



Forest & Bird

TE REO O TE TAIAO | *Giving Nature a Voice*

Further Submission – Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan

Clause 8 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

24 July 2025

To: Hutt City Council
district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

From: Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)
Amelia Geary – Regional Conservation Manager
a.geary@forestandbird.org.nz

This is a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submissions on the proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.

Forest & Bird wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

Forest & Bird will consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar further submission, at a hearing.

Forest & Bird represents relevant aspects of the public interest. Forest & Bird has been around since 1923 and is New Zealand's largest independent conservation organisation with over 100,000 members and supporters.

FURTHER SUBMISSION

| I support or oppose the submission of: | The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: | The reasons for my support or opposition are: | I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Department of Conservation Submitter #405 jmacleod@doc.govt.nz cc: RMA@doc.govt.nz | Support whole submission. | This submission seeks a decision that will assist with integrated management across the relevant legislation and higher order planning documents. | Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, unless where it conflicts with Forest & Bird's original submission, in which case our original submission stands. |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Oppose SP #3 Maps - Natural Environment Values Overlays Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | This submission point is inconsistent with s6b of the RMA which does not recognise private property boundaries or limit protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes to Crown-owned property. The requested amendment to NFL-P1 is also inconsistent with the RMA and does not give effect to Policy 25 of the Regional Policy Statement. Refer to relief sought in original submission PDP/410. | Seek the submission point and requested amendments to NFL-P1 be disallowed. |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Oppose SP #11 CE - Coastal Environment (General) NFL-P4 (Indigenous vegetation removal in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) | This submission point is inconsistent with Policies 11 and 15 of the NZCPS. | Seek the requested exemptions under clause 1 be disallowed. |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Oppose SP #14, 15 and 16 SCHED4 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | The relief sought does not give effect to s6b of the RMA which does not recognise private property boundaries or limit protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes to Crown-owned property. Furthermore, the request to exclude actively farmed land may not give | Seek that the ONFLs in SCHED4 are retained as notified and that these requests for boundary adjustments and exclusions are disallowed. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | effect to Policy 25 of the Regional Policy Statement as it is possible that such land could still meet RPS criteria for outstanding natural values. | |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Oppose SP #19 – 23 NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes NFL-R3 (Indigenous vegetation removal in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) | The relief sought seeks to weaken the indigenous vegetation rules in ONFLs which will negatively affect the value of those landscapes. Applying this rule to the Coastal Environment is also not appropriate as that is addressed in the Coastal chapter. | Seek that the submission points be disallowed. |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Oppose SP #25 NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes NFL-R4 (New land use activities in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) | The relief sought is inconsistent with Policies 11 and 15 of the NZCPS. | Seek that this submission point is disallowed. |
| Federated Farmers Submitter #410 rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz | Support SP #46 EW - Earthworks EW-O1 (Earthworks) | The relief sought makes the objective consistent with s5(2)(c) of the RMA which directs that adverse effects on the environment are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | Seek that the submission point be allowed. |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council Submitter #452 Richard.Sheild@gw.govt.nz cc: regionalplan@gw.govt.nz | Support whole submission. | This submission seeks a decision that will assist with integrated management across the relevant legislation and regional planning documents. | Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, unless where it conflicts with Forest & Bird's original submission, in which case our original submission stands. |
| Clarus Submitter #474 Pam.Unkovich@firstgas.co.nz | Oppose SP #49 – 57 REG – Renewable Electricity Generation Whole chapter REG-O1 – O3 REG-P1 – P3, REG-P5 Rules | No definition is offered by the submitter as to what 'renewable liquid and gas energy sources' are. Not all gases are renewable. The relief sought is potentially incompatible with renewable energy generation and therefore opens up the district plan to unintended | Seek that the submission points and consequential changes sought be disallowed. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | consequences not covered under higher order planning documents. | |
| Transpower Submitter #504 Rebecca Eng environment.policy@transpower.co.nz | Oppose SP #29 INF – Infrastructure INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) | The relief sought weakens the direction for avoiding and minimising adverse effects. | Seek the request be disallowed. |
| Transpower Submitter #504 Rebecca Eng environment.policy@transpower.co.nz | Oppose SP #30 INF - Infrastructure INF-P8 (Upgrading and developing the National Grid) | The relief seeks to improve alignment with the NPS-ET but we are concerned it has weakened the direction of the original policy. | Seek the proposed replacement text be considered against the original policy to ensure no unnecessary weakening of the policy. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |