

Gore Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 4 – Māori Purpose Zone

Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991

Section 42A Report – Māori Purpose Zone Chapter

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	6
2. Introduction	7
2.1 Author and qualifications	7
2.2 Code of Conduct	7
3. Scope of report and topic overview	8
4. Statutory considerations and planning framework.....	8
4.1 Resource Management Act 1991	8
4.2 National Planning Instruments and other Relevant Plans and Policies	9
4.3 Section 32AA evaluation	10
5. Background	11
6. Consideration of submissions	12
6.1 Structure of the report	12
6.2 Overview of submissions.....	12
6.3 Format for consideration of submissions.....	13
6.4 General submissions.....	14
6.4.1 Matters raised by submitters.....	14
6.4.2 Assessment	14
6.4.3 Recommendation.....	14
6.5 MPZ – Overview and Purpose	15
6.5.1 Matters raised by submitters – Overview and Purpose	15
6.5.2 Assessment	15
6.5.3 Recommendation.....	17
6.5.4 Section 32AA Evaluation	17

6.6	MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2, MPZ-O3	18
6.6.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2, MPZ-O3	18
6.6.2	Assessment	18
6.6.3	Recommendation.....	20
6.6.4	Section 32AA Evaluation	20
6.7	MPZ-P2	21
6.7.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-P2	21
6.7.2	Assessment	21
6.7.3	Recommendation.....	23
6.7.4	Section 32AA Evaluation	23
6.8	MPZ-P3	24
6.8.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-P3	24
6.8.2	Assessment	24
6.8.3	Recommendation.....	24
6.9	MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12	25
6.9.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12	25
6.9.2	Assessment	26
6.9.3	Recommendation.....	27
6.10	MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2	27
6.10.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2	27
6.10.2	Assessment	28
6.10.3	Recommendation	28
6.11	MPZ-S4	29
6.11.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S4	29
6.11.2	Assessment	29
6.11.3	Recommendation	29

6.12	MPZ-S5	29
6.12.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S5	29
6.12.2	Assessment	30
6.12.3	Recommendation	30
6.13	MPZ-S6	30
6.13.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S6	30
6.13.2	Assessment	31
6.13.3	Recommendation	31
6.14	MPZ-S7	31
6.14.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S7	31
6.14.2	Assessment	31
6.14.3	Recommendation	32
6.15	MPZ- Additional Provisions (Education & Health Facilities).....	32
6.15.1	Matters raised by submitters – Additional Provisions (Education & Health Facilities) 32	
6.15.2	Assessment	33
6.15.3	Recommendation	33
6.15.4	Section 32AA Evaluation.....	34
6.16	MPZ- Additional Provisions (Natural Hazard Risk)	34
6.16.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ- Additional Provisions (Natural Hazard Risk)	34
6.16.2	Assessment	35
6.16.3	Recommendation	35
6.17	MPZ- Additional Provisions (Relocation of Second Hand Buildings)	35
6.17.1	Matters raised by submitters – Additional Provisions (Relocation of Second Hand Buildings) 35	
6.17.2	Assessment	36
6.17.3	Recommendation	37

6.17.4	Section 32AA Evaluation.....	37
6.18	MPZ-MAP.....	38
6.18.1	Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-MAP	38
6.18.2	Assessment	38
6.18.3	Recommendation	38
7.	Conclusions	38
Appendix A		40
Appendix B - Recommended response to submissions and further submissions.....		50

Abbreviation	Meaning
GDC	Gore District Council
FENZ	Fire and Emergency NZ
MML	McNabb Management Ltd
MPZ	Māori Purpose Zone
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2022
PDP	Proposed District Plan
SDC	Southland District Council
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
UD	Urban Development (chapter of the PDP)

Submitter No.	Submitter name
S23	Mataura Marae
S77	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association
S85	Environment Southland
S101	Transpower New Zealand Limited
S103	McNabb Management Ltd
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ
S125	Ministry of Education
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc
S146	Southland District Council
FS5	Hamish Wier
FS14	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc

1. Executive Summary

1. The Proposed District Plan (PDP) for Gore District was publicly notified on 31 August 2023. The PDP includes the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) chapter.
2. This chapter provides for kaupapa Māori land-uses - such as mixed-use papakāinga, marae, and Māori cultural activities - to be managed in line with kaupapa Māori concepts and values at specific, culturally relevant locations within the district (Māori Purpose Zones).
3. Nine submissions and three further submissions were received on this chapter. Submissions were generally supportive of the intent and direction of the chapter. There were, however, many 'support in part' and 'oppose in part' submission points relating to the specifics of the chapter.
4. Key issues identified through submissions include:
 - Alignment between objectives, policies, and rules;
 - Wording encapsulating the relationship between MPZ, and rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga;
 - Access to water for firefighting purposes;
 - Concern for flood risk within MPZ locations and provision of flood mitigation measures;
 - Built form standard exemptions for Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) infrastructure;
 - Matters relating to relocatable dwellings;
 - Provision of education and health facilities and activities; and
 - Support for the Mataura Marae MPZ.
5. A submission was also received seeking an additional MPZ and changes to the proposed O Te Ika Rama MPZ at McNabb. However, Minute 13 issued by the Hearings Panel on 3 July 2024 deferred consideration of these submission points until Hearing Stream 8, commencing 2 December 2024. Therefore, this matter is not discussed in this S42A report.
6. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 42A of the RMA and outlines recommendations in response to the issues that have been identified through submissions. The report is intended to assist the Hearings Panel to make decisions on the submissions and further submissions on the PDP, and to provide submitters with an opportunity to understand how their submissions have been evaluated and the recommendations made by officers, prior to the hearing.
7. As a result of submissions, a range of recommended changes have been made which are broadly summarised as follows:

- Adding a new rule, MPZ-R11, to make education facilities a permitted activity across all proposed MPZ sites;
- Splitting MPZ-P2 into two individual policies, with MPZ-P2 focusing on the range of activities enabled within MPZ, and the new MPZ-P3 addressing natural hazards and other activity mitigation requirements; and
- Minor rewording to explicitly permit the use of relocatable buildings within the Zone.

2. Introduction

2.1 Author and qualifications

8. My full name is Courtney Louise Bennett. I am a senior advisor and director of Kete Planning Consultancy. I hold a Bachelor of Planning (Hons) from The University of Auckland, and a Master of Science (Dist.) from Canterbury University. I am also an Intermediate member of Te Kōkiringa Taumata New Zealand Planning Institute, and a member of Papa Pounamu - their kaupapa Māori Special Interest Group.
9. I have nine years' experience in planning and resource management with a specialisation in kaupapa Māori environmental planning matters. This experience centres on environmental policy development and plan writing across community, district, regional, and Crown levels. I also have a background in research with a focus on best practice papakāinga policy, mana whenua engagement processes, and bicultural planning approaches. Prior to establishing Kete Planning Consultancy, I held environmental planning and policy roles at Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, and an academic research role at Canterbury University. I have also been involved in a minor periphery capacity alongside Te Ao Marama Inc. and the Southland Local Authorities in the development of the Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Cultural Landscape Study – specifically in supporting the development of a proposed implementation approach within an RMA context.
10. I have been engaged as a contractor by Gore District Council (GDC) to assist in the District Plan review hearings process. I have previously been contracted by Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao as a planning advisor, where I was responsible for providing technical planning support to Hokonui Rūnanga as part of their co-drafting of the PDP alongside GDC. My involvement with Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao ceased in July 2023, meaning I have not been involved with the post- public notification stage of the Gore District Plan Review process on their behalf.

2.2 Code of Conduct

11. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing this report. Having reviewed the submissions and further submissions relevant to this topic I advise there are no conflicts of interest that would impede me from providing independent advice to the Hearings Panel. The opinions expressed in this evidence are based on my qualifications and experience and are within my area of expertise. If I rely on the evidence or opinions of another my evidence will acknowledge that position.

12. I am authorised to give this evidence on GDC’s behalf to the PDP hearing commissioners (“Hearings Panel”).

3. Scope of report and topic overview

13. This report considers the submissions and further submissions that were received by GDC in relation to the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) chapter of the PDP.

14. The assessment of submissions will generally follow this format:

- Submission information
- Analysis of submissions
- Recommendation and any amendments
- Where an amendment is recommended a section 32AA assessment is provided.

15. Recommendations are made to either retain provisions without amendment, or delete, add to or amend the provisions are shown by way of ~~strikeout~~ and underlining. **Appendix A** of this report contains a copy of the Māori Purpose Zone chapter with all recommended amendments shown by way of ~~red~~ ~~strikeout~~ and underlining.

16. Clause 16(2) of the RMA allows a local authority to make an amendment to a proposed plan without using a Schedule 1 process, where such an alteration is of minor effect, or may correct any minor errors. Clause 10(2)(b) also allows a local authority to make consequential alterations necessary to the PDP arising from submissions.

4. Statutory considerations and planning framework

4.1 Resource Management Act 1991

17. The PDP has been prepared in accordance with the RMA and in particular, the requirements of:

- Section 74 – Matters to be considered by territorial authorities; and
- Section 75 – Content of District Plans.

18. As set out in the Section 32 Evaluation Report for Mana Whenua there are a number of higher order planning documents and other relevant plans which have provided direction and

guidance for the preparation of the PDP.¹ These documents and a comprehensive assessment of all relevant consultation and statutory considerations prior to public notification of the PDP are outlined in that Section 32 Report. The Section 42A Introduction, General Provisions and Strategic Direction Report also provides an overview of the relevant statutory considerations, higher order planning documents and other relevant plans and policies.

19. It is not considered necessary to repeat the detail of the relevant RMA sections and higher order documents in this report as these are covered within the relevant Section 32 Evaluation Reports. However, where a higher order document is considered particularly relevant to the assessment of submissions or where there have been amendments to higher documents relevant to this topic these are discussed below.

4.2 National Planning Instruments and other Relevant Plans and Policies

20. The National Policy Statement for Urban Development includes provisions that inform the content of the MPZ chapter. Objective 2 requires that:

“New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.”

21. This is followed by Objective 5 that states:

“Planning decisions relating to urban environments, and FDSs, take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).”

22. These objectives are supported by the following policies:

- Policy 1(a)(ii): Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum: have or enable a variety of homes that: enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms”;
- Policy 2: Tier 1, 2, and 3 local authorities, at all times, provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land over the short term, medium term, and long term;
- Policy 9(b): Local authorities, in taking account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) in relation to urban environments, must: when

¹ [Proposed Gore District Plan Section 32 Report - Mana Whenua](#)

preparing RMA planning documents and FDSs, take into account the values and aspirations of hapū and iwi for urban development.

23. These objectives and policies are reflected in a number of implementation matters that Local Authorities “must do” to give effect to the above objectives and policies. This includes a requirement that plans enable “at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand” for housing and business.²
24. Various Māori communities within the District – including mana whenua – have expressed a desire for urban development areas that are grounded in Māori cultural traditions and norms so as to provide for their cultural wellbeing. To provide for this expected demand, the PDP has enabled several Māori Purpose Zones throughout the District.

4.3 Section 32AA evaluation

25. Any recommended amendments to provisions since the initial section 32 evaluation was undertaken are evaluated in accordance with section 32AA. Section 32AA states:

32AA Requirements for undertaking and publishing further evaluations

(1) Further evaluation required under this Act-

- (a) is required only for any changes that have been made to, or are proposed for, the proposal since the evaluation report for the proposal was completed (the changes); and*
- (b) must be undertaken in accordance with section 32(1) to (4); and*
- (c) must, despite paragraph (b) and section 32(1)(c), be undertaken at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the changes; and*
- (d) must—*
 - (i) published in an evaluation report that is made available for public inspection at the same time as the approved proposal (in the case of a national policy statement or a New Zealand coastal policy statement or a national planning standard), or the decision on the proposal, is notified; or*
 - (ii) be referred to in the decision-making record in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the further evaluation was undertaken in accordance with this section.*

(2) To avoid doubt an evaluation report does not have to be prepared if a further evaluation is undertaken in accordance with subsection (1)(d)(ii).

² 3.2.1; 3.2.2(a); 3.3.1; 3.3.2(a); 3.3.2(c); 3.4.1(b) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.

(3) In this section, proposal means a proposed statement, national planning standard, plan, or change for which a further evaluation must be undertaken under this Act.

26. The required section 32AA evaluation for changes proposed as a result of consideration of submissions with respect to the topics of this report is contained within the assessment of the relief sought in submissions in section 6 of this report, as required by s32AA(1)(d)(ii).
27. The Section 32AA further evaluation contains a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the anticipated effects of the changes that have been made. Recommendations on editorial, minor, and consequential changes that improve the effectiveness of provisions without changing the policy approach are not re-evaluated.

