



Te Rūnanga o NGĀI TAHU

FURTHER SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED TIMARU DISTRICT PLAN

4 August 2023

To: Timaru District Council,
P O Box 522,
Timaru
Attention: Proposed District Plan Submission
Submission lodged by email – pdp@timdc.govt.nz

Name of person making further submission:

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (**Te Rūnanga**).

These are further submissions in support or opposition to submissions on:

The proposed Timaru District Plan.

1. Te Rūnanga **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
2. Te Rūnanga **wishes** to be heard in support of its submission.
3. If others make a similar submission, Te Rūnanga **will** consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

We are a representing a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the general public has.

- 1.1 This response is made on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (**Te Rūnanga**).
- 1.2 Te Rūnanga is the statutorily recognised representative tribal body of Ngāi Tahu whānui (as provided by section 15 of the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (**TRONT Act**)) and was established as a body corporate on 24 April 1996 under section 6 of the TRONT Act.
- 1.3 Te Rūnanga encompasses five hapū, Kati Kurī, Ngāti Irakehu, Kati Huirapa, Ngāi Te Ruahikihiki, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and 18 Papatipu Rūnanga, who uphold the mana whenua and mana moana of their rohe. Te Rūnanga is responsible for managing, advocating and protecting, the rights and interests inherent to Ngāi Tahu as mana whenua.
- 1.4 Notwithstanding its statutory status as the representative voice of Ngāi Tahu whānui “for all purposes”, Te Rūnanga accepts and respects the right of individuals and Papatipu Rūnanga to make their own responses.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
71 Corsair Drive, Wigram, Christchurch 8042
PO Box 13-046, Christchurch, New Zealand
Phone + 64 3 366 4344, 0800 KAI TAHU
Email: info@ngaitahu.iwi.nz
Website: www.ngaitahu.iwi.nz

1.5 Te Rūnanga respectfully requests that the Panel accord this response with the status and weight of the tribal collective of Ngāi Tahu whānui comprising over 74,000 registered iwi members, in a takiwā comprising the majority of Te Waipounamu.

We support or oppose the submission points set out in Schedule One.

The reasons for our support or opposition are also set out in Schedule One.

We seek that the submissions supported in Schedule 1 be allowed.

We seek that the submissions opposed in Schedule 1 be disallowed.

Additionally, we wish to stress that there are missing Rock Art Sites from the notified proposed Timaru District Plan. We acknowledge that due to the time and resource pressure you are under, it is highly unlikely that you can re-notify the Plan to include these sites. We also note that not including these sites creates a potential risk to Council and landowners who may then accidentally cause damage to these sites which are legally protected under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 as well as the Resource Management Act 1991. Therefore we have further submitted on several submissions where you may have scope to consider the issue directly or provide for them to be included in a future plan change or on an individual basis through the resource consent process as an advice note.

Signature of person (s) making further submission

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person (s) making further submission)



Aaron Leith
Acting General Manager,
Te Ao Tūroa,
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

Date: 4 August 2023

Address for service:

Rachael Pull
Senior Environmental Advisor
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
Email: TTW@ngaitahu.iwi.nz
Phone: 021 725 873

NOTE: We note that a copy of this further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making the further submission to the local authority in accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 8A (2) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Schedule 1: Further Submissions on the proposed Timaru District Plan

Name of person making further submission: Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Te Rūnanga)						
This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Kotare Trust	115.1	1. Amend the Objectives, Policies and Methods of the Proposed Plan to enable the use, development and renewal of dwellings on Trust land, and to provide for mana whenua needs and activities on their land. 2. Insert a grandfathering provision, which allows as a permitted activity the re-construction of dwellings that previously occupied Trust land. 3. Provide for the ability for the submitter to construct new buildings on the submitters land as a permitted activity, despite the different flood hazard overlays which affect it. 4. Provide for the ability for the submitter to construct new buildings on their land as a permitted activity, despite the land not being serviced by a reticulated sewage system or reticulated potable water supply.	Support	Kāi Tahu generally supports the intent of the submission.	Allow in full	
Waipopo Huts Trust	189.2	Amend the PDP to enable the submitter's 36 properties at Waipopo Huts, namely, to re-establish the village that once occupied this land and upgrade and redevelopment of the land for safe residential use including for Māori social housing.	Support	Kāi Tahu generally supports the intent of the submission.	Allow in full	
EnviroWaste Services Ltd	162.1	Amend the description of the District's Infrastructure as follows: Infrastructure The district contains the following Regionally Significant Infrastructure: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic land transport network and arterial roads <input type="checkbox"/> [...] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Redruth Landfill and resource recovery facilities.	Oppose	Landfills and resource recovery facilities are not identified in the Regional Policy Statement as Regionally Significant Infrastructure and there is no national direction requiring Landfills or other resource recovery facilities to be treated as such.	Disallow in full	Retain original provision
Federated Farmers	182.13 182.14 182.15	Delete the definition for Intensive Indoor & Outdoor Primary Production; Intensive Primary Production Refers to any of the following: (a) commercial livestock kept and fed permanently in buildings or indoor enclosures on a particular site, where the stocking density precludes the maintenance of pasture or ground cover (e.g., pig farming); (b) Land and buildings used for the commercial boarding and/or breeding of cats, dogs and other domestic cove (c) farming of mushrooms or other fungi; (d) dairy cattle, including cows, that are being milked on irrigated; (e) Intensive winter grazing, that does not follow council rules. AND Instead include within the definition of 'Intensive Primary Production'.	Support in part	In our original submission (185.11) we requested clarification of the farming activity definitions. We support Federated Farmers in attempting to resolve the confusion in this submission, but note that 'Intensive Indoor Primary Production' is a national planning standard definition and therefore unable to be deleted.	Allow in part	Retain the definition of 'Intensive Indoor Primary Production' and 'Primary Production' and consider deleting or simplifying the other agricultural definitions. And based on the changes to the definitions, make subsequent changes to the rules in order to better reflect the intent of the rules.

