



WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING

Order Paper for meeting to be held via zoom
(as per covid restrictions) on
TUESDAY 21 SEPTEMBER at 10am

MEMBERSHIP

David McMahon (Chairperson, Independent Commissioner)
Cr Frazer Mailman (MDC)
Cr Tina Nixon (MDC)

Cr Rob Stockley (CDC)
Cr Robyn Cherry-Campbell (CDC)

Cr Brian Jephson (SWDC)
Cr Alistair Plimmer (SWDC)

Rangitāne o Wairarapa Representative
Ngāti Kahungunu Representative

AGENDA

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (MEMBERS TO DECLARE CONFLICTS, IF ANY)

APOLOGIES

CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Pages 1-6

RMA REFORM (*VERBAL UPDATE*)

REVIEW OF SIGNS – SUMMARY REPORT

Pages 7-11

REVIEW OF TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES – SUMMARY REPORT

Pages 12-16

REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES ON THE SURFACE OF WATER – SUMMARY REPORT

Pages 17-22

REVIEW OF RUAL ZONE – RURAL SUBDIVISON – SUMMARY REPORT

Pages 23-33

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DIRECTION (*PRESENTATION ONLY*)

COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Pages 34-44

CONFIRMATION OF NEXT TOPICS FOR REVIEW

CLOSE OF MEETING

WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING**HELD AT THE CARTERTON EVENTS CENTRE, HOLLOWAY STREET, CARTERTON****THURSDAY 18 May 2021 9.00AM****PRESENT**

David McMahon (Chair), Councillors Frazer Mailman (MDC), Tina Nixon (MDC), Robyn Cherry-Campbell (CDC), Rob Stockley (CDC) (by Zoom), Alistair Plimmer (SWDC) and Brian Jephson (SWDC), iwi representatives Robin Potangaroa and Jo Hayes.

IN ATTENDANCE

Masterton District Council: Manager Planning and Consents (Peter Matich), Consultant Planner (Sue Southey) and Senior GIS Analyst (Alan Flynn)

Carterton District Council: Infrastructure, Services and Regulatory Manager (Dave Gittings), Senior Planner (Solitaire Robertson) and Asset Engineer (Tony Pritchard)

South Wairarapa District Council: Group Manager Planning and Environment (Russell O'Leary)

Boffa Miskell: Hamish Wesney, Kate Searle. Erica Jane and Charles Horrell

Ngati Kahunugnu ki Wairarapa: Mariana Mutu

Four media representatives and one member of the public

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts were declared.

APOLOGIES

No apologies had been received.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

In relation to conflicts of interest, a request was made to record the discussion from the previous meeting in relation to members' ownership of property and potential conflicts that might arise - that all members were property owners, and that interest was no more than the ordinary interest of a ratepayer or resident and that members would make the best decisions in the interests of the Wairarapa. The register of interests would record property ownership, so those interests were in the public domain.

In relation to Greater Wellington Regional Council involvement, it was advised that GW staff had been invited to the Advisory Group.

Action: The Chair will circulate his declaration of interests and members will complete in time for the next meeting. The register will be on the agenda in the future and can be added to at each meeting.

Moved by Councillor Brian Jephson

That the minutes of the meeting held 8 April 2021 are a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Seconded by Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell and CARRIED

2

REVIEW OF COMMERCIAL ZONE – SUMMARY REPORT

The summary report was presented by Kate Searle (Boffa Miskell).

Matters discussed included:

- the impact of SH2 going through the towns (the road corridor wasn't part of the DP).
- whether there should be provision in the revised plan to enable more parking on private land (as there was a need to remove minimum parking requirements from the DP).
- the capacity of the existing zoning and whether there was sufficient capacity in the future.
- whether the Masterton Growth Strategy needed review to ascertain the level of industrial and commercial land needed as the assumptions in the strategy were conservative.
- the need for SWDC to do further work on commercial and industrial areas;
- whether the CBD areas needed to be protected from big box retail;
- the relationship between the commercial and industrial zones;
- whether some bespoke zones should be looked at or a single zone where standards are applied;
- whether mixed use zones might be appropriate in particular areas;
- activities within zones to enable or discourage non-commercial activities;
- the interface of the commercial zones with the heritage pedestrian precincts and character areas and whether the current approach should be retained;
- the heritage areas should remain as they cover more than commercial and have specific objectives;
- whether the Carterton character area could be absorbed into a heritage overlay or whether it would be better in a pedestrian overlay to be more enabling for business.
- whether the preference is to retain a commercial zone and have an overlay which applies to the spatial area or whether to create a series of subzones that reflect areas.
- the interplay between the heritage overlay, protecting that and allowing development that's compatible.

The next report back would look at all options.

Other stakeholders: Tranzit, Go Carterton and other business associations, Masterton, and Greytown Trust Lands Trusts.

Moved by Councillor Alistair Plimmer

That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee

- (i) Receives the Review of the Commercial Zone – Summary Report**
- (ii) Agrees to commence the review in accordance with undertaking a comprehensive review of the commercial zone provisions, and to develop new zones and provisions in accordance with National Planning Standards.**

Seconded by Councillor Brian Jephson and CARRIED

REVIEW OF INDUSTRIAL ZONE – SUMMARY REPORT

Kate Searle (Boffa Miskell) presented the report providing a summary of the review of the industrial zone.

Matters discussed included:

3

- the Opaki area around Hansells which included more land than currently used by Hansells – the underlying zone needed to be revised to protect the current activity and to provide for increasing residential development;
- whether other non-industrial activities are appropriate in the zone – e.g. Bidwill’s Cutting and Waingawa;
- whether there was enough capacity in the current zone and whether it is in the right places;
- whether there should be a light, medium, heavy differentiation; need to enable small-medium industrial to relocate to the Wairarapa – the business park concept;
- the issue with residential development creeping into industrial and the potential need to take a grandfathering approach with current landowners;
- industrial zoning for Māori land needed to be discussed with iwi.

Moved by Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell

That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee:

- (i) **Receives the Review of the Industrial Zone Summary Report**
- (ii) **Agrees to commence the review in accordance with undertaking a comprehensive review of the industrial zone provisions, and to consider appropriate zones and provisions in accordance with National Planning standards.**

Seconded by Councillor Frazer Mailman and CARRIED

Due to the attendance of Haami Te Whaiti, Foss Leach and Christine Barnett (Heritage NZ based in Wellington) the item on the Tangata Whenua provisions was brought forward.

REVIEW OF TANGATA WHENUA PROVISIONS – SUMMARY REPORT

Erica Jane (Boffa Miskell) presented the report providing a summary of the review of Tangata Whenua provisions.

Foss Leach spoke about the need to provide for better information management in the plan to enable better protection of sites. There was also a need identify more sites. ArchSite (managed by the Department of Conservation, the Archaeological Association and Heritage NZ) was a GIS platform that could be added into the DP as a layer to provide reliable information. Councils could purchase a license and the platform could be updated as further information was added.

Council also needed to recognise that there would be other places iwi knew about that haven’t been visited by archaeologists and may not have any physical evidence left behind but that didn’t diminish the importance of those places. There needed to be another layer incorporating that information (e.g. information from old survey plans) that needed to be negotiated with iwi. It was also noted that ArchSite was a good resource, but also needed interpretation.

The challenge for the DP was in sufficient identification of known sites but also to have a trigger in the consent process for unknown sites.

To enable iwi to provide the best input into the plan, whether a dedicated person with planning and other relevant expertise should be engaged to help iwi was discussed and a motion was put for the Committee to seek funding from their respective councils to help with that resource. The iwi representatives agreed that it would be beneficial to have dedicated resource with the right skillset as neither group had the capacity to take that on themselves. The resource needed was to work

4

alongside the planners at the advisory group level but to also have experience in tikanga and be able to work alongside kaumatua to draw out the necessary information.

Members noted that the other important aspect of the DP review for iwi, aside from processes to allow the protection of sites of significance, was to enable Māori to manage and develop their own land.

Moved by Councillor Tina Nixon

That Joint Committee members take back to their respective councils a proposal to seek funding for resource to assist with iwi input into the district plan review at both the advisory group and at the governance level.

