requiring Māori data and mātauranga Māori to be interpreted within Te Ao Māori; and  (g) recognising that the impacts of activities may extend beyond immediate</p>		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
									and directly adjacent area, and beyond organisational or administrative boundaries  Explanation  This policy requires that a holistic, integrated view is taken when making resource management decisions. It also requires both regional and district councils to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua are actively involved in resource management and decision making, including the protection of mātauranga Māori and Māori data."		
<b>S128.037</b>	Horticulture New Zealand			<b>S128.037</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Support a more consistent and efficient approach to resource management that includes partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua. HortNZ's support this being focused on the plan-making level and governance, so that values inform the plan approach. In respect to consent applications, this clause needs to be appropriate to the size/scale/significance of the consent.	Consider providing further clarification in respect to partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua at the consenting level.		Reject
<b>S128.037</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS2.12</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.12</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Rangitāne support a holistic and integrated approach to resource management and protecting the environment, seeing this as crucial to positive outcomes for the environment, mana whenua, communities and businesses. Further clarification of partnerships with mana whenua in the resource consent process is supported where this is driven by mana whenua and enhances social, cultural, environmental and economic outcomes.	Allow in part		Reject
<b>S128.037</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS20.024</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.024</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	As Treaty Partners, Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over land, waterways and all other taonga in our rohe. Tino rangatiratanga should be enacted at all levels of decision-making, from governance and decision-making, through to the social and technical inputs into decision-making, into the analysis of decision-making, and in ensuring compliance with decision-making and other types of regulation. We note that, Ātiawa already have partnership arrangements with local authorities that include the consenting level, Ātiawa seek to ensure these partnership arrangements under Te Tiriti o Waitangi are protected.	Disallow		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S128.037</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS20.025</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.025</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submission point, as in our original submission, Ātiawa is pleased that the notified Policy IM.1 supports Te Tiriti; the policy principally recognises and upholds several core concepts that are fundamental to te ao Māori approach to resource management, including working in partnership with local government, ki uta ki tai/integrated management, mātauranga Māori.	Disallow		No recommendation
<b>S131.080</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.080</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Ātiawa supports Policy IM.1. Ātiawa is pleased that the drafting supports Te Tiriti; the policy principally recognises and upholds several core concepts that are fundamental to te ao Māori approach to resource management, including working in partnership with local government, ki uta ki tai/integrated management, mātauranga Māori.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S131.080</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.350</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.350</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.			
<b>S133.05 2</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.05 2</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Supports the inclusion of policies that reflect requirements for integrated management.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S133.05 2</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS2.73</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.73</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Rangitāne endorses Muaūpoko support for the inclusion of policies that reflect requirements for integrated management.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S133.052</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.399</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.399</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation
<b>S140.057</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.057</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Support as proposed.	Retained as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S147.063</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.063</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S147.063</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.127</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.127</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		Reject
<b>S147.063</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.232</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.232</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.</p>	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S165.061</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			<b>S165.061</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support		Retain		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)				(Forest & Bird)						
<b>S165.061</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S167.096</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.096</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support policy direction.	Amend clause (d) to read:  (d) making decisions based on <b>achieving outcomes set in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua and using</b> the best available information, improvements in technology and science, and mātauranga Māori; and		Reject
<b>S167.096</b>	Taranaki Whānui	<b>FS6.036</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.036</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	We support this submission because decisions cannot be made just based on mātauranga Māori, as the use of mātauranga Māori is required to be done by those who hold the mātauranga (mana whenua/ tangata whenua). Therefore, partnership is required with mana whenua/ tangata whenua in order for mātauranga Māori to be included in decisions.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S170.047</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.047</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support in part	The policy ensures the involvement of mana whenua in resource management and decision making. It incorporates a more holistic view of the environment and its interconnectedness. There might need to be further clarification that making decisions based on mātauranga Māori need to be informed by mātauranga Māori knowledge holders. In terms of sharing data and information across all relevant agencies it should be specified that mātauranga Māori data sovereignty will be upheld, and Māori decide when their knowledge is shared.	Add further clarification that making decisions based on mātauranga Māori need to be informed by mātauranga Māori knowledge holders, and that in terms of sharing data and information across all relevant agencies mātauranga Māori data sovereignty will be upheld, and Māori decide when their knowledge is shared.		Accept in part
<b>S170.047</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS2.93</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.93</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to Policy IM.1 proposed by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.047	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.161	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.161	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S170.066</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.066</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	How does this Policy and its consideration work in the greater context for the Regional Policy Statement?	Clarify in the provision how this will work in the context of the wider RPS.		Reject
<b>S170.066</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS29.180</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.180</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.			