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.2	1. Add a new definition of Ancestral Lands. OR 2. Amend the Proposed District Plan to use a singular term for 'ancestral lands' and 'Māori land'.	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.6 187.14	Amend the definition of Noise Sensitive Activity as follows: Means <u>any lawfully established:</u> <u>a. residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation, including boarding houses, residential visitor accommodation and papakāinga;</u> <u>b. Educational activity;</u> <u>c. health care activity, including hospitals;</u> <u>d. congregation within any place of worship; and</u> <u>e. activity at a marae.</u> a. Residential activities; b. Visitor accommodation; c. Educational facility; d. Healthcare activities; and e. Marae (building only).	Oppose	This submission seeks to significantly increase the amount of restriction on Iwi activities without a clear proven issue. Currently the definition applies to buildings that have a sleeping component and this submission seeks to include all activities at a marae. This is a significant increase in restrictions that does not have a clear rationale behind it. The noise effects are a long term effect that has the greatest impact while sleeping. Restricting all marae activities through the rules associated with this definition is unreasonable and requires a site specific noise study to prove that there is a potential health risk for marae activities within Timaru from the activities that the rules that this definition relates to.	Disallow in full	No changes
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.3	Amend the definition of Papakāika as follows: Means any building associated with any activity undertaken in the traditional rohe of mana whenua <u>or on Māori land subject to the District Plan</u> , to sustain themselves mana whenua <u>or Māori landowners</u> , and may include (but is not limited to) residential, social, cultural, economic, conservation and recreation activities including	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
BP Oil, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy	196.17	Amend SD-O4 Natural Hazards as follows: Natural hazards risks are addressed so that: i. areas subject to natural hazards and risk are identified; ii. development is avoided in areas where the risks of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are assessed as being unacceptable; and <u>development does not increase risks of social, environmental and economic harm natural hazards are assessed;</u> and for other areas, natural hazards risks are appropriately mitigated	Support	Support the expansion of the Strategic Direction to consider more than just the immediate risk, but also the impacts associated with recovery and wellbeing.	Allow in full	Accept Submission
Fonterra Limited	165.29	Submitter agrees that the needs of Kāti Huirapa should be provided for within the district. Given the rural location of the Māori Purpose Zones care should be taken to ensure that papakāinga are not located where there may be impacts on human health due to existing or permitted rural, and rural industrial, activities. Māori reserve lands are able to be used by Kāti Huirapa for their intended purposes <u>in a manner that maintains the health and safety of their people;</u>	Oppose	Note that the introduction of the zone states the following: " <i>One of the main aspirations of the Māori Purpose Zone is to create an enabling planning regime to not only encourage the development and use of the existing Māori land, but to create a place for mana whenua to return to. Māori should benefit from these provisions and enjoy the additional activities that can be undertaken within the Zone .</i> " If there are adjoining activities that will impact the health a safety of adjoining properties, then Council needs to undertake enforcement action under s17 of the Act.	Disallow in full	No changes
Opuha Water Limited	181.22	Amend SD-O5 Mana Whenua as follows: The mana whenua status of Kāti Huirapa is recognised and their historic and contemporary relationship with the District's land, water bodies and wetlands, coastal environment, and indigenous species is recognised and provided for by ensuring: [...] iv. Where appropriate, Kāti Huirapa retains, and where appropriate is able to enhance access to their sites and areas of significance; ... vi. Where appropriate, Kāti Huirapa are able to carry out customary activities in accordance with tikanga; .	oppose	Note that the introduction of the zone states the following: " <i>One of the main aspirations of the Māori Purpose Zone is to create an enabling planning regime to not only encourage the development and use of the existing Māori land, but to create a place for mana whenua to return to. Māori should benefit from these provisions and enjoy the additional activities that can be undertaken within the Zone .</i> " The addition proposed by the submitter restricts this aspiration and is contrary to MW2.2.5 in regards to expressing rakatirataka and kaitiakitaka as the District Plan is administered by the Council and Council is not the correct authority to determine the 'appropriateness' of iwi activities.	Disallow in full	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.3	Amend SD-O5 Mana Whenua The mana whenua status as follows: [...] iii. the values of identified sites and areas of significance to Kāti Huirapa are recognised and protected <u>Kāti Huirapa retains, and where if appropriate, agreed to by private landowners, the ability to enhance access to their sites and areas of significance. Kāti Huirapa recognises many of these are on private land and must form relationships between landowner and hapu on a case-by-case basis. Kāti Huirapa recognises that accessway may be denied for health and safety or animal welfare by the landowner, access is a privilege, not a right.</u> AND Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	oppose	The proposed deletion of the recognition and protection of SASM is a direct breach of s6 of the RMA and the purpose behind the development of the SASM Chapter which is identified in the National Planning Standards and is opposed. The suggested additional text is also opposed as the District Plan has no authority to tell Kāti Huirapa what it can recognise or agree to. Public access within a RMA framework is addressed in the Subdivision Framework and if Federated Farmers wish to discuss additional access options with Kāti Huirapa this can occur outside the proposed plan process.	Disallow in full	No changes (accept where already identified in submission 185.20)