Seconded by Councillor Brian Jephson and CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell

That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee:

- (i) Receive the Review of Tangata Whenua Provisions – Summary Report (Attachment 1 to Report 088/21).**
- (ii) Agrees to:**
 - a. review the Tangata Whenua chapter to ensure it aligns with the national and regional directions outlined in this summary (National Planning Standards, Mana Whakahono a Rohe, Wellington Regional Policy Statement), and**
 - b. review and update the Tangata Whenua chapter and the sites of significance to Maori in partnership with local iwi, and taking into account the Rangitāne o Wairarapa and the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Deeds of Settlement, and**
 - c. review the rules and standards relating to marae and papakāinga in the Residential and Rural Zones to ensure that the District Plan enables appropriate customary land uses while managing the on-site and off-site effects of those land uses (e.g., flooding, traffic generation).**

Seconded by Robin Potongaroa and CARRIED

REVIEW OF NATURAL HAZARDS TOPIC – SUMMARY REPORT

Kate Searle (Boffa Miskell) presented the report providing a summary of the review findings in relation to the natural hazards topic.

It was advised that the natural hazards topic would be brought back to the Committee.

Matters discussed included:

- the lack of recent flood modelling data for the lower valley and the need to look at whether the current information should be used or whether a more precautionary approach is needed (the risk is with developers/builders at the moment);
- in relation to coastal hazards the current approach of site by site assessment was working – it was noted that some of the mapping needed updating as there had been erosion in places and the 50m setback should also be looked at;
- whether the plan should take the opportunity to be proactive in identifying areas of risk and where there should be managed retreat (recognising that investigation would need to be paid for by the councils);

5

- in relation to fault hazards GNS had some more up to date data that needed analysis but the councils would need to fund that work, possibly in conjunction with GWRC;
- the need for further information about the costs involved to update the necessary information – the precautionary approach with flooding and coastal hazards was based on the information available, with faults more technical information was available so councils should take the opportunity to update that and whether the focus of that updated information should be in the urban area where there was more risk;
- in relation to the options for dealing with liquefaction in either the DP or by other methods it was agreed that staff would report back to the next meeting and provide some scoping around the information needed. The recommendation in the report was amended accordingly.

Moved Councillor Tina Nixon

That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee:

- (i) **Receives the Review of Natural Hazards Provisions – Summary Report (Attachment 1 to Report 087/21).**
- (ii) **Agrees to undertake a comprehensive review of the natural hazard provisions, and to develop new natural hazard provisions in accordance with National Planning Standards.**
- (iii) **Agrees to scope investigations for managing liquefaction and fault hazard identification and report back to the next Committee meeting.**

Seconded Councillor Robyn Cherry- Campbell and CARRIED

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Masterton District Council Planning Manager provided an update on the Communications Plan which was underway. Website information would be prioritised and there will be an open invitation for anyone interested in being informed to let us know. At which point and how there might be public engagement before the Draft plan engagement needed to be worked out.

The Chair noted that it was early in the process and that it was important to recognise that the discussions the Committee was having at the moment were generic discussions on direction.

STAKEHOLDER UPDATE

- Stakeholders added: GNS, Waka Kotahi.
- Start discussion with iwi (subject to resourcing).

CONFIRMATION OF NEXT TOPICS FOR REVIEW

The next topics for review at the meeting would be

- open space
- strategic direction
- rural subdivision
- liquefaction and faults – report back

6

RMA reform timeline – a draft to Cabinet is expected in mid-June.

Water Resilience Strategy – the Strategy will go to Greater Wellington Regional Council for adoption, with the Wairarapa councils receiving it.

The meeting closed at 12.18pm

To:	Chair and Members, Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee
From:	Boffa Miskell
Date:	21 September 2021
Subject:	Review of Signs summary
DECISION	
Recommendation: That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Receives the Review of signs summary report.(ii) Agree to undertaking a targeted review to revise the signs rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards.	

Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review

Summary of Signs Topic Review

August 2021

1 Summary of Review Findings

Summary of the Signs Topic

1. Excessive or poorly controlled signage can adversely affect amenity values in the districts and cause issues with traffic and pedestrian safety. “Amenity values” refers to environmental characteristics of an area that contribute to the pleasantness and attractiveness of that area as a place to live, work or visit. Inherently, amenity values are subjective in nature, although there are qualities that are commonly accepted and shared by most people.
2. In general, the combined amenity values of an area go towards defining the character of that area. Thus, amenity values within the Wairarapa vary from location to location, and largely depend upon the perceived character of each area. For example, the amenity values of an industrial area differ from that of a residential area.
3. These differences in character are important factors in determining which environmental characteristics may be acceptable in one area while not in another. For example, the size of signs within a commercial or industrial area would generally not be acceptable in a residential neighbourhood. Permanent signs are managed under the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (“District Plan”) policies and rules for the various environmental zones and management areas to allow the effects on character and environmental quality of each of these parts of the Wairarapa to be managed.
4. Temporary signs are captured by the district wide General Amenity Values and District Wide Land Use Rules. Temporary activities generally have a minor effect on amenity due to their short duration, provided that some limitations are imposed as necessary to avoid significant, albeit short-term, effects.
5. Official Traffic Signs are excluded from complying with the standards that apply to both temporary and permanent signs across the districts provided they comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 and the Manual of Traffic Signs and Marking (MOTSAM).

Summary of Signs in Operative District Plan

6. Provisions relating to signs are located within several different chapters, with provisions relating to permanent signs contained in each Environmental Zone chapter and those relating to temporary signs included with the Temporary Activities provisions:
 - a. Chapter 4: Rural Zone, Chapter 5: Residential Zone, Chapter 6: Commercial Zone, and Chapter 7: Industrial Zone each contain objectives, policies and rules relating to permanent signs.
 - b. Chapter 19: General Amenity Values contains objectives and policies relating to temporary signs and Chapter 21: District Wide Land Use Rules contains the applicable rules in the permitted activity Rule 21.1.16: Temporary Activities and discretionary activity Rule 21.6(a).

9

- c. Chapter 10 Historic Heritage contains objectives and policies relating to historic heritage and Chapter 21 contains specific rules for signs in Historic Heritage Precincts.
 - d. Chapter 22: Assessment criteria sets out the relevant considerations for sign-related resource consent applications in Section 22.2.10: Signs.
 - e. Chapter 27: Definitions includes definitions for “sign”, “official signs” and “official traffic sign”.
- 7. The most recent amendments to these sections were made in 2014.
 - 8. Objectives in the Rural, Residential, and Commercial Zones all refer to maintaining and enhancing amenity values. In the Industrial Zone, Objective 7.3.1 Ind1 refers to activities functioning efficiently within acceptable levels of amenity. This is reflective of a reduced expectation around amenity in this zone.
 - 9. The objectives are supported by policies and implemented by rules in each of the zones that specify standards for permitted activities, with a restricted discretionary activity status if the standards are not met. The standards differ by zone but generally control the number of signs per site, size, location, obstruction of other signs, and whether the sign is illuminated or moving. Signs are not permitted to be affixed to listed heritage items in any zone. All signs must comply with sight distance requirements in Appendix 5. Official Traffic Signs are excluded from complying with the above standards provided they comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 and the Manual of Traffic Signs and Marking (MOTSAM).
 - 10. The standards are generally more restrictive in the Residential and Rural zones and less restrictive in the Commercial and Industrial zones, in line with the expected character and amenity of those areas. In the Rural and Residential Zones any sign must relate to the activity undertaken on the site. The Commercial and Industrial zone standards include some additional controls to manage effects of signs in those areas on nearby Residential/Rural zones.
 - 11. Specific objectives and rules exist in the Commercial Zone chapter for the Carterton Town Centre and in the Industrial Zone chapter for Opaki Special Management Area and Waingawa Industrial Area. Within the Historic Heritage Precincts in Appendix 1.8 signs in the Commercial and Industrial Zones are subject to the permitted activity standards in 21.1.3(b) and those within Residential Zones are a discretionary activity (Rule 21.6).
 - 12. Objectives, policies and rules relating to temporary signs are contained in Chapters 19 and 21 with the district wide Temporary Activities rules.

Other controls on signs

- 13. The Wairarapa Consolidated Bylaw 2019 Part 2 controls the placement of signs in public places to avoid obstruction (Rules 5.1(b) and 14.1).
- 14. Election signage is subject to the restrictions in the Electoral Act 1993, which requires signs to be removed the day before an election.

