

Gore Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 8 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	5
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	10
6. Consideration of submissions	11
6.1. Structure of the report	11
6.2 Overview of submissions	12
6.3 Format for consideration of submissions	13
6.4 Whole of plan.....	13
6.4.1. Matters raised by submitters – Whole of plan.....	13
6.4.2. Assessment	14
6.4.3. Recommendation	17
6.5. SASM – General	17
6.5.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM General.....	17
6.5.2. Assessment	19
6.5.3. Recommendation	24
6.5.4. Section 32AA Evaluation.....	25

6.6. SASM – Overview and Purpose.....	26
6.6.1. Matters raised by submitters – Overview and purpose	26
6.6.2. Assessment	26
6.6.3. Recommendation	27
6.6.4. Section 32AA Evaluation.....	27
6.7. SASM-O1	27
6.7.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-O1	27
6.7.2. Assessment	29
6.7.3. Recommendation	29
6.7.4. Section 32AA Evaluation.....	30
6.8. SASM-P1.....	30
6.8.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-P1	30
6.8.2. Assessment	32
6.8.3. Recommendation	33
6.8.4. Section 32AA Evaluation.....	33
6.9. SASM-P2.....	34
6.9.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-P2	34
6.9.2. Assessment	35
6.9.3. Recommendation	35
6.9.4. Section 32AA Evaluation.....	36
6.10. SASM- Additional provisions sought.....	36
6.10.1. Matters raised by submitters – additional provisions sought	36
6.10.2. Assessment	37
6.10.3. Recommendation	38
7. Consequential and Minor Amendments.....	38
8. Conclusions	38

Appendix A – Track Changed Amendments	40
Appendix B - Recommended Response to Submissions and Further Submissions	43
Appendix C – Analysis of “91 Day-to-day Primary Production Activities” List as provided by SFF Submission.....	75
Appendix D – Hokonui Rūnanga and Council Joint Response to Minute 15 of the Hearings Panel.....	1
Appendix One (of Appendix D) – Hokonui Rūnanga Proposed amendments to PDP MW – Mana Whenua Chapter.....	2
Appendix Two (of Appendix D) – Hokonui Rūnanga Proposed NTCV Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values Chapter	18

Abbreviation	Meaning
SASM	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori
GDC	Gore District Council
PDP	Proposed District Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
SFF	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Stoney Creek	Stoney Creek Station Limited
ES	Environment Southland
HS3	Hearing Stream 3 of the Gore District Plan Review
NTCV	Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values (proposed plan chapter)

Submitter No.	Submitter name
S3	Stoney Creek Station Limited
S18	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd
S19	Karen Temple
S20	Sarah and Peter Barclay
S23	Mataura Marae
S24	Helen McIntosh
S59	Adrienne Crispin
S60	Ronald Crispin
S64	Jet Boating NZ
S68	John Baynes
S74	Hamish Weir
S85	Environment Southland
S101	Transpower New Zealand Limited
S103	McNabb Management Ltd
S104	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station
S105	Farm Manager: Wantwood Station
S109	Department of Conservation

S113	Trudy Bokser
S115	Kevin Robertson
S116	Nathan Bokser
S117	Greg Bokser
S118	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust
S123	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand
S127	Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters
S128	Greenbriar Ltd.
S136	Jenny Campbell
S138	Port Blakely Limited
S139	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc
S142	Alan Taylor
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group
S146	Southland District Council
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt
S153	Oakland Farming Ltd
FS5	Hamish Weir
FS17	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited

1. Executive Summary

1. The Proposed District Plan (PDP) for Gore District was publicly notified on 31 August 2023. The PDP includes the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter.
2. This chapter provides a policy framework for Ngāi Tahu cultural values to be managed, as is required under Section 6(e) of the RMA: Matters of National Importance. The SASM chapter provides a high-level policy framework to guide how impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are assessed and provided for within the PDP. The rules associated with this topic, however, are spread across multiple chapters of the PDP to allow impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values to be considered in the context of specific activities – not in the context of specific locations. Because the PDP has taken this approach of connecting impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values to specific activities instead of specific locations, the PDP does not contain any specific Sites or Areas of Significance to Māori overlays.
3. Ninety-six submissions and fifty-seven further submissions were received on this chapter, with most in opposition. Several supportive submissions were also received however, along with some neutral submissions.
4. Key issues identified through submissions include:

