

***Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan***  
**Decision Report pursuant to Clause 10 of the First Schedule**  
**of the Resource Management Act 1991**

---

**Subject: Chapter 9 - Landscape**

**In Reference to:**

- ***Landscape Provisions 9.1 – 9.4***
  - ***District Wide Rules 21.1.4, 21.4(b) and (c)***
  - ***Assessment Criteria 22.1.5***
  - ***Appendices 1.1 and 1.2***
- 

## **9.0 General**

<b>Submitter Number</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>	<b>Further Submitter Name and Number</b>	<b>Further Submission Support/Oppose</b>
492.20	Horticulture New Zealand	-	-
220.1	Stonehenge Aotearoa	FS 46 Java Trust Limited	Support
383.2	Sustainable Wairarapa	-	-

### **Discussion**

**Horticulture New Zealand** (492.20) requests to maintain the focus on clearly defined outstanding landscapes and natural features.

**Sustainable Wairarapa** (383.2) supports the inclusion of the landscape section.

**Stonehenge Aotearoa** (220.1) requests the night sky be protected by adoption of the International Astronomical Union Guidelines for minimising urban sky glow near astronomical observatories, and shields on outdoor lighting. **Java Trust Limited** supports this submission.

### **Evidence Heard**

**Sustainable Wairarapa** presented evidence supporting the inclusion of the landscape chapter.

**Stonehenge Aotearoa** presented evidence highlighting the importance of the night sky for astronomical observatories, and that the night sky formed part of the Wairarapa landscape.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

Chapter 9 ensures the responsibilities and roles of District Councils under Sections 6 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991 are provided for in the District Plan. The Chapter identifies the significant resource management issues for the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The Chapter also takes into account maintaining and enhancing amenity values, which includes values associated with the landscape.

The Commissioners noted support from some submitters for the Chapter and retaining the Plan provisions.

The Commissioners acknowledge the value of the night sky, and its contribution as an important element in the Wairarapa. However, the Commissioners do not consider the sky (day or night) forms part of the landscape. The matter of protecting the night sky is further addressed in the General Amenity Chapter of the Plan.

## Decision

Submission Reference: 492.20	Accept
220.1	Reject
FS 46	Reject
383.2	Accept

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The Landscape Chapter provisions represent the most appropriate approach for managing the range of resource management issues associated with the Wairarapa landscape.
- The management of the amenity of the night sky is most appropriately managed in the General Amenity Chapter of the Plan.

## 9.1 Introduction

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
521.13	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	Support Support

## Discussion

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.13) seeks that the first paragraph of '9.1 Introduction' be amended to outline that the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes is bound by the Purpose of the Act and the definition of sustainable management. The submission also seeks retention of paragraph 5 of '9.1 Introduction'. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** (FS85) and **D Riddiford** (FS112) support this submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding reference to the Act's purpose of promoting sustainable management. They also requested the addition of a sentence in paragraph 5 to acknowledge the broad range of considerations in Part 2 of the Act.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that referring to the overall purpose of the Act better reflects the requirements of the Act.

However, the Commissioners do not consider the addition of the sentence about the broad range of matters in Part 2 is the most appropriate approach. Chapter 9 of the Plan focuses on landscape issues, therefore, it is appropriate that the Introduction specifically deals with these matters. In assessing a resource consent application, the District Plan would be applied as a whole, with other chapters in the Plan addressing the other Part 2 matters do not associated with landscape issues.

## Decision: 9.1 Introduction

Submission Reference: 521.13	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part

## Decision Amendment: 9.1 Introduction

Amend the first paragraph of '9.1 Introduction' as follows:

***"The Purpose of the Resource Management Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. In achieving the Purpose of the Act, Section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires ~~the~~ recognition and provision for the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and Section 7 of the Act requires the Council to have regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values, which includes values associated with the landscape."***

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended text better describes the purpose of the Act in promoting sustainable development, which includes the landscape matters.
- The Landscape Chapter is one chapter in the District Plan and addresses requirements of the Act on this issue. Other Part 2 matters in the Act are most appropriately addressed in the other respective chapters of the Plan.

## 9.2 Significant Resource Management Issues: Issue 4

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.20	Department of Conservation	-	-
524.26	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	FS 157 J Diederich FS 155 K Reedy	Support Support
238.2	R Scott	-	-
239.2	S Scott	-	-

### Discussion

The **Department of Conservation** (525.20) seeks that Significant Resource Management Issue 4 be deleted or re-worded to be consistent with Part 2 of the Act which includes the protection of outstanding landscape values as a matter of national importance. It also opposes reference to having due regard to the reasonable exercise of private property rights when considering landscape protection.

**Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)** (524.26) seeks Significant Resource Management Issue 4 to be amended by deleting reference to the public estate being excluded from Issue 4 as the Plan should be neutral in its application irrespective of land tenure. **J Diederich** and **K Reedy** support this submission.

### Evidence Heard

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence accepting the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining Issue Statement 4.

### Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that many of the Wairarapa's outstanding landscapes and natural features are located within reserves or the conservation estate such as State Forest Parks. The Issue statement appropriately recognises that areas identified as outstanding landscape on private land is use for a range of purposes, and these uses need to be taken into account in the management of the landscape values. The existing Issue statement is appropriate as the underlying land use influences the qualities and characteristics of an outstanding landscape.

### Decision: 9.1 Introduction

Submission Reference: 525.20	Reject
524.26	Reject
FS 157	Reject
FS 155	Reject

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Issue statement appropriately recognises the underlying land use influences the qualities and characteristics of an outstanding landscape.