<b>S16.030</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.030</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	The policy is not supported by any provisions of the RMA or higher-level statutory planning document. Council is also concerned that the proposed policy contradicts itself by stating it is a policy that must be considered, but then requires decision makers to have particular regard to all objectives and policies in the RPS - many of which must be given effect to, while others are only to be considered.	Delete Policy IM.2.		Reject
<b>S16.030</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS20.050</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.050</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the submission point and the rationale set out by Kāpiti Coast District Council. As in our original submission, Ātiawaki supports ensuring that resource management creates fair and equitable outcomes and avoids exacerbating inequalities.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S16.030</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<b>FS26.042</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.042</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Kapiti Coast DC requests deletion of Policy IM.2.  Meridian agrees the policy is not supported by any RMA provisions or higher order policy instruments and provides no clear policy guidance.	Allow		Reject
<b>S25.035</b>	Carterton District Council			<b>S25.035</b>	Carterton District Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	CDC seeks further guidance on how this should be implemented in an RMA framework.	Further guidance provided by GWRC on how this should be given effect to.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S25.035	Carterton District Council	FS2.103	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.103	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose in part	Rangitāne supports the emphasis on equity and inclusiveness in resource management and decision making of this policy. Land use, development and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of access to resources, quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Requiring such considerations in resource management decision making will likely prevent existing inequities being exacerbated, increase intergenerational equity, and improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities. Rangitāne wish to work with GWRC to provide further guidance on the implementation of this policy at the territorial level.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S30.057	Porirua City Council			S30.057	Porirua City Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	The policy lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation, directs district plans to address matters which are outside their scope, and due to its drafting and scope represents a high regulatory requirement. Issues of concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not achieve the purpose of the RMA. The purpose is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This is to be done in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while meeting the three environmental bottom lines set out in s5 to the RMA. The purpose does not require that this is done in an equitable or inclusive way.</li> <li>• It does not identify how potential tensions between having to give effect to other objectives and policies of the RPS and ensuring an "equitable and inclusive way" are to be reconciled if they arise.</li> <li>• It requires a common understanding and agreed baseline on what existing inequities exist. Without this it cannot be determined when a resource consent, variation or plan change would exacerbate an existing inequity. There are examples of inequities, but not an exclusive list. This could be construed very broadly to address social inequities that are well beyond the ability of any RMA decision to address. This needs to be more clear, certain and defined to avoid legal challenges on things that cannot be managed through the RMA.</li> <li>• Regional council or territorial authorities cannot manage access to public transport, amenities and housing through a resource consent or a plan change. This is quite a step change to be requiring a council through a consent to consider how a housing</li> </ul>	Delete policy.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								<p>development in one area for example is not exacerbating lack of access to housing in another.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no definition of "environmental issues" provided for this policy. The definition of "environment" in the RMA is broad and includes all natural and physical resources, amenity values, ecosystems and their constituent parts. This needs to be more certain, including specifying the degree to which "environmental issues" should not be exacerbated.</li> <li>• The requirement not to exacerbate "environmental issues" is both uncertain and draconian given the RMA broad definition of "environment" and lack of any policy guidance on what an "issue" is nor any direction of degree of exacerbation to be considered before a resource consent, variation or plan change would fail this test.</li> <li>• Section 5 of the RMA requires that the needs of future generations are met, so "not increasing the burden" could be seen as a lower bar. However, the policy does not provide any direction on guidance on what is meant by "burden" in clause (d), burden of what exactly? This needs to be more clear and certain.</li> <li>• Unlike IM.1, this refers to just notified consents. It is unclear why there is a discrepancy between notified and non-notified consents in these policies.</li> </ul>			
<b>S30.057</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.090</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.090</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Reject
<b>S170.064</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangātira			<b>S170.064</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangātira	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy CC.9 Equity and inclusiveness - consideration This clause should apply all policy in the RPS, not just to Climate Change parts. Inter-racial and inter-generational equity is impacting iwi and Mana Whenua differently as far as Climate Change impacts.	This clause should apply all policy in the RPS, not just to Climate Change parts. It should also be recognised that inter-racial and inter-generational equity is impacting iwi and Mana Whenua differently as far as Climate Change impacts.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.064	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.178	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.178	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S30.057	Porirua City Council	FS26.043	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.043	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	<p>Porirua CC requests deletion of Policy IM.2.</p> <p>Meridian agrees that the policy lacks the necessary precision to enable its meaningful implementation and introduces a requirement for Plans to address matters beyond their s. 30 and s. 31 RMA functions.</p>	Allow		Reject
S34.011	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.011	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>This policy reads more like an overarching objective or policy.</p> <p>Council supports clause a) but is concerned that clauses b) to d) may be difficult to achieve, particularly at a resource consent level.</p> <p>The language here is also very strong, which sets a high bar, and there are no measures to determine how you would know that these lists of matters were not being met. As an example, the location of development could have an impact on access to public transport if connections are severed or not properly planned. However, access is also related to service provision, which is a regional council function, and regional and district plans have no control over the implementation or withdrawals of public transport services.</p> <p>Clause b) is open to much interpretation that would also be difficult to evidence at a resource consent level.</p> <p>Clause c) would not require if the policy becomes an overarching objective/policy as this is already covered by other provisions in the RPSPC1.</p> <p>Under clauses c) and d) it is unclear what the environmental issues and burdens are that this provision is seeking to address. There may also be circumstances where acting in a way that is not considered equitable, could reduce a future burden.</p> <p>The provisions should more accurately reflect the purpose of the RMA.</p>	<p>Amend to be an overarching objective or policy, and amend to read:</p> <p>Policy / <b>Objective IM.2 XX</b>: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a notified resource consent, a notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a regional and district plan particular regard shall be given to achieving the objectives and policy outcomes of this RPS in an equitable and inclusive way, by:</p> <p>(a) <del>avoiding</del> <b>addressing</b> compounding historic grievances with iwi/Māori; and</p> <p>(b) <del>not exacerbating existing</del> <b>addressing</b> social inequities, in particular but not limited to, access to public transport, amenities and housing; and (c) <del>not exacerbating environmental</del> issues; and (d) <del>not increasing the burden on</del> <b>supporting the sustainable management of resources for</b> future generations.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>This policy requires that equity and inclusiveness are at the forefront of resource management and decision making to prevent any increase in existing inequities, to ensure intergenerational equity, and to improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities.</p>		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S100.017	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.017	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	There are so many expressions within Policy IM.2 that are ambiguous or undefined (for example: 'equitable', 'inclusive', 'historic grievances', 'existing inequities', 'environmental issues', 'burden') that the policy is incapable of reasonable or consistent application. Policy IM.2 is not supported by any meaningful section 32 evaluation.	Delete Policy IM.2 and the accompanying explanation.		Reject
S100.017	Meridian Energy Limited	FS2.18	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.18	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne supports ensuring that resource management creates fair and equitable outcomes and avoids exacerbating inequalities. The criteria included in IM.2 are supported. Development in urban areas and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Rangitāne does not support the deletion of this Policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
S100.017	Meridian Energy Limited	FS11.014	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.014	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Policy IM.2 includes a number of vague terms that create uncertainty. Therefore, interpretation of the policy will likely be inconsistent, create significant complexity and result in differing interpretations. On this basis the submission is supported.	Allow		Reject