5. Background

28. The Section 42A Introduction, General Provisions and Strategic Direction Report includes details of the PDP notification and total submission statistics. The background of this hearing report is specifically focussed on the MPZ chapter of the PDP.
29. The MPZ chapter was co-drafted by GDC) and Hokonui Rūnanga. Provisions were refined through workshops with the GDC District Plan review sub-committee, research into best practice papakāinga policy frameworks, and discussions with mana whenua cultural experts. Through this process GDC and Hokonui Rūnanga agreed to a suite of objectives, policies, and built form standards that apply across the four MPZs. They also co-designed the locations of, and specific rules that apply at each Zone.
30. Two pan-tribal marae in the district - Mataura Marae and Hokonui Marae – were also engaged with during the drafting process. This engagement confirmed a desire for a MPZ at both Mataura Marae and Hokonui Marae, and informed the range of activities provided in their respective MPZ. Engagement took the form of face-to-face hui at each pan-tribal marae, where planners working on this chapter listened to each community's aspirations for their marae complexes. Subsequent conversations occurred with representatives from Mataura Marae to discuss preliminary provisions for their MPZ.³
31. After completing the co-drafting of this chapter, Hokonui Rūnanga – as is their statutory right – elected to submit on this chapter of the PDP. In this submission [S139] they have raised

³ The offer for subsequent hui was also made to Hokonui Marae, but their representatives did not consider it necessary

several new matters of concern regarding the MPZ provisions as drafted, and propose a range of amendments.

32. Another submitter, McNabb Management Limited [S103], lodged several submission points relating to their desire to establish a new MPZ on their property, and make amendments to the O Te Ika Rama MPZ adjacent to them. However, Minute 13 issued by the Hearing Panel on 3 July 2024 deferred consideration of these submission points until Hearing Stream 8, commencing 2 December 2024.

6. Consideration of submissions

6.1 Structure of the report

33. Submissions on the MPZ chapter have raised a number of matters which have been grouped by Plan provision or common theme within this report, as appropriate. I have considered substantive commentary on primary submissions contained in further submissions as part of my consideration of the primary submission(s) to which they relate.
34. In accordance with Clause 10(3) of the First Schedule of the RMA, I have undertaken the following evaluation on both an issues and provisions-based approach, as opposed to a submission by submission approach. I have organised the evaluation in accordance with the layout of chapters of the PDP as notified.
35. Due to the number of submission points, this evaluation is generic only and may not contain specific recommendations on each submission point, but instead discusses the issues generally. This approach is consistent with Clause 10(2)(a) of Schedule 1 to the RMA. Specific recommendations on each submission / further submission point are contained in **Appendix B**.
36. The following evaluation should be read in conjunction with the summaries of submissions and the submissions themselves. Where I agree with the relief sought and the rationale for that relief, I have noted my agreement, and my recommendation is provided in the summary of submission table in **Appendix B**. Where I have undertaken further evaluation of the relief sought in a submission(s), the evaluation and recommendations are set out in the body of this report. I have provided a marked-up version of the Chapter with recommended amendments in response to submissions as **Appendix A**.

6.2 Overview of submissions

37. A total of nine submissions and three further submissions are addressed in this report. A list of submitters on the MPZ chapter is provided at the start of this report.
38. The Section 42A report for Hearing Stream 3 Rural Zones identified that the following submission and further submission points from McNabb Management Ltd (MML) and NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi were to be deferred until Hearing Stream 4 to allow for an integrated and comprehensive assessment of the entire zone changes and amendments to provisions sought:

- MML (s103.008, s103.009, s103.010, s103.005, s103.014 & s103.029)
 - NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (FS14.029, FS14.030, FS14.031, FS14.027)
39. However, Minute 13 issued by the Hearing Panel on 3 July 2024 subsequently deferred consideration of these submission points until Hearing Stream 8 commencing on 2 December 2024.
40. The following submission points from MML and further submissions from NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi were set down for Hearing Stream 4 Māori Purpose Zones:
- MML (s103.002, s103.028)
 - NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (FS14.058)
41. Whilst these additional submission points are not referred to in Minute 13, practically, these submissions should be considered at the same time as those listed in Minute 13 as they all pertain to the same issue. Therefore, they have not been assessed in this report, and it is recommended that they are also deferred to Hearing Stream 8.
42. Most submitters were supportive of the intent and general direction of the Chapter, and no submissions, in principle, opposed the creation of any MPZ. One, however, raised concerns around their location on areas perceived to have a flood risk.
43. Most submission points are classified as ‘support in part’ or oppose in part’, and raise to the following issues:
- Alignment between objectives, policies, and rules;
 - Wording encapsulating the relationship between MPZ, and rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga;
 - Access to water for firefighting purposes;
 - Concern for flood risk within MPZ locations and provision of flood mitigation measures;
 - Built form standard exemptions for Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) infrastructure;
 - Matters relating to relocatable dwellings;
 - Provision of education and health facilities and activities; and
 - Support for the Maitāwera Marae MPZ.

6.3 Format for consideration of submissions

44. For each identified topic, I have considered the submissions that are seeking changes to the PDP in the following format:
- Matters raised by submitters;

- Assessment;
- Summary of recommendations; and
- Section 32AA assessment.

45. The recommended amendments to the relevant chapters are set out in **Appendix A** of this report where all text changes are shown in a consolidated manner.

6.4 General submissions

6.4.1 Matters raised by submitters

46. Southland District Council (SDC) [S146.095] and Mataura Marae [S23.001; S23.002; S23.003] each support the Chapter as drafted. Mataura Marae [S23.002; S23.003] has requested that provisions related to the Mataura Marae MPZ be retained as drafted. SDC [S146.095] did not specify any relief sought. Transpower New Zealand Limited [101.103] has submitted in support of the whole Plan insofar as it relates to the National Grid, and particularly the extent to which the provisions of the PDP give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093] and MML [S103.031] have both noted their support for all PDP provisions, except for those where amendments have been requested specifically within their submission.

6.4.2 Assessment

47. I note the submission in support for this chapter lodged by SDC [S146.095], and the more general support of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093], MML [S103.031], and Transpower New Zealand Limited [S101.103]. I accept the support of all three submission points, subject to the changes recommended in this report.

48. I note Mataura Marae's submission [S23.001; S23.002; S23.003] supporting the Mataura Marae MPZ site, and their request for this MPZ site and its associated policy framework to be retained as drafted. As the primary beneficiaries of this MPZ site and its associated provisions, I consider it appropriate to give their submission significant weight. Therefore, I recommend retaining all provisions related to the Mataura Marae MPZ as drafted.

6.4.3 Recommendation

49. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that S146.095, S139.093, S103.031, S101.103, S23.001, S23.002, and S23.003 all be accepted, and that no changes be made as a consequence.

50. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.5 MPZ – Overview and Purpose

6.5.1 Matters raised by submitters – Overview and Purpose

51. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc. [S139.001] and MML [S103.025] both support in part the overview and purpose section of this chapter, whilst Environment Southland [S85.284] oppose it in part.
52. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.001] have provided alternative wording to be used in this section. Their proposed wording (included in full in **Appendix B**) explicitly highlights the role MPZ play in recognising mana whenua whakapapa and rangatiratanga. By way of reasoning, the submitter notes that the purpose of the Act requires recognition and provision for the relationship of Māori and their customs and traditions with all their ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga in the entire takiwā, not just in MPZ. They consider MPZ to be an enabler of Māori land use development in recognition of the absence of provisions to enable mana whenua to use and develop their land in accordance with tikanga, through successive generations of planning legislation.
53. MML [S103.025] disputes the naming of individual MPZs within this section. They consider this inappropriate, firstly, because individual pockets of other land use zones within the district are not named, and secondly, because they understand it to be the role of the relevant Māori community to name each MPZ in due course. They also consider this approach to something that will create difficulty if additional MPZ are proposed. The submitter requests that either the list of MPZ names and locations be deleted from this section, or that the list is changed to street addresses and landmarks only.
54. Environment Southland [S85.284] opposes this section in part, requesting that it be amended to recognise the residual flood risk that exists in MPZ despite stop banks. No reasoning or further information about these risks was provided by the submitter.

6.5.2 Assessment

55. I agree in principle with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.001] assertion that GDC is required to recognise the relationship of Māori and their customs and traditions with all their ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga throughout the plan, as opposed to relegating these matters solely to the MPZ chapter. I am, however, concerned that their proposed rewording of the first part of the overview and purpose section is only applicable to the two MPZ that are affiliated to mana whenua, and do not apply as equally to the two MPZ affiliated with mātāwaka. This concern is reinforced by S23.002 from one such mātāwaka group – Mataura Marae – who explicitly seek that the wording as drafted be retained in order to recognise their rangatiratanga within their MPZ.
56. The rewording proposed by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.001] appears to equate MPZ with mana whenua specifically, which I consider to be an inaccurate description of the zone purpose. Whilst I agree that mana whenua have additional rights and interests in the context of resource management, I consider the submitters proposed rewording to inaccurately reflect the rights also held by other Māori communities in the District.

57. MPZs are one tool that enable Plans to give effect to the NPS-UD – specifically its directive to “enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms”. The National Planning Standards also describe MPZs as areas that provide a range of activities that “specifically meet Māori cultural needs”. Based on this wording, I consider both the requirements of the NPS-UD and the description of a MPZ to apply to all Māori within a district, as opposed to mana whenua exclusively. This clarification is particularly relevant in the context of the PDP, as two of the four MPZ sites reflect the aspirations of Māori communities within the District who are not mana whenua.
58. I suspect that the perceived reframing of non-mana whenua rights under this submission point is unintended. This is for two reasons. Firstly, as part of the co-drafting of this chapter, Hokonui Rūnanga supported the extension of MPZ sites to non-mana whenua Māori groups. Secondly, the Hokonui Rūnanga Inc submission does not seek the removal of, or amendments to provisions impacting, the two MPZ sites connected with non-mana whenua Māori communities in the District.
59. I do, however, support in part the submitters [S139.001] rewording of the overview and purpose section where it refers to tikanga-guided land use and development, and summarises the way activities are managed within the zone. Regarding the first matter, I agree that including reference to tikanga-guided land use and development provides a more accurate description of the purpose of this chapter.
60. I also consider the submitter’s alternative wording summarising how activities are managed within the zone to be, in most part, a more accurate and succinct description of how various activities are managed within the MPZ. I do not consider it relevant to mention development plans, however, as there are no provisions within the chapter that refer to the use of such a tool, nor has this submitter proposed any new provisions doing so.
61. On the matters raised by MML [S103.025], I query their reasoning. The submitter requests the names of each MPZ site be removed from this section as they consider it to be both inappropriate and unnecessary. They note that listing specific MPZ creates difficulty when proposing new MPZ sites. However, the addition of any new MPZ site in the District would always require a plan change. As part of the plan change process, this text would be updated accordingly. Therefore, the listing or otherwise of MPZ sites makes no difference to the difficulty of proposing a future site.
62. Additionally, I consider it essential to list the specific MPZ sites in this section as it assists in the interpretation of the rules. Several rules apply differently across various MPZ sites, meaning that some provisions refer to specific MPZ sites by name. Listing all MPZ sites in this section of the chapter provides plan readers with the context to understand the wording of the rules that follow.
63. MML [S103.025] also states that, “in accordance with tikanga any new MSPZ [sic] will be gifted a name in due course”. In the same submission point, they propose new descriptive names for each MPZ site. I note that the names included in the PDP were chosen by mana whenua, and, for the non-mana whenua-affiliated MPZ sites, by their affiliated Māori community during the initial drafting of this chapter. For this reason, I do not consider it appropriate to alter them unless the request comes from the relevant Māori community affiliated to each MPZ site.

64. Finally, MML [S103.025] seek that, if the list of MPZ sites are retained, they be updated to include their proposed McKinnon Rd MPZ site. As per paragraphs 38-41 above, submission points relating to these matters will be covered in Hearing Stream 8.
65. Lastly, I consider the amendments requested by Environment Southland [S85.284] to already be addressed by the PDP wording. The submitter has requested that this section recognises the risk of natural hazards in MPZ. The existing wording already refers to activities only being appropriate where the “constraints of the site” are not a barrier. I consider this statement to be broad enough to cover the natural hazards reference sought by the submitter. I also note that the consideration of the Natural Hazards Chapter will be the subject of a future hearing stream, at which time the PDP wide approach to natural hazards will be examined.

6.5.3 Recommendation

66. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that:

- The wording amendments proposed by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.001] be accepted in part;
- The wording amendments proposed by MML [S103.025] be rejected; and
- No amendments are required to address the matter raised by Environment Southland [S85.284].

67. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.5.4 Section 32AA Evaluation

68. The following evaluates my recommendation to amend MPZ – Overview and Purpose under section 32AA of the RMA to include some minor wording amendments offered by S139.001.

Effectiveness and efficiency

69. The recommended amendments will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner.

Costs and benefits

70. The benefits of the recommended amendments are that it is clear what is required in terms of PDP administration, and the PDP is interpreted in a consistent manner. There are no apparent costs with the recommended amendments.

Risk of acting or not acting

71. There is the potential for the purpose of the zone to be described in an incomplete and verbose manner if the recommended amendment is not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

72. The recommended amendment is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act than the notified version of the PDP.

6.6 MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2, MPZ-O3

6.6.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2, MPZ-O3

73. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002] and Ministry of Education [S125.087] both support in part MPZ-O1. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.003; S139.004] also opposes in part MPZ-O2 and MPZ-O3.
74. The Ministry of Education [S125.087] supports MPZ-O1 in principle, but requests that educational opportunities be added to the current list of opportunities enabled within the Zone. They note that this amendment aligns with UFD-05 in the PDP, which states that 'Māori Purpose Zones provide for the specific needs of Māori communities, including small to medium-scale residential, education, commercial, community, cultural and employment opportunities.'
75. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002] has provided alternative wording for MPZ-O1, and has requested it be reordered to become MPZ-O2. The submitter considers that the existing wording of MPZ-O1 implies that MPZ are the only place where mana whenua rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga should be recognised in the District. They also consider the current wording to imply tangata whenua communities who are not mana whenua also have rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga rights and responsibilities – an assertion the submitter contests. Their alternative proposed wording under S139.002 focuses solely on enabling “a range of social, economic, environmental and cultural activities” within Māori Purpose Zones, “in recognition of rangatiratanga; and in accordance with mātauranga and tikanga”.
76. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.003] opposes in part MPZ-O2 on the same grounds as MPZ-O1 [S139.002]. The submitter has provided alternative wording for this objective that focuses on the role of MPZ to “enable whānau Māori connections to place, and to undertake a variety of land uses and development opportunities to provide for their economic, social and cultural well-being”.
77. Additionally, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.004] seeks a reordering of the chapter’s objectives, and the deletion of MPZ-O3 on the grounds that they consider it to be a policy – not an objective.

6.6.2 Assessment

78. I agree with the Ministry of Education [S125.087] that education opportunities should be enabled within MPZs. I also agree that this amendment reflects the wording of UFD-05, and note that this amendment would better align MPZ-O1 with the rules in this chapter.
79. I agree in principle with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002] assertion that MPZ are not the only place to recognise rangatiratanga and enable kaitiakitanga. Rather, these matters must be taken into account in the development of the entire plan. I also agree in principle that mana

whenua have additional rights and interests in the context of resource management compared to non-mana whenua Māori communities.

80. However, when comparing the alternative wording for MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2 provided by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002; S139.003], I do not see significant, meaningful differences between the two objectives. Both of the submitter's proposed objectives refer to enabling a range of land uses or activities that relate to economic, social and cultural matters. From my assessment, the main differences between the two proposed objectives are that the amended MPZ-O1 includes references to rangatiratanga, mātauranga, and tikanga; which appears to be a combining of the PDP MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2. The submitters proposed replacement MPZ-O2 is largely the same as their proposed reworded MPZ-O1, except it substitutes references to rangatiratanga, mātauranga, and tikanga with a reference to "whānau Māori connection to place".
81. Reading into the wider intent of these submission points, I can see that the submitter may prefer these objectives to be justified in the context of rangatiratanga as opposed to the paraphrased RMA s(6) wording used in the PDP MPZ-O1. I can also understand that this approach may create duplication with the PDP MPZ-O2, thus leading to the necessary combining of the two objectives. At an objective drafting level, I have no strong view either way on whether the submitter's proposed rewording of MPZ-O1 results in a more appropriate chapter objective.
82. I am less inclined to support the replacement MPZ-O2 proposed by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.003]. I consider these two proposed objectives to be too similar, which would likely create ambiguity in the Plan. If the intent of this objective is to highlight the theme of "whānau Māori connections to place", then I consider this a matter reflected in the PDP drafting of MPZ-O1. If MPZ-O1 is reworded in line with the submitter's previous submission point, however, then this reference will be lost. This would then require a new objective to be drafted to cover this aspect.
83. When analysing Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002; S139.003] submission points on MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2 together, I am less inclined to support either point. This is because, on balance, I do not think that the benefits of altering these objectives outweigh the costs of doing so. This is exacerbated by my perspective that the alternative wording provided by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002; S139.003] is not suitable for direct inclusion as currently drafted.
84. If revised wording can be provided by the submitter in their evidence, then I will reconsider this position.
85. On the matter of reordering MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2, I am supportive of this submission point made by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002]. Whilst the change may not impact the application of the plan provisions, I can recognise the impact this reordering may have on how the objectives are perceived.
86. Finally, in the matter of [139.004], I note that this objective sits at the top of a policy framework threaded through the policies, rules, and standards of the MPZ chapter that relate to avoiding or mitigating adverse effects on the environment and people. Without this objective, the associated policies, rules, and standards would have no corresponding objective to connect

with. Therefore, I cannot support its deletion. If the submitter can provide alternative wording for this objective in their evidence, I am open to reconsidering this matter.

6.6.3 Recommendation

87. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that:

- The proposed rewording of MPZ-O1 offered by Ministry of Education [S125.087] be accepted;
- The proposed rewording of MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2 offered by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.002; S139.003] be rejected;
- The proposed reordering of MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2 offered by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.003] be accepted; and
- The proposed deletion of MPZ-O3 offered by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.004] be rejected.

88. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.6.4 Section 32AA Evaluation

89. The following evaluates the recommendations to reorder MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2, and make minor amendments to MPZ-O1 to include references to educational activities under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

90. The proposal will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner.

Costs and benefits

91. The benefits of the proposal are that it is clear what is required in terms of PDP administration, and the PDP is interpreted in a consistent manner. There are no apparent costs with the proposal.

Risk of acting or not acting

92. There is the potential for cross-plan inconsistency, and inconsiderate perceptions of mana whenua priorities if the proposed amendment is not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

93. The proposed amendment is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act than the notified version of the PDP.

6.7 MPZ-P2

6.7.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-P2

94. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.005] support this policy in part, but propose rewording to widen its scope. Ministry of Education [S125.088] support it as drafted.
95. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.005] consider the list of activities enabled under MPZ-P2 to be narrower than those provided for in the rules of this chapter. Along with general rewording of the policy, the amended wording provided by the submitter adds 'primary production' and 'urupā' to the list of activities enabled within MPZ. They also raise a concern that the policy as drafted seems to imply that only 'environment-related employment opportunities' are enabled in the Zone.
96. Additionally, the submitter [S139.005] proposes splitting MPZ-P2 into two separate policies by removing MPZ-P2(5) and MPZ-P2(6): clauses that caveat the enabling of a range of activities within MPZ with the need to "ensur[e] any significant adverse effects from these activities on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated", and "requiring that all activities are adequately serviced". Instead, they recommend adding a new policy to the chapter that reads:
- *Ensure activities within the Māori Purpose Zone:*
 1. *Do not create or exacerbate natural hazard risk;*
 2. *Have appropriate standards of access and infrastructure; and*
 3. *Do not have adverse effects such as noise or night lighting which are incompatible with the amenity values of the area."*
97. Ministry of Education [S125.088] support MPZ-P2 due to its reference to enabling education facilities within MPZ. This, they consider, aligns with UFD-O5 in the PDP, and allows for mana whenua to use and development the zone for educational activities as they see fit. They request this be retained.

6.7.2 Assessment

98. I note the supportive submission lodged by Ministry for Education [S125.088] and agree that references to educational facilities being enabled within MPZ should be retained.
99. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc's submission point S139.005 comprises a number of changes to MPZ-P2 – some of which I support and some of which, with the information available, I cannot. I therefore discuss aspects of S139.005 individually below to make clear which parts of the relief sought I recommend be accepted, and which I do not.
100. I consider the submitter's alternative wording for the first sentence of MPZ-P2 to be an improvement on the PDP drafting of this policy. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc's amended wording [S139.006] replaces:

“Enable the use and development of the Māori Purpose Zone for a range of appropriate activities that enable the Māori community to support itself, including:”

With:

“Enable a range of activities in the Māori Purpose Zone which enable whānau Māori to provide for their economic, social, and cultural well-being, including but not limited to:”

101. I consider this alternate wording to be more concise, and reflective of objectives and purpose of the Zone. I do, however, recommend swapping out the second use of the word ‘enable’ for the word ‘support’ to remove duplication.

102. S139.005 also highlights that the activities listed in MPZ-P2 are narrower than those provided for in the rules; specifically in the omission of primary production and urupā activities. I note, however, that the list of activities included in the policy is not exhaustive as it says:

*“Enable the use and development of the Māori Purpose Zone for a range of appropriate activities that enable the Māori community to support itself, **including** [emphasis added]:...”*

103. This implies that it is not an exhaustive list. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary to add ‘primary production’ and ‘urupā’ to the list of examples as this then raises the question of whether all other activities listed in the Rules need to be added to this list as well (i.e. emergency services facilities, visitor accommodation).

104. As part of S139.005, the submitter proposes a rewording of those activities listed as examples. Aside from the omission of ‘primary production’ and ‘urupā’, the activities listed in the PDP version of MPZ-P2 and the submitters amended version [S139.005] are almost identical. I recognise that there are some differences in terminology and grouping of activities, but I do not consider these differences to impact the meaning of the policy. For this reason, I query the benefits of rewording this aspect of the policy, and recommend rejecting this amendment.

105. I am, however interested to further understand the submitter’s proposal to include the term ‘kāinga nohoanga’ alongside the term ‘papakāinga’. This term does not appear anywhere else in the PDP, and does not appear in any higher order statutory documents. I am, however, aware of its use in district plans within Greater Christchurch, due to local mana whenua preferences linked to specific wording in their land sale deed, Kemp’s Purchase. I do note, however, that the term ‘kāinga nohoanga’ appears in Te Tangi a Tauira, the Iwi Management Plan applicable to the Gore District. Based on the information available to me though, it appears that the term ‘kāinga nohoanga’ may have a different context in Te Tangi a Tauira than the way it is used to refer to papakāinga-style developments in other district plans such as those in Greater Christchurch. As this term has not been defined in the Hokonui Rūnanga Inc submission to clarify its local meaning, it is difficult to assess how this amendment will impact MPZ-P2.

106. In principle, if mana whenua consider it appropriate to add the term ‘kāinga nohoanga’ to this policy, then I would typically support doing so. However, I am uncomfortable recommending this amendment without first understanding the local definition of the term, and being able to

properly consider the implications of its inclusion. If the submitter can provide a local meaning of the term – including its differences (or otherwise) to the term ‘papakāinga’ – as part of their hearing evidence then I will be able to better assess the implications of including it in MPZ-P2 and likely change my position from opposing its inclusion to supporting it.

107. If this aspect of S139.005 is accepted, then a definition for the term ‘kāinga nohoanga’ will need to be added to the plan as a consequential amendment.

108. S139.005 also proposes splitting MPZ-P2 into two policies, so that matters relating to mitigating adverse effects and the servicing of activities is separate from the policy wording describing the activities that are enabled. I agree that splitting this policy into two separate policies as sought by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.006] would make the policies easier to interpret for plan users. I also support the addition of wording referencing natural hazards. The wording as provided by the submitter, however, creates a level of ambiguity in some areas that I do not consider helpful. Therefore, I recommend combining their proposal to split the policy in half, and some of their proposed wording with the original wording from MPZ-P2 that addresses mitigating adverse effects. This would result in a new MPZ-P3 that reads as follows:

“Ensure activities within the Māori Purpose Zone:

- 1. Do not create or significantly exacerbate natural hazard risk;*
- 2. Have appropriate access and infrastructure standards; and*
- 3. Mitigate any significant adverse effects they cause on adjoining properties beyond the zone or on the wider environment .”*

109. This would then require the PDP MPZ-P3 to be reordered to be MPZ-P4 as a consequential amendment.

6.7.3 Recommendation

110. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that:

- The amendments offered by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.005] be accepted in part as described above; and
- S125.088 offered by Ministry of Education be accepted in part insofar as to retain reference to education facilities.

111. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.7.4 Section 32AA Evaluation

112. The following evaluates my recommendation to amend MPZ-P2 under section 32AA of the RMA as described in Section 6.7.2.