### 9.3.1 Objective Lan1 – Outstanding Landscape & Natural Features

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
521.18	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited	Support Support Support

#### Discussion

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.18) seeks that Objective 9.3.1 be amended to focus on outstanding landscapes being protected from *inappropriate subdivision, use and development* rather than from *the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development*. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc), D Riddiford** and **Mighty River Power Limited** support this submission.

#### Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence noting the Section 42A report and recommendation addressed their concern.

#### Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that adding the reference to “inappropriate” subdivision, use and development is better expressed in terms of consistency with the Resource Management Act 1991.

#### Decision: 9.3.1 Objective Lan1

Submission Reference: 521.18	Accept
FS 112	Accept
FS 85	Accept
FS 74	Accept

#### Decision Amendment: 9.3.1 Objective Lan1

Amend 9.3.1 Objective Lan1 by inserting the word “inappropriate” as follows:

“9.3.1 Objective Lan1 – Outstanding Landscape & Natural Features

To identify and protect the Wairarapa’s outstanding landscapes and natural features from the adverse effects of **inappropriate** subdivision, use and development.”

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Objective better expresses the purpose and principles of the Act.

### 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Policy (a)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.21	Department of Conservation	FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited	Support
524.27	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	FS 52 Horticulture New Zealand FS 84 Meridian Energy Limited FS 54 New Zealand Winegrowers	Support Support Support

## Discussion

The **Department of Conservation** (525.21) seeks that a timeframe of 2008 be added to Policy (a) to provide greater certainty of the period within which the outstanding landscapes and natural features will be identified and assessed. **Mighty River Power Limited** supports this submission.

**Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)** (524.27) seeks Policy (a) be amended by adding a statement that the process of identifying outstanding landscapes and natural features will include full consultation with land owners when in private ownership or with the wider community when in Crown or Council ownership. **Horticulture New Zealand, Meridian Energy Limited** and **New Zealand Winegrowers** support this submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence accepting and supporting the Section 42A report recommendation that Method 9.3.4(a) already addressed this matter.

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence accepting the Section 42A report recommendation that Method 9.3.4(a) already addressed this matter.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that the relief sought by the submitters is already provided for in Method 9.3.4(a).

In terms of consultation, the Commissioners anticipate the future landscape assessment would include consultation with the respective landowners and wider community. However, this consultation process does not need to be detailed in the Methods, as it would be determined as part of the process for undertaking the assessment.

### Decision: 9.3.2 Policy (a)

Submission Reference: 525.21      Reject  
FS 74      Reject

524.27      Reject  
FS 52      Reject  
FS 84      Reject  
FS 54      Reject

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing policies and methods are the most effective in managing the future assessment of landscape values in the Wairarapa.

### 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Policy (c)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
441.1	Genesis Power Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 84 Meridian Energy Limited FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited	Support Support Support Support
521.19	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited FS 16 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support Support
238.2	R Scott	-	-

### Discussion

**Genesis Power Limited** (441.1) seeks that Policy (c) be amended as the submitter considers that the requirement to “protect the particular attributes and values” is superfluous, as by avoiding, remedying or mitigating the effects on these landscapes these attributes and values will be protected. **D Riddiford, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc), Meridian Energy Limited** and **Mighty River Power Limited** support this submission.

**Meridian Energy Limited** (521.19) seeks Policy (c) be amended to focus on landscapes being protected from *inappropriate subdivision, use and development* rather than all effects. **Mighty River Power Limited** and **Transpower New Zealand Limited** support this submission.

**R Scott** (238.2) seeks Policy (c) to be retained as currently worded.

## Evidence Heard

**Genesis Power Limited** presented evidence stating the requirement to 'protect the particular attributes and values' is narrowly focused and is superfluous. More appropriately wording of avoiding, remedying and mitigated the adverse effects would ensure the values of the landscape are protected.

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence stating the Act requires the protection of outstanding landscapes and natural features from 'inappropriate' development, and suggested alternative policy wording.

**Transpower New Zealand Limited** presented evidence requesting the policy specifically refer to 'inappropriate' development.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters, that the policy is to be consistent with the purpose and principles of the Act. The wording suggested by Meridian Energy Ltd is adopted by the Commissioners in part, as it recognises the requirements of the Act. However, the Commissioners do not support the use of the phrase 'where practicable' in avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects, as the Act does not use this approach.

## Decision: 9.3.2 Policy (c)

Submission Reference: 441.1	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part
FS 84	Accept in part
FS 74	Accept in part
521.19	Accept in part
FS 74	Accept in part
FS 16	Accept in part
238.2	Accept in part

## Decision Amendment: 9.3.2 Policy (c)

Amend 9.3.2 Policy (c) to read as follows:

~~"Control development affecting~~ **Protect the particular attributes and values of outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate development, with any adverse effects on those** ~~by ensuring all proposals are able to protect the particular attributes and values being , with any adverse effects satisfactorily avoided, remedied or mitigated."~~

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Policy better expresses the outstanding landscape and natural feature responsibilities in accordance with the purpose and principles of the Act.



### 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Policy (d)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
441.2	Genesis Power Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 84 Meridian Energy Limited FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited FS 16 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support Support Support Support Support
521.20	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	Oppose Oppose
238.2	R Scott	-	-

#### Discussion

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.20) and **R Scott** (238.2) seek Policy (d) be retained as currently worded. **D Riddiford** and **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** oppose this submission.