National Policy Direction

- 15. The first set of National Planning Standards was released in 2019 to improve consistency of council plans and policy statements across the country. The National Planning Standards direct that a stand-alone chapter for signs is provided within the ‘General District-Wide Matters’ section of district plans.

Regional Policy Direction

16. The Wellington Regional Policy Statement (RPS) provides an overview of the resource management issues for the Wellington Region and sets out policies and methods to manage these issues. There are no specific policies relating to signs in the Wellington RPS. However, there are some objectives and policies that could be adversely affected by poor management of signs, including Objective 18 and Policy 28 relating to identifying special amenity landscapes and maintaining or enhancing the quality of those landscape values.

State of the Environment Monitoring/Plan Effectiveness

17. Reviewing the National Monitoring Data from 2014/15 – 2018/19 from the Ministry for the Environment, there were 28 applications for resource consent for signage across the three Wairarapa districts. Most of these were in the South Wairarapa District, with several in Masterton District and two in the Carterton District. These included applications in each of the four zones and for varying sign types including Welcome signage and advertising, although it is not clear from the data which standards were infringed. Several applications were for signs were within heritage precincts.

18. The Advisory Group noted the following observations and key issues in relation to signs:

- a. There is some duplication and inconsistency between the Electoral Act requirements for election signage and the District Plan rules. (The District Plan requires signs to be taken down within 7 days of the election, but the Electoral Act requires signs to be taken down the day before the election).
- b. There is a need to ensure signs fronting state highways meet Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency requirements. There should also be clear direction in the District Plan that Waka Kotahi is an affected party for applications for signs fronting state highways.
- c. There is a need for a logical framework for signs on verandahs over the road reserve.
- d. There have been issues with real estate signs being left up for extended periods and being used for advertising purposes rather than sales.
- e. Digital signs can be an issue and clear rules are needed for these. Rules need to align with rules relating to light and support the Dark Sky Management Area provisions.
- f. Many of the resource consents for signs are within heritage areas. It may be appropriate to allow for some limited signage as a permitted activity with standards.
- g. There have been some issues with signs not relating to the site they are located on, particularly in the Rural Zone. Council officers see this as an important control that limits the cumulative effects and visual dominance of signage. Some strengthening of this requirement may be needed to reduce scope for any loopholes.

19. Accordingly, there are no known issues with the signs objectives and policies or assessment criteria as they are currently drafted. The rules relating to signs are largely operating as intended, although there are some issues with compliance. Some small tweaks may be required to the rules to ensure that they work effectively and efficiently. Consideration will need to be given to linkages and alignment with other parts of the District Plan, including heritage and light.

Key Resource Management Issues

20. The key resource management issues for signs are:

- a. Continuing to manage adverse effects, including cumulative effects, of excessive or poorly controlled signage on amenity values (e.g. visual dominance, clutter) in the districts.

- b. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency has an interest in signs along state highways. Waka Kotahi's interests need to be canvassed and the rules updated if necessary.

2 Options/Direction Sought from Joint Committee

- 21. To address the issues identified above, we recommend undertaking a targeted review to revise the signs rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards. This would largely see a roll-over of the existing signs provisions in the Operative District Plan and would restructure the existing temporary and permanent signs provisions into a new Signs Chapter to align with the National Planning Standards 2019. It would also review the signs provisions for any necessary updates or editorial improvements.
- 22. Under Section 79 of the Resource Management Act, Council must commence a review of the provisions of the District Plan if the provision has not been a subject of a proposed district plan, a review, or a change during the previous ten years. As the provisions relating to signs have not been recently reviewed, this option would fulfil the requirements of Section 79 of the Resource Management Act.

Key Stakeholders

- 23. At this early stage, engagement with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency is proposed to ensure rules align with Waka Kotahi's requirements for signs along state highways. Broader community engagement will take place when the draft plan is released to the public. This may include groups such as business associations, heritage groups, and real estate agents.
- 24. Engagement methods will be confirmed as part of the communications and engagement plan (TBC).

3 Recommendation

- 25. To receive this report and commence a review in accordance with the outline above.

To:	Chair and Members, Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee
From:	Boffa Miskell
Date:	21 September 2021
Subject:	Review of Temporary Activities
DECISION	
Recommendation: That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Receives the Review of temporary activities summary report.(ii) And agree to undertaking a targeted review to revise the temporary activity rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards.	

Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review

Summary of Temporary Activity Topic Review

August 2021

1 Summary of Review Findings

Summary of the Temporary Activity Topic

1. A Temporary Activity in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (“District Plan”) means an activity in any zone that is of a non-repetitive, transient nature and includes entertainment, cultural and sporting events. Temporary activities generally have a minor effect on amenity due to their short duration, provided that some limitations are imposed as necessary to avoid significant, albeit short-term, effects. “Amenity values” refers to environmental characteristics of an area that contribute to the pleasantness and attractiveness of that area as a place to live, work or visit.
2. The District Plan includes an objective to maintain and enhance amenity values, a policy that recognises the minor effects on amenity of some temporary activities and rules that provide for temporary activities as permitted activities subject to certain standards.
3. Examples of temporary activities include galas and fairs, construction works and sports events, and temporary filming. In general, because their duration is short-term, and there are economic, social and cultural benefits from such activities, the adverse effects are largely accepted by the community. However, where such effects may become unacceptable, for example if they are too frequent or too lengthy, standards may need to be specified, such as maximum durations.

Summary of Temporary Activities in Operative District Plan

4. Temporary Activities are managed under two chapters in the District Plan:
 - a. Chapter 19: General Amenity Values, which includes objectives, policies, and anticipated environmental outcomes relating to temporary activities
 - b. Chapter 21: District Wide Land Use Rules, which includes permitted activity rules and standards relating to temporary activities under Rule 21.1.16: Temporary Activities and a discretionary activity Rule 21.6(a) if the standards are not met.
5. The most recent amendments to these sections were made in 2014.
6. “**temporary activity**” is defined in Chapter 27 of the District Plan as “an activity in any zone that is of a non-repetitive, transient nature and includes entertainment, cultural and sporting events”.
7. As noted above, objectives and policies relating to temporary activities are contained in Chapter 19: General Amenity Values of the District Plan. There is one overall objective covering all amenity values in the Operative District Plan:

19.3.1 *Objective GAV1 – General Amenity Values*

To maintain and enhance those amenity values which make the Wairarapa a pleasant place in which to live and work, or visit.
8. Chapter 19 also contains one specific policy on temporary activities:

19.3.2 GAV1 Policies

- (a) *Recognise that temporary activities generally have a minor effect on amenity due to their short duration, provided that some limitations are imposed as necessary to avoid significant, albeit short-term, effects.*

9. To determine whether the General Amenity Values objectives are being achieved, Section 19.4 sets out anticipated environmental outcomes, which are:

- a. *The maintenance of amenity values appropriate to the surrounding environment*
- b. *Minimised conflict over amenity values between established uses and temporary activities.*

10. There are no assessment criteria in Chapter 22 relating to temporary activities.

National Policy Direction

11. The first set of National Planning Standards was released in 2019 to improve consistency of council plans and policy statements across the country. The National Planning Standards direct that a stand-alone chapter for temporary activities is provided within the 'General District-Wide Matters' section of district plans.

Regional Policy Direction

12. The Wellington Regional Policy Statement (RPS) provides an overview of the resource management issues for the Wellington Region and sets out policies and methods to manage these issues. There are no specific policies relating to temporary activities in the Wellington RPS. However, there are some objectives and policies that may be relevant if temporary activities are not managed effectively, including those objectives and policies relating to preserving and protecting habitats and features, including managing special amenity landscape values and preserving the natural character of the coastal environment (Objective 3, Objective 18, Policies 28 and 35).

State of the Environment Monitoring/Plan Effectiveness

13. Reviewing the National Monitoring Data from 2014/15 – 2018/19 from the Ministry for the Environment, there have only been a small number of resource consents for temporary activities during this time.

14. These included a consent for the Country Music Festival in South Wairarapa (for extending outside of permitted hours in the evening) and a consent for construction structures to remain in place longer than 12 months. Although not assessed as a temporary activity, a consent was also granted for a temporary accessory flat to remain in place on a site for 12 months.

