

Form 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Greater Wellington Regional Council (by email: regionalplan@gw.govt.nz)

Name of person making further submission: Cannon Point Development Limited (Ltd.)

This is a further submission in support of, and in opposition to, submissions on the change proposed to the following plan (the proposal):

- *Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region*

I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has because:

- I am affected by the content of a submission.

I support, or oppose, the submission of:

- Refer to further submission attached.

The particular parts of the submission I support, or oppose, are:

- Refer to further submission attached.

The reasons for my support, or opposition, are:

- Refer to further submission attached.

I seek that the whole, or part, of the submission be allowed, or disallowed:

- Refer to further submission attached.

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.



.....
Signature of person authorised to sign
on behalf of person making further submission.

.....
Date 8 March 2024

Electronic address for service of person making further submission: michael.hall@awa.kiwi

Telephone: 



Postal address: Awa Environmental Limited, Level 1/ 1 Ghuznee Street, Te Aro, Wellington 6011
Contact person: Michael Hall, Urban Spaces Lead



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought	Reasons:
					<p><i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i></p> <p><i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i></p>	<p><i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i></p>
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.014	General comments - urban development	Support in part	Allow in part	Support the decision requested to delete provisions prohibiting urban expansion beyond existing urban zoned land.	Supported as it generally aligns with the relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd. in its original submission.
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.020	General comments - stormwater management	Support	Allow	Support the decision requested to delete or significantly amend the addition of financial contributions with respect to stormwater discharges.	Supported as agree with submitter that there is a lack of justification and understanding of monitoring of these projects.
S206 Winstone Aggregates	S206.020	General comments - stormwater management	Support	Allow	Support the decision sought to provide for other forms of aquatic offsetting and aquatic compensation is enabled where aquatic offsetting cannot be achieved. Retain financial contribution offsetting as optional.	Supported as agree with submitter that the financial contribution provisions are inconsistent with the NPS:FM and limits the ability to implement the effects management hierarchy.
S30 Dean Spicer	S30.005	Interpretation: Unplanned	Support	Allow	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decision requested to remove the prohibited 	Supported as it aligns with the relief sought by Cannon Point



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
		greenfield development			activity status and allow applications for new unplanned greenfield developments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasoning that GWRC should consider greenfield development individually based on impacts and proposed mitigants. • amendment of prohibited activity status to reflect the outcome of UHCC Plan Change 50. 	Development Ltd. in its original submission.
S194 Urban Edge Planning Group on behalf of Mangaroa Farms Ltd	S194.003	Interpretation: Unplanned greenfield development	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support that part of the submission that seeks that the definition of unplanned greenfield development does not relate to the Rural Lifestyle zone and related prohibited activity framework.	Support this part of the submission as it reflects Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s original submission that the inclusion of the Rural Lifestyle Zone as Unplanned Greenfield Area is inconsistent with the inclusion of other similar zones as planned development across other local authorities. However, the submission is only supported in



