Please enter your details below:	
1. Details of further submitter:	
***Submitter Name:** Full name, or Name of Organisation / Company	Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust
Contact person for submission: (If different to above)	Chris Hansen
Telephone no: (*Not required*)	[redacted]
***Address for service:** (Email, or physical address) Please note, an email address is the preferred method	chris@rmaexpert.co.nz
***I wish to be heard in support of my submission at a hearing**	Yes
***I would consider presenting a joint case at the hearing with others who make a similar submission**	Yes
2. Criteria applicable to Further Submitter:	
***Only certain people may make further submissions Please select the option that applies to you:**	
A) I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or	Yes
B) I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or	Yes
C) I am the local authority for the relevant area.	No
***Specify the reasoning behind why you qualify for either of these above options:**	Submitters are addressing the need for housing in the Hutt Valley; submitters own land affected by PC1; submitters operate a commercial forest that is affected by PC1
3. For the further submitter to action	
Service of your further submission: Please note that any person making a further submission **must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Greater Wellington.** Each submitter has an address for service available at: NRP PC1 Address for Service If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.	
4. Disclosures:	
If providing a submission on behalf of a company / organisation **I confirm that I have authority to do so:**	[redacted]
Date:	8-Mar-24

Public information:
Note that under the RMA all submissions and accompanying data must be made available for public inspection. To achieve that, Greater Wellington Regional Council will publish all Further Submissions and accompanying data on our website.
In providing a further submission on the Natural Resources Plan, Plan Change 1, you confirm that you have read and understood the below:

Plan Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan Information Statement.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. Please contact us at **privacy@gw.govt.nz**.

5. Further Submission:

• The original submissions received have been summarised into submission points and collated into one summary table.
This document(s) is a Summary of Decisions Requested:
NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested – By Submitter

NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested –By Provision

• Further submitters can submit on multiple submission points (identified in the Summary of Decisions Requested above) within the following section. Please use additional pages if necessary.
• If you are providing suggested text amendments to a provision, please do so in the following format:
- Suggested added text, shown as **bolded text** format
- Suggested deleted text, shown as ~~strikethrough~~ format
Please enter your Further Submission in the next worksheet. All of the original submitters and their associated submission points on the proposed change have been included so please place your comments in the corresponding cells.

If you have questions on how to use this submission form please email one of our friendly team at **regionalplan@gw.govt.nz**

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
Filter by the original submitter Name and associated Submitter Number	Unique identifying number allocated to each specific submission point	Support Oppose Support in part Oppose in part Not stated	Allow Disallow Allow in part Disallow in part	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.	Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.
S36 - Wellington Branch of New Zealand Farm Forestry Association	S36.010	Support	Allow	The withdrawal of the prohibition on harvesting forests	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and recognises the NES-CF addresses the concerns relating to managing adverse effects of commercial forests (as outlined in by the submitter in S36.013)
S36 - Wellington Branch of New Zealand Farm Forestry Association	S36.020	Support	Allow	Commission a technical review of the mapping of highest risk erodible land	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the accuracy of the Maps showing high risk erodible land
S36 - Wellington Branch of New Zealand Farm Forestry Association	S36.012	Support	Allow	Explore other ways of mitigating risk of erosion from steep slopes after harvesting rather than prohibiting Plantation Forestry	Submission is correct in identifying the need for input from experienced soil conservators and seeks other ways of mitigating the risk of erosion from steep slopes after harvesting rather than using the prohibited activity approach opposed by GTC in it's own submission
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.006	Support	Allow	Amend to correctly implement national planning standards	Request represents good planning practice and assists in the implementation of the NRP
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.007	Support	Allow	Delete or significantly amend provisions which have a lack of higher order document direction or evidentiary support	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.015	Support	Allow	Delete or significantly amend hydrological controls for all development, which are going beyond hydraulic neutrality, as these are unclear and seem to be overly onerous	Request represents good planning practice and is pragmatic and reasonable
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.005	Support	Allow	Amend maps as requested in submission	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the accuracy of the Maps at a property scale and using correct data, particularly Map 88
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.017	Support	Allow	Delete or amend rules surrounding plantation forestry trying to provide a higher level of protection than currently allowed under NES-CF	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.020	Support	Allow	Delete or amend the additional financial contributions relating to stormwater management	Submission raises key matter regarding lack of justification and an understanding of monitoring of these projects
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.014	Support	Allow	Delete provisions prohibiting urban expansion beyond existing urban zoned land, particularly where this does not align with recent rezoning notified before this plan change	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding unnecessary and onerous prohibiting of urban expansion beyond existing urban zoned land which is not good planning practice and contrary to the NPS-UD
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.048	Support	Allow	Amend date by which provisions apply to when Decisions are released on PC1	Amendment is considered pragmatic and appropriate and will allow planning processes (including zone changes through PC50 to the Upper Hutt District Plan) to proceed and be completed which is good planning practice
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.009	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete or amend Rule WH.R6 to remove thresholds and financial contributions	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.104	Support	Allow	Delete rule or amend Rule WH.R13 to change from prohibited and provide a consenting pathway for unplanned greenfield developments	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding prohibiting unplanned greenfield development which does not represent good planning practice, does not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S225 - Upper Hutt City Council	S225.120	Support in part	Allow in part	Remove requirements to pay financial contributions	Submitter raises a real concern that application of financial contributions could result in double dipping which is inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice
S237 - John Turkington Limited	S237.009	Support	Allow	Rules to be consistent with NES-CF	Request is consistent with GTC submission that seeks the NRP to rely on the requirements of the NES-CF to address water quality affects associated with commercial forestry which are considered appropriate; more rigorous requirements in the NRP are not considered necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S237 - John Turkington Limited	S237.011	Support in part	Allow in part	Council to provide evidence that NES-CF is insufficient to meet the objectives of water quality, ecosystem health and mana whenua values before progressing with PC1	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.020	Support	Allow	Retain financial contribution offsetting as optional	Request represents good planning practice as the PC1 provides for other forms of aquatic offsetting and aquatic compensation is enabled where aquatic offsetting cannot be