**Genesis Power Ltd** (441.2) opposes Policy (d) in part and seeks that it be amended as it considers the requirement for new developments to be visually absorbed into the landscape to be an onerous restriction for any development. Genesis Power Ltd considers that its suggested changes to the Policy mean that the values and attributes of the outstanding landscapes and natural features will still be protected. **D Riddiford, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc), Meridian Energy Limited, Mighty River Power Limited** and **Transpower New Zealand Limited** support this submission.

#### Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence expressing concern with the phrase ‘visually absorbed’, and they contended could mean anything. They withdrew their original submission on Policy (d), and support the original submission from Genesis Power on Policy (d).

**Genesis Power Limited** presented evidence also relating to the phrase ‘visually absorbed’, which it contended to be an onerous restriction.

**Transpower New Zealand Limited** presented evidence similar to the above two parties, noting the phrase ‘visually absorbed’ to be inappropriate, and request it be deleted.

#### Commissioners’ Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters that the phrase ‘visually absorbed’ may be problematic. The intent of Policy (d) is to encourage and support developments to be sympathetic with the particular attributes and values of the different outstanding landscapes. The location and design of developments are two key factors which influence the effects on outstanding landscapes.

Therefore, Policy (d) has been amended to better reflect this intent, and focuses on supporting good design outcomes.

### Decision: 9.3.2 Policy (d)

Submission Reference: 521.20	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part
441.2	Accept
FS 112	Accept
FS 85	Accept
FS 84	Accept
FS 74	Accept
FS 16	Accept
238.2	Accept in part

### Decision Amendment: 9.3.2 Policy (c)

Amend 9.3.2 Policy (d) to read as follows:

*~~“Encourage new development to be located and designed in a way that it will be visually absorbed within the landscape, and protects the attributes and values of the Wairarapa’s outstanding landscapes and natural features.”~~*

### Consequential Amendment: 9.3.3 Explanation

Delete the following sentence from the fourth paragraph of 9.3.3 Explanation:

*~~“...landscape patterns and character. The ability of the landscape to visually absorb the activity or development with minimal adverse effects will be determined as part of the consent process. Policy and assessment criteria...”~~*

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Policy better expresses the intent of encouraging development in locations and design which protects the attributes and values of the outstanding landscapes and natural features.

### 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Policy (g)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
441.3	Genesis Power Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited	Support Support Support

521.21	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited FS 16 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support Support Support Support
238.2	R Scott	-	-

## Discussion

**Genesis Power Ltd** (441.3) seeks that Policy (g) either be deleted or amended to clearly identify the areas in the vicinity of outstanding landscapes and natural features, and elaboration on what this would mean for the management of such areas in terms of subdivision, use and development. **D Riddiford, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** and **Mighty River Power Limited** support this submission.

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.21) seeks that Policy (g) be amended to focus on the wording of the Act by including text that recognises that under the RMA landscapes are not to be protected from all adverse effects, but from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. **D Riddiford, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc), Mighty River Power Limited and Transpower New Zealand Limited** support this submission.

**R Scott** (238.2) seeks that Policy (g) be retained as currently worded.

## Evidence Heard

**Genesis Power Limited** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of amending Policy (g).

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence commenting the Section 42A report recommendation did not completely resolve the issues raised in their submission, in particular, they are concerned with the use of the phrase 'in the vicinity of'. Submitted that Policy (g) be deleted as the matter is already covered by the submitted amended Policy (c).

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter that the use of the phrase 'in the vicinity of' is subjective. However, we consider the wider landscape values, not just the identified outstanding landscapes, are an important resource in the Wairarapa, and the effects of subdivision and development needs to be managed accordingly. These landscape values are important elements to an area's amenity values, and to the general perceptions of the Wairarapa. The landscape values of different areas vary, therefore, it is important each proposal responds to the particular landscape characteristics of each specific area. Accordingly, Policy (g) has been amended to better reflect this intent.

## Decision: 9.3.2 Policy (g)

Submission Reference: 441.3	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part
FS 74	Accept in part
521.21	Accept in part

FS 112 Accept in part  
FS 85 Accept in part  
FS 74 Accept in part  
FS 16 Accept in part

238.2 Accept in part

### Decision Amendment: 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Policy (g)

Amend Policy (g) as follows:

*“(g) Ensure subdivision and ~~consequent land~~ development **is managed by having regard to the** ~~avoids, remedies or mitigates any adverse effects on the landscape values of the vicinity~~ **site and locality.**”*

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Policy better expresses the management of the wider landscape values in the Wairarapa, outside of the identified outstanding landscapes.

### 9.3.2 Lan1 Policies: Add New Policy

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
526.22	Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS 52 Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose

### Discussion

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** (526.22) seeks that a new policy be added to 9.3.2 to reflect the importance of landscape values in the Wairarapa generally. **Horticulture New Zealand** opposes this submission.

### Evidence Heard

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** presented evidence requesting the Plan include a policy framework for significant amenity landscapes, as the existing policies only relate to outstanding landscapes.

### Commissioners' Deliberations

As outlined above in relation to Policy (g), the Commissioners concur with the submitter that the Act does not only relate to “outstanding” landscapes, but that areas outside the areas identified as ‘outstanding’ also contribute to the quality and amenity values of the Wairarapa environment.

However, in the absence of a detailed Wairarapa wide landscape assessment identifying these non-outstanding landscapes, it is not considered the most effective approach to add

further policies as requested. The amended Policy (g) is considered the most appropriate wording for managing subdivision and development in relation to landscape values in other areas until the completion of the Wairarapa landscape assessment.

### Decision: 9.3.2 Policies

Submission Reference: 526.22      Reject  
FS 52      Accept

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Policy (g) effectively addresses the matter raised at this time, until a detailed landscape assessment is completed, as outlined in the Methods for the Landscape chapter.

### 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (a)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.22	Department of Conservation	FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited	Support
521.22	Meridian Energy Ltd	-	-
398.19	Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa	-	-
524.28	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	FS 41 Java Trust Limited FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited FS 89 Wellington Regional Council	Oppose Support  Oppose

### Discussion

**Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa** (398.19) supports Method (a).

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.22) and the **Department of Conservation** (525.22) support Method (a) and seek the addition of words in relation to consultation with stakeholders and that outcomes be incorporated in the District Plan. **Mighty River Power Limited** supports the submission from the Department of Conservation.

**Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)** (524.28) seeks Section 9.3.4 to be amended by deleting Appendix 1.1 and adding reference to the preparation of a Plan Variation to introduce the results of the landscape assessment. **Mighty River Power Limited** supports this submission. **Java Trust Limited** and **Wellington Regional Council** oppose this submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence accepting and supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of amending Method (a) in relation to consultation.

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence noting the Section 42A report of retaining Method (a).

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that amending the wording of Method (a) better expresses the process and outcome of the landscape assessment to be initiated in 2008. Consultation with landowners and stakeholders is an important part of the process of undertaking the landscape assessment. Given the timing of the decisions and to ensure sufficient time is provided for consultation, we consider initiating the assessment in 2009 is an appropriate timeframe.

Listing the Outstanding Landscapes and Natural Features is considered the most effective and efficient method for protecting these areas and features. Listing provides certainty to the community and landowners as to the specific landscapes and features that are considered outstanding. The particular areas requested to be deleted by Federated Farmers are discussed further below in relation to the submissions on Appendix 1.1.

## Decision: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (a)

Submission Reference: 398.19	Accept
521.22	Accept
525.22	Accept
FS 74	Accept
524.28	Reject
FS 41	Accept
FS 74	Reject
FS 89	Accept

## Decision Amendment: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (a)

Amend Method (a) as follows:

“(a) *By 20089, ~~conduct~~ **initiate** a comprehensive assessment of landscape values across the Wairarapa, ~~applying consistent criteria and with due~~ **in** consultation with landowners, **stakeholders** and the wider community **with the consequent application of appropriate methods to manage those values.***”

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended Method is the most effective in outlining the timing, process and outcomes for the landscape assessment.

### 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Methods (b), (c) & (f)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
521.22, 521.23	Meridian Energy Ltd	-	-

#### Discussion

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.22) seek Methods (b) & (c) be retained.

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.23) seek Method (f) be retained.

#### Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence noting the Section 42A report recommendation to retain Methods (b), (c) and (f).

#### Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that the existing Methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objective for outstanding landscapes and natural features.

#### Decision: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies

Submission Reference: 521.22      Accept  
521.23      Accept

#### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Methods are the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (h)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
260.1	G & J Diederich	FS 157 J Diederich	Support

#### Discussion

**G & J Diederich** (260.1) seeks that incentives like carbon credits or similar be added. They support their original submission.

## Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that the existing Methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objective for outstanding landscapes and natural features.

### Decision: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (h)

Submission Reference: 260.1      Accept

FS 157      Accept

### Decision Amendment: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (h)

Amend Method (h) as follows:

*“(h)      Incentives as appropriate to encourage landowners to protect outstanding landscape values, such as, **but not limited to**, rates relief and assistance with applications for protective covenants.”*

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Methods are the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (n)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
521.24	Meridian Energy Ltd	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	Support Support

## Discussion

**Meridian Energy Ltd** (521.24) seeks Method (n) be deleted. **D Riddiford** and **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** support this submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Ltd** presented evidence noting the outcome of the landscape assessment may influence the cooperation with parties with an interest in landscape matters.



## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter, that Method (n) is not necessary, as the implementation of the other Methods in Section 9.3.4 would be effective in achieving the policies for landscape matters.

### Decision: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (n)

Submission Reference: 521.24      Accept  
FS 112      Accept  
FS 85      Accept

### Decision Amendment: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (n)

Delete Method (n) as follows:

~~“(n) — Cooperation with groups and interested parties involved in conservation and landscape protection.”~~

### Consequential Change:

Re-number Methods (o) and (p) to (n) and (o) respectively.

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The other methods are the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (o) and (p)

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
260.2	G & J Diederich	FS 157 J Diederich	Support

## Discussion

**G & J Diederich** (260.2) requests that the Councils recognise the right of the landowner to get on with managing their own land as the landowner sees fit. **J Diederich** supports the submission.

## Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that Methods (o) and (p) of land purchase, covenants and consultation plans would be implemented in partnership with landowners. Therefore, the existing Methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objective for outstanding landscapes and natural features.