Effectiveness and efficiency

113. The proposal will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner.

Costs and benefits

114. The benefits of the proposal are that it is clear what is required in terms of PDP administration, and the PDP is interpreted in a consistent manner. There are no apparent costs with the proposal.

Risk of acting or not acting

115. There is the potential for inconsistencies between objectives, policies and rules within the chapter, and for the plan to be difficult to interpret if the proposed amendments are not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

116. The proposed amendment is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the Objective than the notified version of the PDP.

6.8 MPZ-P3

6.8.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-P3

117. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.006] opposes this policy, considering it to be unclear in its purpose. The submitter instead recommends MPZ-P3 be reworded to focus specifically on effects from land adjoining an MPZ, with the intent of minimising “the potential for both sensitivity and reverse-sensitivity effects”.

6.8.2 Assessment

118. I disagree that MPZ-P3 is unclear in its purpose. The purpose of this policy is to identify the instances in which the plan intends to restrict activities, as opposed to enable or control them. This is consistent with the drafting approach used across the PDP, and supports the legibility of the plan as a whole for plan users.

119. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.006] has suggested that the intent of MPZ-P3 is to manage the impacts of activities outside of MPZ sites on those within them. This does not align with my interpretation of this policy. As I understand it, MPZ-P3 supports decision-makers to consider resource consent applications for activities within MPZ. It reinforces the weight decision-makers should give to tikanga and rangatiratanga matters when considering activities that breach plan rules, and directs decision makers to focus their decision making on the outcomes of an activity, as opposed to the non-compliance itself.

6.8.3 Recommendation

120. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the amendments sought by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc be rejected.

121. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.9 MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12

6.9.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12

122. Environment Southland sought a number of identical amendments across multiple rules, as did FENZ. Environment Southland [S85.285; S85.286; S85.287; S85.288; S85.289; S85.290; S85.295; S85.291; S85.292; S86.293] supported MPZ-R3 – MPZ-R12 in part, but sought the inclusion of a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels in all twelve rules. FENZ [S124.276; S124.277; S124.278; S124.286; S124.279; S124.280; S124.281; S124.282; S124.283; S124.284; S124.285] supported MPZ-R1 – MPZ-R3, MPZ-R3 – MPZ-R5-R10, and MPZ-R12 in part, subject to their submission point relating to MPZ-S7.
123. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc sought the inclusion of additional permitted activities as part of MPZ-R8 [S139.007] and MPZ-R9 [S139.008]. Further submission points relating to all the aforementioned Environment Southland and FENZ submission points were also received from Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.014; FS20.015; FS20.016; FS20.017; FS20.036; FS20.037; FS20.038; FS20.039; FS20.040; FS20.041; FS20.042; FS20.043; FS20.044; FS20.045; FS20.046; FS20.047; FS20.048; FS20.049; FS20.050; FS20.051; FS20.052; FS20.053].
124. Environment Southland [S85.285; S85.286; S85.287; S85.288; S85.289; S85.290; S85.295; S85.291; S85.292; S86.293] considers that new buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associated with flood inundation. They go on to state that consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths. To achieve this, the submitter has recommended including a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels for all permitted activities under MPZ-R3 – MPZ-R12, which impacts all MPZ locations. No specific performance standard has been provided in their submission.
125. The further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.041; FS20.042; FS20.043; FS20.012; FS20.036; FS20.037; FS20.038; FS20.039; FS20.040; FS20.045] opposes in part all of Environment Southland’s submission points on MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12 [S85.285; S85.286; S85.287; S85.288; S85.289; S85.290; S85.295; S85.291; S85.292; S86.293]. The further submitter notes that, whilst it is important to recognise and address the risk of inundation in the MPZ, they consider the “blanket approach” proposed by their various submission points to be inappropriate.
126. FENZ [S124.276; S124.277; S124.278; S124.286; S124.279; S124.280; S124.281; S124.282; S124.283; S124.284; S124.285] supports in part MPZ-R1 – MPZ-R3, MPZ-R3 – MPZ-R5-R10, and MPZ-R12. However, they note that this support is subject to their proposed amendment to MPZ-S7 [S124.291]. This amendment (discussed in more detail at 6.14 below) relates to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply.
127. The further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.014; FS20.053; FS20.015; FS20.046; FS20.047; FS20.048; FS20.049; FS20.050; FS20.051; FS20.052] supports in part FENZ’s submission points on MPZ-R1 – MPZ-R3, MPZ-R3 – MPZ-R5-R10, and MPZ-R12 [S124.276; S124.277; S124.278; S124.286; S124.279; S124.280; S124.281; S124.282; S124.283; S124.284; S124.285]. The further submitter notes that, whilst they support the intent of the submission

points raised by FENZ, they do not believe that all MPZ will have buildings on them, and therefore do not need to be bound by the servicing requirement.

128. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.007] sought the expansion of MPZ-R8 from 'community facility' to 'community and cultural facilities, activities, and events'. Similarly, this submitter sought the expansion of MPZ-R9 from 'commercial activity' to 'commercial activities and facilities' [S139.008]. These amendments, they consider, better align these provisions with MPZ-P2.

6.9.2 Assessment

129. Like Hokonui Rūnanga Inc, I support the intent of the submission points Environment Southland has raised [S85.258; S85.286; S85.287; S85.288; S85.289; S85.290; S85.295; S85.291; S85.292; S86.293]. However, I also agree with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.041; FS20.042; FS20.043; FS20.012; FS20.036; FS20.037; FS20.038; FS20.039; FS20.040; FS20.045] that this issue is most appropriately addressed through provisions that respond specifically to the land-use being undertaken on a site.
130. The broader issues around flood hazard management and development within flood prone areas will be dealt with in more detail through the Natural Hazards Chapter S42A, as directed by the National Planning Standards 2019, and will provide district wide direction for development which will be considered at a future hearing. It should also be noted that there are objectives, policies and rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter related to flood risk, including standards for minimum floor levels within areas subject to actual or potential inundation. Risks associated with natural hazards can therefore be managed through the Natural Hazard Chapter provisions.
131. Moreover, the setback standard for rivers and streams applies to buildings and structures in all zones, and earthworks, and includes the following matter of discretion:
- The potential for flooding and to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards, impact natural drainage patterns, redirect overland flow paths or flood flows, including on to other sites.
132. Although the matter of discretion is not a performance standard as requested by the submitter, it allows for consideration of the matters raised by Environment Southland in relation to development near rivers and streams in addition to the provisions in the Natural Hazard Chapter.
133. I also agree with the submission points raised by FENZ [S124.276; S124.277; S124.278; S124.286; S124.279; S124.280; S124.281; S124.282; S124.283; S124.284; S124.285] which were supported in part by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.014; FS20.053; FS20.015; FS20.046; FS20.047; FS20.048; FS20.049; FS20.050; FS20.051; FS20.052]. I note that these points raised by FENZ are supported subject to amendments sought on MPZ-S7, which, as discussed in section 6.14 below, I also support.
134. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.007] sought the expansion of MPZ-R8 from 'community facility' to 'community and cultural facilities, activities, and events'. I consider this expansion unnecessary, as 'cultural activities and events' are already provided for under MPZ-R1, based

on the PDP definition of Māori Customary Activities.⁴ I also consider it unnecessary to expand MPZ-R8 to reference 'cultural facilities' as these are also already provided for under MPZ-R3, based on the PDP definition of Marae or Papatipu Rūnanga Complex.⁵

135. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.008] sought the expansion of MPZ-R9 from 'commercial activity' to 'commercial activities and facilities'. The term 'commercial activity' is defined in the PDP as per the National Planning Standards, therefore I cannot support deviating from the set wording. Aside from this, it is my understanding that by allowing an activity (in this case, commercial activity) its associated facility is covered under the provision as well. Therefore, S139.008 appears to be unnecessary.

6.9.3 Recommendation

136. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that all amendments sought to MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R12 be rejected, and all submission points seeking these provisions be retained as drafted be accepted. .

137. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.10 MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2

6.10.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2

138. FENZ [S124.287; S124.288] support in part these two standards. However, they seek and exemption for emergency service facilities. Emergency Service Facilities are defined in the PDP as:

⁴ Māori Customary Activities (as per PDP): Activities relating to the expression and revitalisation of Māori culture, including mahinga kai activities, performing arts/sporting activities, tangihanga and other mourning rituals, Matariki or Pūanga observance activities, wānanga, hui, short-term (under 7 days) events or festivals, temporary (under 14 days) camping that facilitates involvement in Māori customary activities, and other activities that reflect the special relationship mana whenua and tangata whenua have to place, including any ancillary structures.

⁵ Marae or papatipu rūnanga complex (as per PDP): Means kaupapa Māori cultural complex centred around a wharehau (meeting house) and/or Papatipu Rūnanga. A complex can also include a range of ancillary structures and activities such as wharekai (kitchen & dining facilities), a whare moe (sleeping spaces), whare hui (meeting spaces), ablution blocks, administration spaces, whare taonga (spaces for displaying treasures), permanent hāngī pits, outdoor food preparation areas, small-scale associated storage areas, carving installations, and landscaped outdoor areas.

“land and buildings used by organisations that respond to and deal with accidents, emergencies, or urgent problems such as fire, illness, or crime. It includes but is not limited to:

- (a) police, fire and ambulance stations;
- (b) surf lifesaving activities;
- (c) administration related to emergency services;
- (d) vehicle and equipment storage and maintenance;
- (e) personnel training; and
- (f) any ancillary activities.
- (g) defence facilities

It excludes:

- (h) healthcare activities;
- (i) hospitals; and
- (j) private security companies.”

139. MPZ-S1 sets a maximum height limit within the MPZ of 8m, and MPZ-S2 restricts buildings from projecting beyond the height in relation to boundary plane.

140. The submitter notes that, as part of FENZ fire station operational requirements, many stations include a multipurpose tower or pole between 12- 15m in height. Due to the likelihood that any fire and emergency station will breach this standard, they seek an amendment stating that emergency service facilities are excluded from both MPZ-S1 and MPZ-S2.

6.10.2 Assessment

141. I agree that MPZ-S1 and MPZ-S2 as drafted will likely result in any FENZ fire station development in an MPZ requiring a resource consent [S124.287; S124.288]. However, I consider this to be an appropriate outcome. These standards ensure that the environmental effects of oversized structures are fully considered before an activity commences. I do not agree that a FENZ fire station should automatically be exempt from these types of assessment. I also note that these standards do not automatically remove the ability for FENZ to locate in these areas. If they cannot meet these standards, they can apply for a Restricted Discretionary activity consent.

6.10.3 Recommendation

142. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the submission points offered by FENZ [S124.287; S124.288] be rejected.

143. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.11 MPZ-S4

6.11.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S4

144. FENZ [S124.289] support in part this standard. However, they seek an exemption for emergency service facilities. The definition for this activity is listed above in paragraph 138 of this report. MPZ-S4 sets a road setback standard of 10m for any buildings or structures within the Hokonui Rūnanga and O Te Ika Rama MPZ. The submitter notes that road setbacks greater than 8-10m create operational and financial barriers for building emergency service facilities such as fire stations. To remove this barrier, the submitter seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities at these two MPZ sites.

6.11.2 Assessment

145. I agree that MPZ-S4, as drafted, will likely require any FENZ fire station development within the Hokonui Rūnanga and O Te Ika Rama MPZ sites to apply for a resource consent. However, I consider this to be an appropriate outcome. As noted above, these standards ensure that the environmental effects of oversize structures are fully considered before an activity commences. I do not agree that a FENZ fire station should automatically be exempt from these types of assessment. I also note that these standards do not automatically remove the ability for the submitter [S124.289] to locate in these areas. If they cannot meet these standards, they can apply for a Restricted Discretionary activity consent.

6.11.3 Recommendation

146. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the submission points offered by FENZ [S124.289] be rejected.

147. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.12 MPZ-S5

6.12.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S5

148. Environment Southland [S85.294] opposes in part this standard, which sets minimum setbacks for buildings or structures near rivers and streams. In their further submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.044] oppose in part this submission point.

149. Environment Southland [S85.294] considers that new buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associated with natural hazards and flood inundation. They go on to state that consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths. To achieve this, the submitter has recommended including a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels as part of MPZ-S5, which impacts all MPZ locations. No specific performance standard has been provided in their submission.

150. The further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.044] opposes in part S85.294. The further submitter notes that, whilst it is important to recognise and address the risk of inundation in the MPZ, they consider the “blanket approach” proposed by their various submission points to be inappropriate.