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					achieved and retaining financial contribution offsetting as an option is appropriate
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.022	Support	Allow	Review PC1 - Only provisions where freshwater is the primary issue to be subject to FPP - remaining provisions allocated to Schedule 1 process	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.025	Support	Allow	Update mapping with accurate evidence based mapping or delete definition and retain existing NRP definition; if definition retained, seek it be subject to the Part 1 Schedule 1 Process and not the FPP	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the accuracy of mapping and the provisions being subject to the Part 1 Schedule 1 Process and not the FPP
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.042	Support	Allow	Amend Policy WH.P15 as requested by submitter	While GTC sought for Policy WH.P15 to be retained as written in it's original submission, in principle GTC supports the amendments sought to better clarify how aquatic effects will be managed through aquatic offsetting or aquatic compensation that represents good planning practice that would implement the NPS-FM and achieve the purpose of the RMA
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.053	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.057	Support in part	Allow in part	Consider Rule WH.R18 under a Part 1 Schedule 1 process	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S206 - Winstone Aggregates	S206.058	Support in part	Allow in part	Consider Rule WH.R19 under a Part 1 Schedule 1 process	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S177 - Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.007	Support	Allow	Remove mandatory requirement for financial contributions as a condition of rules relating to stormwater management	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S177 - Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.035	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S177 - Transpower New Zealand Limited	S177.040	Support	Allow	Relocate rule to be part of the Part 1 Schedule 1 Process, and not the FPP	Request represents good planning practice and has legal merit
S188 - Wellington Fish and Game	S188.012	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the intent and wording of Policy WH.P10 as notified	The need to demonstrate functional need is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought * "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Decision Sought	Reason for feedback:
Regional Council					
S188 - Wellington Fish and Game Regional Council	S188.013	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the current approach in the objectives and policies and not add the requirement to demonstrate functional need	The need to demonstrate functional need is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.002	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain Target Attribute States as per notified PC1	The need for the additional TAS relating to 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.049	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O1 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.050	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O2 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.060	Oppose	Disallow	Retain wording of Objective WH.O9 as notified	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.062	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P1 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.063	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P2 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to prohibit and avoid adverse effects of unplanned greenfield development; include ephemeral watercourses; and prohibiting land use intensification that individually of collectively may lead to a decline in water quality is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.067	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P5 as notified	The need to amend the policy to apply to all discharges is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.089	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P28 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to add direction regarding large setbacks and a cap on the area logged in one harvest is not necessary in the NRP as the requirements of the NES-CF should take precedence; retaining of clause (c) is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.090	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P29 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM and NES-CF already addresses this matter
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.099	Oppose	Disallow	Retain permitted activity status of Rule WH.R5 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to controlled is not necessary as the permitted activity conditions are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.100	Oppose	Disallow	Retain controlled activity status of Rule WH.R6 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of control are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.110	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Rule WH.R17 as notified	The additional standards sought by the submitter include matters already addressed in the NES-FM and are not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA; including reference to ephemeral watercourses is unnecessary and inappropriate
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.111	Oppose	Disallow	Retain controlled activity status of Rule WH.R18 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of control are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.113	Oppose	Disallow	Retain controlled activity status of Rule WH.R20 as notified, subject to amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	If the rule remains, the need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.116	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Rule WH.R23 as notified	The additional standards sought by the submitter include matters already addressed in the NPS-FM and are not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NES-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA; including

