

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

UNDER THE Resource Management Act 1991 (**Act**)
IN THE MATTER OF Proposed Change 1 to the Wellington Regional
Council's Regional Policy Statement (**PC1**)
BETWEEN **WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**
Local Authority
AND **WAIRARAPA FEDERATED FARMERS**
Submitter 163 to PC1

**HEARING STREAM SEVEN
HEARING STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH MCGRUDDY ON BEHALF OF
WAIRARAPA FEDERATED FARMERS**

10 APRIL 2024

INTRODUCTION

1. Wairarapa Federated Farmers (**WFF**) made a submission on Proposed Change 1 (**PC1**) to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**).
2. The purpose of this Hearing Statement is to summarise Federated Farmers' position in respect of matters under consideration in Hearing Stream 7 (**HS7**).
3. It should be read alongside the WFF submission, and alongside WFF evidence (Natasha Berkett) and hearing statement to HS5, including in respect of Variation One.
4. This statement addresses the following matters:
 - (a) WFF Primary Relief
 - (b) WFF response to Council recommended amendments including:
 - Variation One – long-term freshwater visions
 - Definition of RSI - in respect of water storage
 - Consideration policies – in respect of resource consents

FFNZ PRIMARY RELIEF

5. WFF relief sought generally that the scope of PC1 be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development; and that other proposed amendments be deleted and considered in the upcoming full review of the RPS.
6. WFF reiterate that this approach would provide a more measured, integrative and consultative process.
7. To the extent that the proposed amendments under consideration in HS7 are progressed, WFF propose alternate relief on specific provisions below.

VARIATION ONE

8. Variation One proposes to insert two freshwater visions as objectives to give effect to the NPS-FW:
 - 3.3 “*Long-term vision for water bodies or catchments*” directs that visions be developed for FMUs and catchments which are developed through discussion with communities and tangata whenua and which are ambitious but reasonable.
9. WFF note that the proposed long-term visions were not crafted as such in the respective WIPs (Whaitua implementation Plans); and does not agree that proposing long-term visions which apply “*generally*” (HS5, supplementary evidence, Kate Pascall, para 11) to entire whaitua is a substitute for the NPS-FW directive that these be prepared for FMUs (or part-FMUs).
10. WFF note that Council reporting officers do not propose including long-term visions for other whaitua (Kapiti, Ruamahanga, Wairarapa Coast). WFF agree (HS5, supplementary evidence, Kate Pascall, para 13) that “*adding these via submissions on Change One does not provide sufficient opportunity for all parties to provide input*” and that these can be inserted (our emphasis) “*prior to or in parallel with the Councils future NRP change for the remaining whaitua*”.
11. WFF preferred relief is that proposed long-term visions for the Porirua and Wellington-Hutt Whaitua be progressed in parallel with the NRP Change One process for those two whaitua; and amended to provide for long-term visions in respect of FMUs which are identified in NRP Change One.
12. To the extent Variation One is progressed within the RPS Change One process, WFF recommend that the caveats recommended in respect of clause 7 which provides for social and economic benefits be deleted. WFF submit that a long-term vision which is “*ambitious but reasonable*” can reasonably aspire to provide for all values (social and economic alongside cultural and recreational) while also providing for progressive environmental improvement. WFF recommend amending clause 7 to provide more generously for social and economic values, including a thriving primary sector, or alternatively amend to simply read:
 7. Provide for social and economic use.

DEFINITION OF RSI

13. WFF reiterate that the definition of RSI should provide more generally for water storage infrastructure – not just local authority networks - including for the reasons set out in the WFF HS5 Hearing Statement.
14. WFF acknowledge that the NES provides a consenting pathway subject to gateway tests. Further to this, however, as noted in the WFF HS5 Hearing Statement, MfE encourage regional councils “*to begin the process of identifying appropriate infrastructure in their policy statements and plans*”.
15. WFF acknowledge reporting officers concern that while off-line storage is promoted within the RPS, other forms of water storage may not necessarily be assessed as having regional benefits. As above, however, proposals are still subject to gateway tests and the effects management hierarchy.
16. WFF recommend the definition of RSI be amended to include words to the following or similar effect:
 - Rural water storage and supply networks

CONSIDERATION POLICIES

17. WFF reiterate its preferred relief (as set out in the WFF submission and in statements to earlier hearing streams) is that RPS consideration policies should appropriately direct regional and district plans but should not apply to resource consents.

ENDS