- A general misunderstanding of how the SASM approach proposed in the PDP works, with many submitters incorrectly believing that a SASM overlay is being proposed for the entire Gore District;
 - A preference for individually mapped Sites or Areas of Significance to Māori to be included in the PDP, with SASM-related provisions only applying in these locations;
 - Concerns about potential administrative burdens that the PDP SASM approach may cause for landowners, Council, and mana whenua;
 - Confirmation of existing use rights as part of the management of SASM;
 - Opposition to any references to Māori in the PDP more generally; and
 - Support for the PDP approach to SASM and its alignment with Ngāi Tahu worldviews.
5. The Hearings Panel also issued Minute 15 prior to HS8 which directed Council and Hokonui Rūnanga to consider several matters that impact the SASM chapter. Minute 15 focuses mostly on the Mana Whenua chapter, however some of this Minute's recommendations also impact recommendations on the SASM Chapter. Of particular relevance is a proposal from Hokonui Rūnanga to replace the SASM chapter with a bespoke chapter called *NTCV: Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values*. This proposal, and other matters relating to Minute 15, are discussed where relevant in this report. The full Minute 15 response is attached as **Appendix D**.
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:
- Minor grammatical corrections in the Overview and Purpose section;
 - The deletion of SASM-O1, in favour of a new Man Whenua Chapter objective, MW-O2 (as proposed in the joint Hokonui Rūnanga and Council response to Minute 15);
 - Amendments to several provisions to clarify the specific Ngāi Tahu cultural values relevant to decision-makers under this chapter; and
 - Consequential renumbering of Objectives.
8. This report also reserves its recommendations on the Hokonui Rūnanga Inc proposal. It notes that this matter will be revisited via supplementary evidence so that the perspectives of other submitters (shared via their evidence) can be considered before making any final recommendations.

2. Introduction

2.1. Author and qualifications

9. 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.
10. I have ten 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.
11. 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 public notification or hearings stages of the Gore District Plan Review process on their behalf.

2.2. Code of Conduct

12. 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.
13. 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

14. This report considers the submissions and further submissions that were received by GDC in relation to the SASM chapter of the PDP.
15. 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.
16. 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 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter with all recommended amendments shown by way of ~~red strikeout~~ and underlining.
17. 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

18. 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.
19. 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.

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

20. 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

21. This chapter and its associated whole of plan issues have been heavily influenced by *Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono: Ngā Whenua o Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku – Stage 1 Southland Cultural Landscape Assessment Study*. This report, published in October 2021, was undertaken by Te Ao Marama Inc on behalf of Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku, and in partnership with Environment Southland, Southland District Council, Gore District Council, and Invercargill City Council.
22. The Study's purpose was "to provide a comprehensive understanding of the cultural values of the Southland landscape as it relates to Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku". The Study was also designed to inform the development of Southland-wide policy and planning processes and enable Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku to exercise kaitiakitanga.
23. The purpose of Stage 1 of the Study (as delivered in the aforementioned report) was to "identify, describe and collate what Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku value within the Southland landscape". It looks at criteria to identify and assess relationships with places and sites for the purpose of:
- a) Describing (either narratively or visually) the relationship(s) that Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku have with the region's landscape.
 - b) Describing the different types of relationships with specific places, and the different cultural values that are attributed to each if applicable.
 - c) Providing a collation of place specific information that supports why specific places/areas/sites may differ within the landscape from traditionally identified sites as these will be specific stories from iwi that may not be formalised.
 - d) Visually/spatially displaying these stories and relationships that Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku have to a place or specific area/site within the landscape.
24. On instruction from mana whenua, the PDP's approach to conceptualising and managing Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori were drafted to align with this Study and the recommendations of this report. Most prominently, this has resulted in individual sites with cultural significance to mana whenua no longer being identified and mapped in the PDP. This is due to the Study's assertion that all sites within Murihiku hold values from a Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku worldview. In lieu of attaching SASM-related provisions to mapped sites, the PDP has attached these considerations to specific activities with a high likelihood of impacting Ngāi Tahu cultural values instead.