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					reference to ephemeral watercourses is unnecessary and inappropriate
S261 - Forest & Bird	S261.117	Oppose	Disallow	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule WH.R24 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.006	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete clause (a) from Policy WH.P2 regarding the need for financial contributions for greenfield development	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.007	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy WH.P10	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.008	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Policy WH.P15	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.013	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R5	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.014	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R6	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.016	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete reference to financial contributions from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S169 - KORU HOMES NZ LIMITED	S169.036	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S286 - Taranaki Whānui	S286.004	Support	Allow	Freshwater effects of development of unplanned greenfield development addressed through resource consent process and not a regional plan change	Request represents good planning practice and is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA including s.6 matters
S286 - Taranaki Whānui	S286.032	Support	Allow	Amendments to Clause (a) of Policy WH.P2 as sought by submitter	Request represents good planning practice and addresses issue raised by submitter regarding the policy imposing costs and impacts on them developing their ancestral lands; amendment will ensure the purpose of the RMA achieved, including s.6 matters
S286 - Taranaki Whānui	S286.047	Support	Allow	Delete Policy WH.P16	Request is consistent with GTC submission; represents good planning practice; and addresses issue raised by submitter

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					regarding the policy imposing costs and impacts on them developing their ancestral lands; amendment will ensure the purpose of the RMA achieved, including s.6 matters
S286 - Taranaki Whānui	S286.077	Support	Allow	Delete Rule WH.R13	Request is consistent with GTC submission; represents good planning practice; and addresses issue raised by submitter regarding the policy imposing costs and impacts on them developing their ancestral lands; amendment will ensure the purpose of the RMA achieved, including s.6 matters
S286 - Taranaki Whānui	S286.088	Support	Allow	Delete clause (b) of Rule WH.R24 regarding the earthworks winter shut down period	Request is consistent with GTC submission; represents good planning practice as the submitter identifies the possibility of this clause can escalate the activity to a non-complying activity
S18 - PF Olsen Ltd	S18.002	Support in part	Allow in part	Exclude forestry from earthworks rules	Request is consistent with GTC submission that seeks the NRP to rely on the requirements of the NES-CF to address water quality affects associated with commercial forestry which are considered appropriate; more rigorous requirements in the NRP are not considered necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S18 - PF Olsen Ltd	S18.022	Support	Allow	Amend Policy WH.P2 to exclude forestry activities from management to achieve target attribute states	Request is consistent with GTC submission that seeks the NRP to rely on the requirements of the NES-CF to address water quality affects associated with commercial forestry which are considered appropriate; more rigorous requirements in the NRP are not considered necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S18 - PF Olsen Ltd	S18.032	Support	Allow	Amend Rule WH.R17 to default to the NES-CF standards for vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry	Request is consistent with GTC submission that seeks the NRP to rely on the requirements of the NES-CF to address water quality affects associated with commercial forestry which are considered appropriate; more rigorous requirements in the NRP are not considered necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S18 - PF Olsen Ltd	S18.037	Support	Allow	Amend Rule WH.R23 to default to the NES-CF standards for earthworks associated with commercial forestry	Request is consistent with GTC submission that seeks the NRP to rely on the requirements of the NES-CF to address water quality affects associated with commercial forestry which are considered appropriate; more rigorous requirements in the NRP are not considered necessary to

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought * "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Decision Sought	Reason for feedback:
					implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.023	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Objective WH.O2 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to add a reference to 'ephemeral watercourses' and 'natural form and character' is opposed as including these waterbodies in the objective is unnecessary and impractical and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.032	Oppose	Disallow	Retain wording of Objective WH.O9 as notified	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.034	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P1 (b) as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need for the additional wording 'natural form and character' and the requirement to restore natural form and character is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.035	Oppose	Disallow	Either delete clause (f) of Policy WH.P2 or amend as requested by GTC in their original submission	The need to avoid (and not manage) adverse effects from earthworks, forestry and vegetation clearance activities is not required in the NRP and is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.048	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P28 as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	The need to require setbacks, alternative harvesting methods and/or limit harvesting is not necessary in the NRP as the requirements of the NES-CF should take precedence and the additional wording is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.049	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P29 as notified	The need to require setback distances is not required in the NRP as the NES-FM and NES-CF already addresses this matter
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.060	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain controlled activity status of Rule WH.R20 as notified, subject to amendment sought by GTC in their original submission	If the rule remains, the need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary or restricted discretionary is not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.063	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the wording of Rule WH.R23 as notified	The greater setback sought by the submitter is already addressed in the NES-FM and the NES-CF and is not required in the NRP and are not necessary to implement the NPS-FM or to achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S222 - Environmental Defence Society Inc.	S222.064	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain restricted discretionary activity status of Rule WH.R24 as notified	The need to reclassify the activity status to discretionary is not necessary as the matters of discretion are robust and appropriate and will ensure the implementation of the NPS-FM and the purpose of the RMA is achieved
S37 - Donald Skerman	S37.001	Oppose	Disallow	Delete the prohibition of unplanned greenfield development as per GTC's original submission and financial contributions requirement as supported by submitters seeking this outcome in this further submission	The request to retain the prohibition of unplanned greenfield development and the mandatory financial fees is unnecessary and onerous, is not good planning practice and would not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S37 - Donald Skerman	S37.003	Oppose	Disallow	Delete the 'unplanned greenfield area' covering the Southern Growth Area from Map 88 as requested in GTC's original submission	The request to retain the submitter's land known as the Southern Growth Area does not represent good planning practice and fails to appropriately implement the requirements of the NPS-UD and achieve the purpose of the RMA
S37 - Donald Skerman	S37.004	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the paper road extending from Kiln St as shown on Planning Map 88	The request is not a regional plan matter and is unnecessary and inappropriate for the Council to consider as part of PC1
S216 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (Te Rūnanga)	S216.006	Support	Allow	Change Rule WH.R13 from prohibited to non-complying	The request is consistent with GTC's original submission and represents good planning practice and would implement the NPS-UD and achieve the purpose of the RMA
S282 - Pat van Berkel	S282.014	Oppose	Disallow	Retain the wording of Policy WH.P10 as notified	The request is unnecessary and inappropriate, does not represent good planning practice and would not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S282 - Pat van Berkel	S282.021	Oppose	Disallow	Delete the 'unplanned greenfield area' covering the Southern Growth Area from Map 88 as requested in GTC's original submission	The request to retain the submitter's land known as the Southern Growth Area does not represent good planning practice and fails to appropriately implement the requirements of the NPS-UD and achieve the purpose of the RMA
S110 - Save Our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated	S110.001	Oppose	Disallow	Either delete Policy WH.P16 or amend to provide for stormwater discharges from unplanned greenfield development as sought in GTC's original submission	The request not to allow any new stormwater discharges from the Southern Growth Area (being GTC's land) is unnecessary and inappropriate, does not represent good planning practice and would not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S195 - New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	S195.005	Support	Allow	Remove regulating of replanting of plantation (commercial) forests	The request represents good planning practice as the NES-CF addresses effects of plantation (commercial) forestry and controls on replanting are not needed in the NRP to implement the NPS-FM and to achieve the purpose of the RMA