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR.</i> <i>E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR.</i> <i>E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.4	<p>Amend SD-05 as follows: SD-05 Mana Whenua</p> <p>The mana whenua status of Kāti Huirapa is recognised and their historic and contemporary relationship with the District's land, water bodies and wetlands, coastal environment, and indigenous species is recognised and provided for by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. mahika kai resources and habitats of indigenous species are sustained and opportunities for their enhancement or restoration are encouraged; ii. the health of water body and wetland environments is protected from adverse effects of land use and development; iii. the values of identified sites and areas of significance to Kāti Huirapa are recognised and protected; iv. Kāti Huirapa <u>and Māori landowners</u> retains, and where appropriate <u>is able</u> to enhance access to their sites and areas of significance; 	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.5	<p>Amend UFD-01 as follows:</p> <p>UFD-01 Settlement Patterns</p> <p>A consolidated and integrated settlement pattern that:</p> <p>[...]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. avoids areas with important natural, cultural and character values; vii. minimises the loss of versatile soils; viii. enables papakāiika, to occur on ancestral lands <u>and Māori land</u>; 	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	156.51	<p>Amend EI - Energy and Infrastructure introduction as follows: ... [first paragraph]</p> <p>Regionally Significant Infrastructure and other infrastructure have important functions and enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. The positive effects of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and other infrastructure may be realised locally, regionally or nationally. However, they can also have adverse effects, especially on sensitive environments. <u>In managing the effects of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and other infrastructure the provisions including rules for Overlays, the ECO, NATC, NFL and CE chapters also apply.</u> ...</p> <p>[second paragraph] With reference to Part 1 - National Direction Instruments, the provisions in this chapter (in combination with the other chapters cross-referenced below):</p>	Support	We support the increased clarity of referencing the overlays that apply, but consider that all the relevant overlays should be listed and not just the ones identified. For example the NZCPS Policy 2 (the Treaty of Waitangi, tangata whenua and Māori) can be implemented by referring to the SASM overlay during consideration of energy and infrastructure activities.	Allow in Part	List all the relevant overlays that the Energy and Infrastructure Activities must consider and comply with.
Timaru City Centre Ratepayers Action Group	219.1	Add to the HH-Historic Heritage chapter, provisions to allow new heritage items to be added to SCHED3-4, without having to wait for the next District Plan Review.	Support in part	SASM are defined as Historic Heritage and the ability to review and add new heritage items to Schedule 6 should be considered along with Schedules 3 & 4. For example, missing Rock Art sites.	Allow in part	The ability to add new Historic Heritage Items outside the full Plan review process is encouraged for all Historic Heritage items either in the Introduction of the chapter or as a policy for Council to action.

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Timaru Civic Trust	223.11	Add to the HH-Historic Heritage chapter, provisions to allow new heritage items to be added to SCHED3-4, without having to wait for the next District Plan Review.	Support in part	SASM are defined as Historic Heritage and the ability to review and add new heritage items to Schedule 6 should be considered along with Schedules 3 & 4. For example, missing Rock Art sites.	Allow in part	The ability to add new Historic Heritage Items outside the full Plan review process is encouraged for all Historic Heritage items either in the Introduction of the chapter or as a policy for Council to action.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	114.18	<p>Policies or at the start of SCHED3. Suggested definitions as follows:</p> <p>Historical and social significance value: Historical and social significance values that demonstrate or are associated with a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political, or other patterns.</p> <p>Cultural and spiritual value: Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.</p> <p>Architectural and aesthetic value: Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture, and material of the place.</p> <p>Technological and craftsmanship value: Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with the nature and use of materials, finishes, and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period</p> <p>Contextual value: Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a</p>	oppose in part	It is unclear the scope of this submission is limited to Eurocentric heritage or all of New Zealand's heritage. If the scope is wider than the items in Schedule 3 then this criteria may impact the recognition or protection of SASM sites or increase the resourcing burden on mana whenua.	Disallow in part	Limit the submission to the items in Schedule 3
Fonterra Limited	165.78	<p>Amend HH-R10 Subdivision of land containing a Historic Heritage Item as follows:</p> <p><u>Activity status: Discretionary</u> <u>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>1. Whether the subdivision maintains the heritage setting;</u> <u>2. Whether the subdivision would result in a disconnect with adjoining sites that assists in heritage interpretation; and</u> <u>3. Whether sufficient area is achieved on the balance site to comply with the zone standards and avoid adversely affecting the heritage item.</u></p>	oppose in part	It is unclear the scope of this submission is limited to Eurocentric heritage or all of New Zealand's heritage. If the scope is wider than the items in Schedule 3 then this criteria may impact the recognition or protection of SASM sites or increase the resourcing burden on mana whenua.	Disallow in part	Limit the submission to the items in Schedule 3
Road metals Company Limited	169.21	Add a new rule as follows: ECO-RX Clearance of indigenous vegetation for quarrying activities Activity status: Restricted discretionary The matters of discretion are: 1. The effects that the vegetation alteration or removal will have on ecological values, including on threatened systems and ecosystems. 2. The effects that vegetation removal will have on soil conservation, water quality and hydrological function of the catchment 3. Methods to offset and compensate for the adverse effects of vegetation alteration and removal. 4. Methods to contain and control plant pathogens and diseases, and pest plants.	Oppose in Part	This new activity status is limited in scope that does not consider mana whenua effects on the mauri of the site, mahika kai, wāhi tāpu or wāhi taoka as an example or the need for end of site remediation. It is also unclear why this activity would need to be separate from other vegetation clearance activities and separate from the quarrying activities.	Disallow in part	That the activity status is discretionary in order to better understand and avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential effects.