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).*
- (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 SASM chapter of the PDP.
29. The SASM chapter was co-drafted by GDC and Hokonui Rūnanga. Provisions were refined through workshops with the GDC District Plan review sub-committee, hui with technical planning and cultural heritage experts, and discussions with mana whenua cultural experts. Through this process GDC and Hokonui Rūnanga agreed to an approach informed by the findings of the *Stage 1 Southland Cultural Landscape Assessment Study: Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono*. This study is discussed above in Section 4.2.

30. This approach moves away from using SASM overlays (i.e. 'mapped sites'). Traditionally, these types of overlays would be placed over specific locations mana whenua consider 'culturally significant', and more restrictive planning provisions would apply in these areas by default. The approach adopted by the PDP does not use SASM overlays. Instead, it moves to a more permissive approach that focus less on the location of an activity and more on the impacts of the activity itself.
31. Under the PDP, individual activities have been identified as having the potential to impact Ngāi Tahu cultural values. These activities were identified through hui with technical planning and cultural heritage experts, and discussions with mana whenua cultural experts. When one of these identified activities requires a resource consent, its impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values will be considered as part of that consenting process. This ensures that Council is still meeting its Section 6(e) responsibilities under the RMA by considering these matters during the consenting stage, as opposed to using the blanket approach of restricting all activity at place through the district plan. It also means that there is less restriction for landowners because there are no restrictive SASM overlays adding additional development rules in some places over others.
32. 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 several new matters of concern regarding the SASM approach as drafted. Hokonui Rūnanga and Council have met informally several times since their submission was lodged to discuss their evolving positions on this matter. As part of this process, Hokonui Rūnanga has proposed that the SASM chapter be replaced with a bespoke *NTCV: Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter. A copy of this proposed chapter is included as **Appendix Two** of this report. This, they consider, would address many of their broader concerns about the notified SASM approach. Hokonui Rūnanga elaborate on this position in the Minute 15 response, included as **Appendix D** of this report.
33. Council has also attended informal meetings between Hokonui Rūnanga and SFF to discuss their positions on the notified SASM approach.
34. The Hearings Panel also issued Minute 15, requiring Council and Hokonui Rūnanga to revisit several matters within the Mana Whenua Chapter. Some of these matters have flow-on effects to both the SASM chapter and general approach the PDP takes to managing SASM (such as the aforementioned Hokonui Rūnanga proposal). The joint response to Minute 15 is included at **Appendix D**.

6. Consideration of submissions

6.1. Structure of the report

35. Submissions on the SASM chapter have raised several 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.

36. 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.
37. 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**.
38. 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

39. A total of ninety-six submission points and fifty-seven further submission points are addressed in this report, as well as one additional proposal born from Minute 15. These submissions and further submissions were received from thirty-four submitters and five further submitters . A list of these parties is provided at the start of this report.
40. Most submissions opposed or opposed in part the SASM approach taken by the PDP. They expressed a view that it equates to placing a SASM overlay across the entire Gore District, and that it would create unacceptable levels of uncertainty and bureaucracy for plan users - especially farmers. Instead, many submitters request that individual locations within the district be mapped as SASM, and restrictions only apply in these locations. Concerns were also raised around the recognition of existing use rights, scope ambiguity within some provisions, and general opposition to recognising any Māori rights and interests within the PDP.
41. Several supportive submissions were also received. These submissions largely supported the PDP SASM approach based on its alignment with mana whenua worldviews. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20] also lodged several further submissions opposing requests for mapped SASM sites to be adopted. This is because they consider it inconsistent with their worldview. They do, however support some revisions to the PDP SASM approach to support its application. Since lodging their original submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc has provided additional detail on the types of revisions they would support. Primarily, they seek to replace the SASM chapter with a bespoke *NTCV – Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter. This proposed chapter is included as **Appendix Two** of this report.
42. There is significant duplication across submission points in this report, with two clear groups of submitters emerging. The first is the Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand-led group. This comprises of Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand (SFF) [S126] and five other submitters who have lodged submissions identical to those lodged by SFF. The second

is the Stoney Creek Station Limited-led group. This comprises of Stoney Creek Station Limited (Stoney Creek) [S3] and ten other submitters who have lodged submissions identical to those lodged by Stoney Creek. In most cases, both groups of submitters hold the same positions on matters and seek the same relief, resulting in seventeen near-identical submissions being lodged per provision.

43. There is also significant crossover between the submissions discussed in this report and those previously discussed in the Mana Whenua Chapter S42A report. This is because many submitters raised their concerns about the PDP approach to SASM via their submissions on the Mana Whenua chapter as well. Submissions that could not be fully considered in the context of the Mana Whenua chapter have been reconsidered in this report. This also contributes to the crossover between the two chapters.

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 Whole of plan

6.4.1. Matters raised by submitters – Whole of plan

46. Transpower New Zealand Limited [101.103] has submitted in support of the whole Plan insofar as it relates to the National Grid, particularly to the extent the provisions of the PDP give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093] and McNabb Management Ltd [S103.031] have also noted their support for all PDP provisions, except for those where amendments have been requested specifically within their submission.
47. Jenny Campbell [S136.001] supports mana whenua involvement in environmental decision making. No reasoning or specific amendments were offered by the submitter.
48. The SFF submission [S126.175] opposes the PDP's approach to acknowledging the relationships Ngāi Tahu hold with the natural environment in the SASM chapter. Five other submitters - Kevin Robertson [S115.176], Ronald Crispin [S60.178], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.187], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.188], and John Baynes [S68.296] - noted their

support for matters raised in the SFF submission, which includes point S126.175. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.021] has lodged a further submission in opposition to S126.175.

49. The SFF-led submitters are concerned that the SASM approach will slow down the ability for farmers to carry out basic farming duties. In their submissions they have listed 91 “day-to-day primary production activities” that would require impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values to be considered when applying for a resource consent. They consider these requirements to be a hinderance to farmers. The submitters “acknowledge[e] the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes”, but assert that “the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised”.
50. In their further submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.021] argue that the position of SFF [S126.175] is contradictory to the purpose of the RMA and incapable of giving effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. They also attest that it is not the role of a third party to tell mana whenua how to understand or express their relationship with the whenua and wai of their takiwā.

6.4.2. Assessment

51. The submissions of SFF [S126.175], Kevin Robertson [S115.176], Ronald Crispin [S60.178], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.187], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.188], and John Baynes [S68.296]; and FS20.021 lodged by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc were first discussed in *HS3 – Mana Whenua*. At that time, the scope of HS3 limited their assessment to specific wording changes within the Mana Whenua chapter. Therefore, their full assessment was deferred to *HS8 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori*. This follows below.
52. Firstly, I acknowledge the list of 91 “day-to-day primary production activities” that the group of submitters led by SFF [S126.175] reference.
53. I acknowledge submitters concerns that these listed provisions will “regulate and restrict even the most minor activities” that submitters consider to be “day-to-day primary production activities”. Their list of “day-to-day primary production activities” include:
- Running retirement facilities in the medium density residential zone
 - Undertaking temporary military training
 - Erecting cultural markers such as pou whenua
54. I struggle to understand how these are “day-do-day primary production activities”. I highlight this matter because I acknowledge that, for many in the farming community, hearing that the PDP provisions may put additional restrictions on “91 day-to-day primary production activities” would be alarming. Therefore, I consider it important to highlight that, in reality, this number is potentially significantly lower based on the types of activities farmers are likely to undertake day-to-day on their properties.
55. I have also reviewed all ninety-one provisions listed in Appendix 1 of the SFF submission and found that only fourteen - less than 16% - of the listed activities always require a resource

consent. I also found several duplications in this list. Both findings are illustrated in **Appendix C**.

56. The fourteen activities on SFF's Appendix 1 list that always require a resource consent are:

- INFR-R8: Telecommunications lines, cabinets, poles and new antennas regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted activity standards in Regulations 20, 21, 22, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 or 37 of the NESTF and are not expressly provided for as a controlled activity in Part 3 of the NESTF in all zones
- NFL-R6: New Roads, farm tracks, walking and cycling tracks within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape/Feature in any zone
- SUB-R5: All other subdivision outside of Development Areas
- SUB-R6: Subdivision in Gore South Industrial Development Area
- SUB-R7: Subdivision in Gore West Residential Development Area
- SUB-R9: Subdivision of notable trees (land on which a listed notable tree resides)
- GRZ-R9: Retirement Village in the General Residential Zone
- GRZ-R10: Community facility in General Residential Zone
- GRZ-R11: Comprehensive Residential Development in General Residential Zone
- GRZ-R12: Healthcare Activity in General Residential Zone
- MRZ-R9: Retirement Village in Medium-density Residential Zone
- MRZ-R10: Community facility in Medium-density Residential Zone except Hospital Precinct
- NOSZ-R11: Building Activity in the Natural Open Space Zone
- NOSZ-R12: Education Facility in the Natural Open Space Zone

57. The other seventy-seven activities identified by SFF are either built form standards, permitted activities, or duplicates of provisions already included on their list.² The built form standards and permitted activity provisions do not require an assessment of Ngāi Tahu cultural values. If an activity can't meet the permitted activity's conditions or built form standards, then a resource consent is required. It is only at this point that Ngāi Tahu cultural values may be considered. I note that none of the permitted activity conditions or built form standards relate to Ngāi Tahu cultural values.

² There are two duplicated provisions in the SFF's Appendix 1 table.

58. When a resource consent is required, these remaining activities all have multiple matters of discretion, as shown in **Appendix C**. This means that, if the requirement to consider impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values was removed from each activity, all activities on SFF's list would still require a resource consent in order to assess the remaining matters of discretion. This negates the argument that the PDP approach to SASM is responsible for increasing the number of resource consents farmers may require under the PDP provisions.
59. I do recognise the argument that, whilst the overall number of resource consents required may not be influenced by the SASM-related provisions, the number of individual matters of discretion that must be considered per resource consent may increase. In response I note that, under the Operative Plan, many of the activities identified by SFF already require impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values to be considered as part of the consenting process. The engagement process landowners and Council are expected to follow under the PDP does not differ from the current process under the ODP. Therefore, it can be expected that the administrative requirements of the PDP will not be significantly different to those that landowners experience now.
60. Based on the above analysis, I do not consider that the SASM approach taken in the PDP will have a significantly different impact to "day-to-day primary production activities" any more than the ODP. Therefore, I do not support the arguments made by SFF[S126.175], Kevin Robertson [S115.176], Ronald Crispin [S60.178], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.187], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.188], and John Baynes [S68.296].
61. In their further submission, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.021] state that the position of SFF [S126.175] is contradictory to the purpose of the RMA and incapable of giving effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. I agree with this assessment, as there is clear direction in both documents regarding the rights and interests of Māori, and how these must be addressed in lower order documents such as a district plan. Prioritising private property rights over Councils obligation to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga is inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA.³ It is also inconsistent with Policy TW.4 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement.⁴

³ Relevant sections of Part 2 of the Resource Management Act include:

- S8: In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).
- S7(a): In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to... kaitiakitanga;
- S6(e): In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for... the relationship of Maori [sic] and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga;

⁴ Southland Regional Policy Statement Policy TW.4 – Decision making

When making resource management decisions, ensure that local authority functions and powers are exercised in a manner that:

62. Adopting the relief sought by SFF [S126.175], Kevin Robertson [S115.176], Ronald Crispin [S60.178], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.187], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.188], and John Baynes [S68.296] would therefore result in GDC not meeting its responsibilities under these higher order documents, and thus not complying with legislation.
63. Lastly, I acknowledge the submissions of Jenny Campbell [S136.001], Transpower New Zealand [S101.103], Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093], and McNabb Management Ltd [S103.031]. I note that the intent of the PDP aligns with S136.001 that seeks mana whenua involvement in environmental decision-making. I accept the support of all three submission points, subject to the changes recommended in this report.

6.4.3. Recommendation

64. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that no changes be made in response to these submission points.
65. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

6.5. SASM – General

6.5.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM General

66. Stoney Creek [S3.001] opposes the approach the PDP has taken to drafting the SASM chapter. Ten other submitters – Trudy Bokser [S113.001], Nathan Bokser [S116.001], Greg Bokser [S117.001], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.001], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.003], Karen Temple [S19.003], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.003], Helen McIntosh [S24.003], John Baynes [S68.005], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.037] - noted their support for matters raised in the Stoney Creek submission, which includes point S3.001.
67. Stoney Creek-led submissions consider the PDP approach equates to identifying the entire Gore District as a Site or Area of Significance to Māori. The submitters do not consider this approach to be justified, considering that “Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan”. They are also concerned that the PDP approach to managing Ngāi Tahu cultural values, “may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing

(a) recognises and provides for:

- (i) traditional Māori uses and practices relating to natural resources (e.g. mātaihai, kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga, matauranga, rāhui, wāhi tapu, taonga raranga);
- (ii) the ahi kā (manawhenua) relationship of tangata whenua with and their role as kaitiaki of natural resources;
- (iii) mahinga kai and access to areas of natural resources used for customary purposes;
- (iv) mauri and wairua of natural resources;
- (v) places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua;
- (vi) Māori environmental health and cultural wellbeing.

(b) recognises that only tangata whenua can identify their relationship and that of their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.

time, cost and workload”. Instead, this group of submitters seek specific sites to be identified and mapped within the PDP. This, they consider, would create a more transparent and consistent process.

68. Transpower New Zealand Limited has lodged further submissions in support of all the above submission points [FS30.084; FS30.086; FS30.055; FS30.009; FS30.064; FS30.044; FS30.074; FS30.034; FS30.039; FS30.062; FS30.031]. They state that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori should be “clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users”. Hamish Wier [FS5.33] has further submitted in support of Stoney Creek [S3.001] only, but has provided no explanation for doing so.
69. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.031] has further submitted in opposition to S3.001. They consider Stoney Creek to be suggesting that “private property rights are paramount” and highlight that, if this is their argument, then they consider it to be erroneous in law.
70. McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station [S104.029], Farm Manager: Wantwood Station [S105.029], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.029] also oppose the SASM approach. In their identical submissions, they express concern that the PDP approach will mean, “All activities regardless of their risk level will, therefore, require an assessment of cultural effects”. They seek that the PDP clarifies why the entire district has been identified as a SASM, and that a list of ‘high-risk activities’ that require cultural assessment be included.
71. Transpower New Zealand Limited [FS30.026; FS30.049] further submitted in support of S104.029 and S105.029 for the same reasons outlined above in para. 68. S104.029 also attracted a supportive further submission from Stoney Creek [FS25.002], and support in part from Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.030]. Stoney Creek supported S104.029 because they also consider the PDP approach to SASM to create uncertainty for landowners. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc stress that they “do not adhere to the concept of identifying specific sites as culturally significant [because] all the whenua and wai of its takiwā is important to them.” They do, however, agree that the PDP should include “a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.”
72. In their response to Minute 15, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc has elaborated on their FS20.030 position that a more tailored approach should be explored. In doing so, they have proposed that the SASM chapter be replaced with a bespoke *NTCV – Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter. The full detail of this chapter is included in **Appendix D**. In summary, this chapter removes all references to SASM from the PDP, and instead replaces them with a framework for how Ngāi Tahu cultural values should be considered when making decisions using the PDP. It also provides a set list of Ngāi Tahu values relevant for consideration under the PDP. Their proposed NTCV chapter also makes reference to a new provision proposed via Minute 15: MW-P1. This policy reinforces and clarifies the specific activities that may require consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values under the PDP. MW-P1 can be found below at para. 93, and in **Appendix D**.
73. Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.003] submitted in opposition to the PDP’s SASM approach, as they also consider it tantamount to deeming the entire District a SASM. This, they consider,

“creates enormous uncertainty and bureaucracy”, and a risk that landowners could be “surprised” when lodging resource consents. Instead, they seek individual sites be publicly identified as SASM. S148.003 was supported in further submissions by SFF [FS17.003], Transpower New Zealand [FS30.002], and Stoney Creek [FS25.001] who all share the view that this approach creates uncertainty for landowners.

74. Adrienne Crispin [S59.003] and Ronald Crispin [S60.003] oppose the concept of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori on principle, stating that any recognition of mana whenua relationships with place “cause more division”, and therefore should be omitted from the PDP entirely.
75. Jet Boating NZ lodged a neutral submission [S64.024] which was supported by Stoney Creek Station Ltd [FS25.003]. The submitter does not oppose the principles underpinning the PDP’s approach to SASM. Rather, they are concerned about how the approach will work on a day-to-day basis. They note, however, that “If effective and streamlined procedures are established for initiating early consultations with hokonui runanga [sic], followed by their subsequent involvement in applications for land use consents, and similar processes then concerns may be allayed”.
76. Submissions in support of the SASM chapter were received by Department of Conservation [S109.046], Southland District Council [S146.034], Mātaura Marae [S23.007], and McNabb Management Ltd [S103.031]. All five seek that the chapter be retained as notified.
77. Department of Conservation [S109.046] supports the chapter for recognising the relationship of Māori with the natural environment and the practicing of Māori cultural activities throughout the district. Mātaura Marae [S23.007] consider the SASM approach adopted by the PDP to be an improvement on the ODP approach as it better enables Council to meet its obligations to all Māori living within their district – not just mana whenua. Southland District Council [S146.034] do not specify why they have submitted in support.
78. The scope of S103.031 (McNabb Management Ltd) also indicates that these submitters support for the SASM chapter as originally drafted.

6.5.2. Assessment

79. The relief sought by Adrienne Crispin [S59.003] and Ronald Crispin [S60.003] cannot be actioned as this would result in the PDP being inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA and higher order documents such as the Southland Regional Policy Statement.
80. Many of the other submission points lodged in opposition of the SASM chapter express the following, more specific, concern: that the PDP approach to managing SASM equates to identifying the entirety of the Gore District as a Site of Significance to Māori.⁵ This is

⁵ The following submission and further submission points express this view: Stoney Creek [S3.001; FS25.001; FS25.002], Trudy Bokser [S113.001], Nathan Bokser [S116.001], Greg Bokser [S117.001], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.001], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.003], Karen Temple [S19.003], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.003],

inaccurate. Whilst the PDP does acknowledge that mana whenua hold a range of relationships across the entirety of the district, this does not mean that all of Gore District is therefore placed under the level of restriction mapped SASM locations typically have under other district plans. Instead, a different approach has been proposed where, instead of attaching blanket restrictions to specific locations, more flexible provisions are attached to carefully chosen activities throughout the PDP.