### Decision: 9.3.4 Methods to Implement Landscape Policies: Method (o) and (p)

Submission Reference: 260.2      Reject  
FS 157      Reject

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Methods are the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### 21.1.4 Permitted Activities Outstanding Landscapes and Natural Features

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
397.2	Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd	-	-
525.86	Department of Conservation	FS 17 Telecom New Zealand Limited	Oppose
327.15	Telecom New Zealand Limited	-	-
524.59	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	FS 157 J Diederich FS 155 K Reedy FS 89 Wellington Regional Council	Support Support Oppose
524.60	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	FS 157 J Diederich FS 155 K Reedy FS 89 Wellington Regional Council	Support Support Oppose
328.9	New Zealand Police (Information and Technology Group)	-	-
526.94	Wellington Regional Council	-	-
205.2	C Bargh	-	-
229.2	A Barton	-	-

512.2	M Butterick	-	-
291.2	N Dalgliesh	-	-
390.2	M & S Guscott	-	-
437.4	A Johnson	-	-
264.26	D Riddiford	-	-
24.5	M Taylor	-	-
228.2	B Tosswill	-	-
25.1	M & C Clarkson Limited	-	-
29.1	G McKay	FS 57 Java Trust Limited	Oppose
185.1	L McLeod	-	-

## Discussion

**Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd** (397.2), **C Bargh** (205.2), **A Barton** (229.2), **M Butterick** (512.2), **M & S Guscott** (390.2), **N Dalgliesh** (291.2), **A Johnson** (437.4), **M Taylor** (24.5), **M & C Clarkson Limited** (25.1) and **G McKay** (29.1) request Rule 21.1.4 be deleted. **Java Trust Limited** opposes the submission from G McKay.

**Department of Conservation** (525.86) requests that the standards be amended to 20m<sup>3</sup> of earthworks and 50m<sup>2</sup> structures to be erected as a permitted activity. **Telecom New Zealand** opposes this submission.

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** (526.94) requests the maximum permitted floor area for structures be amended from 200m<sup>2</sup> to 50m<sup>2</sup>.

**Telecom New Zealand Limited** (327.15) and **New Zealand Police (Information and Technology Group)** (328.9) request undergrounding lines and cables be allowed as a Permitted Activity.

**Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** (524.59) seeks earthworks be amended to up to 2000m<sup>3</sup> per site in any 12 month period, and normal farming activities such as maintaining existing roading and tracks, vegetation clearance, soil disturbance activities be permitted. They also seek that structures be permitted up to 500m<sup>2</sup> in total gross floor area per site (524.60). **J Diederich** and **K Reedy** support these submissions. **Greater Wellington Regional Council** opposes this submission.

**D Riddiford** (264.26) and **L McLeod** (185.1) do not state any specific relief sought.

**B Tosswill** (228.2) requests the use of local committees to determine the areas of natural significance (SNA).

## Evidence Heard

**C & J Bargh** presented evidence outlining the identified outstanding landscapes were privately owned and had been farmed in a sustainable manner for a number of years without the obedience of the Resource Management Act. They stated that it is not necessary to take on draconian rules and regulations.

**M Butterick** presented evidence stating there needed to be consistency across the Wairarapa in relation to outstanding landscapes. He supported the Section 42A report recommendation of rejecting the thresholds requested by the Department of Conservation and Greater Wellington Regional Council.

**A Johnson** presented evidence requesting more stringent rules for outstanding landscapes, given their sensitivity to modifications and the potential for significant visual effects.

**M Taylor** presented evidence requesting that landowners rights should not be constrained.

**G McKay** presented evidence noting the rules could limit some farming operations.

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence requesting only very minor work be permitted, and 20m<sup>3</sup> of earthworks in any 12 month period, and 50m<sup>2</sup> for gross floor area for structures.

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** presented evidence requesting the 200m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area standard for buildings be introduced to 50m<sup>2</sup>, or alternatively, if the 200m<sup>2</sup> standard is retained, additional standards are introduced in relation to height, colour, reflectivity and material used.

**Telecom New Zealand Limited and New Zealand Police (Information and Technology Group)** presented evidence requesting that earthworks associated with the undergrounding of cables and lines be exempt from the earthworks standard, as the effects of these earthworks would be negligible.

### Commissioners' Deliberations

As noted above in the Methods, rules are considered an efficient and effective approach for managing inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the identified outstanding landscapes. Rule 21.1.4 sets the permitted activity standards for earthworks and structures in these identified areas. The submissions on this rule highlighted the divergent views in how to most appropriately manage permitted activities, with some submissions requesting no limitations, through to submissions requesting all activities and development requiring resource consent as a discretionary activity. The Commissioners consider the effects based approach is most appropriate for outstanding landscapes, with structures and earthworks having potential for compromising the landscape values, rather than activities per se.

In terms of earthworks, a volume threshold is considered the most effective mechanism as it provides a certain level of flexibility in the type and nature of earthworks, while protecting the overall landscape values of an area. The identified Outstanding Landscapes are of a broad scale, but do have some specific characteristics and values which are sensitive to change. In particular, as most of the identified Outstanding Landscapes are associated with elevated land, the topographical and landform values are relatively high. Earthworks have the potential to degrade these values, therefore, the Commissioners have concluded a 100m<sup>3</sup> volume in any 12 month period is the most appropriate level for a permitted activity. This threshold would provide some flexibility in allowing for the efficient operation of primary production activities, including the maintenance of existing tracks, formation of a building platform and re-contouring for a new fence line. For earthworks above this threshold, the resource consent process is considered an efficient and effective mechanism for managing the effects on the outstanding landscapes.

For the undergrounding of cables and lines, the Commissioners concur with the submitter, that provided appropriate reinstatement occurs, the effects from this type of earthworks would be minimal. Accordingly, earthworks associated with the undergrounding of cables and lines are permitted in the identified Outstanding Landscapes.

In terms of structures, an area (footprint) threshold is considered an effective mechanism, as the greater the size (coverage) of a structure the greater the potential for the landscape values of the identified area to be degraded. Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the Commissioners consider the existing 200m<sup>2</sup> threshold is too high, and could compromise the landscape values of the identified area. The Commissioners consider 100m<sup>2</sup>

to be the most appropriate threshold, as it would allow for a reasonably sized structure which could be used for a range of purposes.