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
S195 - New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	S195.029	Support	Allow	Remove rules more stringent than the NES-CF	The request represents good planning practice as the NES-CF addresses effects of plantation (commercial) forestry and more stringent are not needed in the NRP to implement the NPS-FM and to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S195 - New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	S195.041	Support in part	Allow in part	Remove afforestation from Rule WH.R20	Should the rule be retained and not deleted as requested by the GTC in their submission, the amendment requested represents good planning practice as the NES-CF addresses effects of plantation (commercial) forestry and controls on afforestation are not needed in the NRP to implement the NPS-FM and to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S195 - New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	S195.030	Support	Allow	Remove rules more stringent than the NES-CF	The request represents good planning practice as the NES-CF addresses effects of plantation (commercial) forestry and more stringent are not needed in the NRP to implement the NPS-FM and to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S195 - New Zealand Farm Forestry Association (NZFFA)	S195.031	Support	Allow	Remove rules more stringent than the NES-CF	The request represents good planning practice as the NES-CF addresses effects of plantation (commercial) forestry and more stringent are not needed in the NRP to implement the NPS-FM and to achieve the purpose of the RMA
S256 - Waste Management NZ Limited	S256.006	Oppose	Disallow	Delete definition of unplanned greenfield development as sought in GTC's original submission	The request to amend the current definition of unplanned greenfield development is unnecessary and inappropriate and does not represent good planning practice and would not implement the NPS-UD or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S2 - Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	S2.001	Support in part	Allow in part	Include definition of 'greenfield development'	Request represents good planning practice and will assist with the implementation of the NRP
S2 - Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	S2.031	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S161 - GILLIES GROUP MANAGEMENT LTD	S161.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S161 - GILLIES GROUP	S161.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
MANAGEMENT LTD					way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S165 - PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S165 - PUKERUA HOLDINGS LIMITED	S165.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S173 - ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	S173.021	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S173 - ARAKURA PLAINS DEVELOPMENT LIMITED	S173.041	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S207 - Firth Industries Limited	S207.018	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S236 - Parkvale Road Limited	S236.009	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S236 - Parkvale Road Limited	S236.011	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S251 - Peka Peka Farm Limited	S251.008	Support	Allow	Delete Clause (b) from Rule WH.R11	Request represents good planning practice as the policy proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way
S251 - Peka Peka Farm Limited	S236.015	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S43 - Fulton Hogan Ltd	S43.013	Oppose	Disallow	Delete Policy WH.P31 in its entirety, as sought by GTC in their submission	The additional provisions sought to Policy WH.P31 regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought * "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Decision Sought	Reason for feedback:
					impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S43 - Fulton Hogan Ltd	S43.017	Oppose	Disallow	Delete clause (b) from Rule WH.R24 regarding the earthworks winter shut down period	The additional provisions sought to Clause (b) regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S190 - David McKevitt	S190.002	Oppose	Disallow	Delete Policy WH.P31 in its entirety, as sought by GTC in their submission	The additional provisions sought to Policy WH.P31 regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S190 - David McKevitt	S190.004	Oppose	Disallow	Delete clause (b) from Rule WH.R24 regarding the earthworks winter shut down period	The additional provisions sought to Clause (b) regarding the winter shut down period are unnecessary and impracticable and do not represent good planning practice, and would not implement the NPS-FM or achieve the purpose of the RMA
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.001	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Include a new definition of 'greenfield development' but not with the restrictive criteria included in the definition proposed by the submitter	While the request to include a new definition of 'greenfield development' is appropriate and necessary and supported, however, the area and lot restrictions proposed by the submitter are opposed as they are not necessary to be included in a definition to describe what a greenfield development is
S219 - Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	S219.006	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Retain the definition of hydrological control as notified, subject to the amendment sought by GTC in it's original submission	The additional wording sought by the submitter is overly detailed and technical and not necessary or appropriate to be included in a definition in the NRP
S243 - Land Matters Limited	S243.001	Support	Allow	Include definition of 'greenfield development'	Request represents good planning practice and will assist with the implementation of the NRP
S243 - Land Matters Limited	S243.032	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S241 - Pukerua Property Group Ltd	S241.038	Support	Allow	Delete Schedule 30	Request represents good planning practice as the schedule proposed to use financial contributions in an inappropriate way and is not necessary in the NRP to implement the NPS-UD or to achieve the purposes of the RMA
S247 - Carrus Corporation Ltd	S247.001	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Include a new definition of 'greenfield development' but not with the restrictive criteria included in the definition proposed by the submitter	While the request to include a new definition of 'greenfield development' is appropriate and necessary and supported, however, the area and lot restrictions proposed by the