6.12.2 Assessment

151. Similar to both Environment Southland [S85.294] and Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.044], I support the intent of the submission points Environment Southland has raised. I also agree with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.044] that this issue is most appropriately addressed through provisions that respond specifically to the land-use undertaken on a site. It is also worth noting that this matter has been considered during the drafting of this chapter and has resulted in some MPZ with a high flood risk having a much narrower list of permitted activities so as to manage this risk. For example, residential, community, and commercial activities are all Restricted Discretionary activities within the O Te Ika Rama MPZ due to its propensity to flood.

152. As the issue in question under S85.294 is the same as those raised in Environment Southland’s earlier submission points, I direct the reader to my assessment on these matters in para. 129-132 above.

6.12.3 Recommendation

153. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that S85.294 be rejected in line with the request of FS20.044.

154. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.13 MPZ-S6

6.13.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S6

155. FENZ [S124.290] support in part this standard. However, they seek an exemption for emergency service facilities. MPZ-S6 sets a maximum site coverage standard for sites within each MPZ. The submitter notes that the minimum building coverage for a volunteer fire station is 250m², and up to 1500m² for a career fire station. MPZ-S6, however, limits building coverage to 1000m² at the O Te Ika Rama MPZ. This, the submitter highlights, would not provide for emergency service facilities should they need to construct a new fire station in this MPZ in future. To remove this barrier, the submitter seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities at O Te Ika Rama MPZ site.

156. In their further submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.016] oppose the decision requested on MPZ-S6 by FENZ [S124.290]. The further submitter queries whether the submitter is familiar with the location covered by the O Te Ika Rama MPZ. They highlight that this MPZ site is highly unlikely to be available to FENZ for a future fire station development, as the land is both tribally owned and subject to inundation. On these grounds, they seek that S124.290 be disregarded.

6.13.2 Assessment

157. I agree that MPZ-S6, as drafted, will likely require any FENZ fire station development within O Te Ika Rama MPZ sites to apply for a resource consent [S124.290]. However, I consider this to be an appropriate outcome. As noted in previous sections, these standards ensure that the environmental effects of oversize structures are fully considered before an activity commences. I do not agree that a FENZ fire station should automatically be exempt from these types of assessment. I also note that these standards do not automatically remove the ability for FENZ to locate in these areas. If they cannot meet these standards, they can apply for a Restricted Discretionary consent.

158. Additionally, I recognise the further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.016] and accept their request that S124.290 be disregarded.

6.13.3 Recommendation

159. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the submission points offered by FENZ [S124.290] be rejected, as sought by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.290].

160. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.14 MPZ-S7

6.14.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-S7

161. FENZ [S124.291] support in part MPZ-S7. However, they seek the inclusion of additional wording to require all developments to have an independent water supply for firefighting that is compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. The submitter seeks this amendment in order to manage fire risk.

162. The further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.017] supports in part S124.291. The further submitter notes however, that whilst they support the intent of the submission point, they do not believe that all MPZ will have buildings on them. For this reason, they consider a “blanket rule” to be inappropriate.

6.14.2 Assessment

163. I agree with the further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.017] that whilst the intent of S124.291 is supported, their approach to addressing the issue should be revised. I acknowledge that providing a standard for firefighting supply is a conscientious response to development, and there is currently no firefighting standard in the PDP. Moreover, the Building Code requirements are limited in this aspect. There is however a firefighting provision within

the Subdivision and Land Development Bylaw 2019 (Amendment No 1, 2021)⁶ which references part of the FENZ Code of Practice. The bylaw provision can continue to be relied on, although monitoring and enforcement issues have generally been identified with the bylaw. Alternatively, firefighting requirements could be incorporated into the PDP. However, including the entirety of the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice as proposed by the submitter raises concerns in relation to the useability of the plan and the determining of compliance by Council officers due to the complexity and technical nature of the FENZ Code of Practice.

164. The submitter may consider providing a standard which includes the key components of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 which could be a more effective means of managing firefighting water supply through the PDP than simply referring to the FENZ Code of Practice. Any additional evidence provided by the submitter to justify inclusion of a new standard for firefighting water should be supported by a Section 32AA evaluation.

6.14.3 Recommendation

165. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the submission point offered by FENZ submission [S124] be rejected and no amendments are recommended.

166. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.15 MPZ- Additional Provisions (Education & Health Facilities)

6.15.1 Matters raised by submitters – Additional Provisions (Education & Health Facilities)

167. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.009] MML [S103.026], and Ministry of Education [S125.089] have all sought the addition of a rule listing 'education facility' as a permitted activity within MPZ. Neither Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.009] or Ministry of Education [S125.089] have indicated specific MPZ sites that their proposed new rule relates to, but S125.089 implies that it should be permitted a cross all zones. MML [S103.026] has also requested that 'education facility' be a permitted activity within the new MPZ they are proposing for McKinnon Rd. As discussed earlier, matters relating to MML's new MPZ proposal have been deferred to HS8. Therefore, S103.026 will consider the addition of the activity to the Zone more generally like S139.009.

⁶ [Gore District Council Subdivision and Land Development Bylaw 2019](#)

168. Similarly, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.010] and MML [S103.027] seek the addition of a rule listing 'healthcare facility' as a permitted activity within MPZ.

6.15.2 Assessment

169. I agree with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.009], MML [S103.026], and Ministry of Education [S125.089] that 'education facilities' should be a permitted activity within MPZ. Correcting this omission will better align the rules of this chapter with its policies and objectives, and provisions with the UD chapter of the PDP. I support the rule framework provided by S125.089 and shown in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1: PROPOSED RULE FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATION FACILITY WITHIN MPZ

MPZ-R11 Education Facility		
All Māori Purpose Zones	Activity status: Permitted	Activity status where compliance is not achieved:
	Where: 1. Any new or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZS4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7	Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; 3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.

170. I also agree in principle with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.010] and MML [S103.027] that 'healthcare facility' should be a permitted activity. I note, however, that it already is under MPZ-R8. The definition of 'community facility', as per both the PDP and the National Planning Standards, is as follows:

"means land and buildings used by members of the community for recreational, sporting, cultural, safety, health, welfare, or worship purposes. It includes provision for any ancillary activity that assists with the operation of the community facility."

171. Under this definition, health care facilities are classed as a type of community facility, and is therefore permitted under MPZ-R8.

6.15.3 Recommendation

172. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that:

- The Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.009], MML [S103.027] and Ministry of Education [S125.089] submission points pertaining to the inclusion of 'educational facility' as a permitted activity be accepted, and that the wording provided by S125.089 be adopted to create a new rule, MPZ-R11;

173. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.15.4 Section 32AA Evaluation

174. The following evaluates the recommendation to add a new rule, MPZ-R11, under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

175. The proposal will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner.

Costs and benefits

176. The benefits of the proposal are that it is clear what is required in terms of PDP administration, and the PDP is interpreted in a consistent manner. There are no apparent costs with the proposal.

Risk of acting or not acting

177. There is the potential for inconsistency between the rules in this chapter, and other provisions within the plan if the proposed amendment is not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

178. The proposed amendment is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the Objective than the notified version of the PDP.

6.16 MPZ- Additional Provisions (Natural Hazard Risk)

6.16.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ- Additional Provisions (Natural Hazard Risk)

179. Environment Southland [S85.296] seeks a new objective and policy relating to natural hazard risk be added to this chapter. In their further submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.013] oppose in part this submission point.

180. Environment Southland [S85.296] considers that new buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with flood inundation. They go on to state that consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths. To achieve this, the submitter has recommended including an objective and policy relating to natural hazard risk in this chapter alongside performance standards regarding minimum floor levels in areas still vulnerable to flood risk.

The submitter also seeks that the chapter “manage development within secondary flow paths”. No specific wording for these additional objectives or policies has been provided in their submission.

181. The further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.13] opposes in part Environment Southland’s submission point on this matter. The further submitter notes that, whilst it is important to recognise and address the risk of inundation in the MPZ, they consider the “blanket approach” proposed by S85.296 to be inappropriate.

6.16.2 Assessment

182. I consider this matter to be sufficiently addressed in the existing PDP wording. MPZ-O3 directs use and development to only be enabled where “adverse effects on the health and safety of people and the environment are avoided or mitigated.”. Similarly, the recommended redrafting of MPZ-P2, as discussed in section 6.7.2 of this report, ensures activities within the MPZ “do not create or exacerbate natural hazard risk”.

6.16.3 Recommendation

183. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the submission point of Environment Southland [S85.296] be dismissed.
184. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.17 MPZ- Additional Provisions (Relocation of Second Hand Buildings)

6.17.1 Matters raised by submitters – Additional Provisions (Relocation of Second Hand Buildings)

185. New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association [S77.016] seek additional provisions for second hand buildings within the MPZ. The submitter notes that whilst residential activity is provided for, the associated standards refer to “new” buildings. To address this policy gap, New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association has provided two potential policy approaches for consideration in S77.16.
186. The first option provided by S77.016 is an additional standard to be added to the chapter (presumably to be used as a compliance condition across relevant chapter rules). The wording provided sets out five conditions for considering the relocation of a second hand building a permitted activity within MPZ. This wording is included in full in **Appendix B** under Submission Point S77.016. The submitter notes that this wording is supported on the basis of the decision of Environment Court - New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council.
187. Alternatively, New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association seeks the inclusion of the words “new or relocated buildings” to the activity rules for residential activity (MPZ-R7).
188. NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi [FS14.052] provided a further submission opposing S77.016 and seek it be disallowed on the basis that relocated dwellings may be used for noise sensitive

activities and S77.016 does not seek to ensure that relocated dwellings are subject to NOISE-S3 acoustic treatment requirements. In its original submission NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi specifically sought to amend NOISE-R7 to include relocated buildings used for noise sensitive activities to manage the effects of noise from activities relocating close to the state highway network.

6.17.2 Assessment

189. I agree in part with New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association [S77.016], however, I consider that a new standard is unnecessary. Instead amending the activity rules within the MPZ chapter, as outlined further below, would be sufficient to ensure that relocated buildings are provided for as a permitted activity.

190. The proposed amendment will ensure that relocated buildings meet the permitted activity conditions subject to compliance with the relevant standards and that undertaking an activity within a relocatable building does not inadvertently trigger a need for resource consent under the activity rules.

191. The PDP Temporary Activities Chapter contains rule TEMP-R8 in relation to Relocated Buildings. The ‘temporary’ factor being the relocation of a building to a site before it is fully reinstated. This rule is not subject to any submissions.

TEMP-R8	Relocated Buildings	
All zones	Activity Status: Permitted Where: - Any relocated <i>building</i> complies with the relevant standards for <i>buildings</i> in the relevant zone; and - A <i>building</i> pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a <i>building</i> consent for the destination site. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the <i>building</i>. The report shall include a certification by the property owner that the reinstatement works shall be completed within the specified 12 month period; and - The <i>building</i> shall be located on permanent foundations approved by <i>building</i> consent, within 2 months of the <i>building</i> being moved to the site; and - All other reinstatement work required by the <i>building</i> inspection report and the <i>building</i> consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed within 12 months of the <i>building</i> being delivered to the site. Without limiting (3) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all <i>infrastructure</i> services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary. Matters of discretion: - The matters of discretion of any breached standard for <i>buildings</i> in the relevant zone. - External appearance and <i>amenity values</i>. - The timeframe for completion and reasons for delay. - Health and safety. - Any bond or other condition required to ensure completion of any <i>restoration work</i>.

192. The above rule permits relocated buildings across the district, where they meet the performance standards.

193. The performance standards include compliance with zoning standards relating to buildings, ensuring semblance of character and amenity from bulk and location of built form. The standard further requires a pre-inspection report to be submitted with any building consent application ensuring an appropriate level of scrutiny is undertaken by Council. S77.16 request to include a new activity for relocated buildings in each zone is essentially a duplication of the Temporary Activities rule. However, including the additional wording of “relocated” in each existing activity rule which permits buildings will improve the clarity and useability of the PDP.

194. The further submission from NZTA [FS14.052] is acknowledged, however, relocated buildings will be captured by the requirements of NOISE-S3 if they are used for a 'noise sensitive activity'. NOISE-S3 relates to an activity (being a noise sensitive activity) rather than the physical building within which the activity takes place, that is it does not matter if the building is new or second-hand (relocated) it is the activity undertaken within that building which is a trigger for NOISE-S3.

6.17.3 Recommendation

195. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that each relevant MPZ rule is amended to provide for relocated, as well as new and extended, buildings as a permitted activity subject to compliance with the performance standards. The specific wording for each rule is provided within **Appendix A**, however, the wording would generally be (new text underlined and in red):

"Any new ,relocated, or extended building or structure complies with....."

196. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.17.4 Section 32AA Evaluation

197. The following evaluates the recommendation to amend the zone rules to reference 'relocated' as well as 'new' buildings under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

198. The proposal will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner as it will be clear to a plan user viewing the specific zone chapters that relocatable buildings are permitted subject to the zone standards.

Costs and benefits

199. The benefits of the proposal are that it is clear what is required in terms of PDP administration, and the PDP is interpreted in a consistent manner. There are no apparent costs with the proposal. Enabling the use of relocated buildings for activities will avoid any unintended resource consents as a result of activities utilising relocated rather than new buildings.

Risk of acting or not acting

200. There is the potential for unintended policy gaps to remain in the chapter if the proposed amendment is not made. There is also the potential for confusion or inconsistency over the status of relocated buildings if the proposed amendment is not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

201. The proposed amendment is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the Objective than the notified version of the PDP.

6.18 MPZ-MAP

6.18.1 Matters raised by submitters – MPZ-MAP

202. Environment Southland [S85.063] oppose any intensifying development in flood prone (or hazard) areas, as they consider this to put communities at risk. S85.063 seeks to prevent any new zone changes from the Operative District Plan which have the potential to intensify land use change and development within a flood inundation area. This submission point applies to all zones and maps, including MPZ. Hamish Weir [FS5.195] opposes this submission point, but provides no explanation as to why.

6.18.2 Assessment

203. Whilst I acknowledge that development within flood inundation areas can pose a serious threat to those who go on to live in these developments, I note that much of this risk can be mitigated through design choices such as raised floor levels and stream setbacks – both of which are built form standards within the MPZ chapter.

204. I also note that the locations of MPZ are not as flexible as other planning zones such as residential or industrial. Māori Purpose zoning reflects the whakapapa or other intergenerational cultural links a Māori community has with a specific location. These links cannot be easily transposed onto another land parcel to avoid a flood inundation zone. For this reason, it is considered, on balance, appropriate to locate MPZ on areas prone to flooding if these areas are identified by Māori communities as still being the most appropriate locations for MPZ. The heightened flooding risk can be managed through built form standards and carefully chosen land uses that accommodate for the movement of water, as opposed to restricting all development in these places Māori communities want to consolidate their activities. I note that natural hazard matters across the District will be further considered as part of the Natural Hazards Chapter in a future hearing stream.

205. Based on these reasonings, I agree with FS5.195 that Environment Southland's S85.063 be disregarded.

6.18.3 Recommendation

206. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that no changes be made to the MPZ maps.

207. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

7. Conclusions

208. This report has provided an assessment of submissions received on the MPZ chapters and associated definitions and mapping of the PDP.

209. Submissions were generally supportive of the intent and direction of the chapter. There were, however, a large number of 'support in part' and oppose in part' submission points relating to specific wording, and one proposal for a new MPZ.

210. Key issues identified through submissions include:

- Access to water for firefighting purposes;
- Built form standard exemptions for FENZ infrastructure;
- Flood protection and mitigation standards for new buildings (specifically minimum floor levels);
- Provision of education and health facilities and activities;
- Support for the Mataura Marae MPZ;
- A proposed concept development plan, including augmentation to the O Te Ika Rama MPZ site
- Wording encapsulating the relationship between MPZ, and rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga; and
- Alignment between objectives, policies, and rules

211. I consider that the submissions on the MPZ Chapter and associated definitions and mapping assessed in this report be accepted, accepted in part, rejected or rejected in part, as set out in my recommendations in this report including **Appendix B**.

212. Overall, I recommend that the provisions are amended as shown in Appendix A for the reasons set out in this report. The main changes recommended include:

- Adding a new rule, MPZ-R11, to make education facilities a permitted activity across all MPZ
- Splitting MPZ-P2 into two individual policies, with MPZ-P2 focusing on the range of activities enabled within MPZ, and the new MPZ-P3 addressing natural hazards and other activity mitigation requirements
- Minor rewording to explicitly permit the use of relocatable buildings within the Zone

213. I consider that the amended provisions will be efficient and effective in achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of the PDP and other relevant statutory documents, for the reasons set out in the Section 32AA evaluations undertaken throughout this report.

Appendix A

MĀORI PURPOSE ZONE - MPZ

Overview and Purpose

Māori Purpose Zones recognise s and enables the use and development of land in these zones to provide for a variety of social, economic, cultural, and environmental activities of benefit to whānau Māori, in accordance with tikanga, & further enable whānau Māori within the Gore District to provide for their cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing in ways that reflect their unique rights and interests as mana whenua and tangata whenua. This zone provides for a range of activities to be undertaken, such as Māori cultural hubs (including *marae* complexes), papakāinga, community-focused activities, and environmental and economic activities which support Māori values & aspirations. The plan provides for some activities as permitted activities across all MPZ, whilst other activities require resource consents These provisions recognise that there are some activities that should be permitted across all Māori Purpose Zones (such as cultural activities), whilst other activities (such as residential activities or commercial activities) may be appropriate only in specific zones, depending on the constraints of the site.

There are four Māori Purpose Zones included in the Gore District Plan. They are:

- Hokonui Rūnanga (Charlton Road, Gore)
- Mataura Marae (Dorset Street, Mataura)
- Te Ika Rama Marae (McKinnon Road, McNab)
- Hokonui Marae (Hyde Street, Gore)

Objectives

MPZ-O1 The Māori Purpose Zone enables a range of social, cultural, environmental, educational
MPZ-O2 and economic development opportunities that support the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship between *mana whenua* and *tangata whenua*, and both their ancestral lands and the natural environment.

MPZ-O2 *Mana whenua* and *tangata whenua* are able to exercise rangatiratanga and
MPZ-O1 kaitiakitanga to the fullest extent practicable within a Māori Purpose Zone.

MPZ-O3 Use and development in the Māori Purpose Zone is enabled where adverse *effects* on the health and safety of people and the environment are avoided or mitigated.

Policies

MPZ-P1 Enable the incorporation of whānaungatanga, mātauranga and tikanga in relation to the use, design, layout, and decision-making relating to development within the Māori Purpose Zone.

MPZ-P2 Enable a range of activities in the Māori Purpose Zone which support whānau Māori to provide for their economic social, and cultural well-being, the use and development of the Māori Purpose Zone for a range of appropriate activities that enable the Māori community to support itself, including but not limited to:

1. residential uses (including papakāinga);
2. *Marae* and/or *Papatipu Rūnanga* complexes, and other Māori cultural facilities and activities;
3. environmental-focused activities including restoration, mahinga kai practices, and environment-related employment opportunities;

4. social, recreational, *educational facilities*, and economic facilities;

~~while:~~

~~5. ensuring any significant adverse effects from these activities on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; and~~

~~6. requiring that all activities are adequately serviced.~~

MPZ-P3 Ensure activities within the Māori Purpose Zone:

1. Do not create or significantly exacerbate natural hazard risk;

2. Have appropriate standards of access and infrastructure; and

3. Mitigate any significant adverse effects they cause on adjoining properties beyond the zone or on the wider environment .

MPZ-P3 Restrict activities that are inconsistent with the objectives, policies, or rules related to
MPZ-P4 Māori Purpose Zones unless it can be demonstrated that they are appropriate, having regard to:

1. its appropriateness in the context of MPZ-O1 and MPZ-O2;

2. the *site* design, layout, and scale of the activity, and its integration or relationship with existing *land* uses;

3. whether there is adequate *infrastructure* and services available to service the activity;

4. any *reverse sensitivity* or adverse *effects* on anticipated activities within the Māori Purpose Zone; and

5. the ecological impacts of the proposed activity.

Notes

Note 1 Provisions in Other Chapters

The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua.

Rules

MPZ-R1	Māori Customary Activities	
MPZ-R2	Conservation Activity	
All Māori Purpose Zones	MPZ-R1 to MPZ-R2	Activity status where compliance is not achieved:
	Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The GFA of any ancillary structure does not exceed 30m²; and 2. Any ancillary structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7.	Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; 3. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.
MPZ-R3	Marae or Papatipu Rūnanga Complex	
All Māori Purpose Zones	Activity status: Permitted	Activity status where compliance not achieved with:
	Where: 1. Any new <u>relocated</u>, or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7.	Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; 3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.
MPZ-R4	Emergency Services Facility	
MPZ-R5	Primary Production	
All Māori Purpose Zones	Activity status: Permitted	Activity status where compliance not achieved with:
	Where: 1. The activity is not at the Hokonui Mare Site; 2. Any new <u>relocated</u>, or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7; and 3. <i>Primary Production</i> complies with RLZ-R6.	Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; 3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.
MPZ-R6	Cluster Housing	

MPZ-R7	Residential Activity	
MPZ-R8	Community Facility	
MPZ-R9	Commercial Activity	
MPZ-R10	Visitor Accommodation	
All Māori Purpose Zones	MPZ-R6 to MPZ-R10 Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The activity is not at the Te Ika Rama Marae site; 2. Any new, <u>relocated</u>, or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7; and 3. <i>Retail Activities</i> are limited to 100m² <i>Gross Floor Area</i>.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; 3. The extent to which adverse <i>effects</i> on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider <i>environment</i> are mitigated; 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements; and 5. For non-<i>residential activities</i> matters relating to: (a) traffic generation (b) <i>noise</i> (c) scale (d) access (e) <i>reverse sensitivity</i>.
<u>MPZ-R11</u>	<u>Education Facility</u>	
<u>All Māori Purpose Zones</u>	Activity status: Permitted Where: <u>1. Any new, relocated, or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7</u>	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: <u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard;</u> <u>2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated;</u> <u>3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and</u> <u>4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.</u>

MPZ-R12		Urupā
Mataura Marae	Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The GFA of any ancillary structure does not exceed 30m2 2. Any new <u>or relocated</u> buildings or structures comply with relevant standards Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZ-S4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; 3. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.
	MPZ-R13 All other activities	
All Māori Purpose Zones	Activity status: Discretionary 1. Any activities, including associated buildings, not otherwise provided for in the list of rules.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: N/A

Standards

MPZ-S1	Height	
All Māori Purpose Zones	1. Any building must not exceed a maximum height of 8 metres above ground level. Excluding any art, carvings, or other cultural symbols fixed to buildings or roof mounted structures such as: panels, architectural features, satellite dishes or antennas, aerials or flues, provided these do not exceed the height by more than 1m and is no more than 1 metre in width or length.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The adverse effects on adjoining sites including privacy, shading, outlook and dominance; 2. The reason for the increase in height; 3. The ability to mitigate adverse effect on adjoining sites through layout, building design and landscaping; 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements; and 5. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW-2.3
MPZ-S2	Height in relation to boundary	
All Māori Purpose Zones	1. No part of any building shall project beyond the height in relation to boundary plane, measured from points 2.6 metres above ground level at site boundaries adjoining a Residential Zone. See Appendix 2 for boundary plane angles. Except that: (a) this standard does not apply to road boundaries. (b) the following intrusions are permitted: (i) for any roof with a slope of 15 degrees or greater and the roof ridge generally at right angles to the boundary, the end of the ridge may be up to 1.5 metres above the indicator plane and the end area up to 2.5 square metres when viewed in elevation. (ii) roof mounted structures such as panels, architectural features, satellite dishes or antennas, aerials, flues as long as these are not more than 1m above height limit in MPZ-S1 and not more than 1m in width or length. Note: Where a boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site or pedestrian access way, the rule applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way	Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; 3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.