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
						part because this alone does not address the full scope of relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd.
S210 Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate	S210.012	Interpretation: Unplanned greenfield development	Support	Allow	Support decision requested to delete the definition. Agree that the 'Note' that includes reference to 30th October 2023 is inflexible and unnecessary and does not account for councils (such as UHCC) that may have a plan change going through the process that intends to rezone land to residential beyond that date, or for future plan changes, including the IPI UHCC plan change.	Supported as it aligns with the relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd. in its original submission.
S217 R P Mansell; A J Mansell, & M R Mansell	S217.003	Interpretation: Unplanned greenfield development	Support	Allow	Support decision sought that all greenfield development should be considered on its merits. Agree with reasoning that the dual plan change process required under PC1, to change greenfield development from	Supported as it aligns with the relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd. in its original submission.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					<p>unplanned to planned, should not be used as an alternative to the resource consenting process.</p> <p>Agree that the prohibition of activities is contrary to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Agree that insufficient evidence is provided in the s32 report.</p>	
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.048	Interpretation: Unplanned greenfield development	Support in part	Allow in Part	<p>Agree with submitter that Map 88 does not accurately reflect UHCC proposed Plan Change 50 notified on 4 October 2023.</p> <p>Agree that application of this provision from date of notification would circumvent ongoing planning process and prevent rezoning submissions on active plan changes.</p> <p>Agree in part with request to amend the definition to relate to the corrected map provided by</p>	Support in part because these aspects of the submission only partly provide for the development of the Cannon Point site.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					the submitter, insofar as it reflects the proposed General Residential Zoning of part of the Cannon Point Site under UHCC Plan Change 50. However, additional areas are sought to also be included, as provided for in Appendix A and Paragraph 1.12 of Cannon Point’s submission.	
S238 Greater Wellington Regional Council	S238.009	Interpretation: Unplanned greenfield development	Oppose	Disallow	The retention of the notification date of 30 October 2023 as it applies to this definition is opposed. The introduction of the urban zone, future urban zone or settlement zone does not address submitter concerns regarding the exclusion of the Rural Lifestyle Zone from planned development.	This submission is opposed as the amendments do not address the concerns raised by Cannon Point Development Ltd. regarding the application of the provision from the date of notification and the inclusion of the Cannon Point Site as an unplanned greenfield area on Map 88.
S33 Wellington City Council	S33.035	Policy WH.P2 Management of activities to achieve target attribute states and	Support	Allow	Support the submitter’s concerns regarding the prohibitive provisions framework.	The submission is supported as it reflects the relief sought and reasons set out in Cannon Point Development Ltd.’s submission on this provision.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
		coastal water objectives			<p>Agree that the prohibited activity status is not demonstrated through the s32 report as the most appropriate option to achieve the objectives of the plan, and that a Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate.</p> <p>Agree that the District Plan is the most appropriate tool to manage urban development as set out in s3.5(4) of the NPS-FM 2020.</p>	
S38 Summerset Group Holdings Limited	S38.005	Policy WH.P2 Management of activities to achieve target attribute states and coastal water objectives.	Support	Allow	Support the amendment sought to encourage greenfield development to minimise contaminants, rather than prohibiting greenfield development. Agree that the activity status will provide no consenting pathway for proposals located in these areas that may have positive/better outcomes for the	The submission is supported as it reflects the relief sought and reasons provided in Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. It also raises valid concerns regarding the impact on housing supply which are shared by Cannon Point Development Ltd.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					<p>community, freshwater and intensive rural activities.</p> <p>Agree that the dual plan change process required will make it difficult for the market to be responsive to providing housing, be expensive and impact the economic viability of development. Share the submitters concern that these impacts on housing supply have not been sufficiently assessed in the Section 32 Evaluation</p>	
S210 Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited	S210.025	Policy WH.P2 Management of activities to achieve target attribute states and coastal water objectives.	Support	Allow	Support the request to amend clause (a) to encourage unplanned and other greenfield development to minimise contaminants, rather than prohibiting unplanned greenfield development.	The proposed change to Clause (a) reflects the relief sought in Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission on this provision.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
and the Goodwin Estate Trust.						
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.067	Policy WH.P2 Management of activities to achieve target attribute states and coastal water objectives.	Support	Allow	Support the request to amend Clause (a) to manage unplanned greenfield development rather than prohibiting it. Agree with, and support, all reasons for relief sought, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposition to prohibition of development, as it limits options to give effect to NPS-UD and overrides District Plan changes and reviews currently underway or proposed in future. • greenfield development has more opportunity to address effects, particularly given space 	The proposed change to Clause (a) reflects the relief sought in Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission on this provision and supporting reasons. The submission also raises valid points regarding the opportunities for greenfield development to address adverse effects and the practical curtailing of future plan changes.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					<p>available to incorporate design and infrastructure solutions when compared to constrained urban environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibition in policy, and direction in objective above it, would render a future plan change an impossibility as it wouldn't implement higher order documents. Considers the section 32 analysis would need to consider provisions PC1 and recent changes to NRP and therefore would be at risk of being contrary to objectives and policies in these plans. 	
S161 GILLIES	S161.013	Policy WH.P15:	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support deletion of reference to financial contributions.	Support amendment to the policy to provide that financial