15. The Advisory Group noted several issues that have arisen in relation to temporary activities:

- a. There have been issues with weddings, particularly vineyards hosting weddings and exceeding the number of permitted events per year and the operating hours. Sometimes multiple events are held over a weekend and these can be clustered in certain locations.
- b. The use of the temporary activities rules to circumvent controls such as yard and size requirements for "temporary dwellings" e.g. tiny homes, which are removed after 12 months, and then may be placed back on site after a period.
- c. The use of shipping containers for storage that do not meet setback requirements. There is a need for clarity as to whether these fall under the temporary activity rules or not.
- d. Issues with the stockpiling of gravel on sites. This can have quite a visual impact, even if for a short period.

- e. Some events require a resource consent only because they finish after 10pm. Consideration should be given to whether this is an appropriate time.
 - f. There has been an increase in the number of larger scale events such as concerts and festivals, and multi day events.
 - g. There is a general need for a review and rethink of the temporary activity rules, including consideration of the definition of what falls within the temporary activity rules, whether existing controls need to be modified and whether additional controls are required.
16. There are currently no temporary activity rules in the District Plan relating to temporary military training activities (TMTA). TMTA is a defined term in the National Planning Standards and New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) is seeking to get consistent rules for TMTA across all district plans in New Zealand.
17. Accordingly, while there are no known issues with the temporary activity objectives and policies as they are currently drafted, the rules for temporary activities may need amendment to effectively and efficiently achieve the objectives. Consideration will need to be given to linkages with other parts of the District Plan, including activities within zones and provisions relating to quarrying and earthworks.

Key Resource Management Issues

18. The key resource management issues for temporary activities are:
- a. Ensuring that there is a clear definition and a rules framework for temporary activities that enables genuine temporary activities of limited duration, while ensuring that activities that are repetitive or of a more permanent nature are captured by the additional controls in the zone rules.
 - b. Recognising and providing for the positive economic and social effects of temporary activities, including events.
 - c. Continuing to manage adverse effects of temporary activities in the districts by ensuring that appropriate controls are in place to manage their adverse effects.

2 Options/Direction Sought from Joint Committee

19. To address the issues identified above, we recommend undertaking a targeted review to revise the temporary activity rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards. This option would restructure the existing temporary activity provisions into a new Temporary Activities Chapter to align with the National Planning Standards 2019. It would also review the temporary activities provisions for any necessary updates or editorial improvements.
20. For example, consideration is to be given to the permitted activity standards for the number of events per year and the operating hours. In addition, clarifying the definition of 'temporary activities' to ensure repetitive events are clearly defined – i.e. are they included or excluded. In addition, the temporary activity provisions should be reviewed to ensure they integrate with other parts of the plan.
21. Under Section 79 of the Resource Management Act, Council must commence a review of the provisions of the District Plan if the provision has not been a subject of a proposed district plan, a review, or a change during the previous ten years. As the provisions relating to temporary activities have not been recently reviewed, this option would fulfil the requirements of Section 79 of the Resource Management Act.

Key Stakeholders

22. At this early stage, engagement with New Zealand Defence Force is proposed to understand its desires in relation to TMTA provisions. Broader community engagement will take place when the draft plan is released to the public.
23. Engagement methods will be confirmed as part of the communications and engagement plan (TBC).

3 Recommendation

24. To receive this report and commence a review in accordance with the outline above.

To:	Chair and Members, Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee
From:	Boffa Miskell
Date:	21 September 2021
Subject:	Review of activities on the surface of water
DECISION	
Recommendation: That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Receives the Review of activities on the surface of water summary report.(ii) And agrees to the undertaking of a targeted review to revise the activities on the surface of water rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards, NPSFM and NES Freshwater.	

Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review

Summary of Activities on the Surface of Water Topic Review

August 2021

1 Summary of Review Findings

Summary of the Activities on the Surface of Water Topic

1. The Wairarapa has numerous rivers, streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands, which are valued for a range of conservation, recreation, cultural, amenity and intrinsic reasons. One of the functions of district councils under the Resource Management Act is to manage the effects arising from activities on the surface of these water bodies – the water itself, as well as the beds of freshwater bodies, are managed by the Regional Council. Water within the coastal marine area is also managed by the Regional Council.
2. The surface of waterbodies in the Wairarapa is used for a range of activities, mainly recreational, and some food gathering. The potential for conflict is often between such activities: for example, between jet boating and fishing. Increased activity such as jet boat use can also adversely affect wildlife.
3. The Wairarapa Combined District Plan (“District Plan”) anticipates that some structures may be appropriate in freshwater environments. These may include bridges, small recreational structures, and infrastructure related structures. If structures are not effectively managed they may create environmental effects such as adverse visual impacts and loss of public access to riparian areas.
4. The District Plan generally permits most activities on the surface of fresh water. It requires a resource consent for motorised commercial recreation, for structures over a certain size, and for structures in place for over a certain time period.

Summary of Activities on the Surface of Water in Operative District Plan

5. Activities on the surface of water are managed in three locations in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan:
 - a. Chapter 12: Freshwater Environment, which includes objectives, policies, and anticipated environmental outcomes relating to activities on the surface of water
 - b. Chapter 21: District Wide Land Use Rules, which includes rules and standards relating to activities on the surface of water under Rule 21.1.10: Activities on the Surface of Freshwater and Rule 21.4.6 Motorised commercial recreation on the surface of freshwater
 - c. Chapter 22: Assessment Criteria, which sets out the relevant considerations for resource consent applications for activities on the surface of the water under Section 22.1.8: Surface of the Water.
6. These sections were most recently amended in 2014.
7. As noted above, Chapter 12: Freshwater Environment contains objectives and policies relating to activities on the surface of water. There are two relevant objectives:

12.3.1 Objective Fwe1 – Environmental Quality

To maintain or enhance the environmental quality of the Wairarapa's rivers, lakes, wetlands and groundwater by managing the detrimental effects of development and activities.

12.3.4 Objective Fwe2 – Public Access & Enjoyment

To facilitate public access to and enjoyment of the Wairarapa's rivers, lakes and wetlands and their margins in a manner that preserves their natural character and the property rights of adjoining landowners.

8. There are three relevant policies:

12.3.2 Fwe1 Policies

(c) Ensure that adverse cumulative effects of subdivision, land use and development on the freshwater environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

(k) Prevent structures on waterbodies and their margins unless they are an accepted or essential part of the waterbody environment (for example, culverts, bridges or stock crossings, maimais and flood defence systems).

12.3.5 Fwe2 Policies

(b) Control activities that could have an adverse effect on people's use and enjoyment of the freshwater environment.

9. To determine whether the objectives are being achieved, Section 12.4 sets out anticipated environmental outcomes, the relevant ones are:

(b) Diverse water-based activities on the surface of lakes and rivers that do not adversely affect natural character.

(c) The natural character and amenity values of the Wairarapa's freshwater environments are maintained or, where required, enhanced.

(e) Minimal conflict between users of the surface of rivers, lakes, wetlands and their margins.

10. The rules in Chapter 21 provide for most activities on the surface of water as a permitted activity. A resource consent is required for motorised commercial recreation, for structures over a certain size, and for structures in place for over a certain time period (more than two months within a twelve month period).

National Policy Direction

11. The first set of National Planning Standards was released in 2019 to improve consistency of council plans and policy statements across the country. The National Planning Standards direct that a stand-alone chapter for activities on the surface of water is provided within the 'General District-Wide Matters' section of district plans.

12. The preservation of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers, and their margins and the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along lakes and rivers are matters of national importance in section 6 of the Resource Management Act.

13. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPSFM) sets out the objectives and policies for freshwater management under the Resource Management Act. Its fundamental concept is Te Mana o te Wai – which refers to the fundamental importance of water and recognises that protecting the health of freshwater protects the health and well-being of the wider environment.

Objective 2.1 prioritises the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems. The NPSFM directs regional councils to take several actions to implement the NPSFM, including the preparation of long-term visions for freshwater in its region and ensuring the active involvement of tangata whenua in freshwater management. The Regional Council is currently considering what changes may be needed to its policies and plans to implement the NPSFM. Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.

14. The National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (Freshwater NES) set requirements for carrying out certain activities that pose risks to freshwater and freshwater ecosystems. The Freshwater NES includes standards for some in-stream structures such as culverts and weirs, for the purpose of maintaining fish passage.
15. The NPSFM and Freshwater NES do not specifically address activities on the surface of water. However, the objectives and policies are relevant in providing direction and need to be considered in developing district plan provisions for activities on the surface of water.