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.22	Add a new rule as follows: ECO-RX Clearance of indigenous vegetation for quarrying activities Activity status: Restricted discretionary The matters of discretion are: 1. The effects that the vegetation alteration or removal will have on ecological values, including on threatened systems and ecosystems. 2. The effects that vegetation removal will have on soil conservation, water quality and hydrological function of the catchment 3. Methods to offset and compensate for the adverse effects of vegetation alteration and removal. 4. Methods to contain and control plant pathogens and diseases, and pest plants.	Oppose in Part	This new activity status is limited in scope that does not consider mana whenua effects on the mauri of the site, mahika kai, wāhi tāpu or wāhi taoka as an example or the need for end of site remediation. It is also unclear why this activity would need to be separate from other vegetation clearance activities and separate from the quarrying activities.	Disallow in part	That the activity status is discretionary in order to better understand and avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential effects.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	156.121	Add a new policy to NATC - Natural Character chapter as follows: NATCP-X Identify, map and schedule significant freshwater bodies Continue the identification, mapping, and scheduling of wetlands, rivers, lakes, and their margins with one or more recognised natural character attributes, where the following apply: 1. the wetland, river, lake, and their margins have high indigenous species and habitat values, where they support threatened, at risk, or regionally distinct indigenous species; 2. the presence of distinctive geological features, such as fault traces, fossil localities, geoscience and geohistoric values, or represents a unique geomorphic process; 3. cultural, spiritual or heritage associations of Ngāi Tūāhuriri to the freshwater body, including the ability to undertake customary practices; and 4. importance of the freshwater body to provide access and connections to areas of recreational use.	Support in part	We support the concept of a policy that continues identification of areas with natural character attributes, however we note the following: 1. This could potentially impact the values of SASM 2. It refers to a group that does not have mana whenua status in the area 3. It is unclear how it link to the NES	Allow in part	That the policy is amended to correct the mana whenua and provide clarity on how the policy would be implemented.
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.4	Amends ASW-P6 Other non-commercial activities to remove the restriction on fish spawning/bird breeding seasons and replace with significant adverse effects on breeding or cultural values	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it changes the scope from a clear direction to an objective without clarity on how it will be achieved.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.1	Amend ASW-R10 motorised craft within fish spawning from prohibited to non-complying	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.6	Amend ASW-R4 boats on Orāri River to remove restriction between March and August	oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Ronald Clearwater	243.2	Amend ASW-R4 boats on Orāri River to remove restriction between March and August	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Rob Gerard	40.3	Remove restrictions on Opihi River	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.7	Remove restrictions on Opihi River	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Ronald Clearwater	243.3	Remove restrictions on Opihi River	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Rob Gerard	40.4	Amend ASW-R6 boats on Orāri River to remove restriction between March and August	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.8	Amend ASW-R6 boats on Orāri River to remove restriction between March and August	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Ronald Clearwater	243.4	Amend ASW-R6 boats on Orāri River to remove restriction between March and August	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.9	Amend ASW-R9 All other activities on rivers change status from non-complying to restricted discretionary	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.11	New rule ASW-RX to allow jet boating on Te Ngawai, Te Moana and Waihi Rivers	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Ronald Clearwater	243.5 243.6 243.7	New rule ASW-RX to allow jet boating on Te Ngawai, Te Moana and Waihi Rivers	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR.</i> <i>E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR.</i> <i>E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Timaru District Council	42.42	Amend the policy to reflect a non-complying activity status, within Drinking Water Protection Areas, for the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous facilities; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Earthworks; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Composting facilities; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Buildings that require septic/sewage facilities; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Offal pits; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Silage storage; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vegetation clearance; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exotic tree planting/plantation forestry; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intensive primary production.	Oppose	We oppose a non-complying status for activities within the proposed Drinking Water Protection overlay for the following reasons: 1. Non-complying status is a significant burden that should be used for inappropriate activities where there might be exceptional circumstances. 2. The NES-DW at the time of notification only applies to Regional Council functions. 3. The information that shapes this overlay and its restrictions are the water safety plans which are not yet completed their review. 4. This overlay also covers MPZ for which the purpose of the zone is to enable the use of land.	Disallow in full	No changes
Timaru District Council	42.41	Amend DWP-rules to reflect non-comply status for most activities	Oppose	We oppose a non-complying status for activities within the proposed Drinking Water Protection overlay for the following reasons: 1. Non-complying status is a significant burden that should be used for inappropriate activities where there might be exceptional circumstances. 2. The NES-DW at the time of notification only applies to Regional Council functions. 3. The information that shapes this overlay and its restrictions are the water safety plans which are not yet completed their review. 4. This overlay also covers MPZ for which the purpose of the zone is to enable the use of land.	Disallow in full	No changes
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.15	Amend NOISE-R2 to exclude Jet boats from noise requirements	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it does not achieve sections 5 or 6 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.77 187.78	Amend NOISE-R9 to increase setback from 40m to 100m	oppose	We oppose this submission as this is a significant increase and require Timaru specific data to ensure that the setback addresses an actual health effect.	Disallow in full	No changes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.8	New Noise rule restricting new or altered buildings within 60m of railway	oppose	We oppose this submission as this is a significant increase and require Timaru specific data to ensure that the setback addresses an actual health effect.	Disallow in full	No changes
New Zealand Defence Force	151.5	Amend TEMP=P2 to remove requirements to be consistent with the character and qualities of the area	Oppose	We oppose this submission as there are certain parts of the District that are not suitable for Defence Force activities or other Temporary Activities and this Policy provides guidance to recognise this.	Disallow in full	No changes
New Zealand Defence Force	151.7	Amend TEMP-R2 to increase defence activities and change status of breaches from RD to Controlled without consideration of MW issues	Oppose	It is unreasonable to allow the full range of Defence Force Activities as Controlled and with no consideration of Mana Whenua issues.	Disallow in full	No changes
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.8	Amend GRUZ-R16. Changes activity status from discretionary to RD	Oppose	We submit that the status of new quarries need to remain discretionary in order to consider the impacts under other chapters of the plan (Rock Art and SASM in particular) through the rehabilitation plan and the impacts on the social wellbeing of the area.	Disallow in full	No changes