In addition, the Commissioners consider a more stringent maximum height threshold is also effective in managing the potential degradation of landscape values in the identified area. As all identified Outstanding Landscapes are located in rural areas, the 15m height standard for the Rural Zone is considered too high to protect the landscape values from inappropriate development. Therefore, a 7m maximum height standard is considered appropriate, as this would provide a level of flexibility in the design of the structure.

### Decision: Rule 21.1.4 Permitted Activity

Submission Reference: 397.2	Reject
525.86	Accept in part
FS 17	Accept in part
327.15	Accept
524.59	Reject
FS 157	Reject
FS 155	Reject
FS 89	Accept
524.60	Reject
FS 157	Reject
FS 155	Reject
FS 89	Accept
328.9	Accept
526.94	Accept in part
205.2	Reject
229.2	Reject
512.2	Accept in part
291.2	Accept in part
390.2	Reject
437.4	Accept in part
264.26	Reject
24.5	Accept in part
228.2	Accept in part
25.1	Reject
29.1	Reject
FS 47	Accept
185.1	Reject

### Decision Amendment: Rule 21.1.4 Permitted Activity

Amend Rule 21.1.4 to read as follows:

*“(a) Any activity **or structure** within an area identified as an Outstanding Landscape in [Appendix 1.1](#) which meets the following standards:*

- (i) Earthworks ~~are less than or equal to~~ **do not exceed** 100m<sup>3</sup> per site in any 12 month period,*

***Exception: Earthworks associated with the undergrounding of cables and lines, provided the works comply with Rule 21.1.20;***

***(ii) Structures are less than or equal to 2100m<sup>2</sup> in total gross floor area per site.***

***(iii) No part of any structure shall exceed 7 metres in height above natural ground level"***

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The earthworks threshold of 100m<sup>3</sup> is efficient and effective in achieving the objective of protecting the outstanding landscapes from inappropriate development that could degrade the landscape values of the identified areas. This threshold provides a level of flexibility for enabling the ongoing efficient function of primary production activities, while providing a baseline for the amount of change in the identified areas.
- The exception allowing earthworks for the undergrounding of cables and lines is considered the most efficient approach for these works, as compliance with Rule 21.1.20 would ensure the necessary reinstatement works are completed, mitigating the effects on landscape values.
- Large structures have the potential to degrade the landscape values of the identified outstanding areas, therefore, a 100m<sup>2</sup> threshold is considered an effective tool for managing this type of development.
- The height of structures can also compromise the landscape values of the identified areas, therefore, the addition of a permitted activity maximum height standard is effective in managing this aspect of built development.
- The above combination of thresholds are considered the most efficient and effective levels, as they provide for a certain level of change, while ensuring the overall landscape values are protected from inappropriate development. If development was proposed above these thresholds, the resource consent process would provide an efficient process for assessing the effects on the landscape values.

## Rule 21.4(b) & (c) Discretionary Activities Outstanding Landscapes and Natural Features

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
264.49	D Riddiford	-	-

## Discussion

D Riddiford (264.49) does not state any specific relief sought.

## Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

As no specific relief sought have been provided, the Commissioners consider the existing rule is the most appropriate for assessing proposals which do not comply with the permitted activity standards.

### Decision: Rule 21.4(b) & (c) Discretionary Activity

Submission Reference: 264.49      Reject

### Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing rule is the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate development.

### 22.1.5 Assessment Criteria: Outstanding Landscapes and Natural Features

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
521.42	Meridian Energy Limited	FS 74 Mighty River Power Limited FS 16 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support Support
514.9	Rangitane o Wairarapa Inc	-	-
526.108	Wellington Regional Council	FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 52 Horticulture New Zealand FS 112 D Riddiford FS 84 Meridian Energy Limited FS 61 Mighty River Power Limited	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose
526.23	Wellington Regional Council	FS 52 Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose

### Discussion

**Meridian Energy Limited** (521.42) seeks that the Assessment Criteria be retained and provide additional assessment criterion to assess the positive benefits of development within, or that will impact on outstanding landscapes and natural features. **Mighty River Power Limited** and **Transpower New Zealand Limited** support this submission.

**Rangitane o Wairarapa Inc** (514.9) requests the Assessment Criteria include reference to issues of significance to Tangata Whenua to Wairarapa's outstanding landscapes and natural features.

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** (526.108 and 526.23) requests the word 'outstanding' be removed from the Assessment Criteria and additional criteria be added as

detailed in the above table. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc), Horticulture New Zealand, D Riddiford, Meridian Energy Limited and Mighty River Power Limited** oppose this submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Meridian Energy Limited** presented evidence re-iterating the importance of considering the positive benefits from proposals, such as the positive benefits from the use and development of renewable energy. Meridian support the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining the word 'outstanding' for the criteria.

**Greater Wellington Regional Council** presented evidence accepting the Section 42A report recommendation in part, in that the word "outstanding" should remain, provided "and Significant Amenity Landscapes" are added. In addition, they re-iterated their request to add "rarity" to natural science and "coherence" to aesthetic values assessment criteria.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation that the Assessment Criteria apply to 'Outstanding' Landscapes, therefore, the word "Outstanding" is to be retained.

The Commissioners note bullet point 6 in the matters for assessing the Outstanding Landscapes already listed the value to tangata whenua.

In terms of the benefits from the proposal, the existing assessment criteria do not restrict the positive effects from being considered. The decision report on Chapter 16: Network Utilities and Energy inserts a new assessment matter for 22.1.20 for wind energy facilities in relation to the benefits to be derived from renewable energy.