Regional Policy Direction

16. The Wellington Regional Policy Statement (RPS) provides an overview of the resource management issues for the Wellington Region and sets out policies and methods to manage these issues. There are several objectives and policies that are either directly or indirectly relevant to activities on the surface of water. These are the quality and quantity of water (Objective 12) the healthy functioning of ecosystems (Objective 13), water allocation (Objective 14) and public access (Objective 8). Policy 19 requires regional plans to include provisions to maintain or enhance amenity and recreational values and protect indigenous biodiversity values of identified significant rivers and lakes. Policy 53 requires councils to have regard to public access to and along certain lakes and rivers.
17. The Proposed Natural Resources Plan and the Freshwater Plan for the Wellington Region contain objectives, policies and rules that apply to any activities undertaken in or on the bed of a lake or river. This includes the construction or demolition of structures and bed disturbance.

Deeds of Settlement

18. Two Deeds of Settlement in settlement of historical Treaty claims have been signed since the District Plan provisions were last amended. These are between The Crown and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki Nui-ā-Rua and The Crown and Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Rangitāne Tamaki nui-ā-Rua. Of relevance to activities on the surface of water are:
 - The vesting of several sites in iwi governance entities, including some relating to water bodies. The bed of Wairarapa Moana/Lake Wairarapa is vested in the Rangitāne governance entity (10% share) and the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tamaki Nui-ā-Rua governance entity (90% share).
 - The establishment of a Wairarapa Moana Statutory Board to act as a guardian of the Wairarapa Moana and the Ruamahanga River catchment.
 - Statutory acknowledgements, which include several waterbodies, including the Ruamahanga River and its tributaries. A statutory acknowledgement is an acknowledgement by the Crown that recognises the mana of a tangata whenua group in relation to specified areas - particularly the cultural, spiritual, historical and traditional associations with an area. Councils must consider

statutory acknowledgements when making decisions on who to involve in resource consents and hearings.

State of the Environment Monitoring/Plan Effectiveness

19. Reviewing the National Monitoring Data from 2014/15 – 2018/19 from the Ministry for the Environment, there are no specific applications for activities on the surface of water across the three Wairarapa districts. It may be the case that there have been activities that have triggered the need for a resource consent but that these have been combined with other consent requirements. Feedback from the Advisory Group is that consents for activities on the surface of water are infrequent and usually relate to commercial activities.
20. The Advisory Group noted the following observations and key issues in relation to activities on the surface of water:
 - a. There have been some compliance issues with activities occurring within and around streams associated with residential development activities. Although activities involving disturbance or diversion of streams are a Regional Council issue, there is a need for alignment in district and regional policy and practice with respect to activities in and around streams and other freshwater bodies.
 - b. Recreational activities generally do not cause issues, but there is a need to ensure any structures comply with Freshwater NPS requirements and that consideration is given to the values and significance of particular waterbodies.
21. While the rule framework for activities on the surface of water is relatively straightforward, improvements could be made to the wording to clarify the scope of activities captured by the rules, particularly in relation to structures.
22. Accordingly, while no major issues have been identified with the efficiency and effectiveness of the objectives and policies or assessment criteria as they are currently drafted, there is a need to ensure that the provisions implement the NPSFM. Some small tweaks may be required to the rules to ensure that they work as intended and align with the Freshwater NES.

Key Resource Management Issues

23. The key resource management issues for activities on the surface of water are:
 - a. Ensuring the provisions align with the Freshwater NES and NPSFM and any changes to regional policy as these arise through changes being made by the Regional Council to implement this new national direction. This includes prioritising the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems and managing freshwater in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai.
 - b. Continuing to manage the potential for conflicts between activities occurring on lakes, rivers, wetlands and their margins, as well as with activities on adjacent land.
 - c. Maintaining and enhancing public access to and along waterbodies, without adversely affecting operational requirements of adjoining landowners.

2 Direction Sought from Joint Committee

24. To address the issues identified above, we recommend undertaking a targeted review to revise the activities on the surface of water rules and develop provisions in accordance with the National Planning Standards, NPSFM and NES Freshwater. This would largely see a roll-over of the existing activities on the surface of water provisions in the Operative District Plan and would restructure the

provisions into a new Activities on the Surface of Water Chapter to align with the National Planning Standards 2019. It would also review the provisions for any necessary updates or editorial improvements and incorporate necessary amendments arising from the NPSFM, NES Freshwater and recent Deeds of Settlement.

25. Under Section 79 of the Resource Management Act, Council must commence a review of the provisions of the District Plan if the provision has not been a subject of a proposed district plan, a review, or a change during the previous ten years. As the provisions relating to activities on the surface of water have not been recently reviewed, this option would fulfil the requirements of Section 79 of the Resource Management Act.

Key Stakeholders

26. The key stakeholders identified for the activities on the surface of water topic are:
 - a. Fish & Game Wellington
 - b. Rangitāne o Wairarapa
 - c. Ngāti Kahungunu
 - d. Greater Wellington Regional Council
 - e. Minister for the Environment
 - f. Minister of Conservation
27. Broader community engagement will take place when the draft plan is released to the public.
28. Engagement methods will be confirmed as part of the communications and engagement plan (TBC).

3 Recommendation

29. To receive this report and commence a review in accordance with the outline above.

To:	Chair and Members, Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee
From:	Boffa Miskell
Date:	21 September 2021
Subject:	Review of Rural Zone – Zoning and Approach for Subdivision
DECISION	
Recommendation: That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Receives the Rural Zone – Zoning and Approach for subdivision report(ii) agrees to engagement with key stakeholders to test and obtain feedback on preferred options for managing subdivision both generally and for rural lifestyle.	

Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review

Rural Zone – Zoning and Approach for Subdivision

August 2021

1 Introduction and Context

Background

1. At the 8 April 2021 Joint Committee meeting, the Committee confirmed the review of the Rural Zone would be a “Targeted review revising zoning structure and provisions to provide for appropriate rural zone activities, and appropriate subdivision standards”.
2. At the 1 July 2021 Joint Committee meeting, the Committee endorsed the following general objectives for the rural zone:
 - (a) Maintain and enhance the character and amenity values of rural areas¹.
 - (b) Productive land and resources support a range of production oriented and resource dependent activities.
 - (c) Primary production and other land uses utilising natural resources are able to function efficiently and effectively in rural areas.
 - (d) Sensitive activities are designed and located to minimise reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production and other land uses activities in rural areas.
 - (e) Opportunities for rural lifestyle development are provided for in appropriate locations.
 - (f) Rural lifestyle development avoids fragmentation of productive land outside of the locations where this type of development is provided for.
3. In addition, the Committee endorsed the approach of managing rural lifestyle subdivision through spatially identifying areas. Two approaches were identified for this, being:
 - (a) An “enabling” spatial approach of identifying areas suitable for rural lifestyle development and providing enabling provisions accordingly. This approach would result in a “rural-lifestyle” zone with the areas specifically identified for this zone.
 - (b) A “restrictive” spatial approach of identifying all areas where rural lifestyle development is not appropriate thereby providing for it in the remaining areas. This approach would remain with one “rural” zone and would rely upon an overlay(s) that is associated with the provisions.
4. This paper outlines the further evaluation and consideration for spatially identifying appropriate locations and the approach to rural lifestyle. It outlines the methodology for identifying appropriate rural lifestyle development and concludes that following this evaluation and through discussions with the advisory group, there is significant constraints and difficulties for effectively spatially identifying rural lifestyle, in particular in South Wairarapa and Carterton districts.
5. In order to have an informed understanding of the most appropriate approach for rural subdivision, it is considered that preferred options should be canvassed with key stakeholders. A number of options have been therefore provided, which include the high-level spatial options for the Joint Committees consideration and evaluation.
6. It is useful to first highlight the objectives that either approach would seek to achieve as outlined paragraph 2 above. Objectives (e) and (f) are the key objectives that either approach would be achieving. However, other objectives must also be integrated.

