

**IN THE MATTER OF  
AND  
IN THE MATTER OF**

the Resource Management Act 1991

a resource consent application by Masterton Solar and Energy Storage Limited – CDC Ref# 240005 – for Land Use Consent for a 100-megawatt renewable energy project, being the establishment of an agrivoltaics development (Solar Farm) including solar panels, inverters, transformers, battery energy storage system, a substation, a site office and connection to nearby Masterton Substation, located at 3954A State Highway 2, Carterton.

---

**DECISION OF THE HEARING COMMISSIONER APPOINTED BY  
CARTERON DISTRICT COUNCIL PURSUANT TO SECTION 34A OF  
THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

---

**Independent Commissioner:**

Mark St.Clair

**5 December 2024**

## APPOINTMENTS

- [1] Pursuant to Section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**), independent commissioner Mark St. Clair was appointed as a commissioner by Carterton District Council (CDC or Council) to determine the application lodged by the “**Applicant** or **NZCE**” Masterton Solar and Energy Storage Limited<sup>1</sup> – CDC Ref# 240005 – Land Use Consent for a 100-megawatt renewable energy project, being the establishment of an agrivoltaics development (Solar Farm) including solar panels, inverters, transformers, battery energy storage system, a substation, a site office and connection to nearby Masterton Substation, located at 3954A State Highway 2, Carterton. For completeness, I was also appointed under Section 34A of the RMA, to make a decision on the acceptance of late submissions, see details below.

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

### Directions and procedural matters

- [2] I attach the minutes related to this matter in **Appendix 1**.
- [3] In summary, the minutes primarily address the requests from a number of parties to lodge late submissions, change request not to be heard, and/or challenge the notification process and seek, amongst other things, renotification of the application. In Minute #8, I set out my decision and reasons for declining to accept the late submissions and other directions sought by the parties. In addition, I requested that the Council provide a section 42A of the RMA report (**section 42A Report**) by 3pm Friday 29 November 2024. That report was duly filed and I proceeded to consider the matter and prepare the decision. The section 42A Report is attached as **Appendix 2**.
- [4] I undertook a site visit, which included the surrounding area and the locations of other solar farms, consented and/or appealed in the area. I was not accompanied by any other party.

### Decision format

- [5] I have had regard to the requirements of Section 113 of the RMA when preparing this decision. In particular I note and have acted in accordance with Section 113(3) which states:

*“A decision prepared under subsection (1) may, -*

- (a) instead of repeating material, cross-refer to all or a part of -*
  - (i) the assessment of environmental effects provided by the applicant concerned:*
  - (ii) any report prepared under section 41C, 42A, or 92; or*
- (b) adopt all or a part of the assessment or report, and cross-refer to the material accordingly.”*

---

<sup>1</sup> Masterton Solar and Energy Storage Ltd (trading as New Zealand Clean Energy Limited (NZCE))

[6] The submissions and the section 42A Report raised particular issues in relation to landscape, visual amenity and rural character, glint and glare, acoustic effects, transport effects, contaminant effects, earthworks, services, ecological effects, cultural and heritage effects, decommissioning, cumulative and positive effects. I have considered all those matters in reaching my decision.

## THE APPLICATION PROCESS

[7] NZCE filed an application for land use consent for a 100-megawatt renewable energy project, being the establishment of an agrivoltaics development (**Solar Farm**) including solar panels, inverters, transformers, battery energy storage system, a substation, a site office and connection to nearby Masterton Substation, located at 3954A State Highway 2, Carterton. (**the subject site**) on 1 March 2024.

[8] On 10 March 2024, CDC requested further information including a request for a landscape and visual assessment peer review. That information was provided on 17 April 2024.

[9] The consent application was publicly notified on 3 July 2024 with the submission period closing on 30 June 2024.

[10] CDC received three submissions. *“One in support (Mr Telford at 103 Kaka Amu Road, Masterton) and two in opposition (Ms. Emerson at 3920 State Highway 2 and Mr and Mrs Hendrikse at 532 Hughes Line). Ms. Emerson expressed concern about effects on visual amenity, glare and impacts on her family’s lifestyle. Mr and Mrs Hendrikse did not express any particular concerns.”*<sup>2</sup> Mr Telford set out his reasons for supporting the proposal, including, need for increased capacity of electrical energy, land could continue to be used for agriculture, and ideal use of contaminated land.