Original Submitter Name, and Number	Submission point Number	Stance*	Decision Sought *	Decision Sought "The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is..."	Reason for feedback:
					submitter are opposed as they are not necessary to be included in a definition to describe what a greenfield development is
S252 - Thames Pacific	S252.001	Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Include a new definition of 'greenfield development' but not with the restrictive criteria included in the definition proposed by the submitter	While the request to include a new definition of 'greenfield development' is appropriate and necessary and supported, however, the area and lot restrictions proposed by the submitter are opposed as they are not necessary to be included in a definition to describe what a greenfield development is

Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region – Further Submission Form (Form 6)

Further Submissions on a Publicly Notified Change to a Plan or Policy Statement under Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991. The closing date for Further Submissions is 5:00pm Friday 8 March 2024.

Who can make a Further Submission?

A Further Submission may be made by any person who:

- Represents a relevant aspect of the public interest; or
- Has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest of the general public. (an explanation for the reasoning behind why you qualify for either of these categories must also be provided); or
- The local authority itself.

More information on the Natural Resources Plan, Plan Change 1 and on the consultation and submission processes please visit our website.

How to make a Further Submission:

1. You can use the online submission portal; or
2. You can use the Further Submission Form(s) (Form 6).

- This Further Submission Form(s) (Form 6) – Microsoft Word version; or
- Further Submission Form(s) (Form 6) – Microsoft Excel version.

  Please send the Further Submission Form in by one of the below methods:
  - Email it to the regionalplan@gw.govt.nz.
  - Post it to: PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142, ATT: Hearings Advisor.
  - Drop it off at reception at one of our offices, marked ATT: Hearings Advisor.

Due to delays in postal services and the timeframe for making Further Submissions, we highly recommend that an electronic copy of your Further Submission is provided by the closing date.

Further Submission Form requirements:

- All sections of this form need to be completed for the Further Submission to be accepted.
- You must send a copy of your Further Submission to the original submitter.

  Any person making a Further Submission must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Greater Wellington. Each submitter has an address for service available on our website. If you have made a Further Submission on several original submissions, then copies of your Further Submission will need to be served with each original submitter.

1. Details of further submitter	
Name of Submitter: (First and last name, or organisation / company)	Guildford Timber Company Limited, Silverstream Forest Limited and the Goodwin Estate Trust
Address for service: (Email, or physical address) Please note an email address is the preferred method	Chris@rmaexpert.co.nz
Phone: (Optional)	[redacted]

Contact person for submission: (If different to above)	Chris Hansen
I wish to be heard in support of my submission at a hearing:	Yes
I would consider presenting a joint case at the hearing with others who make a similar submission:	Yes
2. Criteria applicable to Further Submitter:	
Only certain people may make further submissions Please select the option that applies to you:	
A) I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or	Yes
B) I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or	Yes
C) I am the local authority for the relevant area.	Yes
Specify the reasoning behind why you qualify for either of these above options:	Submitters are addressing the need for housing in the Hutt Valley; submitters own land affected by PC1; submitters operate a commercial forest that is affected by PC1

3. For the further submitter to action

Service of your further submission:

Please note that any person making a further submission **must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Greater Wellington.**

Each submitter has an address for service available at: www.gw.govt.nz/nrp-pc1-submissions.

If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.

4. Disclosures:

If submitting on behalf of a company / organisation:
I confirm that I have permission to provide this information on behal of the company / organisation [redacted] 15 March 2024

Public information:

Note that under the RMA all submissions and accompanying data must be made available for public inspection. To achieve that, Greater Wellington Regional Council will publish all Further Submissions and accompanying data on our website.

In providing a further submission on the Natural Resources Plan, Plan Change 1, you confirm that you have read and understood the Plan Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan Information Statement.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. Please contact us at privacy@gw.govt.nz.

5. Further Submission:

- The original submissions received have been summarised into submission points and collated into one summary table. This document(s) is a Summary of Decisions Requested:
  - NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested – By Submitter
  - NRP PC 1 - Summary of Decisions Requested – By Provision
- Further submitters can submit on multiple submission points (identified in the Summary of Decisions Requested above) within the following section. Please use additional pages if necessary.
- If you are providing suggested text amendments to a provision, please do so in the following

format:
Suggested added text, shown as **bolded text** format
Suggested deleted text, shown as ~~strikethrough~~ format

Please enter further submission points in the table on the following page(s)

4. Further submission points

Please complete the following table with details of which original submission points you support and/or oppose, and why.