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD		Stormwater contaminant offsetting for new greenfield development.				contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S165 PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.013	Policy WH.P15: Stormwater contaminant offsetting for new greenfield development.	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support deletion of reference to financial contributions.	Support amendment to the policy to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S169 KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.008	Policy WH.P15: Stormwater contaminant offsetting for new greenfield development.	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support deletion of reference to financial contributions.	Supports amendment to the policy to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S173 ARAKURA	S173.013	Policy WH.P15:	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support deletion of reference to financial contributions.	Support amendment to the policy to provide that financial



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED		Stormwater contaminant offsetting for new greenfield development.				contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S177 Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.023	Policy WH.P15: Stormwater contaminant offsetting for new greenfield development.	Support	Allow	Support proposed amendment to be consistent with the National Policy Statement: Freshwater Management. Agree that financial contributions should not be a mandatory means of aquatic offsetting and that resource consent applicants should have an opportunity to provide for other means of compensation/offsetting as part of proposals.	Support amendments to the policy to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S206 Winstone Aggregates	S206.042	Policy WH.P15: Stormwater contaminant offsetting for	Support	Allow	Support proposed amendment to be consistent with the National Policy Statement: Freshwater Management. Agree that financial contributions should not be a mandatory means of aquatic	Support amendments to the policy to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
		new greenfield development.			offsetting and that resource consent applicants should have an opportunity to provide for other means of compensation/offsetting as part of proposals.	
S33 Wellington City Council	S33.048	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development.	Support	Allow	Agree with relief sought by submitter to allow for discretionary status (as this would be more consistent with objectives and effects management approach sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd.) or to delete policy. Agree with reasons regarding prohibitive provisions framework that is not demonstrated to be most appropriate option in section 32 report and application of case law.	The submission is supported as it aligns with the relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
38 Summerset Group Holdings Limited	S38.009	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development.	Support in part	Allow	Support relief sought to delete policy. Support reasons provided that oppose the prohibited approach to greenfield development.	Agree with the relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Support in part because should the Policy not be deleted in the first instance as sought; Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to amend the policy to reflect an effects-management approach.
S161 GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.014	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development	Support in part	Allow	Agree with relief sought to delete policy. Agree with opposition to prohibited approach to greenfield development. Agree that this does not provide a consenting pathway to consider a proposal that may have positive outcomes for the community or for freshwater.	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Support in part because should the Policy not be deleted in the first instance as sought, Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to amend the policy to reflect an effects-management approach.
S165 PUKERUA	S165.014	Policy WH.P16:	Support in part	Allow	Agree with relief sought to delete policy. Agree with opposition to	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
HOLDINGS LIMITED		Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development			prohibited approach to greenfield development. Agree that this does not provide a consenting pathway to consider a proposal that may have positive outcomes for the community or for freshwater.	generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Support in part because should the Policy not be deleted in the first instance as sought; Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to amend the policy to reflect an effects-management approach.
S169 KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.009	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development	Support in part	Allow	Agree with relief sought to delete policy. Agree with opposition to prohibited approach to greenfield development. Agree that this does not provide a consenting pathway to consider a proposal that may have positive outcomes for the community or for freshwater.	Agree with relief sought and reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Support in part because should the Policy not be deleted in the first instance as sought; Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to amend the policy to reflect an effects-management approach.
S173 ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT	S173.014	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new	Support in Part	Allow	Agree with relief sought to delete policy. Agree with opposition to prohibited approach to greenfield development. Agree that this does not provide a consenting	Agree with relief sought and reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Support in part because should the Policy not be deleted in