[11] The requests for acceptance of late submissions, change in request to be heard and other directions sought by parties I have addressed in the procedural matters above and do not repeat it here.

[12] A section 42A Report dated 28 November 2024, was prepared by Ms Claire Kelly (**section 42A Reporting Officer**), consulting planner for the Council.

[13] I record that the Applicant obtained written approval from 61 East Taratahi Road, 558 Hughes Line, 11 Norfolk Road, 24 Norfolk Road, 45 Waingawa Road, 49 Waingawa Road, 11 Norman Ave/1 Pakihi Road, 7 Pakihi Road, 11 Pakihi Road and Hood Aerodrome, Solway, Masterton.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 13

<sup>3</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 8

[14] I acknowledge that the Greater Wellington Regional Council on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2024 granted a land use consent and discharge permit relating to the construction phase of the proposal, along with a suite of conditions.<sup>4</sup>

[15] I also record that I read the submissions in full and I have had regard to them as part of my evaluation of the application.

[16] All of the material presented by the above parties is held on file at CDC. For the sake of brevity, I do not repeat that material in the decision. However, I do refer to relevant matters raised in the material in subsequent parts of the decision.

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND ZONING

[17] The property (“**the subject site**”) is legally described as follows:

**Legal Description:** Summary Table

RT Ref	Legal Description	Area (ha)
WNF1/1189	Pt Lot 2 DP 2099	27.9819
WNF1/1188	Pt Lot 3 DP 2099	28.313
WNF17b/749	Pt Lot 1 DP 46533	50.0816
WNF765/45	Lot 1 DP 19148	0.0376
WNFD1/413	Pt Lot 4 DP 2099	13.8024
WN638/13	Lot 1 DP 17189	3.0461
WNF248/15	Lot 1 DP 3447	9.9947
WN213/272	Pt Lot 4 DP 2099	13.7593

**Site Area:** 147Ha

**Site Address:** 3954A State Highway 2, Carterton

**District Plan Zone:** Operative District Plan – Rural (Special) and Rural (Primary Production)

Operative District Plan Overlays - Contaminated site (SN/07/006/02), Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface and Air noise contour.

Proposed District Plan – General Rural

Proposed District Plan Overlays - Airport obstacle limitation surface, Air noise contour, highly productive land, and Noise boundary for State Highway 2.<sup>5</sup>

[18] The Application<sup>6</sup> and section 42A Report<sup>7</sup> describe the site and surrounding area, including the history of the site itself, land use classification, ecological values,

<sup>4</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 20 - 21

<sup>5</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 22, 25, 30 and 31

<sup>6</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 4

<sup>7</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 22 – 24, 29, 32 - 36

contaminated land, natural hazards, transportation and cultural and historic heritage features. I adopt those descriptions. However, I also adopt the identification and description of the Masterton Solar Farm Ltd, consented 25 Ha solar farm at 51, 99 and 107 Cornwall Road and the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 consent but appealed to the High Court of Harmony Energy NZ #2 Limited 100MW solar farm, at 510 Hughes Line, 271 Perrys Road & 303 East Taratahi Road,<sup>8</sup> as part of my consideration. For completeness I record, that I have not considered the consented Light Years Solar Farm, 331 Norfolk Road, Waingawa, due its distance from the subject site.<sup>9</sup>

## THE PROPOSAL

[19] The proposal was fully described in the application<sup>10</sup> and the section 42A officer's report prepared by Ms Kelly.<sup>11</sup> In summary, the proposal,

*"... will include establishing a utility-scale 100-megawatt renewable energy project, supported by a battery energy storage system that will have a 100 megawatt / 200-400 megawatt hour capacity. This will include erecting solar panels, inverters, transformers, battery energy storage system, a substation, a site office, and establishing a connection to the nearby Masterton Substation. It is proposed to occupy approximately 138ha of the subject site. It is proposed that the resource consent will have a duration of 40 years."<sup>12</sup>*

[20] For completeness, I record that the connection between the subject site and the Masterton Substation via a new underground cable may require separate approval from Transpower and any consents required under the National Environmental Standard for Electricity Transmission Activities (**NES-ETA**), and any changes required to the Masterton Substation do not form part of this application.<sup>13</sup>

## ACTIVITY STATUS

[21] It was common ground that consent was required as a discretionary activity for earthworks under Regulation 11 of the National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (**NES-CS**).<sup>14</sup>