MPZ-S3		Setbacks to boundaries
Te Ika Rama Marae and Hokonui Runanga Sites	1. Any building must be setback at least 10 metres from the Māori Purpose Zone boundary. Except that: (a) eaves, gutters and associated downpipes on any building may intrude into the setback by up to 600mm. (b) no setback is required for buildings that share a common wall along the boundary. (c) a carport or garage, either standalone or attached to the dwelling may be located up to 500mm from a side or rear boundary provided that the maximum length of the building adjacent to the property boundary does not exceed 6 metres and contains no doors or windows.	Activity status where compliance not achieved with: MPZ-S3(1) or MPZ-S3(2): Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The adverse effects on adjoining sites including privacy, shading, outlook and dominance; 2. The ability to mitigate adverse effect on adjoining sites through layout, building design and landscaping; and 3. The extent to which the reduction in the setback is necessary due to the shape or natural and physical features of the site.
	2. Any building must be setback at least 1 metre from the Māori Purpose Zone boundary. Except that: (d) eaves, gutters and associated downpipes on any building may intrude into the setback by up to 600mm. (e) no setback is required for buildings that share a common wall along the boundary. (f) a carport or garage, either standalone or attached to the dwelling may be located up to 500mm from a side or rear boundary provided that the maximum length of the building adjacent to the property boundary does not exceed 6 metres and contains no doors or windows.	
Mataura and Hokonui Marae Sites		
MPZ-S4		Setbacks from Roads
Te Ika Rama Marae and Hokonui Runanga Sites	1. Any building or structure must be setback a minimum of 10 metres from any road boundary. Except that: (a) fences are permitted within the setback (b) eaves, gutters and associated downpipes on any building may intrude into the setback by a maximum of 600mm.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: MPZ-S4(1) or MPZ-S4(2): Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The safety and efficiency of the road network; 2. The adverse effects on adjoining sites including privacy, and shading; 3. The ability to mitigate adverse effect on adjoining sites through layout, building design and landscaping; and 4. The reason for the reduced setback including any functional or tikanga related requirements.
	2. Any building or structure must be setback a minimum of 3 metres from any road boundary. Except that: (c) fences are permitted within the setback (d) eaves, gutters and associated downpipes on any building may intrude into the setback by a maximum of 600mm.	
Mataura and Hokonui Marae Sites		
MPZ-S5		Setbacks to rivers and streams

All Māori Purpose Zones	1. Any building or structure is set back from the top of the closest bank of any stream or river the minimum distance as follows: (a) 20m for high order rivers or streams (order 5 and above) (b) 10m for middle order rivers or streams (order 3 and 4) (c) 5m for low order rivers or streams (order 1 and 2).	Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Whether there is a functional or tikanga related need for the building or structure to locate in a riparian margin, and the extent to which alternative practicable options have been considered and their feasibility; 2. The effects on water quality and the stability and health of the stream bed and banks, including erosion and sedimentation control measures; 3. The nature of existing riparian vegetation and the effects of proposed planting or modification on indigenous biodiversity and /or habitats; 4. The natural character of the riparian margin and the effects of the activity on landscape values and the ability to restore, rehabilitate or enhance riparian areas; 5. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW-2.3; 6. The effects on public and customary access to the stream or river; and 7. The potential for flooding and to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards, impact natural drainage patterns, redirect overland flow paths or flood flows, including on to other sites.
	Refer to Appendix 3 for river and stream orders	
MPZ-S6	Building Coverage	
Te Ika Rama Marae	1. The maximum building coverage shall not exceed 1000m2 per site.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: MPZ-S6(1) or MPZ-S6(2): Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The adverse effects on adjoining sites including privacy, shading, and dominance; 2. The ability to mitigate adverse effect on adjoining sites through layout, building design and landscaping; 3. The effects on water management; and 4. Ecological and biodiversity impacts.
Mataura and Hokonui Marae sites and Hokonui Rūnanga Site	2. The maximum building coverage shall not exceed 50 percent per site.	
MPZ-S7	Servicing	

**All Māori Purpose
Zones**

1. Any residential unit or place of employment shall be connected to a Council reticulated water supply, or have access to on-site water of a potable standard.
2. Any residential unit or place of employment shall be connected to a Council reticulated wastewater network, or have on-site wastewater management systems with sufficient capacity.
3. If reticulated Council water or wastewater is unavailable, on-site systems must have sufficient capacity.

**Activity status where compliance is not
achieved:**

Non-complying

Appendix B - Recommended response to submissions and further submissions

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S101	Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.103	Whole Plan	Support in part	The specific provisions of the proposal that Transpower’s submission relates to are: The PDP in its entirety insofar as it relates to the National Grid, and particularly the extent to which the provisions of the PDP give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008. The specific details of Transpower’s submission, and decisions sought in relation to the PDP are set out in Appendix A of the submission. It is Transpower’s submission that the Proposed District Plan goes a long way to achieving the statutory requirement set out above but that further amendments to the Proposed District Plan are required to: (a) give effect to the NPSET; (b) give effect to the SRPS; (c) appropriately reflect the relationship of the provisions of the Proposed District Plan with the NESETA; (d) achieve the purpose of the RMA; (e) represent the most appropriate means of exercising Council’s functions having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means; and (f) discharge Council’s duty under section 32 of the RMA	Support in part the PDP as it relates to the National Grid	Accept in part	Pg. 14, para 47
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.093	Whole Plan	Support in part	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc supports all the provisions in the proposed plan as notified except for the amendments requested to the above provisions, which are set out in the submission tables and schedule which are attached to and form part of this submission.	Retain provisions as notified, except for those which have been submitted against as part of Hokonui Runanga's submission	Accept in part	Pg. 14, para 47
S103	McNabb Management Ltd	S103.031	Whole Plan	Support in part	I support all the provisions in the proposed plan as notified except for the amendments requested to the above provisions, which are set out in the schedule and concept plan which are attached to and form part of this submission.	Support in part except requested amendments	Accept in part	Pg. 14, para 47
S146	Southland District Council	S146.095	MPZ – General	Support	None specified	None requested	Accept	Pg. 14, para 47

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S23	Mataura Marae	S23.001	MPZ – General	Support	The submitter supports the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) and the permitted activities as they reflect activities Mataura Marae is interested in exploring on this site especially residential, community and educational activities	None specified	Accept	Pg. 14, para 48
S23	Mataura Marae	S23.002	MPZ – General	Support	The submitter supports the objectives and policies that enable tikanga Māori to influence decision making within the MPZ, as it supports Mataura Marae to express their rangatiratanga as tangata whenua within the MPZ.	That the Mataura Marae MPZ provisions be retained as drafted	Accept	Pg. 14, para 48; Pg. 15, para 55
S23	Mataura Marae	S23.003	MPZ – General	Support	The submitter supports the objectives and policies, enabling the submitter to manaaki our marae community through providing a wider range of experiences grounded in te ao Māori on-site.	That the Mataura Marae MPZ provisions be retained as drafted	Accept	Pg. 14, para 48
S103	McNabb Management Ltd	S103.025	MPZ- Overview And Purpose	Support in part	It isn't clear why the location of MSP zones is listed when it is not something done for other zones but it creates a difficulty when proposing a new MSPZ. In accordance with tikanga any new MSPZ will be gifted a name in due course. If the Council wishes to retain the second paragraph, the paragraph will need to be amended to include reference to the second MSPZ at McNabb.	Delete the second paragraph; or Amend the second paragraph to read: "Current Māori Purpose Zones are located at: - Charlton Rd, Gore (Hokonui Rūnanga Offices) - Dorset St, Mataura (Mataura Marae) - Hyde St, Gore (Hokonui Marae) - McKinnon Rd, McNabb (Te Ika Rama Marae and the kainga development area). "	Reject	Pp. 16-17, para 61-64
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.001	MPZ- Overview and Purpose	Support in part	The purpose of the Act requires recognition and provision for the relationship of Māori and their customs and traditions with all their ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga in the entire takiwā, not just in Māori Purpose Zones. Rather, the MPZ is an enabler of Māori land use development in recognition of the absence of provisions to enable mana whenua to use and develop their land in accordance with tikanga, through successive generations of planning legislation.	Amend the first paragraph of introduction to read: <i>"Māori Purpose Zones recognise mana whenua whakapapa (connection to place) and rangatiratanga; and enables the use and development of land in these zones to provide for a variety of social, economic, cultural and environmental activities of benefit to whānau Māori and the wider community, in accordance with tikanga. The plan provides for some activities as permitted activities across all Māori Purpose Zones, while other activities require resource consents</i>	Accepted in part. First paragraph to be amended as follows: <i>"Māori Purpose Zones enable whānau Māori within the Gore District to use and develop land in specific locations to provide for a variety of social, economic, cultural and environmental activities, in accordance with tikanga Māori. The provisions in this zone</i>	Pp. 15-16, para 55-60

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						<i>and development plans to enable provision of appropriate infrastructure and management of effects."</i>	<i>classify some activities as permitted across all Māori Purpose Zones, while other activities are restricted in specific Māori Purpose Zones to ensure activities have appropriate infrastructure and that adverse environmental effects are appropriately managed."</i>	
S85	Environment Southland	S85.284	MPZ- Overview and Purpose	Oppose in part	None specified	Recognise that a residual flood risk exists despite stop banks.	Reject	Pg. 17, para 65
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.002	MPZ-O1	Support in part	The objectives need tweaking to make it clear that MPZs are not the only place to recognise rangatiratanga and enable kaitiakitanga. Those rights are recognised in the Treaty, the principles of which must be taken into account in the development of the entire district plan; and lay the foundations for mana whenua input into the management of land uses and associated activities across the entire District, not solely in the MPZ. Under National Planning Standards a MPZ can apply to any whenua which is at least 50% owned by a Māori organisation; not only land held by mana whenua. However rangatiratanga and the associated duty of kaitiakitanga is held by mana whenua.	Amend MPZ-O1 – <i>"A range of social, economic, environmental and cultural activities are enabled within Māori Purpose Zones in recognition of rangatiratanga; and in accordance with mātauranga and tikanga."</i> Renumber as MPZ-O2.	Rejected in part Renumber MPZ-O1 to be MPZ-O2	Pp. 18-19, para 79-85
S125	Ministry of Education	S125.087	MPZ-O1	Support in part	The submitter supports MPZ-O1 in principle, however, seeks the inclusion of education facilities. Which enables a wide range of activities that cater to mana whenua and tangata whenua. Including education activities aligns with UFD-05 which states that 'Māori Purpose Zones provide for the specific needs of Māori communities, including small to medium-scale residential, education, commercial, community, cultural and employment opportunities.'	Amend as follows: <i>The Māori Purpose Zone enables a range of social, cultural, environmental, educational and economic development opportunities that support the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship between mana whenua and tangata whenua, and both their ancestral lands and the natural environment.</i>	Accept	Pg. 18, para 78

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.003	MPZ-O2	Oppose in part	The objectives[MPZ-O2 and MPZ-O3] need tweaking to make it clear that MPZs are not the only place to recognise rangatiratanga and enable kaitiakitanga. Those rights are recognised in the Treaty, the principles of which must be taken into account in the development of the entire district plan; and lay the foundations for mana whenua input into the management of land uses and associated activities across the entire District, not solely in the MPZ. Under National Planning Standards a MPZ can apply to any whenua which is at least 50% owned by a Māori organisation; not only land held by mana whenua, However rangatiratanga and the associated duty of kaitiakitanga is held by mana whenua.	Delete the Objective and replace with <i>"The Māori Purpose Zones enable whānau Māori connections with place, and to undertake a variety of land uses and development opportunities to provide for their economic, social and cultural well-being."</i> Reorder as MPZ-O1	Reject in part Reorder MPZ-O2 to be MPZ-O1	Pg. 19, para 80-85
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.004	MPZ-O3	Oppose in part	The objectives [MPZ-O2 and MPZ-O3] need tweaking to make it clear that MPZs are not the only place to recognise rangatiratanga and enable kaitiakitanga. Those rights are recognised in the Treaty, the principles of which must be taken into account in the development of the entire district plan; and lay the foundations for mana whenua input into the management of land uses and associated activities across the entire District, not solely in the MPZ. Under National Planning Standards a MPZ can apply to any whenua which is at least 50% owned by a Māori organisation; not only land held by mana whenua, However rangatiratanga and the associated duty of kaitiakitanga is held by mana whenua. MPZ-O3 is a policy not an objective.	Delete MPZ-O3 and replace with the amended Objective sought under MPZ-O2.	Reject	Pg. 19-20, para 86
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.005	MPZ-P2	Support in part	The activities listed in MPZ-P2 are narrower than provided for in the rules. It is not clear why employment opportunities would be limited to environmental areas only in a MPZ. The Policy should be amended to better provide for a range of activities appropriate for MPZ, while ensuring key potential environmental effects are managed.	Amend the policy to create two policies which read: “Enable a range of activities in the Māori Purpose Zone which enable whānau Māori to provide for their economic social, and cultural well-being, including but not limited to: 1. Residential development, including papakāinga/kāinga nohoanga; 2. Marae and other cultural facilities andactivities;3. Mahinga kai and primary production;	Accept in part. Reword as follows: Enable a range of activities in the Māori Purpose Zone which enable whānau Māori to provide for their economic social, and cultural well-being, including but not limited to:	Pp. 21-23 , para. 99-109

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						4. Environmental restoration and enhancement activities; 5. Employment and business opportunities; 6. Community, educational, recreational and health facilities and activities; and 7. Urupā.” "Ensure activities within the Māori Purpose Zone: 1. Do not create or exacerbate natural hazard risk; 2. Have appropriate standards of access and infrastructure; and 3. Do not have adverse effects such as noise or night lighting which are incompatible with the amenity values of the area."	1. residential uses (including papakāinga); 2. Marae and/or Papatipu Rūnanga complexes, and other Māori cultural facilities and activities including urupā; 3. environmental-focused activities including restoration, mahinga kai practices, and environment-related employment opportunities; 4. social, recreational, educational facilities, and economic facilities; 5. Primary production Add new policy MPZ-PX “Manage activities within the Māori Purpose Zone so that they: 1. Do not create or exacerbate natural hazard risk; 2. Avoid or mitigate any significant adverse effects from activities on adjoining properties beyond the zone and the wider environment; and 6. Activities are adequately serviced and connected to necessary infrastructure. Request further information on	