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that the matters of 'rarity' and 'coherence' are already effectively covered by the existing criteria. The rarity of the natural sciences factors would be considered in assessing these factors, as well as other measurable factors such as size, condition, natural state, and connectedness. Similarly, the coherence of the aesthetics values would be assessed in determining these values.

## Decision: Rule 22.1.5 Assessment Criteria

Submission Reference: 521.42	Accept in part
FS 74	Accept in part
FS 16	Accept in part
514.9	Accept
526.108	Reject
FS 85	Accept
FS 112	Accept
FS 84	Accept
FS 61	Accept
526.23	Reject
FS 52	Accept



## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Assessment Criteria are the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### 28.1 Appendix 1.1 Outstanding Landscapes

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.108	Department of Conservation	FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 112 D Riddiford FS 66 Mighty River Power Limited	Oppose  Oppose Oppose
525.109	Department of Conservation	FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 112 D Riddiford	Oppose  Oppose
520.47	Mighty River Power Limited	-	-
397.1	Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd	-	-
397.3	Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd	FS 64 Mighty River Power Limited	Support
468.1	Java Trust Limited	-	-
469.1	Java Trust Limited	-	-
368.8	Oops!! Ltd	-	-
522.67	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Oppose
298.11	Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	FS 57 Mighty River Power Limited	Support
217.2	Upper Hutt Rural Residents' Association	-	-
310.1	Wiri Trust	FS 47 Java Trust Limited	Oppose
518.1	J Beetham	FS 49 Java Trust Limited FS 63 Mighty River Power Limited	Oppose Support

479.1	D & R Broadmore	-	-
480.1	D & R Broadmore	-	-
198.2	S Carlsen	FS 47 Java Trust Limited	Oppose
291.1	N Dalgliesh	-	-
283.2	S & G Saunders	-	-
428.3	A Stewart	FS 48 Java Trust Limited	Oppose
360.1	J Taylor	FS 62 Mighty River Power Limited	Support
22.1	V Tester	FS 47 Java Trust Limited	Oppose
219.1	T & N Vallance	-	-
523.31	K & M Williams	-	-
18.2	D Woodhouse	-	-

## Discussion

**Department of Conservation** (525.108) seeks that a number of sites identified as part of the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy be added alongside Appendix 1.1 for information purposes only. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)**, **D Riddiford** and **Mighty River Power Limited** oppose this submission.

**Department of Conservation** (525.109) seeks that the Pinnacles Scenic Reserve be added as an Outstanding Landscape in Appendix 1.1. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** and **D Riddiford** oppose this submission.

**Mighty River Power Limited** (520.47), **Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited** (298.11), **J Beetham** (518.1), **S Carlsen** (198.2), **S & G Saunders** (283.2), **J Taylor** (360.1) and **D Woodhouse** (18.2) request the Maungaraki Ridge (OLc02) be deleted from Appendix 1.1. **Java Trust Limited** opposes some of these submissions.

**Wiri Trust** (310.1), **S Carlsen** (198.2), **S & G Saunders** (283.2), **A Stewart** (428.3), **J Taylor** (360.1), **V Tester** (22.1), **K & M Williams** (523.31) and **D Woodhouse** (18.2) request the Ponatahi Hills (OLc04) be deleted from Appendix 1.1. **Mighty River Power Limited** supports some of these submissions. **Java Trust Limited** opposes some of these submissions.

**Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd** (397.1) requests the area of the Maungaraki Ridge (OLco2) be reduced in area to protect the skyline only. **Mighty River Power Limited** supports this submission. **Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd** (397.3) request consultation with landowners before placing restrictions on land.

**N Dalgliesh** (291.1) requests Maungaraki Ridge areas identified are incorrect and not visible from the main valley, except for Eringa at the southern end, and the Ponatahi Hills misrepresentation by name for Ahiaruhe north to Gladstone.

**Java Trust Limited** (468.1), **Oops!! Ltd** (368.8) and **D & R Broadmore** (479.1) request all Outstanding Landscapes be retained.

**Java Trust Limited** (469.1) and **D & R Broadmore** (480.1) request the land between the Ponatahi Road and the Ruamahanga River and the land between the Ponatahi Road and the ridgeline generally to the east of the Ponatahi Road be added as an Outstanding Landscape, and the Tiffin area and the associated hills be added as an Outstanding Landscape.

**Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.67) request minor amendments to the map reference numbers. **Windy Peak Trust** (FS103) opposes the Planning Departments submission.

## Evidence Heard

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report and recommendation of adding the Pinnacles Scenic Reserve as an Outstanding Landscape to Appendix 1.1. However, the re-iterated their submission point that Outstanding Landscapes had been identified as part of the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy and that these identified landscapes be added to the District Plan.

**Mighty River Power Limited** presented evidence that the listing OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge should be revised to be consistent with the Operative Carterton District Plan, in particular, the description in Appendix 13A.

**Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited** presented evidence in relation to the listing OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge, which identified as a potential future lime resource for the Wairarapa. Listing this ridge as an Outstanding Landscape may limit its ability to be utilised as a resource.

**S Carlsen** presented evidence highlighting the inconsistency in identifying OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge for the Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts. Noted the area covered in the Proposed Plan was significantly greater than in the Operative Carterton District Plan. Requested that the listing of OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge be deleted.

**J Taylor** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of deleting OLc04 Ponatahi Hills.

**A Stewart** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of deleting OLc04 Ponatahi Hills.

**V Tester** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of deleting OLc04 Ponatahi Hills.

**Bluff Station Wairarapa Ltd** presented evidence relating to OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge, noting that the area covered in the Proposed Plan was significantly larger than in the Operative Carterton District Plan. Requested that the listing of OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge be amended to the Operative Carterton District Plan area.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation that the Ponatahi Hills were incorrectly identified and are removed from Appendix 1.1.