¹ Remains unchanged from the existing

Rural lifestyle in the Wairarapa

7. Before considering rural lifestyle further, it is important to first identify what an appropriate minimum lot size is for rural lifestyle in the Wairarapa and the demand for rural lifestyle. This will assist in understanding what would be anticipated for rural lifestyle regardless of the approach.
8. The size and density of rural lifestyle blocks and the nature and intensity land use of these properties are the key factors to consider.
9. To assist in understanding the relative size for rural lifestyle blocks, a review has been undertaken of other district plans and the minimum lot size for rural lifestyle starting with the other districts within the Wellington Region. The results are outlined in **Appendix 1**. Generally, the minimum lot size is 1 ha. In addition, other districts that have similar characteristics of productive land in close proximity to urban centres have also been considered. These districts generally provide for smaller minimum lot sizes between 2000 – 7500 m², however, demand is generally higher in those districts.
10. The advisory group consider that in the context of the Wairarapa, a 1 hectare minimum is appropriate. This provides sufficient land area for maintaining onsite servicing, small-scale rural activities and residential living, while minimising the potential for an inefficient use of land.
11. Smaller lots begin to lose the rural character, resembling more a large lot residential than rural lifestyle and reduces the ability for some rural activities to occur on site e.g. small-scale grazing.
12. In relation to the demand for rural lifestyle, Table 1 shows the predicted demand per year and over the next 30 years based on long-term planning.

Table 1: Projected demand for rural lifestyle based on Long Term Plans, housing assessments and spatial plans.

District	Projected dwellings in rural areas per annum	Over the next 30 years
South Wairarapa	34	1,032
Carterton	33	988
Masterton	14	426 ²
Total	81	2,446

13. This does put in perspective that there is not significant demand for rural lifestyle currently.

Methodology

14. The general evaluation criteria for identifying where rural lifestyle may be appropriate were endorsed by the Committee on the 1 July 2021 Joint Committee as being:
 - (a) Proximity to urban centres – more intensive rural lifestyle nearer to urban areas.
 - (b) Land use patterns - e.g. Pasture, horticulture, lifestyle, avoiding near established large rural and rural industry activities. Consolidating existing areas of rural lifestyle.
 - (c) Rural character and qualities - e.g. Openness, enclosure.
 - (d) Areas of significance, for instance cultural, landscape, biodiversity.
 - (e) Areas of natural hazards – e.g. flooding, erosion, slope instability

² Data for Masterton appears low based on other data sources (e.g. building consents and resource consents). The projection for Whareama census area unit in the source indicating an increase in households of up to 505 over 30 years but only an increase 104 dwellings. Data from other sources indicates this Masterton projection could be twice this amount ~30 additional dwellings per annum and ~900 additional dwellings over the next 30 years in rural areas.

- (f) Transport infrastructure - transport infrastructure can support rural lifestyle development and an increase in users.
 - (g) Conflict with urban growth areas to avoid fragmentation of future urban development areas.
 - (h) Framing the urban boundary – rural lifestyle as a tool for forming an urban boundary as a tool to contain urban development and avoid continual urban creep.
 - (i) Sensitivity of other surrounding zones and reverse sensitivity.
 - (j) Level of servicing required.
15. The methodology looks to build on this. Each of the key matters is expanded upon along with the methodology considered. To compliment this methodology, the constraints mapping is provided in Appendix 2.

Proximity to urban centres

16. Proximity to urban centres is a key consideration given in ensuring that there is not a fragmentation of development. Rural lifestyle also looks to utilise the benefits of urban centres by ensuring close proximity to them.
17. Rural lifestyle areas are expected to provide an appropriate transition from residential areas to the rural zone, while retaining a sense of spaciousness and prevailing rural character. If reticulated servicing is required, rural lifestyle needs to be located in close proximity to existing networks.
18. Conversely, areas too close to the urban boundary can hinder urban growth in particular if it conflicts with the urban growth areas, or potential urban growth areas.
19. Access and connection to urban centres is another key factor that has been considered. In particular, preference has been provided to areas situated on or directly adjacent to arterial roads and collector roads.
20. Direct access from a State Highway and railways is undesirable because of visibility and traffic safety constraints in place by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and KiwiRail. Any areas that require direct access from a State Highway and railways have been excluded.
21. To evaluate these, the advisory group have considered the buffer/distance from the urban areas by evaluating the spatial extent of the following:
- (a) Distribution of allotments by differing sizes to understand the current patterns for rural lifestyle development;
 - (b) Transport networks including State Highways, railways, arterial roads and collector roads; and
 - (c) General observations of where rural lifestyle subdivisions have been sought or are demanded.

Productive land

22. A key driver for evaluating the rural subdivision provisions in the District Plan is the protection of high production areas. As outlined at the 1 July 2021 Joint Committee meeting, Class I-III soils are located in close proximity to urban areas. While this is a key component to demonstrate productive use, viticulture tends to be located on Class III and above soils, therefore analysis should not be narrowed to the Land Use Classification.
23. To identify productive areas, the advisory group considered the spatial extent of the following, particularly in close proximity to urban areas:
- (a) LUC Class I-III soil; and
 - (b) Existing land use, specifically horticulture, viticulture and intensive grazing.

Natural environment values and human use values

24. Consideration needs to be given to the loss of natural environment values through lifestyle development. To consider this, the advisory group have considering the spatial locations of the following:
- (a) Significant Amenity Landscapes;

- (b) Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;
- (c) Areas of High (and above) Natural Character;
- (d) Natural wetlands;
- (e) Archaeological and historic sites; and
- (f) Tangata Whenua and waahi tapu sites.

Natural hazards

25. Natural hazards are a constraint for residential development which must be accounted for. The advisory group have considered the spatial extent of natural hazards throughout the district. This includes flood hazard, liquification, and erosion hazard.

Results

26. Following an evaluation and a thorough discussions with the advisory group, it has been identified that there are significant constraints to identifying rural lifestyle at this time, in particular in the South Wairarapa and Carterton Districts. The main constraint is managing the trade-off between avoiding loss of productive land and ensuring an appropriate location close to existing urban areas.
27. **Table 2** illustrates the extent of the issues associated with current subdivision encroaching on productive land, showing large portions of the LUC I-III soils have been subdivided. While there is a significant range in the Lot size, the median lot sizes are less than 3 ha illustrates the nature and scale of subdivision. As noted in previous Joint Committee meetings, LUC I-III does not reveal the full extent of highly productive land. Generally, vineyards are located on Classes IV and V LUC soils.

Table 2: Statistics on subdivision within LUC I-III soils.

Land Use Class	LUC I	LUC II	LUC III
Total Area (Ha)	4,311	27,914	75,777
Area Subdivided 2011 - 2021 (Ha)	835	4,387	11,517
% of Total Area Subdivided	19%	16%	15%
Total # of Subdivisions	88	350	892
Average Lot Size (Ha)	9.4886	12.5343	12.9114
Median Lot Size (Ha)	1.4175	2.9865	2.7190
Min Lot Size (Ha)	0.1113	0.1054	0.1000
Max Lot Size (Ha)	115.6220	185.0355	327.9994

28. Generally, the nature and scale of subdivision that has occurred does not conflict with the natural environment values, natural hazards and human use values. Areas for rural lifestyle could be effectively managed to avoid / managed within these areas.
29. Through discussions with the advisory group it is considered that there are few areas that would be appropriate for rural lifestyle without providing for trade-offs with loss of productive land and a desirable location for rural lifestyle.

Evaluation and Options

30. Because of the constraint in relation to productive land and identifying appropriate areas for rural lifestyle at this time, the advisory group consider that engagement with key stakeholders on options for subdivision in the rural area generally should be advanced. In particular, this engagement would focus on sectors with a direct interest in rural subdivision, such as the primary production industry and local surveyors. This engagement would seek to test and obtain feedback on the options for managing rural subdivision before proceeding further. This option testing needs to consider rural subdivision generally as opposed to just rural lifestyle in isolation in order to understand how the options could work together.
31. These further options does not mean a move away from the two initial options provided for spatially identifying the rural residential zone, rather considering further how rural subdivision generally will occur rather than specifically rural lifestyle.
32. A number of options to manage rural subdivision have been provided be in **Table 3** including the pros and cons of each option. These options are not mutually exclusive and may be in combination with one another.

Table 3: Options for managing rural lifestyle. Key: * means currently provided in the Operative Combined District Plan in some way.