[22] Similarly, it was common ground that under the Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan (2011) (**ODP**), the overall activity status was discretionary. The application and the section 42A Report, identified the following rule triggers; Rule 4.5.5(c), Rule 21.1.24(iii), Rule 21.4.10, and Rule 21.6(a)<sup>15</sup>. In addition, I adopt the reasoning in the section 42A Report that the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (notified 11

---

<sup>8</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 27 - 28

<sup>9</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 180

<sup>10</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 5

<sup>11</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 37-44

<sup>12</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Para 1.0.2

<sup>13</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Bullet Point 1 on Page 11 and Para 43

<sup>14</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 6.1a and Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 49-50

<sup>15</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 6.3b and Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 45-46

Oct 2023) (**PDP**) rules do not have immediate legal effect under s86B of the RMA 1991, and therefore do not influence the activity status of this application.<sup>16</sup>

[23] I accept that overall, the application is to be assessed as a discretionary activity.

## **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

[24] This application falls to be considered as a discretionary activity under Part 2 and Sections 104 and 104B, of the RMA.

### **SECTION 104B of the RMA**

[25] As a discretionary activity, the application must be considered against the requirements of Section 104B, which states that:

***104B Determination of applications for discretionary or non-complying activities***

*After considering an application for a resource consent for a discretionary activity or non-complying activity, a consent authority—*

*(a) may grant or refuse the application; and*

*(b) if it grants the application, may impose conditions under section 108.*

### **SECTION 104 of the RMA**

[26] Section 104 (1) of the RMA requires that a consent authority:

*(1) When considering an application for a resource consent and any submissions received, the consent authority must, subject to Part 2 and section 77M, have regard to—*

*(a) any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity; and*

*(b) any relevant provisions of—*

*(i) a national environmental standard:*

*(ii) other regulations:*

*(iii) a national policy statement:*

*(iv) a New Zealand coastal policy statement:*

*(v) a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement:*

*(vi) a plan or proposed plan, and*

*(c) any other matter the consent authority considers relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application.*

[27] I have regard to each of the above matters listed in Section 104(1) in the below sections.

### **Section 104(1)(a) – Actual and Potential Effects on the Environment**

#### The existing environment

[28] Before addressing the actual and potential effects of the proposed activity, I must consider the environment against which the effects are assessed. This includes existing lawful activities, consented activities and permitted activities.

---

<sup>16</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 47

[29] There was general agreement as to the existing environment to be considered as part of the application as addressed above. I accept from the Application<sup>17</sup> and the section 42A Report<sup>18</sup>, that there is no permitted activity baseline, as provided for under section 104(2), in relation to the proposal.

### Considering the Effects

[30] The effects as to landscape, visual amenity and rural character, glint and glare, acoustic effects, transport effects, contaminant effects, earthworks, services, ecological effects, cultural and heritage effects, decommissioning, reserve sensitivity effects and positive effects, were addressed in the application<sup>19</sup>, landscape peer review and section 42A Report<sup>20</sup>. There is a considerable amount of commonality in the assessments, as well as agreement as to conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, including a reliance on some conditions being offered by the Applicant on an Augier basis. I generally adopt those assessments, which subject to the conditions imposed, I find acceptable.

[31] There are, however, particular aspects in relation to some ecological effects and in relation to cumulative effects where I prefer the assessment of the section 42A Reporting officer and the recommended conditions. Firstly, noting the issue identified by Ms Kelly as to concerns around uncertainty as to long tailed bats within the subject site and the strengthening of the conditions requiring, amongst other things, monitoring prior to construction, preparation of Bat Management Plan and monitoring during operation, by way of adaptive management.<sup>21</sup>

[32] Secondly, as directed in Minute #8 as to an assessment of cumulative effects<sup>22</sup>, the section 42A Reporting officer undertook that analysis in line with the legal opinion of Mr Robinson. I accept the reasoning of Ms Kelly, in that while there is a cumulative effect (loss of openness and a change to rural character), this outcome is preferable to a scattering of such activities across the Rural Zone and that shelterbelts/screen planting also results in loss of openness, which is similar to other areas of the Wairarapa.<sup>23</sup>

### Effects Conclusion

[33] Having considered all of the material on the matter of effects, overall, I am satisfied in terms of resource management effects that the proposal does not create adverse effects, that subject to conditions would be acceptable.

---

<sup>17</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 8.5

<sup>18</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 192

<sup>19</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 7 and Appended Specialist Reports

<sup>20</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 112- 188

<sup>21</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 162 - 169

<sup>22</sup> Minute #8, dated 22 November 2024, Para 24

<sup>23</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 178 - 183

## **Section 104(1)(b) – Relevant Statutory Provisions**

### **National instruments**

#### **National Environmental Standards**

[34] The relevant National Environmental Standard was the NES-CS; the NES-ETA not being applicable as any connection approval requiring authorisation from Transpower and any consent required being applied for at the time of detailed design<sup>24</sup>. I adopt the assessment in the application as to the management of potentially contaminated soils and proffered conditions, as modified by the section 42A reporting officer in relation to the consistency with the conditions imposed by Wellington Regional Council on consent WAR240183. Therefore, I accept those assessments and find that subject to conditions the effect will be acceptable, hence the proposal is consistent with the standard.

#### **National Policy Statements**

[35] The National Policy Statements, referenced and assessed in the application are National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-BI), National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation (NPS-REG), National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission (NPS-ET) and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM).<sup>25</sup>

[36] The section 42A Reporting Officer, Ms Kelly, concurred with the assessments in the application for the NPS-ET and NPS-REG.<sup>26</sup> In relation to the NPS-IB, Ms Kelly noted that the NPS-IB did not apply to development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of electricity generation assets by way of Clause 1.3(3).<sup>27</sup> Ms Kelly, also assessed the NPS-HPL including the amendments made to that NPS-HPL since the application was lodged, concluding, “Overall, in my opinion, this proposal is consistent with the various matters to consider for a development to be appropriate on highly productive land.”<sup>28</sup> Finally, Ms Kelly considered that the NPS-FM addressed functions of Regional Councils and hence was not a relevant consideration. I accept that the NPS-FM is not relevant to this land use proposal.

[37] Based on those assessments, I find the proposal was generally consistent with the relevant national policy statements.

#### **Wellington Regional Policy Statement (“the WRPS”)**

[38] An assessment of the WRPS was included in the application concluding that the proposal would achieve outcomes consistent with the provisions of that document.<sup>29</sup> The section 42A Reporting officer provided additional analysis of the energy provisions of the WRPS, similarly concluding that;

---

<sup>24</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Para 61

<sup>25</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.1f and Appendix 19

<sup>26</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Paras 74 - 76

<sup>27</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Paras 72 - 73

<sup>28</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Para 71

<sup>29</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.1g



*“Overall, I consider that the proposal generally achieves the objectives and policies in the RPS as it will maximise the use of renewable energy resources; and reduce dependency on fossil fuels, which will assist in managing climate change: a benefit of renewable energy. It will also enable dual land use with farming being undertaken beneath and around the panels. Potential and actual adverse effects on the environment will also be avoided or appropriately managed.”<sup>30</sup>*

[39] I adopt those assessments and conclusions, in finding the proposal is generally consistent with the WRPS.

### **Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan (ODP)**

[40] The application included an assessment of the proposal against the ODP<sup>31</sup>. The section 42A Reporting Officer’s view<sup>32</sup> was, that assessment was comprehensive, provided a summary as to the relevant objectives and policies, and specifically setting out areas where the officer disagreed with the application assessment, particularly in regard to the consideration of rural character in terms of the rural zone on a holistic rather than on a ‘site by site’ basis. I accept that analysis. The officer agreeing with the assessment in the application that, overall the proposal was consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the ODP. I accept that conclusion.

### **Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (PDP)**

[41] The application included an assessment of the proposal against the PDP<sup>33</sup>; the PDP having been notified in October 2023, and is currently before a hearing panel. Again, the section 42A Reporting officer<sup>34</sup>, considered the assessment comprehensive, setting out a summary of the objectives and policies, and while noting some areas of difference, agreed with the Applicant’s assessment that the proposal was overall consistent with the PDP.

[42] Overall, I accept the identified objectives and policies set out in the application and section 42 Report. In addition, I find the proposal and recommended conditions are consistent with the provisions of the PDP.

### **Section 104(1)(c) Any other matter**

[43] The application states that there were no ‘other matters’ to be considered in relation to the proposal.<sup>35</sup> No ‘other matters’ were raised in the section 42A Report. I therefore, adopt that position.