S100.017	Meridian Energy Limited	FS3.033	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.033	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support in part	Waka Kotahi seeks further clarity on the intent and implementation of this policy.	Not stated	Waka Kotahi seeks clarification as to the intent and implementation of this policy	Accept in part
S102.027	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.027	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support in part	Policy IM.1 be changed to a regulatory policy to align with the changes sought in Objective A. This is pertinent given that Māori landowners have historically been disadvantaged within the resource management system and decision-making processes. Therefore, the policy should be regulatory to prevent further inequities. This change will directly address issue 3 in the 'Proposed Amendment to Chapter 3'.	Policy IM.2 be changed to a regulatory policy.		Reject
S102.027	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	FS2.99	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.99	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Rangitāne support the proposal by Te Tumu Paeroa that Policy IM.2 to be changed to a regulatory policy.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S102.027</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	<b>FS26.045</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.045</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	The Office of the Māori Trustee considers that Policy IM.2 should be changed to a regulatory policy.  Meridian disagrees. Policy IM.2 is incapable of consistent implementation, is ambiguous and does not give effect to a RMA function and should be deleted.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S115.057</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.057</b>	Hutt City Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	While we appreciate the intent of the policy, the matters it addresses are generally not resource management considerations for city and district councils as they cannot be addressed through controlling land use or subdivision. The policy is also not supported by any higher order document or provision in the RMA.  If the policy is included, it is also insufficiently clear for assessing resource consents about what situations it applies to, the threshold of significance, and what matters should be considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete Policy IM.2, or failing that,</li> <li>Amend the policy so that it does not apply to resource consents, or failing that,</li> <li>Amend the policy to set situations and thresholds for which this assessment should apply.</li> </ul>		Reject
<b>S115.057</b>	Hutt City Council	<b>FS28.055</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	<b>FS28.055</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	HortNZ support amendment that clarifies how this policy would apply to resource consents in the RMA context	Allow		Reject
<b>S129.005</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			<b>S129.005</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support in part	Support that equity, inclusiveness and access to suitable travel choices is important.	Insert new methods to articulate how equity, inclusiveness and access be provided.		Accept in part
<b>S131.081</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.081</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Ātiawaki supports ensuring that resource management creates fair and equitable outcomes and avoids exacerbating inequalities.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S131.081</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.351</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.351</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S133.053</b>	Muaūpo ko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.053</b>	Muaūpo ko Tribal Authority	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness -	Support	Supports the inclusion of policies that reflect requirements for integrated management.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
						consideration					
<b>S133.053</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS2.74</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.74</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Rangitāne endorse Muaūpoko support for the inclusion of policies that aim to achieve equity and inclusiveness.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S133.053</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.400</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.400</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.			
<b>S134.013</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>S134.013</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>S134.013</b>	Powerco Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	There is significant uncertainty in the wording of policy IM.2 and how many of the terms might be interpreted in any given situation. For example, it is unclear how this may be applied in a situation where consent is required for maintenance or upgrade of existing regionally significant infrastructure located in an environmentally or culturally sensitive area. The policy should be deleted on the basis of uncertainty and an inability to apply on a consistent basis	Delete Policy IM.2 in its entirety.		Reject
<b>S134.013</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS2.107</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.107</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne strongly opposes the deletion of Policy IM.2. Rangitāne supports the emphasis on equity and inclusiveness in resource management and decision making of this policy. Land use, development and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of access to resources, quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Requiring such considerations in resource management decision making will assist to prevent existing inequities being exacerbated, increase intergenerational equity, and improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S134.013</b>	Powerco Limited	<b>FS26.044</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.044</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Powerco requests deletion of Policy IM.2/  Meridian agrees that Policy IM.2 is uncertain and incapable of consistent implementation.	Allow		Reject
<b>S140.058</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.058</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support in part	While we understand the intent of the policy, it is uncertain how this will be implemented within the current resource management considerations for city and district councils without further clarification.	Clarify and refine intent and wording of Policy IM.2		Accept in part
<b>S147.064</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.064</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S147.064</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.128</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.128</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		No recommendation
<b>S147.064</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.233</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.233</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.</p>	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S148.014</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.014</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>Considered these to be laudable goals, however it is not clear how they will be applied in a statutory sense under the framework of the Resource Management Act or realistically achievable given the terminology used. For example "not exacerbating" is not something that is consistent with usual resource management practice and requirements.</p>	Delete this policy.		Reject
<b>S148.014</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS8.012</b>	Guardians of the Bays Inc	<b>FS8.012</b>	Guardians of the Bays Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	<p>We note that clarity, refinement and methods are mentioned by other submitters as a way of improving Policy Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness, rather than removal. Clearly it is an important policy to Taranaki Whanui and Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira that should be retained.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S148.014</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS26.046</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.046</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	WIAL requests the deletion of Policy IM.2. WIAL considers these to be laudable goals, however it is not clear how they will be applied in a statutory sense under the framework of the Resource Management Act realistically achievable given the terminology used. For example "not exacerbating" is not something that is consistent with usual resource management practice and requirements.  Meridian agrees: the policy is incapable of consistent implementation.	Allow		Reject
<b>S157.016</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			<b>S157.016</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	There is significant uncertainty in the wording of policy IM.2 and how many of the terms might be interpreted in any given situation. For example, it is unclear how this may be applied in a situation where consent is required for maintenance or upgrade of existing regionally significant infrastructure located in an environmentally or culturally sensitive area. The policy should be deleted on the basis of uncertainty and an inability to apply on a consistent basis.	Delete Policy IM.2 in its entirety.		Reject
<b>S157.016</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	<b>FS2.2</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.2</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne welcomes equity and inclusiveness as a consideration in resource management and decision making. The criteria included in IM.2 are supported.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S157.016</b>	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	<b>FS26.041</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.041</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	The Fuel Companies(p .8) seekthe deletion of Policy IM.2 due to the significant uncertainty in the wording. Meridian agrees the wording creates uncertainty and does not provide clear guidance.	Allow		Reject
<b>S165.062</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.062</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support		Retain		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S165.062</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S167.097</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.097</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the new Policy IM.2 and note the development of Methods are still to come.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S170.088</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			<b>S170.088</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy CC.9 Equity and inclusiveness - consideration  This clause should apply all policy in the RPS, not just to Climate Change parts. Inter-racial and inter-generational equity is impacting iwi and Mana Whenua differently as far as Climate Change impacts.	This clause should apply all policy in the RPS, not just to ClimateChange parts.  It should also be recognised that inter-racial and inter-generational equity is impacting iwi and Mana Whenua differently as far as Climate Change impacts.		Accept in part
<b>S170.088</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	<b>FS2.95</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.95</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	Rangitāne agree with and support the suggestion by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira that Policy IM.2 should apply to all policy in the RPS, and that the issues raised by the submitter should be recognised.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S170.088	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.202	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.202	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal</p> <p>FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal</p> <p>Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal</p> <p>Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S30.092	Porirua City Council			S30.092	Porirua City Council	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support in part	Policy contains grammatical errors and terminology inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.	Amend policy as follows:  To achieve integrated management of natural resources, the Wellington Regional Council, <del>district and city councils</del> <b>and territorial authorities</b> shall: (d) partner with and provide support to mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for their involvement in resource management and decision making; and (e) partner with and provide support to mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for mātauranga Māori in natural resource management and decision making; and (f) work together with other agencies to ensure consistent implementation of the objectives, policies and methods of this RPS; and (g) enable connected and holistic approach to resource management that looks beyond organisational or administrative boundaries; and (h) recognise that the impacts of activities extend beyond <b>the</b> immediate and directly adjacent area; and (i) require Māori data, including mātauranga Māori, sites <b>and areas</b> of significance, wāhi tapu <b>and</b> wāhi tūpuna are only shared in accordance with agreed tikanga and kawa Māori; and (j) share data and information (other than in (f) above) across all relevant agencies; and (k) incentivise opportunities and programmes that achieve multiple objectives and benefits.  Implementation: Wellington Regional Council* <del>and city and district councils</del> <b>territorial authorities</b>		Accept in part
S30.092	Porirua City Council	FS25.125	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.125	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S102.089	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.089	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support in part	Generally supports Method IM.1 for 'Integrated management'. The methods of implementation of Method IM.1 should be alongside mana whenua/tangata whenua to guarantee that the fundamental concept of ki uta ki tai is integrated appropriately.	Amend Method IM.1 as follows:  Implementation: Wellington Regional Council*, city and district councils, <b>and mana whenua/tangata whenua.</b>		Accept
S102.090	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.090	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support in part	Generally supports Method IM.1 for 'Integrated management'. However, considers that Method IM.1 be changed to regulatory. This coincides with the requested change of Policy IM.1 to regulatory, further strengthening the implementation of ki uta ki tai.	Amend Method IM.1 to a 'regulatory' method.		Reject
S115.098	Hutt City Council			S115.098	Hutt City Council	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.  See also our comments on proposed Policy IM.1	Amend Method IM.1 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.  If the method is retained, amend by deleting clauses (f) and (g).		Reject
S129.035	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.035	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Supports Method IM.1(c) as the Wellington Regional Growth Framework provides an opportunity for early multi agency engagement to ensure enabling infrastructure is adequately provided for.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S129.036	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.036	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support in part	Supports Method IM.1(d) a connected approach to resource management, but it is not clear what this method is anticipating to achieve.	Seek to clarify what Method IM.1(d) is anticipated to achieve.		Reject
S129.037	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.037	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Support Method IM.1(e) as acknowledges the need to consider the cumulative impacts of activities and the need to align development with the future development strategies which identify how the well-functioning urban areas will be shaped.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S129.038	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.038	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Supports Method IM.1(g) for the sharing of data and looks forward to an identified information sharing platform.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S129.039	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.039	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Support Method IM.1(h) as acknowledges that we have similar mode shift behaviour change incentives and look forward to working with Greater Wellington Regional Council to rationalise funding.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S147.091	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.091	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Necessary to implement the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S147.091	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.155	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.155	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		Reject
S147.091	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.260	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.260	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.</p>	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
S131.0123	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0123	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	<p>Ātiawaki support Method IM.1. Ātiawaki is pleased that an integrated management, ki uta ki tai is being applied and enabled through the regional policy statement, including Method IM.1</p> <p>Ātiawaki seek an amendment to (b) to provide for mātauranga Māori to be applied to all resource management and decision-making.</p>	(b) partner with and provide support to mana whenua / tangata whenua to provide for mātauranga Māori in natural resource management and decision making; and		Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S131.0123</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.240</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.240</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki ta	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S140.0100</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.0100</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method IM.1: Integrated management	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
						ent - ki uta ki tai					
<b>S165.01 04</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.01 04</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support		Retain		Accept in part
<b>S165.01 04</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.31 9</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.31 9</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki ta	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S167.01 50</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.01 50</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports Method IM.1	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
<b>S168.01 48</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.01 48</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support Method IM.1 to partner with and provide support to mana whenua and require Māori data to only be shared in accordance with agreed tikanga and kawa Māori	Retain as notified		Accept in part
<b>S168.01 48</b>	Rangitāne O	<b>FS31.07 7</b>	Sustainable Wairar	<b>FS31.07 7</b>	Sustainable	Method IM.1: Integrated	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032.	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
	Wairarapa Inc		apa inc		Wairarapa inc	management - ki uta ki tai		<p>Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>			
<b>S102.09 1</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.09 1</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support in part	<p>Generally supports IM.2 for 'Integrated Management'. However, Method IM.2 should be changed to regulatory, ensuring adequate protection is afforded to mātauranga Māori and Māori data sovereignty within the Proposed Policy Statement.</p>	Amend Method IM.2 to a 'regulatory' method.		Reject
<b>S102.09 2</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee			<b>S102.09 2</b>	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support in part	<p>Generally supports Method IM.2 for 'Integrated management'. However, the methods of implementation of Method IM.2 should be alongside mana whenua/tangata whenua. This will ensure that mātauranga Māori and Māori data sovereignty is protected and interpreted as intended.</p>	Amend Method IM.2 as follows:  Implementation: Wellington Regional Council <b>and mana whenua/tangata whenua.</b>		Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S102.092	Te Tumu Paeroa   Office of the Māori Trustee	FS6.004	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.004	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	We support this submission mana whenua/ tangata whenua will need to be implementing the protection and interpretation of mātauranga Māori to protect data sovereignty in accordance with tikanga.	Allow		Accept
S147.092	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.092	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	Necessary to implement the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept
S147.092	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.156	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.156	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		Reject
S147.092	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.261	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.261	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.			