Option Number and Name	Key Outcome	Parameters	Pros	Cons
Option 1 – General Rural Subdivision	Maintain rural land in large properties for primary production activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum lot size: 20 hectares 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for rural character and production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not provide for rural lifestyle; Does not provide for exceptions where primary production is maintained
Option 2 – Boundary Adjustments*	Maintain rural land in large properties for primary production activities by relocating internal boundaries or boundaries with neighbouring properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional lots created No minimum lot size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for rural character and production Provides for small and reasonable changes to occur 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grandparents current areas based on the number of lots owned Provides only limited rural lifestyle subdivision.
Option 3 - Subdivision of Maori Freehold Land*	Enable subdivision of Maori freehold land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a full partition is proposed by the owners, it must be approved by the Maori Land Court as well as Council No minimum parameters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for subdivision of Maori free hold land and papakainga 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets separate rules/standards to recognise this specific type of subdivision
Option 4 – General Rural Subdivision and Surplus	Maintain rural land in large properties for primary production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lot containing surplus habitable dwelling with minimum lot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for rural character and production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides limited rural lifestyle

Habitable Dwellings*	activities with the ability to subdivide a surplus dwelling.	size of 2,500m ² and maximum lot size of 1 ha. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum balance lot size: 20 hectares 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for second dwelling e.g. worker accommodation or small capital income 	
Option 5 – General Rural Subdivision and Limit Rural Lifestyle Subdivision*	Maintain majority of rural land in large properties for primary production activities, and a small amount of rural lifestyle lots in rural locations to provide rural living opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum number (e.g. 1 – 4) of 'small' lots, with a minimum lot size of 1 ha. Minimum balance lot size: 20 hectares Date restriction limiting further subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for rural character and production Provides for limited rural lifestyle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues to be ad-hoc in terms of location Grandparents leading to potential goldrush effect Only provides for limited rural lifestyle Does not fully address loss of productive land
Option 6 – General Rural Subdivision and Rural Lifestyle Subdivision Based on Size of Property	Maintain majority of rural land in large properties for primary production activities, and a small amount of rural lifestyle lots in rural locations to provide rural living opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum number of 'small' lots based on a proportion of the total property size (e.g. one additional small lot per 10 hectares), with a minimum lot size of 1 ha. Minimum balance lot size: 20 hectares 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for rural character and production Ensures a proportional balance between rural lifestyle/maintaining productive land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues to be ad-hoc in terms of location Potential for loopholes Does not fully address loss of productive land. Only provides for limited rural lifestyle Does not fully address loss of productive land
Option 7 – Protect Highly Productive Land and Rural Lifestyle Subdivision on Other Rural Land	Maintain highly productive land (LUC 1 – 3) in large properties for primary production activities, and allow a small amount of rural lifestyle lots in rural locations on other (lower quality) rural land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LUC 1 – 3 Land has minimum lot size: 20 hectares LUC 4 – 8 Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a maximum number (e.g. 1 – 4) of 'small' lots, with a minimum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides direct link between productive land and ability to directly manage the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly prescriptive and may not provide for exceptions. May not provide full coverage of productive land e.g. LUC 4 – 8 land Only provides for limited rural lifestyle

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • m lot size of 1 ha. • Minimum balance lot size: 20 hectares • Date restriction limiting further subdivision 		
Option 8 – Rural lifestyle zone	Enable rural lifestyle to occur in appropriate locations throughout the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum lot size: 1 hectare • Set parameters on nature of rural lifestyle development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables rural lifestyle to occur • Provides certainty for the public • Avoids an ad-hoc approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant constraints in identifying areas
Option 9 – Conservation Lot Subdivision	Provide an opportunity for landowners to create additional lots where a Significant Natural Area exists which is not already legally protected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable up to two additional 'small' lots (e.g. 1 ha) to be created where it does not comply with other subdivision standards (e.g. minimum balance lot size). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides ability for conservation lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets separate rules/standards

2 Recommendation and Direction Sought

33. It is recommended that engagement with key stakeholders is undertaken as outlined below to test and obtain feedback on preferred options from **Table 3** for managing subdivision both generally and for rural lifestyle.
34. It is recommended that the following stakeholders are engaged in the form of a workshop to discuss and test preferred options for rural subdivision:
- Federated Farmers;
 - Dairy New Zealand;
 - Horticulture New Zealand;
 - Wairarapa Wine Growers Association; and
 - Local surveyors.
35. Direction is sought from the Joint Committee on the approach for this early engagement and for the preferred option(s) to test and obtain feedback from the stakeholders as outlined in **Table 3** and/or additional that are not specified.

Appendix 1 – Minimum lot sizes for Rural Lifestyle

Council	Minimum lot size
Wellington Region	
Wellington City Council	1 ha
Upper Hutt City Council	1 ha
Lower Hutt City Council	2 ha
Porirua District Council	2 ha
Kapiti Coast District Council	1 ha average, 4000 m ² average
Other relevant districts	
Horowhenua District Council	2000 – 5000 m ²
Marlborough District Council	7500 m ²
Central Hawkes Bay District Council	4000 m ²
Gisborne District Council	5000 m ²

Appendix 2 – Constraints maps

To:	Chair and Members, Wairarapa Combined Council Forum
From:	Cat White, Communications and Engagement Advisor, Wairarapa Combined District Plan
Date:	21 September 2021
Subject:	Wairarapa Combined District Plan Communications and Engagement Update
DECISION	
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Joint Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Receives Report 179/21 Wairarapa Combined District Plan Communications and Engagement Update ii. Approves the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Communications Plan (Attachment 1 to Report 179/21) 	

Purpose of report

To recommend that the Joint Committee adopt the attached Communications Plan.

Executive summary

The Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee has considered the attached Communications Plan at its workshop on 12 August 2021. The Plan sets out an approach to the communications and engagement process including objectives, key narrative and a project timeline.

Background:

The Joint Committee has previously requested a communications plan to ensure that the Wairarapa community, including key stakeholders and iwi, are aware that:

1. A review of the combined plan is required under the Resource Management Act.
2. The review needs to reflect the respective Councils' and communities' aspirations for the future, as well as respond to the new regional and national policy directions made over the last decade.
3. The combined district plan is the Wairarapa's regulatory land use document and is expected to continue to play a central role in how the Wairarapa evolves and how development is managed in the decades ahead (including an important transitional regulatory function as Resource Management Act legislation is reformed over the next few years).
4. The review of the combined district plan will be a partial review but may also include rolling updates (to reflect RMA reforms currently underway in line with advice from central

Government). The focus of the review is on key issues facing Wairarapa's communities but will not change aspects of the existing district plan that are already working well.

5. There will be opportunities for consultation and input as the new combined district plan is developed, including a formal submission and hearing process to follow, once a new proposed combined district plan has been publicly notified.

The Communications Plan sets out key messages by theme, including reasons for the review, engagement, and a process for ensuring significant resource management issues are identified, along with planning options for addressing these. The Communications Plan also sets out a timeline for the review, which is broken down into three key phases as shown below:



The Communications Plan will be owned by the Joint Committee and implemented by the Technical Advisory Group.

Conclusion

The Communications Plan has been designed to support the Joint Committee in informing stakeholders and the public on the review of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

36

WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

COMMUNICATION PLAN AS AT 5 AUGUST 2021

This plan sets out communications for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Process.

COMMUNICATIONS OBJECTIVES

This plan has been created to ensure the Wairarapa community, including key stakeholders and iwi, are aware that:

- A review of the combined plan is required under the Resource Management Act, to ensure it reflects the councils' and community aspirations for the future, as well as respond to the new regional and national policy directions made over the last decade.
- The Plan is the Wairarapa's most important land use document and plays a central role in how the Wairarapa evolves in the decades ahead.

The review will be a partial review but with rolling updates (to reflect the potential impact of the RMA reforms currently in development and in line with advice by central government), focusing on key segments within the existing plan.

APPROACH

We recommend a proactive approach to highlighting the Wairarapa Combined District Plan and its intended outcomes, utilising milestones during the process to engage and re-engage stakeholders by highlighting its importance to our community as the region's most important land use document.

KEY NARRATIVE

The reason for review

Over the next three years the three Wairarapa Councils will undertake a review of the operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan and complete the preparation, notification and decisions on an updated Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

A review of the combined plan is required under the Resource Management Act, and to ensure it reflects the councils' and community aspirations for the future, as well as respond to the new regional and national policy directions made over the last decade.