In terms of the Maungaraki Ridge, the Commissioners concur with the majority of submitters, that the description in the Operative Carterton District Plan provides a clear description as to the extent of the landform to which the existing line on the Operative Planning Maps apply. The Commissioners considered the Maungaraki Ridge as identified in the Operative Carterton District Plan is outstanding, and the description and mapping be adopted in the Combined Plan.

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation for adding the Pinnacles Scenic Reserve as an Outstanding Landscape.

For other areas requested to be added to the appendix of Outstanding Landscapes, no Wairarapa landscape assessment has been completed which has specifically investigated and evaluated what area are 'outstanding'. It is noted the technical assessment undertaken

as part of the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy identified 'significant' landscape features, but did not categorise them as "outstanding". In the absence of this information, the Commissioners have concluded the existing list, with the above amendments, is the most appropriate as this time. Additional landscapes, or modifications to the existing identified areas may be an outcome of the Wairarapa landscape assessment listed as a Method in the Plan.

### **Decision: Appendix 1.1 Outstanding Landscapes**

Submission Reference: 525.108	Reject
FS 85	Accept
FS 112	Accept
FS 66	Accept
525.109	Accept
FS 85	Reject
FS 112	Reject
520.47	Accept
397.1	Accept in part
FS 64	Accept in part
397.3	Accept in part
468.1	Accept in part
469.1	Reject
368.8	Accept in part
522.67	Accept
FS 102	Reject
298.11	Reject
FS 57	Reject
217.2	Reject
310.1	Accept
FS 47	Reject
518.1	Reject
FS 49	Accept
FS 63	Reject
479.1	Accept in part
480.1	Reject
198.2	Accept in part
FS 47	Accept in part
291.1	Accept in part
283.2	Accept in part
428.3	Accept
FS 48	Reject

360.1	Accept in part
FS 62	Accept in part
22.1	Accept
FS 47	Reject
219.1	Reject
523.31	Accept in part
18.2	Accept

## Decision Amendment: Appendix 1.1 Outstanding Landscapes

Delete OLc04 Ponatahi Hills from Appendix 1.1.

Amend Appendix 1.1 by adding Map Reference Number 63 to OLs01 and Map Reference Number 35 to OLs03.

Amend the “Location and Legal Description” of OLc02 Maungaraki Ridge to read as follows:

***“The Eastern side of the ridge shown on Topographic Maps 260 series as follows: extending in a north east direction from T27 325 995 to the boundary of the Carterton District and within a 60 metre contour of the top of the ridge.”***

Planning Map 34: Extend the existing Aorangi (Haurangi) Forest Park (OLs03) overlay to include the Pinnacles Scenic Reserve area.

## Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing listed Outstanding Landscapes have been determined as being outstanding in the Wairarapa, and the scheduling and mapping of these areas provides certainty to the community for their protection.
- A Wairarapa wide landscape assessment would provide a basis for identifying other areas and re-evaluating previously identified areas using the same criteria. Until this assessment is completed, it is most appropriate to retain the current listings.

## 28.2 Appendix 1.2 Outstanding Natural Features

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.110	Department of Conservation	FS 85 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) FS 112 D Riddiford	Oppose Oppose
468.2	Java Trust Limited	-	-
368.9	Oops!! Ltd	-	-
479.2	D & R Broadmore	-	-
526.115	Wellington	-	-

	Regional Council		
--	------------------	--	--

## Discussion

**Department of Conservation** (525.110) seeks that the addition of the second sail to Kupes Sails and the Blue Rock Stream Glow-worm caves to Appendix 1.2 as Outstanding Natural Features. **Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** and **D Riddiford** oppose this submission.

**Java Trust Limited** (468.2), **Oops!! Ltd** (368.9) and **D & R Broadmore** (479.2) request all Outstanding Natural Features be retained.

**Wellington Regional Council** (526.115) request amend the listing of ONFm03 to read 'Uruti Point and Dune Complex –Uruti Point'

## Evidence Heard

**Department of Conservation** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report and recommendation of adding the second sail to Kupes Sail and adding Blue Rock Stream Glow worm Caves as Outstanding Natural Features to Appendix 1.2.

**Wellington Regional Council** presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report and recommendation of amending the spelling of Uriti Point to Uruti Point.

## Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and Section 42A report assessment and recommendation, that the existing identified Outstanding Natural Features and the submitted additional features are the most appropriate list for achieving the objective of protecting outstanding natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

## Decision: Appendix 1.2 Outstanding Natural Features

Submission Reference: 525.110	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
468.2	Accept
368.9	Accept
479.2	Accept
526.115	Accept

## Decision Amendment: Appendix 1.2 Outstanding Natural Features

Amend the Planning Maps to show the extent of ONFs01 Kupe's Sail to cover the second sail.

Add Blue Rock Stream Glow-worm caves as an Outstanding Natural Feature in Appendix 1.2 as below:

ONFs08	Blue Rock Stream Glow Warm Caves	South Wairarapa	31
--------	----------------------------------	-----------------	----

Amend Appendix 1.2 as below:

ONFm03	Uruti Point and Dune Complex	Uruti Point and Dune Complex – Uruti Point.	22
--------	------------------------------	--	----

## **Reasons**

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing and amended list of Outstanding Natural Features is the most effective and efficient in protecting outstanding landscapes and natural features from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.