*Submitter name or, Submitter number of the submission you are commenting on:	*Submission point number: Unique identifying number allocated to each specific submission point, located in the second column of the summary of decisions requested table:	*Stance on the submission point: (Support, Oppose, Oppose in part, Support in part, Not stated)	*Decision sought: (Allow, Disallow, Allow in part, or Disallow in part)	Decision sought 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.	Reasons: Please provide a summary of the reasons why you support or oppose this original submission to help us understand your position.
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.001 – General comments - overall	Support in part	Allow in part	Align rules relating to forestry with requirements of the NES-CF	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.023 – Definition - Erosion and sediment management plan	Support	Allow	Use NES-CF schedule 4 & 5 for erosion and sediment plans relating to commercial forestry	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.056 – Policy WH.P28: Achieving reductions in sediment discharges from plantation forestry	Support in part	Allow in part	Remove policy and reset to address deficiencies as requested by submitter	Submission is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding Policy WH.P28
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.057 – Policy WH.P29: Management of earthworks	Support	Allow	Amend policy as requested by submitter and include a new	Request for clarification that the policy relates to general earthworks and not commercial

				policy covering commercial forestry earthworks consistent with the NES-CF	forestry and the request for a new policy covering commercial forestry is appropriate to implement the objectives of the NRP and represents good planning practice
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.066 – Rule WH.R17 – Vegetation clearance on highest erosion risk land – permitted activity	Support	Allow	Separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry activities from general vegetation clearance and rely on NES-CF	The submitter makes a good point being the need to separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry that Is already addressed by the NES-CF – this request is consistent with GTC's own submission seeking the provisions of the NES-CF to be relied on
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.067 – Rule WH.R18 – Vegetation clearance on highest erosion risk land – controlled activity	Support	Allow	Separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry activities from general vegetation clearance and rely on NES-CF	The submitter makes a good point being the need to separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry that Is already addressed by the NES-CF – this request is consistent with GTC's own submission seeking the provisions of the NES-CF to be relied on
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.068 – Rule WH.R19 – Vegetation clearance – discretionary activity	Support	Allow	Separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry activities from general vegetation clearance and rely on NES-CF	The submitter makes a good point being the need to separate vegetation clearance associated with commercial forestry that Is already addressed by the NES-CF – this request is consistent with GTC's own submission seeking the provisions of the NES-CF to be relied on
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.069 – Rule WH.R20 – Plantation forestry – controlled activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete rule and rely on provisions of NES-CF	The request is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry

					being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.070 – Rule WH.R21 – Plantation forestry – discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Delete rule and rely on provisions of NES-CF	The request is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.071 – Rule WH.R21 – Plantation forestry on highest erosion risk land – discretionary activity	Support	Allow	Delete rule and rely on provisions of NES-CF	The request is consistent with GTC's own submission and the concern regarding the level of control on commercial forestry being onerous and not consistent with the requirements of the NES-CF
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.072 – Rule WH.R23 – Earthworks – permitted activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Align earthworks associated with commercial forestry activities with the provisions of the NES-CF	The submitter makes a good point being the need to align earthworks associated with commercial forestry with the requirements of the NES-CF – this request is consistent with GTC's own submission seeking the provisions of the NES-CF to be relied on
S288 China Forest Group Company New Zealand Limited	S288.073 – Rule WH.R24 – Earthworks – restricted discretionary activity	Support in part	Allow in part	Separate earthworks associated with commercial forestry activities from general earthworks and rely on NES-CF	The submitter makes a good point being the need to separate earthworks associated with commercial forestry that Is already addressed by the NES-CF – this request is consistent with GTC's own submission seeking the provisions of the NES-CF to be relied on

S37 - Donald Skerman	Map 88: Unplanned greenfield areas – Upper Hutt City Council	Oppose	Disallow	All GTC land on Map 88 to be categorized as 'Planned/existing urban area'	The request to remove GTC from the 'Planned/existing urban area' is opposed as it would not provide for the implementation of the NPS-UD, the objectives of the RPS, and the requirement to meet the housing needs of Upper Hutt City. The request is contrary to GTC's own submission to seeking all of its land to be included as 'Planned/existing urban area' (submission Point #2)