S131.01 24	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.01 24	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	<p>Ātiawa support Method IM.2.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek that the Regional Council provide for this partnership through adequate funding and resourcing.</p>	Insert the following sentence to Method IM.2. <b>Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.</b>		Reject
S131.01 24	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.24 1	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.24 1	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.			
<b>S140.01 01</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.01 01</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.		Accept
<b>S167.01 51</b>	Taranaki Whānui			<b>S167.01 51</b>	Taranaki Whānui	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports Method IM.2.  Taranaki Whānui want to indicate our intention to partner with council on this important mahi.  Taranaki Whānui are keen to see assurances in regard to resourcing/funding and capability building.	Retain as notified.		Accept
<b>S168.01 96</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			<b>S168.01 96</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of this method.  This method should be amended to be explicit that mana whenua and tangata whenua will determine how this is implemented.	Amend the method so that it explicit that mana whenua / tangata whenua will define how and when their data will be collected, stored, protected, shared, and managed, and how or when it might be modified or deleted.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S168.01 96</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.127</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.127</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Method IM.2: Protection and interpretation of Mātauranga Māori and Māori data	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S131.01 50</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.01 50</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa support the intent of the Anticipated Environmental Result (AER), that Regional Council and territorial authorities collaborate to undertake integrated management and recognise the importance of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori in natural resource management and decision-making.</p> <p>Ātiawa view is that although the AER identified is appropriate to the objective/policy framework, it is so broad that it will not offer meaningful data in terms of monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies and methods. The AER should be specific and measurable (based on evidence when relevant), and appropriately, time-bound. AER and monitoring is an integral step (and statutory requirement) in the planning cycle (plan-domonitor-review), and setting robust and meaningful AER produce better data to understand and assess the planning framework.</p>	Ātiawa request that the Regional Council provide more specific, measurable and time-bound AER. Ātiawa seek to work together in the drafting of the AER, particularly given the relationship of the planning framework to mana whenua values.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S131.01 50	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.270	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.270	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated		No recommendation

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S147.01 04	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.01 04	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	<p>Support an overarching objective that incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• incorporates a Te Ao Māori worldview and Maturanga Māori; and</li> <li>• recognises the holistic nature and interconnectedness of all parts of the natural environment.</li> </ul> <p>As drafted, however, the objective lacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a clear statement of the desired environmental outcomes to be delivered by the proposed approach to integrated management; and</li> <li>• does not reflect the role of the community and other stakeholders.</li> </ul>	Replace objective A with an environmental result such as: <b>recognition of the importance of Te Ao Māori and Matuaranga Māori, and collaboration with community and other stakeholders, leads to integrated management of natural resources with a significant stated improvement in community engagement with environmental projects with noted positive environmental improvements.</b>		Reject
S147.01 04	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.15 2	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	FS20.15 2	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Oppose in part	While Ātiawa recognise the role of stakeholders, landowners and community and the collective effort that must occur to result in meaningful outcomes for te taiao, first the Council must honour their partnership with mana whenua under Te Tiriti.	Disallow		No recommendation
S147.01 04	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.16 8	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.16 8	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.</p> <p>Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9.</p> <p>Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified.</p> <p>Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S147.01 04	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.27 3	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.27 3	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
S167.01 84	Taranaki Whānui			S167.01 84	Taranaki Whānui	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Support in partnership (resourcing/funding) with mana whenua.  Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the process to establish the AERs.  What input has come from mana whenua?  Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that AERs need to be developed and monitored in partnership with mana whenua and include mātauranga Māori. (State of Environment Reports).	Amend anticipated environmental results in partnership with mana whenua.		Reject
S168.01 95	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.01 95	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this, but consider the wording could be strengthened.	Amend the text as follows:  Regional Council and Territorial Authorities collaborate to undertake integrated management of natural resources and recognise <b>and provide for importance</b> of Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori in natural resources management and decision making. <b>or by alternative wording that provides similar relief.</b>		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S168.0195</b>	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS31.126</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	<b>FS31.126</b>	Sustainable Wairarapa inc	Integrated Management Anticipated environmental results	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S133.002</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			<b>S133.002</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Overarching Objective A	Support in part	Supports the intent of the objective, particularly the reference to integrated management being guided by te ao Māori and incorporating mātauranga Māori. However, request specific acknowledgement of Muaūpoko as having connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara.	Amend the objective to ensure Muaūpoko's connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara is acknowledged.		Reject
<b>S133.002</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS6.047</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.047</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow	We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S133.002</b>	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	<b>FS20.349</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.349</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Overarching Objective A	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the whole submission	Accept
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	<p>As set out in our reasons in respect of amendments to Chapter 3 - over-arching issues and objectives.</p> <p>The reference to "partner" is not supported for the reasons set out in Policy 12.</p>	That Policy IM.1 be deleted Delete the FW icon.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS2.33</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.33</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne strongly opposes the deletion of Policy IM.1. This policy requires an integrated approach to resource management, recognising the interconnectedness of living things with the environment, which is fundamental to Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori. Involvement of mana whenua in resource management and decision making is also provided for by this policy. As tangata whenua, our whānau and hapū must have a central role in this process, reflecting the unique and inseparable relationship that we have with every living thing in the taiao.	Disallow		Accept
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.106</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.106</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.228</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.228</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS29.079</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.079</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S163.063</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.135</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.135</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	The purpose and principles of the RMA do not require considerations of 'equity' or 'inclusiveness' when considering plan changes or resource consent applications; and would practically be unworkable, especially at the level of resource consents. Refer to submission for more details.	That Policy IM.2 be deleted. Delete the FW icon.		Reject
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS2.34</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.34</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Rangitāne strongly opposes the relief sought. Rangitāne supports the emphasis on equity and inclusiveness in resource management and decision making of this policy. Land use, development and urban expansion in the past has resulted in poor outcomes for tangata whenua in terms of access to resources, quantity, quality and affordability of housing, the ability to construct papakāinga, as well as adversely affecting our relationship with our culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Requiring such considerations in resource management decision making will assist in preventing existing inequities being exacerbated, increase intergenerational equity, and improve the overall wellbeing of people and communities.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.107</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.107</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.229</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.229</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
								compound environmental and resource management issues.			
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS29.080</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.080</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
<b>S163.064</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.136</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.136</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method IM.1: Integrated	Oppose	Our proposed over-arching Objectives A and B are intended to provide a concrete pathway towards a similar result.	That Method IM.1 be deleted. Delete the FW icon		Reject
<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.135</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.135</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IM.1: Integrated	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.257</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.257</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IM.1: Integrated	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS29.108</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.108</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IM.1: Integrated	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
<b>S163.092</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.164</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.164</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IM.1: Integrated	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Reject
<b>S32.001</b>	Director-General of Conservation			<b>S32.001</b>	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	The proposed additions usefully outline the issues to be addressed.	Retain introduction section as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S32.001</b>	Director-General of Conservation	<b>FS30.025</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.025</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S80.001</b>	Anders Crofoot			<b>S80.001</b>	Anders Crofoot	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	With full review of the RPS scheduled for 2024 and various NPS forthcoming between now and then, it would be better to address changes in light of NPS rather than trying to preempt them. It would also be better to review policies and objectives at the same time.	Delete all proposed amendments to Chapter 3.		Reject
<b>S80.001</b>	Anders Crofoot	<b>FS30.001</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.001</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	B+LNZ support that regional and national policy statements and plans are created in a streamlined way that avoids duplication of review processes.	Allow		Reject
<b>S94.001</b>	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			<b>S94.001</b>	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S100.00 1</b>	Meridian Energy Limited			<b>S100.00 1</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	Proposed RPS Change #1 proposes objectives, policies and methods responding to the challenges associated with future climate change. This warrants acknowledgement of the challenges as a regionally significant issue. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure is essential in supporting communities' resilience against the effects of climate change. Infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is itself particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Maintaining the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure will be key to achieving community resilience to the challenges of climate change. Enabling the upgrading, adaptation and relocation of regionally significant infrastructure will support community resilience.	Insert into the overview of issues the following additional issue numbered '4' (or words that have similar effect): "The overarching resource management issues for the Wellington Region are: 1. .... 2. .... 3. .... 4. <b>The region's environment, communities and infrastructure are vulnerable to future national and global challenges associated with climate change. Climate change is expected to exacerbate flood hazard, including coastal inundation, and drought conditions. The effects of climate change, including coastal and river flood inundation and erosion, are expected to damage or impair the operation of infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure). Community resilience to the effects of climate change will depend on the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure. Regionally significant infrastructure will need to be upgraded and adapted or relocated to maintain the necessary functionality and capacity to support community resilience.</b> "		Reject
<b>S100.00 1</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS2.16</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	<b>FS2.16</b>	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	Rangitāne agree maintaining the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure will be key to achieving community resilience to the challenges of climate change; however, this must be undertaken in a holistic and integrated manner that is fair and equitable to ensure inclusiveness and that existing inequalities in community resilience are not exacerbated.	Allow in part		Reject
<b>S100.00 1</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS19.02 6</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.02 6</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	Necessary for delivery of regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
S100.001	Meridian Energy Limited	FS3.006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	FS3.006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	WK supports the recognition of regionally significant infrastructure as an overarching resource management issue.	Allow		Reject
S113.001	Wellington Water			S113.001	Wellington Water	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	Maintaining the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is essential in supporting communities' resilience against the effects of climate change. Infrastructure is also vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Enabling the upgrading, adaptation and relocation of regionally significant infrastructure will support community resilience.	Amend the list of issues to include: <b>4. The region's environment, communities and infrastructure are vulnerable to future national and global challenges associated with climate change. Climate change is expected to exacerbate flood hazard, including coastal inundation, and drought conditions. The effects of climate change, including coastal and river flood inundation and erosion, are expected to damage or impair the operation of infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure). Community resilience to the effects of climate change will depend on the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure. Regionally significant infrastructure will need to be upgraded and adapted or relocated to maintain the necessary functionality and capacity to support community resilience.</b>		Reject
S113.001	Wellington Water	FS2.20	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.20	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	Rangitane supports the maintenance of the functionality and integrity of infrastructure, and acknowledges that ensuring adaptability of infrastructure is an important factor in community resilience. Rangitāne would support protection and adaptability measures that are developed in consultation with mana whenua, that are primarily nature-based and that do not require trade-off impacts on other components of the environment.	Allow in part		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S113.001</b>	Wellington Water	<b>FS26.001</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	<b>FS26.001</b>	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	WWL seeks insertion of an additional issue highlighting the vulnerability of infrastructure: **4. The region's environment, communities and infrastructure are vulnerable to future national and global challenges associated with climate change. Climate change is expected to exacerbate flood hazard, including coastal inundation, and drought conditions. The effects of climate change, including coastal and river flood inundation and erosion, are expected to damage or impair the operation of infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure). Community resilience to the effects of climate change will depend on the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure. Regionally significant infrastructure will need to be upgraded and adapted or relocated to maintain the necessary functionality and capacity to support community resilience.** Meridian agrees that maintaining the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure including regionally significant infrastructure is essential in supporting communities' resilience against the effects of climate change	Allow in part	Allow to the extent any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Reject
<b>S115.003</b>	Hutt City Council			<b>S115.003</b>	Hutt City Council	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	The purpose of including overarching issues is presumably to provide a more integrated approach across the range of regional resource management issues in the RPS and subordinate planning documents. As such, it is important that all relevant issues are visible in this overarching section. As proposed, they are not. In general, the Regional Policy Statement is already lengthy and including both issues and objectives does not add significantly to the plan's usability. Accordingly, the Council seeks the deletion of overarching issues. These are detailed further in our submission.	Omit the issue statements. Alternatively, if the overarching issues are retained, the following amendments are sought: • Reframe the issue statements as general environmental issues, rather than as critiques of current practice. • Ensure issues relating to the needs of the urban environment are included (not just the impacts of the urban environment on the natural environment)		Accept in part
<b>S131.009</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			<b>S131.009</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	In principle, Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust (Ātiawa) supports the inclusion of these provisions as they set the high-level framework for the proposed changes - that is they set out the issues and rationale for addressing these matters in the Regional Policy Statement.	Specific amendments in relation to the 'Issue' statements are proposed below.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S131.009</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS29.213</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.213</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated		No recommendation