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.11	GRUZ-S4 no sensitive activities within 50m of rural contractor	oppose	If there are adjoining activities that will impact the health and safety of adjoining properties, then Council needs to undertake enforcement action under s17 of the Act or increase restrictions for these activities on their sites. Its not for the Marae to protect itself from the private business	Disallow in full	No changes
J R Livestock Limited	241.32	GRUZ-S4 no sensitive activities within 50m of rural contractor	oppose	If there are adjoining activities that will impact the health and safety of adjoining properties, then Council needs to undertake enforcement action under s17 of the Act or increase restrictions for these activities on their sites. Its not for the Marae to protect itself from the private business	Disallow in full	No changes
NZ Frost Fan Limited	255.27	GRUZ-S4 no sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan	oppose	If there are adjoining activities that will impact the health and safety of adjoining properties, then Council needs to undertake enforcement action under s17 of the Act or increase restrictions for these activities on their sites. Its not for the Marae to protect itself from the private business	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.9	Amend Intro to include Māori landowners	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.1	AmendMPZ-01 to include Māori landowners	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.11	Amend MPZ-02 to include Māori landowners	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.12	Amend MPZ-P6 to include Māori landowners	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kuri, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Timaru District Council	42.59	Add a new rule to the MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone Chapter as follows: MPZ-RX Any activities not otherwise listed in this chapter Activity Status: Discretionary.	Oppose	While we accept that the idea behind this submission is a consistency with other zones, we note the following: 1. The purpose of the MPZ is to enable Mana Whenua more than other zones, therefore the same restriction is unreasonable 2. We are unclear which activities this rule would apply to, given the range of activities identified in the zone.	Disallow in part	Provide clarity to which activities the new rule would relate to and re-consider the status of the rule in relation to the enabling purpose of the Māori Purpose Zone.
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.13	Noticed Schedule 17 refers to the RPA -3 river section and incorrectly references the Opihi River. This should correctly reference the Orari River.	Oppose	We submit that the Opihi is the correct reference.	Disallow in full	No changes
Rangitata Diversion Race Management	234.1	1. Remove all district Plan layers on the Rangitata River from the District Planning maps and; or 2. Make it clear within the Timaru District Plan provisions and mapping that any overlays are for information only and/or have no rules attaching to them.	Oppose	The Rangitata River is a Statutory Acknowledgement and a part of the District and therefore needs to be subject to the District Plan and its rules in order for Council to fulfil its legal obligations.	Disallow in full	No changes
Penny Nelson, Director- General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.97	Amend the Planning Maps to: - Extend the Fish Spawning Area to include the Upper Rangitata River as Upland Longjaw galaxias habitat; -to consider other native fish within the Timaru District where the associated rules for surface water activities should also apply.	Support	We support this submission as it improves the mauri of the Rangitata River and Taonga Species	Support in full	Amend the Planning Maps to: - Extend the Fish Spawning Area to include the Upper Rangitata River as Upland Longjaw galaxias habitat; -to consider other native fish within the Timaru District where the associated rules for surface water activities should also apply.
Timaru District Council	42.73	An area of the MPZ has inadvertently been left off the map in the Waipopo Area. The extent of the MPZ was intended to correlate to the former Māori Reserves (Native Reserve for Māori occupation or use). The map should be updated to include the correct extent of the former reserves.	Support	We support this submission as it improves clarity and the ability to achieve the statutory direction of the Plan.	Disallow in full	No changes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.49	Amend HH-Historic Heritage Chapter to provide for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Sensitive Areas, by adding new a new objective and policy.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as an objective and policy that 'provides' for infrastructure in 'sensitive areas' (we assume you mean sensitive environments) as this will create a permissive framework that allows for infrastructure to override the local significance and values of these areas. A less enabling framework is required for these areas in order to endure that they are only located in these zones when there are no other practical option.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Federated Farmers	182.79	1. Amend the SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter to: a) recognise the role that landowners of private property have to play in the identification and protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori; AND b) state that the Council will play a major role in facilitating an enduring relationship and promoting effective engagement between tangata whenua, landowners and the Council in the identification and protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori. AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Support in part	We recognise the role landowners play in protecting all historic heritage, but note that SASM exists regardless of the plan and its not for landowners to have a defined role in the identification or recognition of them.	Allow in part	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.8	1. Add a new policy to the SASM-Site and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as follows: SASM-PX Provide recognition for grazing and farming activities that have not increased in their scale or intensity of effects from commencement date of the plan. OR 2. With wording to similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Support in part	We recognise the concern of the submitter about the ability to retain existing grazing activities. However we also note that this issue is already covered for legally established activities through s10 of the RMA and a duplicate policy only in the SASM and not every chapter is inconsistent and will raise confusion.	Allow in part	No changes
Rangitata Island Dairy Ltd	221.1	Request the district plans that: a) balances environmental, cultural, social, and economic values while ensuring rules are equitable, cost-effective, pragmatic and effects based; b) are easy to use and understand; c) acknowledge and reward the positive effects farming has on conservation; and d) recognise the importance of collaborating with rural communities to achieve desired environmental outcomes.	Oppose in full	We oppose the submission as the SASM rules do not over-regulate farming in our opinion as only intensive farming is restricted. We also note that legally existing activities will have existing use rights under s10 of the RMA.	Disallow in full	No changes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.53	Amend SASM Chapter to provide for Regionally Significant Infrastructure in sensitive areas, by adding a new objective and policy.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as an objective and policy that 'provides' for infrastructure in 'sensitive areas' (we assume you mean sensitive environments) as this will create a permissive framework that allows for infrastructure to override the local significance and values of these areas. A less enabling framework is required for these areas in order to endure that they are only located in these zones when there are no other practical option.	Disallow in full	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.81	1. Amend SASM-O1 Decision making Kāti Huirapa as follows: Kāti Huirapa are actively involved in decision making that affects the values of the identified Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa, <u>not extending to existing use rights, the value of landowners' land, and only when required at no cost to the landowner.</u> AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Oppose	We oppose this submission for the following reasons: 1. Property value is not a RMA consideration 2. Existing Use Rights are not impacted by a new Proposed Plan 3. It is unreasonable to suggest that the effects generated by an applicant on a SASM should not be remedied at cost by the person causing the effects.	Disallow in full	No changes