### **SECTION 104(6) and (7) of the RMA**

[44] For the reasons expressed in the section 42A Report, I accept that, “... *nothing has been identified which would result in Council refusing this application or granting it subject to conditions in accordance with this section of the Act, ...*”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Para 82

<sup>31</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.1h and Appendix 16

<sup>32</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Paras 83 - 98

<sup>33</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.1h and Appendix 17

<sup>34</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, dated 28 November 2024, Paras 99 - 111

<sup>35</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Para 9.1.50

<sup>36</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 194

## SECTION 108 and SECTION 108AA of the RMA - Conditions

- [45] The Applicant proffered a suite of conditions to address the effects.<sup>37</sup> The section 42A Reporting officer, acknowledging the “Augier” conditions that seek to manage glint and glare effects, took a similar approach to preparing a recommended suite of conditions as those imposed by the expert consenting panel appointed under the COVID-19 Recovery (FastTrack Consenting) Act 2020 for the Harmony Energy Solar Farm, with a focus on the adverse effects of NZCE proposal.<sup>38</sup>
- [46] Having reviewed the conditions and associated plans presented, I find the conditions annexed to the section 42A Report to be generally appropriate having considered the effects and my findings above. I observe and accept the changes to the conditions to address inconsistent use of, ‘shall’ and ‘must’, the connection of the various management plans to state the purpose and standards, and monitoring and reporting requirements. In reaching the decision as to the conditions, I record that the Applicant was silent on requesting a hearing. I have made some amendments to the recommended the conditions to address minor typographical errors. The final conditions set is attached as **Appendix 3**.

## PART 2 – RMA

- [47] This application is to be considered under Section 104 of the RMA, which sets out the matters that consent authorities shall have regard to when considering resource consent applications.
- [48] In the decision *RJ Davidson Family Trust v Marlborough District Council* [2018] NZCA 316, the Court of Appeal reconfirmed the pre-eminence of Part 2 matters in the consideration of resource consents. The Court however found that in those instances where it is clear that a planning document has been competently prepared having regard to Part 2 and contains a coherent set of policies leading toward clear environmental outcomes, consideration of Part 2 is unlikely to assist an evaluation of a proposal. Conversely, where a plan has not been prepared in a manner which appropriately reflects Part 2, or the objectives and policies are pulling in different directions, consideration of Part 2 is both appropriate and necessary.
- [49] The application included an assessment of the proposal as to Part 2 of the RMA, concluding that the proposal was consistent with those sections of the Act.<sup>39</sup> The section 42A reporting officer view was;
- “... the proposal has been assessed against all relevant planning instruments and is consistent with / not contrary to those instruments. In my opinion, those instruments are not considered to be invalid, incomplete, or uncertain, and in turn can be assumed to have particularised and already given effect to Part 2 of the Act, therefore the Activity is also consistent with Part 2.”*<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.3 and Appendix 21

<sup>38</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Paras 196 – 197 and Appendix 1

<sup>39</sup> Application Report and Assessment of Environmental Effects, NZ Clean Energy, dated 29 February 2024, Section 9.1a

<sup>40</sup> Section 42A Report, Ms C Kelly, 28 November 2024, Para 191

[50] Noting the effects and planning instrument conclusions above and recommended conditions appended to the section 42A Report, I find that reference to Part 2 of the RMA is not required adopting the reasoning of the section 42A reporting officer.

### Conclusion and Decision

[51] Acting under delegated authority pursuant to Section 34A, and Sections 104, 104B, 108 and 108AA of the Resource Management Act 1991, the application made by Masterton Solar and Energy Storage Limited – CDC Ref# 240005 – Land Use Consent for a 100-megawatt renewable energy project, being the establishment of an agrivoltaics development (Solar Farm) including solar panels, inverters, transformers, battery energy storage system, a substation, a site office and connection to nearby Masterton Substation, located at 3954A State Highway 2, Carterton is **granted**.

[52] This decision is made for the reasons discussed throughout this report and, in summary, because:

- The activity that is **granted** is consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991;
- The activity that is **granted** is consistent with the provisions of the Operative and Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plans; and
- The activity that is **granted** avoids, remedies or mitigates the adverse effects on the environment.

DATED this 5th day of December 2024



---

Mark St.Clair (Independent Commissioner)

Appendix 1 – Minutes

Appendix 2 – Section 42A Report

Appendix 3 – Conditions