<b>S147.001</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council			<b>S147.001</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S147.001</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS30.058</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.058</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Reject
<b>S147.001</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS19.065</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.065</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow		Reject
<b>S147.001</b>	Wellington Fish and Game Council	<b>FS20.103</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.103</b>	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	General comments - Chapter 3	Support in part	Ātiawa are generally supportive of the proposed changes by GWRC, provided that the suggested amendments by Ātiawa (in our original submission) are accepted. Ātiawa in principle support the changes necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Allow in part	Allow in part, Ātiawa seek the relief sought as stated in our original submission. We support the overall intent of these changes to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S148.012</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			<b>S148.012</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose in part	Insert into the overview of issues recognition that infrastructure providers, particularly those which are nationally and regionally significant must be given sufficient flexibility to accommodate changes in technology as we move toward meeting our nation's net carbon zero 2050 commitment. Maintaining the functionality, integrity and adaptability of infrastructure will also be key to achieving community resilience to the challenges of climate change and this needs to be adequately recognised.	Add or amend the issues statement to recognise that key infrastructure assets within the region are vulnerable to the effects of climate change and that such facilities need to be given sufficient flexibility to accommodate new technology, respond and adapt to climate related issues.		Reject
<b>S148.012</b>	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	<b>FS19.061</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.061</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	Flexibility for regionally significant infrastructure will be critical to achieving the outcomes of the RPS.	Allow		Reject
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	The over-arching resource management issues and objectives in this chapter would more properly be considered in the full review of the RPS scheduled in 2024.	All proposed amendments to Chapter 3 be deleted		Reject
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS19.055</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	<b>FS19.055</b>	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	The provisions provide clarity about integrated management.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS7.031</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS7.031</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS20.153</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.153</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	Ātiawaki oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawaki do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS29.004</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	<b>FS29.004</b>	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - Chapter 3	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated		Accept in part
<b>S163.002</b>	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	<b>FS30.060</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.060</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - Chapter 3	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S11.023</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			<b>S11.023</b>	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	General comments - overall	Support in part	Can we remove all the words information, promote, support and encourage to an action. We have been doing this for years and now is time for action. Still too passive. My local Council have been ignoring your information, promotion, support and encouragement to date. The document is far too passive.	Use stronger language throughout the document: Replace "information", "promote", "support" and "encourage" with "implement" or "incentivize" (or better word), Replace "consideration" with "essential". Replace "non-regulatory" with "regulatory".		Accept in part
<b>S16.097</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.097</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Support in part	Objectives : Many objectives are not drafted clearly with regard to what outcome is sought, and some do not appear to be achievable within the scope of a regional policy statement.	Ensure all objectives are specific, state what is to be achieved where and when, clearly relate to (or state) an issue, and can be determined through implementation and monitoring whether the objectives have been met. Delete all objectives that are not achievable within		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
									the scope of a regional policy statement (with respect to legal justification, and the effectiveness and efficiency in light of alternative methods outside of the regional policy statement).		
<b>S16.0100</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.0100</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inappropriate use of verbs within objectives and policies: There are a number of examples throughout RPS Change 1 that proposes the use of verbs within objectives and policies that do not align with the RMA or relevant higher-level statutory planning documents. Council submits that the use of the correct verb in each instance is of critical importance due to their specific meaning and requirements for implementation that have been determined through case law. Council has not identified all instances of the use of inappropriate verbs, but this submission requests all verbs are reviewed and replaced where appropriate.	All verbs used in objectives and policies are reviewed and replaced with the appropriate verb in accordance with the RMA and relevant higher-level statutory planning documents.		Accept in part
<b>S16.0102</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.0102</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Use of 'and/or' throughout RPS Change 1: We note the use of and/or generally means a choice can be made. This is an issue across RPS Change 1 where it appears there is uncertainty as to whether there should be a choice or not. We request all instances of 'and / or' are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	All instances of and/or are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.		Accept in part
<b>S16.0103</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.0103</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Plan-wide provisions that are based on the misconception that district plan content, decision making on resource consents or notices of requirement by the Council are not limited by legislation: There are many examples in the plan change where there is a misconception that a district plan can require certain actions or require specific changes in behaviour. There are many free-market factors that district plans cannot regulate, and therefore should be pursued by the regional council via non-regulatory methods. Examples include but are not limited to: • Emission of greenhouse gases. • Transportation mode choice. • Restoration and enhancement activities. Nature based solutions	Delete all district plan requirements where the proposed methods (including the consideration of RPS policies, district plan making, resource consents, and notices of requirement) attempt to regulate free-market activities and behaviours of individuals that are not clearly supported by the RMA or a higher-level statutory planning document.		Accept in part
<b>S16.0104</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.0104</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Explanations to objectives and policies: There are many examples where explanations to objectives and policies either contain information that is unnecessary, or content that should be included in the relevant objective or policy itself. Explanations can provide useful context in some situations, but as they have no legal status under the RMA they should be used sparingly and appropriately.	Review and amend all explanations to objectives and policies to: a. Delete those that are unnecessary; and b) Delete text that should have been included in the relevant objective or policy		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S16.0106</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council			<b>S16.0106</b>	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or an evidence base that supports and justifies the proposed provisions: We have been unable to find an evidence base supporting and justifying a number of provisions in the plan change. The section 32 evaluation does not assist us in understanding the resource management basis or evidence base for many of the proposed provisions - particularly where a regulatory method is proposed.	Delete all provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or a robust evidence base that supports and justifies their inclusion in a regional policy statement.		Accept in part
<b>S30.0116</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.0116</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The real value of regional policy statements is to provide policy direction that either does not exist at a national level or exists at a national level but needs to be articulated at a regional level. Council is concerned about the many provisions in Proposed Change 1 that either duplicate or are inconsistent with matters now comprehensively addressed by national direction. In some instances, they duplicate national direction without giving specific guidance in a Wellington Region context.	Greater alignment with National Direction		Accept in part
<b>S30.0116</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.033</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.033</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S30.0116</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.159</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.159</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Accept in part