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
LIMITED		unplanned greenfield development			pathway to consider a proposal that may have positive outcomes for the community or for freshwater.	the first instance as sought; Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to amend the policy to reflect an effects-management approach.
S210 Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.	S210.032	Policy WH.P16: Stormwater discharges from new unplanned greenfield development.	Support	Allow	<p>Agree with relief sought to delete policy or amend policy to provide a more flexible effects management approach consistent with the objectives and other policies in PC1.</p> <p>Agree with the submitters, who do not consider that the implementation of the PC1 objectives requires or justifies the avoidance as the only option for managing stormwater discharges from unplanned greenfield development, and the subsequent prohibited activity rule approach.</p>	Agree with relief sought and reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
S161 GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.015	Policy WH.P31: Winter shut down of earthworks.	Support	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this policy. Support all the submitter's reasoning.	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.
S165 PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.015	Policy WH.P31: Winter shut down of earthworks.	Support	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this policy. Support all the submitter's reasoning.	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.
S210 Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.	S210.037	Policy WH.P31: Winter shut down of earthworks.	Support	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this policy. Support all the submitter's reasoning.	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.
S161 GILLIES GROUP	S161.021	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
MANAGEMENT LTD		redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity.			financial contributions for greenfield development.	
S165 PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.021	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity.	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield development.	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S169 KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.016	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity.	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield development.	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S173 ARAKURA PLAINS	S173.021	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
DEVELOPMENT LIMITED		redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity			financial contributions for greenfield development.	
S177 Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.035	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity.	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield development.	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S206 Winstone Aggregates	S206.053	Rule WH.R11: Stormwater from new and redeveloped impervious surfaces - discretionary activity.	Support in Part	Allow in Part	Supports request to delete clause (b) regarding the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield development.	Supports amendments to rule to provide that financial contributions are used in an appropriate way.
S210 Guildford Timber	S210.044	Rule WH.R13: Stormwater from new	Support	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this rule and introduce a non-complying activity rule for	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust.		unplanned greenfield development - prohibited activity			activities that cannot comply with one or more conditions or standards in proposed rules. Support and agree with all submitters supporting reasons.	generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.
S161 GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.023	Rule WH.R13: Stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development - prohibited activity	Support in part	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this rule and supporting reasons.	Cannon Point Development Ltd. supports the relief sought. However, in addition, it also seeks that stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development is managed under Rule WH.R11 as a discretionary activity or Rule WH.R12 as a non-complying activity.
S165 PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.023	Rule WH.R13: Stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development -	Support in Part	Allow	Support the relief sought to delete this rule and supporting reasons.	Cannon Point Development Ltd. supports the relief sought. However, in addition, it also seeks that stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development is managed under Rule WH.R11 as a



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
		prohibited activity.				discretionary activity or Rule WH.R12 as a non-complying activity.
S211 Hutt City Council	S211.022	Rule WH.R13: Stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development - prohibited activity	Support	Allow	Support relief sought. Strongly agree with all supporting reasons, including that the prohibited activity status precludes consenting pathways for development in unplanned greenfield areas that may have positive outcomes, as highlighted in Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.	Agree with relief sought and supporting reasons as they generally align with Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.104	Rule WH.R13: Stormwater from new unplanned greenfield development - prohibited activity	Support	Allow	Support relief sought to delete rule or amend significantly to change from prohibited and provide a consenting pathway for unplanned greenfield developments. Support reasons. In particular, concerns regarding the implications and practicality of	Agree with relief sought as it generally reflects that sought in Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission. Strongly agree with supporting reasons with respect to the implications for current and future plan changes.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					<p>this rule and that prohibition in policy, and the direction in objective above it, would effectively render a future plan change an impossibility because it would not be implementing higher order documents.</p> <p>Section 32 analysis for such a plan change would need to consider provisions in PC1 and recent changes to NRP and therefore would be at risk of being contrary to objectives and policies in these plans.</p>	
S238 Greater Wellington Regional Council	S238.018	Rule WH.R23: Earthworks - permitted activity.	Support	Allow	Supports the proposed amendment to provide that Rule WH.R23 should apply to all Earthworks.	Support as it provides for the relief sought by Cannon Point Development Ltd.
S261 Forest & Bird	S261.116	Rule WH.R23: Earthworks - permitted activity	Oppose	Disallow	Opposed as it is considered that the 5m setback, as proposed, is sufficient to protect ecosystems and maintain water quality.	Opposed as it is considered the 5m setback as notified is appropriate.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
S161 GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.025	Rule WH.R24: Earthworks - Restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Support relief sought to delete clause (b). Support all reasons in relation to this and impacts on the provision of housing supply.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission seeks deletion of clause (b), it also seeks the deletion of matter of discretion (8) and considers deletion of both parts are required to adequately address its concerns.
S165 PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.025	Rule WH.R24: Earthworks - Restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Support relief sought to delete clause (b). Support all reasons in relation to this and impacts on the provision of housing supply.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission seeks deletion of clause (b), it also seeks the deletion of matter of discretion (8) and considers deletion of both parts are required to adequately address its concerns.
S169 KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.020	Rule WH.R24: Earthworks - restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Support relief sought to delete clause (b). Support all reasons in relation to this.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission seeks deletion of clause (b), it also seeks the deletion of matter of discretion (8) and considers deletion of both parts are



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
						required to adequately address its concerns.
S173 ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LTD	S173.025	Rule WH.R24: Earthworks - restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Support relief sought to delete clause (b). Support all reasons in relation to this and impacts on the provision of housing supply.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission seeks deletion of clause (b), it also seeks the deletion of matter of discretion (8) and considers deletion of both parts are required to adequately address its concerns.
S211 Hutt City Council	S211.024	Rule WH.R24: Earthworks - restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Support the relief sought to delete clause (b). Support reasoning that the BAU approach for winter earthworks should be maintained as a standard condition of consent as a discretionary activity which would allow GW to provide permits to undertake earthworks within this period as appropriate and subject to conditions.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission seeks deletion of clause (b), it also seeks the deletion of matter of discretion (8) and considers deletion of both parts are required to adequately address its concerns.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
S225 Upper Hutt City Council	S225.126	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas - Upper Hutt City Council	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Supports the submitters stance that Map 88 as does not accurately reflect Council plan change 50 notified on 4 October 2023.</p> <p>Agree that application of this provision from date of notification would circumvent ongoing planning process and prevent rezoning submissions on active plan changes.</p> <p>Agree in part with request to amend the definition to relate to the corrected map provided by the submitter, insofar as it reflects the proposed General Residential Zoning of part of the Cannon Point Site under UHCC Plan Change 50. However, additional areas are sought to also be included, as provided for in</p>	Support in part because the relief sought will only provide for part of the Cannon Point site to be zoned as planned development, rather than the extent as sought in Appendix A and Paragraph 1.12 of Cannon Point Development Ltd.'s submission.



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose.</i> <i>Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
					Appendix A and Paragraph 1.12 of Cannon Point's submission.	
S38 Summerset Group Holdings Limited	S38.037	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas - Upper Hutt City Council.	Support in part	Allow	Support the relief sought by the submitter to delete Map 88. Support all reasons provided.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd seeks that, in the first instance, Map 88 is deleted, if this is not accepted, it seeks for the Map to be amended as provided for in its submission.
S161 GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.044	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas - Upper Hutt City Council.	Support in part	Allow	Support the relief sought by the submitter to delete Map 88. Support all reasons provided.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks that. in the first instance. Map 88 is deleted, if this is not accepted, it seeks for the Map to be amended as provided for in its submission.
S169 KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.039	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas - Upper Hutt City Council.	Support in part	Allow	Support the relief sought by the submitter to delete Map 88. Support all reasons provided.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks that. in the first instance. Map 88 is deleted, if this is not accepted, it seeks for the Map to be amended as provided for in its submission.
S173 ARAKURA PLAINS	S173.044	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield	Support in part	Allow	Support the relief sought by the submitter to delete Map 88.	Support in part because whilst Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks that, in the first instance, Map



Submitter number and name	Submission point number	Provision	Stance on the submission point	Decision Sought	Decision Sought <i>Illustrate which aspects of this original submission that you support or oppose. Please identify which part(s) (if not the whole submission point) of the original submission point that this further submission is in reference to.</i>	Reasons: <i>Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.</i>
DEVELOPMENT LIMITED		areas - Upper Hutt City Council.			Support all reasons provided.	88 is deleted, if this is not accepted, it seeks for the Map to be amended as provided for in its submission.
S194 Urban Edge Planning Group on behalf of Mangaroa Farms Ltd	S194.023	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas - Upper Hutt City Council.	Support in Part	Allow in part	Support relief sought to provide that the areas identified in Map 88 relating to unplanned greenfield development do not relate to development occurring in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Do not support the submitter's neutral stance.	The submission is supported in part only because the stance of the submitter differs. The scope of the submission only covers part of that area that Cannon Point Development Ltd. seeks to be excluded from Map 88 (in the instance it is not deleted).