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
							submitter preference to include the term 'kāinga nohoanga', to support the interpretation of this term in the context of this policy.	
S125	Ministry of Education	S125.088	MPZ-P2	Support	The submitter supports MPZ-P2, enabling education facilities under (4) which aligns with UFD-O5 and allows for mana whenua to use and development the zone for educational asse	Retain as proposed	Accept in part References to education activities retained, but surrounding wording amended.	Pg. 21, para 98
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.006	MPZ-P3	Oppose	It isn't clear which activity this policy is intended to apply to. We suggest the issue is effects from incompatible and uses adjoining the MPZ and suggest rewording the policy to make this clear.	Amend policy to read: <i>"Ensure activities on land adjoining the MPZ have effects which are compatible with the activities in the MPZ to minimise the potential for both sensitivity and reverse-sensitivity effects."</i>	Reject	Pg. 24, para 118-119
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.276	MPZ-R1	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.014	MPZ-R1	Support in part S124.276	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.277	MPZ-R2	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.046	MPZ-R2	Support in part S124.277	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.278	MPZ-R3	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.047	MPZ-R3	Support in part S124.278	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S85	Environment Southland	S85.285	MPZ-R3	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.012	MPZ-R3	Oppose in part S85.285	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.285	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.286	MPZ-R4	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of emergency service facilities in the Māori Purpose Zone as a permitted activity (MPZ-R4).	Retain as notified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.286	MPZ-R4	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.036	MPZ-R4	Oppose in part S85.286	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.286	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.279	MPZ-R5	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.048	MPZ-R5	Support in part S124.279	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.287	MPZ-R5	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.037	MPZ-R5	Oppose in part S85.287	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.287	Accept .	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.280	MPZ-R6	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.049	MPZ-R6	Support in part S124.280	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.288	MPZ-R6	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.038	MPZ-R6	Oppose in part S85.288	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.288	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.281	MPZ-R7	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.050	MPZ-R7	Support in part S124.281	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.289	MPZ-R7	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.039	MPZ-R7	Oppose in part S85.289	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.289	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.007	MPZ-R8	Support in part	The rules should provide for activities allowed by MPZ-P2.	Amend the rule to read: Community and cultural ~~facility~~ facilities, activities and events.	Reject	Pg. 26-27, para 134
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.282	MPZ-R8	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 -	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.			
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.051	MPZ-R8	Support in part S124.282	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.290	MPZ-R8	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.040	MPZ-R8	Oppose in part S85.290	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.290	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.008	MPZ-R9	Support in part	The rules should provide for activities allowed by MPZ-P2.	Amend the rule to read: "Commercial ~~activity~~ activities and facilities."	Reject	Pg. 27, para 135
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.283	MPZ-R9	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.			
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.052	MPZ-R9	Support in part S124.283	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
S85	Environment Southland	S85.295	MPZ-R9	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.045	MPZ-R9	Oppose in part S85.295	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.295	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.284	MPZ-R10	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.053	MPZ-R10	Support in part S124.284	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S85	Environment Southland	S85.291	MPZ-R10	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.041	MPZ-R10	Oppose in part S85.291	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.291	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S85	Environment Southland	S85.292	MPZ-R11	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.042	MPZ-R11	Oppose in part S85.292	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.292	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.285	MPZ-R12	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part MPZ-R1-R3, R5R10 and R12 subject to the inclusion of a servicing standard which includes firefighting water supply - MPZS7 - Servicing. It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the subdivision chapter that requires subdividers to provide water supply. Therefore, requiring the inclusion of servicing including firefighting water supply within a new standard where development is not subject to the subdivision provisions of the plan. The assessment matter pertaining to the infringed standard will provide council with the discretion of the extent of an activity to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Subject to the acceptance of the relief sought relating to an additional standard for servicing.	Retain as notified subject to the amendment sought in MPZ-S7.	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.015	MPZ-R12	Support in part S124.285	Support in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 26, para 133

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S85	Environment Southland	S85.293	MPZ-R12	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 26, para 129-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.043	MPZ-R12	Oppose in part S85.293	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.293	Accept	Pg. 26, para 129
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.287	MPZ-S1	Support in part	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in a district plan. However, as part of Fire and Emergency fire station operational requirements many stations include a multipurpose tower or pole between 12- 15m in height. Fire and Emergency towers are typically either lattice towers that can support a siren, aerials and hose drying or are platform towers that can support all the above plus be used for firefighter training. Similarly, poles can support sirens, aerials and hose drying activities. Examples of these structures are attached as Appendix B. The frequency of towers or poles being required at stations is generally dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. Some existing fire station sites across the country have aerial and sirens mounted on the roof of the building which is not ideal, and Fire and Emergency are slowly rectifying this with the construction of towers and poles. Ideally all stations would have a tower or structure. Fire and Emergency therefore seek an exemption from the height standard for emergency service facilities which encompass communication towers and poles.	Amend as follows: Excluding emergency service facilities.	Reject	Pg. 28, para 141
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.288	MPZ-S1	Support in part	As per the points raised in relation to MPZ-S1 Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for communication towers and poles regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Amend as follows: Except that: (c) This standard does not apply to communication towers and poles for emergency service facilities	Reject	Pg. 28, para 141
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.289	MPZ-S4	Support in part	Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities (as proposed) are excluded from the	Amend as follows:	Reject	Pg. 29, para 145

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					minimum setback from road boundary rule. Where are setback is greater than 8-10m, this will result in increased civil costs, land parcel size and can create fire separation issue at rear boundaries The exclusion would support the logistical and operational requirements of Fire and Emergency	Except that: (e)Emergency service facilities are exempt from this rule		
S85	Environment Southland	S85.294	MPZ-S5	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths	Include a performance standard regarding minimum floor levels.	Reject	Pg. 30, para 151-152
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.044	MPZ-S5	Oppose in part S85.294	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.294	Reject	Pg. 30, para 151-152
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.290	MPZ-S6	Support in part	Fire and Emergency note that the minimum building coverage for a volunteer fire station is 250m2 and up to 1500m2 for a career fire station. Fire and Emergency are concerned that 1000m2 building coverage in the Te Ika Rama Marae would not provide for emergency service facilities should they need to construct a new career fire station in the MPZ in future. Typically, Fire and Emergency purchase land from 2000m2 to 4000m2 to facilitate the construction and operation of new emergency service facilities. Therefore, the 1000m2 would facilitate a volunteer fire station but not a career fire station and would limit their ability to expand in future. It is requested that this rule in relation to the Te Ika Rama Marae is amended for emergency services facilities in the MPZ.	Amend as follows: Te Ika Rama Marae The maximum building coverage shall not exceed 1000m2 per site. Except that: Emergency service facilities are exempt from this rule	Reject	Pg. 31, para 157
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.016	MPZ-S6	Oppose S124.290	The submitter is obviously not familiar with Te Ika Rama Marae – the is tribal land, is subject to inundation and is not suitable nor available for any new building let alone an emergency service facility.	Disregard S124.290	Accept	Pg. 31, para 158
S124	Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.291	MPZ-S7	Support in part	Fire and Emergency consider that new buildings located in the MPZ should be required to provide a firefighting water supply in order to manage fire risk.	Amend as follows: MPZ-S7 Servicing 4.All developments must have an independent water supply for firefighting that is compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire	Rejected	Pg. 31-32, para 163-164

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice		
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.017	MPZ-S7	Support in part S124.291	MPZs cover a range of purposes, activities and locations, so the need for firefighting water supply will depend on the MPZ and the building., A blanket rule is not appropriate.	None specified	Accept	Pg. 31-32, para 163-164
S103	McNabb Management Ltd	S103.026	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Support in part	These are usual activities and facilities that may occur within a MPZ and which we would like to see as options for the second MPZ at McKinnon Rd.	Add new rule: MPZ- R11 educational facilities.	Accept in part	Pg. 33, para 169
S103	McNabb Management Ltd	S103.027	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Support in part	These are usual activities and facilities that may occur within a MPZ and which we would like to see as options for the second MPZ at McKinnon Rd.	Add new rule: MPZ- R12 health facilities.	Reject	Pg. 33, para 170-171
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.009	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Amend	The rules should provide for activities allowed by MPZ-P2.	Add new rule MPZ-R11 that reads: Educational facilities and activities	Accept in part	Pg. 33, para 169
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.010	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Amend	The rules should provide for activities allowed by MPZ-P2.	Add new rule MPZ-R12 that reads: Health facilities	Reject	Pg. 33, para 170-171
S125	Ministry of Education	S125.089	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Support	The Ministry / Mana Whenua may have operational needs to locate educational assets within the zone, particularly Kohanga Reo or Kura Kaupapa Māori, aligning with UFD-05 and MPZ-P2(4) which enables educational activities.	Educational Facilities Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. Any new or extended buildings or structures comply with Māori Purpose Zone standards MPZ-S1, MPZ-S2, MPZ-S3, MPZS4, MPZ-S5, MPZ-S6, and MPZ-S7 Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard; 2. The extent to which adverse effects on adjoining properties	Accept	Pg. 33, para 169

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						beyond the zone and the wider environment are mitigated; 3. The extent to which all activities are adequately serviced; and 4. Any functional or tikanga related requirements.		
S77	New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association	S77.016	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Support	"Residential Activity and Residential Units" is provided for as a permitted activity where compliance with standards is achieved. However, standards within the PGDP only refer to buildings that are "new". The approach used is supported on the basis of the decision of Environment Court - New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council.	Permitted activity performance standards and criteria for relocation of second hand buildings: a. Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling. b. A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination site. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building. c. The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than 2 months of the building being moved to the site. d. All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (c) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations. e. The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the 12-month period Restricted Discretionary activity status for	Accept	Pp. 36-37, para 189-194

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards. OR The inclusion of the words "new or relocated buildings" to the activity rules for residential activities/units.		
FS14	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS14.052	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Oppose S77.016	Relocated second-hand dwellings may be used for a noise sensitive activity. The permitted activity performance standards and criteria listed by NZHHA in its submission does not give any certainty that a relocated second-hand dwelling will be able to comply with the requirements of NOISE-S3, whereby that standard seeks to manage noise impacts on the noise sensitive activity. The New Zealand Transport Agency is concerned that the proposed provision by NZHHA would enable second hand dwellings, that do not have acoustic treatment that complies with NOISE-S3 requirements, to be relocated to within a proximity of the state highway network where noise sensitive activities undertaken within that dwelling would be adversely impacted by noise arising from the operation of the highway. We suggest that the performance standards proposed by NZHHA either include measures to ensure compliance with NOISE-S3, otherwise we consider that noise effects may not be appropriately managed. In its original submission, the New Zealand Transport Agency sought amendments to rule NOISE-R7 to expressly include relocated buildings used for noise sensitive activities to manage noise impacts on activities relocating to within a proximity of the road network where they could be adversely impacted by noise generated from the use of the existing state highway network	Disregard S77.016	Reject	Pp. 36-37, para 189-194
S85	Environment Southland	S85.296	MPZ- Additional provisions sought	Oppose in part	New buildings or activities should only be established where they will be designed and built to minimise impacts associate with natural hazards, flood inundation. Consideration should also be given to effectively providing for secondary flow paths by preventing buildings structures and earthworks which could impede or redirect secondary flow paths.	Include an objective and policy relating to natural hazard risk and set performance standards regarding minimum floor levels in areas still vulnerable to flood risk. Manage development within secondary flow paths.	Reject	Pg. 35, para 182

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.013	MPZ- Additional provision sought	Oppose in part S85.296	It is important that the risk of inundation is recognized and addressed in the Māori Purpose Zone, but the submitter is wanting to a blanket approach to determine how this is done in all MPZs	Disregard S85.296	Accept	Pg. 35, para 182
S85	Environment Southland	S85.063	MPZ-MAP	Support in part	Intensifying development in flood prone (or hazard) areas will put communities at risk	Prevent any new zone changes from the current District Plan which have the potential to intensify land use change and development within a flood inundation area. This comment applies to all zones and maps	Reject	Pg. 38, para 204-205
FS5	Hamish Wier	FS5.195	MPZ-MAP	Oppose S85.063	None provided	Disregard S85.063	Accept	Pg. 38, para 204-205