Opuha Water Limited	181.58	Amend SASM-O2 Access and Use as follows: <u>Where appropriate</u> , Kāti Huirapa are able to access, maintain and use resources and areas of cultural value within identified Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as 'where appropriate' is a subjective and demeaning term. Health and Safety is a section 5 matter and is already considered and does not require a specific reference in the SASM Objective, unless it is going to be added to every activity and objective. As a s6 matter, the relationship of Māori and their taonga as well access are a matter of national significance that should be prioritized and not limited unnecessarily.	Disallow in full	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.82	1. Amend SASM-O2 Access and use as follows: Kāti Huirapa are able to access <u>if appropriate agreed to by private landowner, the ability to maintain and use resources and areas of cultural values within the identified Sites and Areas of Significance, access to sites that need to be identified in detail to landowners, to Kāti Huirapa, following health and safety of the landowner, whilst not disturbing the welfare of animals and farm operations.</u> AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it seeks to create a directive for private arrangements between Mana Whenua and landowners. Any agreement between these two groups are not required to be overseen by Council. The purpose of an Objective is to outline the goal to be considered only during a resource consent application to change the existing activity. It is something to be considered during a new activity, not mandated for an existing.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.6	SASM-O2 Access and use Kāti Huirapa are able to, <u>in agreement with affected landowners</u> , access, maintain and use resources and areas of cultural value within identified Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it seeks to create a directive for private arrangements between Mana Whenua and landowners. Any agreement between these two groups are not required to be overseen by Council. The purpose of an Objective is to outline the goal to be considered only during a resource consent application to change the existing activity. It is something to be considered during a new activity, not mandated for an existing.	Disallow in full	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.83	1. Amend SASM-O3 Protection of Sites and Areas of Significance as follows: The values of identified areas and sites of significance to Kāti Huirapa are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development <u>unless it fits within the existing rights of the landowner, or as a mitigation to the effects of climate change.</u> AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as new activities (even mitigation of climate change options) need to be considered against the effects on the SASM.	Disallow in full	No changes
Timaru District Council	42.34	Consider replicating regionally significant infrastructure/network utility provisions to NFL-P4.7.d and NFL-R3 within the policies and rules of this chapter.	Support in part	We support the concept of consistent rules throughout the plan, however one of the purposes of the overlay is to balance the regional infrastructure needs against the local significance and values of these areas. A less enabling framework is required for infrastructure in SASM in order to endure that they are only located in these overlays when there are no other practical option.	Disallow in full	No changes
Fenlea Farms Limited	171.29	1. Amend SASM-P4 Cultural access to focus on the grant of safe access and to recognise the impact of access on existing rural activities; 2. Amend Policies to recognise that an adverse effect of the activities should not negatively impact existing uses of the affected land; 3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitters concerns.	Oppose	We oppose this submission. Health and Safety is a section 5 matter and is already considered and does not require a specific reference in the SASM, unless it is going to be added to every activity and objective. As a s6 matter, the relationship of Māori and their taonga as well access are a matter of national significance that should be prioritized and not limited unnecessarily. We also note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. It is a consideration during a resource consent for a new activity in which it will be balanced against the practicalities such as Health and Safety.	Disallow in full	No changes
Alastair Joseph Rooney	177.11	1. Amend SASM-P4 Cultural access to focus on the grant of safe access and to recognise the impact of access on existing rural activities; 2. Amend Policies to recognise that an adverse effect of the activities should not negatively impact existing uses of the affected land; 3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitters concerns.	Oppose	We oppose this submission. Health and Safety is a section 5 matter and is already considered and does not require a specific reference in the SASM, unless it is going to be added to every activity and objective. As a s6 matter, the relationship of Māori and their taonga as well access are a matter of national significance that should be prioritized and not limited unnecessarily. We also note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. It is a consideration during a resource consent for a new activity in which it will be balanced against the practicalities such as Health and Safety.	Disallow in full	No changes
Opuha Water Limited	181.59	Add a new policy in the SASM chapter that address RSI within the sensitive environments addressed by this chapter.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as it will create a permissive framework that allows for infrastructure to override the local significance and values of these areas. A less enabling framework is required for these areas in order to endure that they are only located in these zones when there are no other practical option.	Disallow in full	No changes
K J Rooney Limited	197.4	1. Amend SASM-P4 Cultural access to focus on the grant of safe access and to recognise the impact of access on existing rural activities; 2. Amend Policies to recognise that an adverse effect of the activities should not negatively impact existing uses of the affected land; 3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitters concerns.	Oppose	We oppose this submission. Health and Safety is a section 5 matter and is already considered and does not require a specific reference in the SASM, unless it is going to be added to every activity and objective. As a s6 matter, the relationship of Māori and their taonga as well access are a matter of national significance that should be prioritized and not limited unnecessarily. We also note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. It is a consideration during a resource consent for a new activity in which it will be balanced against the practicalities such as Health and Safety.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Federated Farmers	182.85	Supports the policy and considers that developing protocols and key contact people will give landowners some confidence when wanting to conduct activities near SASM. Consultation should be outside a council setting away from bureaucracy, and the basis should be developed on an individual relationship between hapu and landowner.	Support in part	The Council is already required to keep records of Hapū in their area and have identified in the Mana Whenua Chapter who to contact in relation to these matters.	Disallow in full	No changes