Objectives of the Review

Develop a plan (or make changes to our operative plan) that:

- Is developed in consultation with the community
- is developed in consultation with tangata whenua
- meets Treaty of Waitangi responsibilities, legislative requirements
- complies with Government policy directives and legislation
- implements National Planning Standards
- is evidenced-based
- is informed by knowledge
- gives effect to higher order planning documents
- implements the strategic aims/plans of the three Councils
- is user-friendly
- is an easy-to-understand document

Engagement and planning

During development and Draft Plan engagement:

- Wairarapa is growing – we’re reviewing our District Plan to make sure our future growth reflects our communities’ lifestyles.
- We are looking at whether the District Plan is working, what issues have emerged since the last plan and how to reflect any changes in legislation, national policy statements, environmental standards and other regulations/
- Help us shape Wairarapa’s future by getting involved with the review of the Combined Wairarapa District Plan.
- We are updating the district plan to comply with Government legislative and policy directives, including urban development, essential freshwater management and climate change resilience.

Significant Resource Management issues

The review will be a full review but with rolling updates (to reflect the potential impact of the RMA reforms currently in development and in line with advice by central government), focusing on key segments within the existing plan. The key segments for review are:

- Environmental zones: rural, residential, commercial, industrial
- District-wide issues: tangata whenua, historic heritage, natural hazards, subdivision rules, land development and urban growth and district-wide land use rules
- Consenting process: designations and definitions

TIMING OF THE REVIEW

In broad terms, the review project has six key components:

1. Gaining an understanding of the significant resource management issues for the Wairarapa, how the current District Plan is performing in managing those issues, and how the District Plan Review process will address each issue.
2. Undertaking early and ongoing engagement, providing opportunities for wider public input as well as focused sessions with key stakeholders and interested parties.
3. Developing an appropriate information base upon which the review is based, and which informs and supports key decisions on policy direction.
4. Ensuring the review is locally relevant, which recognises and supports local planning solutions which can be easily implemented.
5. Retaining sections of the operative plan that remain effective and efficient.
6. Providing a timely and efficient notification and submission process, which focuses on resolving issues and achieving a high level of buy-in from councillors, officers and the community.

The process can be broken into three key phases of work as illustrated below:



COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITIES

Communication opportunities should focus on generating interest in and awareness of the review of the Plan process from its commencement. Engagement and attendance opportunities for key stakeholders should be promoted and should provide avenues for interested members of the public to participate in the development phase and the Draft Plan engagement phase. People already in the process should be kept informed of progress and making accessible background and context available will enable new audiences to get involved.

Stage One – from December 2021

Scoping, research and consultation including:

- Initial engagement with key stakeholders to identify/confirm significant resource management issues
- Community and stakeholder engagement on Issues and Options

Stage Two – January 2022-December 2022

Consultation on possible changes through draft plan including:

- Engagement and consultation on Draft Plan

- Engagement – in the form of targeted engagement relating to feedback on Draft Plan

Stage Three – January 2023 – December 2023

Formal notification of proposed plan and submission/hearing process.

- Engagement and consultation on Proposed Plan

SPOKESPEOPLE

Councillor representatives from the Joint Committee will be spokespeople for the Plan review process.

All media enquiries should be directed in the first instance to [xxxxxxx.](#)

APPENDIX 1

TABLE 1 – COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW COMMS ACTIVITY

TACTIC	ACTIVITIES	DATE
Establish branded easy to find communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish specific branding for all review project related comms Website updates with key messaging, FAQs, timeline overview, info on how to be involved Local media advertising, social media 	Stage One – from December 2021
Regular and consistent messaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website updates with key messaging, FAQs, timeline overview, info on how to be involved e-newsletters, presentations at key events, media releases, mayoral/CE columns, local media advertising, social media 	From Stage One and throughout
Engaging with key stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and regularly review key stakeholders and interested parties Interviews and tailored emails, letters, phone calls 	From Stage One and throughout

APPENDIX 2 –



WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN PROJECT – STAKEHOLDER UPDATE

21 September 2021

1. Project Background

The Wairarapa Combined District Plan (the Plan) is now ten years old and is due for review.

District Plans must be reviewed and updated every 10 years. The review of the District Plan is an opportunity to influence how the Council controls land use and subdivision in the District.

The three Wairarapa District Councils have resolved to continue having a Combined District Plan for all three districts, and to jointly review the operative Combined District Plan.

2. Progress So Far

A joint committee comprising all three councils was established on 10 November 2020 with an independent chair. This committee is responsible for preparing and approving a new combined district plan covering the Wairarapa.

The Joint Committee comprises David McMahon (independent Chair), Councillors Frazer Mailman (MDC), Tina Nixon (MDC), Robyn Cherry-Campbell (CDC), Rob Stockley (CDC), Alistair Plimmer (SWDC), Brian Jephson (SWDC), and iwi representatives Robin Potangaroa (Ngāti Kahungunu), and Jo Hayes (Rangitāne o Wairarapa).

A work programme has been agreed to which seeks to put a Combined District Plan to Councillors for adoption in 2023.

3. Looking Ahead

The Joint Committee will firstly look at the existing District Plan to determine whether the resource management issues identified are still relevant (and to identify any new issues that have risen) and to assess which provisions are working or are not working.

This process will be supported by planners from the District Councils and input will also be sought from iwi and key stakeholders. The scoping and research phase is likely to conclude in early 2022.

4. Opportunities for Input

Future updates will show our indicative timeline and give you an opportunity to identify the sections you would like to participate in developing. We can then invite you to participate in opening

conversations. There will also be opportunities for formal submissions once the draft consultation document is released.

If you have questions about the review process in the meantime, call your Council directly.

ENDS

APPENDIX 3 – FAQ'S

HOW CAN I BE INVOLVED?

- Over the next few months, we'll give you more information about the review. During the review process we'll be asking you what you want for our district and what's important to you about how our region develops. There will also be opportunities for formal submissions once the draft consultation document is released.
- In addition to this, we will be approaching key interest groups and stakeholders for their input in the early stages.
- If you have questions at any point throughout the review process, call us directly on [\[insert Council contact details\]](#).

WHAT IS A DISTRICT PLAN?

- A District Plan impacts on almost everything you do across our district, and how you do it.
- It's a 'rule book' which sets out what activities you can do (permitted activities) and what activities you will need a resource consent for.
- The District Plan also controls any adverse effects your activity could have on the neighbours and vice versa. For example, how much noise you can make or how close to a boundary you can build your house.
- The District Plan also protects the uniqueness of our district, for example by looking after our cultural and historic heritage, our natural environment and indigenous biodiversity.
- A District Plan also gives effect to Government policies such as managing urban development, protecting productive land, providing affordable housing, safeguarding our freshwater sources and helping communities plan for disruptions from natural hazards and climate change.
- During the review, we expect to receive direction from Government as new policies are rolled out. These policies are likely to prescribe new strategies for
 - reforming the country's water services
 - funding infrastructure costs for new developments
 - protecting indigenous biodiversity.
- The review will therefore need to include consideration of these policies, and possibly others, as they arise.

HOW IS THE DISTRICT PLAN RELEVANT TO ME?

- A District Plan impacts on almost everything you do across our district, and how you do it. It sets out:
 - what you can build on your property and where
 - what kind of business can operate next door to you
 - whether you or your neighbour can subdivide land and for what purpose
 - how our indigenous biodiversity and cultural and natural and historical heritage are to be managed and protected
 - whether you can run a business from home
 - how much noise you or your neighbour can make

- whether your property is at risk from present or future natural hazards

DID YOU KNOW OUR PLAN IS UNIQUE?

- Ten years ago our Councils led the way in preparing the current operative Combined District Plan which is the first plan under the Resource Management Act to be prepared jointly by neighbouring district councils. We have an opportunity now to reflect on how effective a single resource management framework has been for our three districts, which previously had separate District Plans. The aim is to achieve consistent planning outcomes across our combined sub-region, where there were many similar or common planning issues as well as cross-boundary issues.

WHAT WILL THE NEW COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN LOOK LIKE?

- The new District Plan needs to balance cultural, environmental and economic interests that make the Wairarapa such a great place to live. The review provides an opportunity to take a fresh look at how we want our growing region to evolve, how we manage development and address environmental issues, while ensuring economic health and wellbeing.