<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Council has concerns over jurisdictional issues, particularly in relation to the discharge of contaminants to air, land and water; and the management of fresh waterbodies. We consider that various provisions are ultra vires in terms of our respective functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA. Further, territorial authorities do not have the capacity or capability to undertake these functions. Many of the provisions as required would require a transfer of powers from regional councils to territorial authorities.	Query in relation to s30 and s31 functions, RMA, 1991		Accept in part
<b>S30.0117</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.034</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.034</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Reject
<b>S30.0120</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.038</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.038</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S34.011 1</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.011 1</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Council has not: • undertaken a complete check of whether detailed relief sought in this submission, could be/are partly or fully addressed by other provisions in RPS PC1 • undertaken a full review of background documents and higher order documents supporting or relating to these provisions • identified all consequential amendments needed in response to relief sought on specific provisions or that might address our concerns	Seeks any and all other amendments that will address the relief sought.		Accept in part
<b>S34.011 5</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.011 5</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or that extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct: Council has significant concerns that many of the proposed provisions attempt to require city and district councils to carry out some of the functions of regional councils or require Council to address resource management issues in its district plan that are beyond its statutory functions, powers and duties under the RMA. GWRC is not able to legitimately direct these outcomes. Council considers these provisions ultra vires.	Council opposes the provisions and seeks that the RPS is reviewed and amended to more appropriately and accurately reflect the powers, functions and duties of the regional, district and city councils.		Accept in part
<b>S34.011 6</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.011 6</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for provisions, and policies which duplicate national direction: Many of the proposed provisions do not appear to be adequately supported within the Section 32 Assessment by robust evidence, including any existing legislation or higher-level strategic planning document such as a national policy statement. This is particularly evident for the proposed climate change and indigenous biodiversity provisions.	Council submits that a full legal and planning review is undertaken to address these inconsistencies and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.		Accept in part
<b>S34.011 7</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.011 7</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of consideration of scale of provisions: The requirements and evidence base to develop the thresholds require significant effort and resourcing, which Council is not in a position to undertake, and in some cases, thresholds may not be an appropriate mechanism to address effects	Council contends that GWRC should further consider the practicalities associated with threshold-based provisions, to determine if this is the most appropriate method to achieve an objective or policy or develop guidance jointly with territorial authorities to support the development of provisions and decision-making process. Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.		Accept in part
<b>S34.011 8</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.011 8</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inadequacy of Section 32 Assessment: Council is concerned that the Section 32 assessment is not sufficiently evidenced and does not fully evaluate whether many of the regulatory provisions are practical / can be achieved and are the best method of achieving the outcomes sought.	These provisions should be deleted and considered in a later plan change.		Reject

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S34.0120</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			<b>S34.0120</b>	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Council considers that there are fundamental issues with the proposed provisions that require significant revision or deletion to ensure the RPSPC1 is legally robust and practical to implement. Thus, Council seeks that GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of the proposed provisions and amend the RPSPC1 to address these concerns, including detailed submission points on individual provisions included in Table 1.	Council also seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought.		Accept in part
<b>S30.0123</b>	Porirua City Council			<b>S30.0123</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Council opposes all "consideration" policies since they often duplicate or conflict with "regulatory" policies, and represent regulatory overreach without sufficient s32 evaluation or other evidence. We consider that they will create unnecessary regulatory costs due to the way they are drafted. They assume a level of knowledge and expertise on a range of matters generally not available to consent authorities, and in some cases represent a transfer of s31 functions to territorial authorities.	Not stated.		Accept in part
<b>FS25.041</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited			<b>FS25.041</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited		Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Reject
<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Clear and concise definitions are critical to assist in interpretation and implementation of the RPS.	Add any further definitions for any terms that are unclear and where a definition would assist in interpretation and implementation, including any relevant terms proposed to be introduced in response to submissions.		Accept in part
<b>S30.099</b>	Porirua City Council	<b>FS25.132</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	<b>FS25.132</b>	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - definitions	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow		Reject
<b>S140.002</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)			<b>S140.002</b>	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	The title of the regulatory policies as 'consideration' policies set out in chapter 4.2 creates confusion for their statutory weighting and should be amended.	Amend the wording of the title of the regulatory policies as outlined in Chapter 4.2 from 'Consideration' to 'Give particular regard'.		Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Considers that all of the policies in Chapter 4.2 have been worded to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria). Seek that all policies directing matters of consideration for resource consent are deleted from the regional policy statement in full.	That Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full. OR In the alternative that this relief is not granted, seek that the policies are reworded to state the intended outcome such that regional and district plans giving effect to the regional policy statement are suitably informed of the		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
									desired outcomes to address identified resource management issues.		
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.013</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	<b>FS6.013</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS3.032</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	<b>FS3.032</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	WK supports submission in part and also seeks clarification as to the intent and implementation of this policy.	Not stated	Waka Kotahi seeks clarification as to the intent and implementation of this policy.	Accept in part
<b>S158.001</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS20.031</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	<b>FS20.031</b>	Ātiawaki Whakarangotai Charitable Trust	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Ātiawaki strongly oppose the submission point, it would be inappropriate to delete Chapter 4.2, the chapter contains important strategic policy direction to plan users on how te taiao must be managed, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA, national policy and other statutory direction.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Considers that a number of policies have been worded within the chapter to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria).	Seek that Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full, however seeks that Policy UD.3 is retained with amendments and relocated to Chapter 4.1.		Accept in part

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Decision Sought	Summary Recommendation
<b>S158.044</b>	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	<b>FS6.014</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangātira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangātira	<b>FS6.014</b>	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangātira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangātira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.	Disallow		Accept in part
<b>S165.060</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)			<b>S165.060</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose in part	Submission in reference to Chapter Introduction and Table of Contents Chapter 4.2. The introduction (above the table) incorrectly states the weight to be given to the chapter's policies when changing or varying regional and district plans. Those plans must give effect to the RPS, not have particular regard to the RPS' provisions.	This section contains the policies that need to be given particular regard, where relevant, when assessing and deciding on resource consents or notices of requirement. <b>The policies must be given effect to</b> or when changing, or varying district or regional plans. Within this section, policies are presented in numeric order, although the summary table below lists the policy titles by topic headings.		Accept in part
<b>S165.060</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird)	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	<b>FS30.319</b>	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow		Accept in part