Te Tumu Paeroa, Office of the Māori Trustee	240.7	Amend SASM-P3 as follows: SASM-P3 Use of sites and areas for cultural practices Enable Kāti Huirapa and Māori landowners to undertake customary harvest and other cultural practices in identified sites and areas listed in SCHED6 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa, in accordance with tikaka.	Oppose	Provisions relating to Ngāi Tahu are a legal obligation set out in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (NTCSA), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRONT Act) and associated legislation. As set out in our submission and for any avoidance of doubt, the TRONT Act and NTCSA, outlines and confirms that Ngāi Tahu holds rangatiratanga over the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā (a map of the Takiwā is included in our submission). Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tahu Whānui, means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely, Kāti Kurī, Kāti Irakehu, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. It is Ngāi Tahu, as tangata whenua of the Ngāi Tahu Takiwā and of which the boundaries of this plan are wholly within, who must and are to be exclusively recorded as Poutini Ngā Tahu and tangata whenua. This does not allow for the government to recognise other iwi tāngata whenua status within the plan boundaries without further breaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the TRONT Act and NTCSA.	Disallow in full	No changes
Federated Farmers	182.88	Amend SASM-P5 Protection of values of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa as follows: [...] 3. Maintenance of enhancement of access by whanau for customary use and cultural purpose, if <u>on private land in agreement with the landowner</u> ; [...] AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Oppose	We oppose this submission. We note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. If there are agreements between landowners and mana whenua, these do not need to be considered or forced through a policy.	Disallow in full	No changes
Fenlea Farms Limited	171.3	Amend SASM-P8 to recognise existing rural use of sites within the SASM overlays. 2. Amend SASM-P8 as follows: SASM-P8 Protection of wāhi taoka, wāhi tapu, wai taoka and wai tapu sites and areas Where an activity is proposed within any of the wāhi taoka sites, wāhi tapu sites, wai taoka areas and wai tapu areas listed in SCHED6 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa, ensure that: [...] 3. any adverse effects on identified values are avoided unless it can be demonstrated that: a. due to the are for the functional needs of the activity, it is not possible to avoid all adverse effects; and b. any residual effects that cannot be practicably avoided are mitigated, as far as possible, in a way that protects, maintains or enhances the overall values of the site or area; and c. where any historical loss of values can be remediated; 3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	We oppose this submission. We note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. We also oppose the removal of the term 'functional' which is a national planning standards definition that limits the potential impacts on SASM to those new activities that have a defined need to be located within a SASM.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Alastair Joseph Rooney	177.12	<p>Amend SASM-P8 to recognise existing rural use of sites within the SASM overlays.</p> <p>2. Amend SASM-P8 as follows: SASM-P8 Protection of wāhi taoka, wāhi tapu, wai taoka and wai tapu sites and areas Where an activity is proposed within any of the wāhi taoka sites, wāhi tapu sites, wai taoka areas and wai tapu areas listed in SCHED6 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa, ensure that: [...]</p> <p>3. any adverse effects on identified values are avoided unless it can be demonstrated that: a. due to the <u>are for the functional</u> needs of the activity, it is not possible to avoid all adverse effects; and b. any residual effects that cannot be practicably avoided are mitigated, as far as possible, in a way that protects, maintains or enhances the overall values of the site or area; and c. where any historical loss of values can be remediated;</p> <p>3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitter's concerns.</p>	Oppose	We oppose this submission. We note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. We also oppose the removal of the term 'functional' which is a national planning standards definition that limits the potential impacts on SASM to those new activities that have a defined need to be located within a SASM.	Disallow in full	No changes
K J Rooney Limited	197.5	<p>Amend SASM-P8 to recognise existing rural use of sites within the SASM overlays.</p> <p>2. Amend SASM-P8 as follows: SASM-P8 Protection of wāhi taoka, wāhi tapu, wai taoka and wai tapu sites and areas Where an activity is proposed within any of the wāhi taoka sites, wāhi tapu sites, wai taoka areas and wai tapu areas listed in SCHED6 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa, ensure that: [...]</p> <p>3. any adverse effects on identified values are avoided unless it can be demonstrated that: a. due to the <u>are for the functional</u> needs of the activity, it is not possible to avoid all adverse effects; and b. any residual effects that cannot be practicably avoided are mitigated, as far as possible, in a way that protects, maintains or enhances the overall values of the site or area; and c. where any historical loss of values can be remediated;</p> <p>3. Any alternative relief that would address the submitter's concerns.</p>	Oppose	We oppose this submission. We note that as a policy, this does not grant access or impact existing activities. We also oppose the removal of the term 'functional' which is a national planning standards definition that limits the potential impacts on SASM to those new activities that have a defined need to be located within a SASM.	Disallow in full	No changes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.69	<p>Amend all the matters of discretion of the Rules in SASM chapter as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: X. In respect of utilities, <u>the local, regional and national benefits of the utility and</u> the extent to which the proposed utility has functional <u>needs or operational needs</u> for its location.</p>	Oppose	We oppose this submission. There is already the ability to consider the benefits of an activity within the RMA and they could not be a matter of discretion.	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
North Meadows 2021 Limited and Thompson Engineering (2002) Limited	190.9	Amend SASM-R1 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining as follows: 1. Wahi tupuna Overlay (excluding the Māori Purpose Zone) PER-1 The activity is either: 1. earthworks, including those associated with and under new buildings/structures and those necessary for the installation of infrastructure / utilities, do not exceed a maximum area of 750m2; or 2. earthworks for the purpose of maintaining existing roads, tracks, or natural hazard mitigation works, and are within the footprint or modified ground comprised by the existing road, track or natural hazard mitigation works; and PER-2 PER-1 The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the restriction on earthworks is more than managing Archaeological Evidence .	Disallow in full	No changes
Forterra Limited	165.79	Considers that a specific exemption should be provided for earthworks at the Clandeboye site due to the heavily modified nature of the site.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the exclusion of the Strategic Rural Industry Zone does not achieve the s6 purpose to recognise and protect historic heritage and the relationship of Māori with their taonga.	Disallow in full	No changes
Southern Proteins Limited	140.13	Amend SASM-R1 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining as follows: 1. Wahi tupuna Overlay (excluding the Māori Purpose Zone) PER-1 The activity is either: 1. earthworks, including those associated with and under new buildings/structures and those necessary for the installation of infrastructure / utilities, do not exceed a maximum area of 750m2; or 2. earthworks for the purpose of maintaining existing roads, tracks, or natural hazard mitigation works, and are within the footprint or modified ground comprised by the existing road, track or natural hazard mitigation works; and PER-2 PER-1 The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the restriction on earthworks is more than managing Archaeological Evidence .	Disallow in full	No changes
Broughs Gully Development Limited	167.48	Amend SASM-R1 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining as follows: 1. Wahi tupuna Overlay (excluding the Māori Purpose Zone) PER-1 The activity is either: 1. earthworks, including those associated with and under new buildings/structures and those necessary for the installation of infrastructure / utilities, do not exceed a maximum area of 750m2; or 2. earthworks for the purpose of maintaining existing roads, tracks, or natural hazard mitigation works, and are within the footprint or modified ground comprised by the existing road, track or natural hazard mitigation works; and PER-2 PER-1 The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the restriction on earthworks is more than managing Archaeological Evidence .	Disallow in full	No changes

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.3	Delete SASM-R1.PER-1.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the restriction on earthworks is more than managing Archaeological Evidence .	Disallow in full	No changes
Silver Fern Farms	172.46	Amend SASM-R1 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining to: 1. align the permitted maximum earthworks area with the limits and timescales specified for the underlying zones in EW-S1; AND 2. retain the performance standard under SASM-R1 PER-2 for Accidental Discovery Protocols to be observed.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the effects to be managed in the SASM are different to the effects to be managed in the EW rules. We support the comments about timescales in order to better manage the effects.	Disallow in part	The inclusion of a timescale for the earthworks in order to better manage the effects.
Alliance Group Limited	173.45	Amend SASM-R1 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining to: 1. align the permitted maximum earthworks area with the limits and timescales specified for the underlying zones in EW-S1; AND 2. retain the performance standard under SASM-R1 PER-2 for Accidental Discovery Protocols to be observed.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the effects to be managed in the SASM are different to the effects to be managed in the EW rules. We support the comments about timescales in order to better manage the effects.	Disallow in part	The inclusion of a timescale for the earthworks in order to better manage the effects.
Alliance Group Limited	173.46	Amend SASM-R2 Earthworks not including quarrying and mining to: 1. align the permitted maximum earthworks area with the limits and timescales specified for the underlying zones in EW-S1; AND 2. retain the performance standard under SASM-R2 PER-2 for Accidental Discovery Protocols to be observed.	Oppose	We oppose this submission as the effects to be managed in the SASM are different to the effects to be managed in the EW rules. We support the comments about timescales in order to better manage the effects.	Disallow in part	The inclusion of a timescale for the earthworks in order to better manage the effects.
Jet Boating New Zealand	48.19	Amend SASM-R4 Temporary events as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Any temporary event where this is limited to a cultural event undertaken in accordance with tikanga, <u>or the temporary event has been formally approved by iwi, recognising that approval will not be unreasonably withheld.</u>	Oppose	We oppose this submission. It is not for Council or the applicant to determine if mana whenua have 'unreasonably withheld consent'.	Disallow in full	No changes
Road Metals Company Limited	169.7	Amend the Sites and Areas of Significance of Māori (SASM) map overlay to align with areas of significance used by Environment Canterbury's planning documents.	Oppose in Part	We recognise the intent behind the submission to be consistent with the Regional Council planning documents but note that the information within them is out of date and incomplete. Therefore we oppose this submission as the more accurate the planning information is in the plan, the less likely there will be unintended adverse effects.	Disallow in full	No changes
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.8	Amend the Sites and Areas of Significance of Māori (SASM) map overlay to align with areas of significance used by Environment Canterbury's planning documents.	Oppose in Part	We recognise the intent behind the submission to be consistent with the Regional Council planning documents but note that the information within them is out of date and incomplete. Therefore we oppose this submission as the more accurate the planning information is in the plan, the less likely there will be unintended adverse effects.	Disallow in full	No changes
Timaru District Council	42.75	Submits that the map incorrectly labels SASM1a as Normanby. This is an error that should be corrected to Te Wharetawhiti (Pig Hunters Creek).	Support	We support the provision of accurate SASM mapping in order to provide as much certainty as possible to landowners.	Allow in full	That the planning maps are amended to provide accurate information to plan users in respect of SASM.
EJAPS Ltd	4.6	Considers that there is one set of rock drawings on property at Winchester Hanging Rock Road that has been fenced off for over 30 years and is protected. The submitters are unaware of any other rock drawings on their property, yet the mapping seems to suggest that are more. Amend the Planning Maps to more accurately depict the location of rock drawings in SASM9.	Support in part	We support the submission in regards to accurately mapping the rock art sites in the area and acknowledge the protection undertaken by the owner to date. There are several Rock Art sites not identified on the maps that may or may not be within the ownership of EJAPS Ltd. The inclusion of all Rock Art sites will improve the clarity of landowner's and Council legal obligations.	Allow in part	That the planning maps are amended to accurately depict all Rock Art sites.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.37	Amend SCHED6 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa so that Council work with AECL to amend the Schedule 6 to better reflect the advice given and used as evidence for this Plan review.	Support in part	We wish to further submit to this that there are additional Rock Art sites within the District that have not been included in Schedule 6. We note that Council and landowners have legal obligations to these sites regardless of the fact that they are not currently mapped.	Allow in part	That the Introduction to the Historic Heritage and SASM Chapters have an Advice note added regarding unmapped historic heritage sites (including SASM like Rock Art) and the legal obligations to not modify or destroy them.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	114.15	Supports HH-01 which promotes the identification of Historic Heritage items and the documentation of their heritage values.	Support	We support the submission in regards to the identification and documentation of heritage items, as it is noted that not all historic heritage is recorded in the plan. We further submit that there needs to be acknowledgement of this fact and that there are legal obligations on the landowner and Council to recognise and protect them.	Allow in part	That the Objective or the Introduction to the Chapter has an advice note regarding unmapped historic heritage sites (including SASM like Rock Art) and the legal obligations to not modify or destroy them.