81. This means that there are no locations within the District where activity is automatically restricted in an attempt to preserve Ngāi Tahu cultural values (i.e., the approach traditionally taken to manage SASM in other plans).
82. Instead, the PDP requires impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values to be considered at the resource consent stage for a limited number of activities – not for all activities throughout the district. If an activity does not require a resource consent, then there is no need to consider its impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, regardless of its location.
83. I acknowledge, however, that there is significant confusion within the community as to how the PDP SASM approach works. This confusion has also been highlighted by the Hearings Panel, who have issued Minute 15 directing Hokonui Rūnanga and Council to consider a number of matters aimed at clarifying this approach for Plan users. Some of the amendments discussed below relate to this Minute.
84. To allay the misconception that the entirety of the Gore district is a SASM, I recommend deleting SASM-O1, which currently reads:

SASM-O1	All land, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are afforded appropriate considerations in relation to their management, development, and use.
---------	---

85. I note that the NTCV chapter proposed by Hokonui Rūnanga has no equivalent to SASM-O1 either, implying that they may be supportive of deleting this Objective as well.
86. This deletion is recommended on the proviso that a new provision, MW-O2 (proposed as part of the joint Council and Hokonui Rūnanga response to Minute 15) is accepted. The proposed MW-O2 reads as follows:

Helen McIntosh [S24.003], John Baynes [S68.005], Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.037; S127.029], Farm Manager - Wantwood Station [S105.029], McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station [S104.029], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.003], Transpower New Zealand Limited [FS30.084; FS30.086; FS30.055; FS30.009; FS30.064; FS30.044; FS30.074; FS30.034; FS30.039; FS30.062; FS30.031; FS30.026; FS30.049; FS30.002], SFF [FS17.003], and Hamish Weir [FS5.033].

MW-O2	Resource management decisions in the Gore District reflect the relationships Ngāi Tahu mana whenua hold with all land, waterbodies, natural features, and their affiliated cultural developments (such as marae, urupā, Māori Purpose Zones) within District.
-------	---

87. Deleting SASM-O1 in favour of MW-O2 may alleviate some of the misconceptions about the entirety of Gore District being a SASM. Instead, it moves the acknowledgement of the relationships mana whenua hold to the MW chapter where it can sit as a higher level strategic objective that reflects the decision-making approach underpinning the PDP.
88. The same submitters that hold the concerns raised in para. 80 also request the PDP abandon its SASM approach in favour of utilising individually mapped SASM sites. I do not support this approach on the grounds that mana whenua (through FS20.030 and FS20.031) do not consider a map-based approach as culturally appropriate, hence why they recommended Council explore the approach ultimately proposed in the PDP. I agree with FS20.030 that mana whenua have a right to choose how their relationship with their ancestral lands and waters are reflected in a planning context. I also agree that to prioritise private property rights over this matter would be inconsistent with both the RMA and the Southland Regional Policy Statement, as stated in FS20.031.
89. Hokonui Rūnanga do, however agree that the approach could be improved by “a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.”. I note that Hokonui Rūnanga has proposed several amendments to other chapters that add more specificity to the types of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that should be considered in conjunction with individual activities. These types of amendments have been largely accepted in their relevant Section 42A reports.
90. Hokonui Rūnanga have also proposed replacing the SASM chapter with a more bespoke *NTCV – Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter. I do see some merit in the proposal, as it clearly signals that there are no SASM overlays in the PDP. This may help combat the significant misunderstandings about the PDP SASM approach expressed by some submitters. Alongside this proposals merits though, I do have some concerns. My first concern relates to the way the proposed NTCV chapter excludes mātāwaka Māori within the district, whose connections to place and culture were intentionally woven through the SASM chapter. I note that Mataura Marae [S23.007] supports the SASM chapter as drafted specifically because of its recognition of mātāwaka Māori and their cultural needs. Secondly, I am wary of making a full assessment of this proposal without understanding the perspectives of other submitters. Therefore, my preference at this stage is to reserve my assessment of this proposal until other submitters have had the opportunity to comment on it through their HS8 evidence.
91. I will, however, support the following amendment to SASM-O3, which has been proposed by Hokonui Rūnanga as NTCV-O3. I consider this wording to be a useful way to address concerns around the uncertainty of the SASM approach raised by a number of submitters – particularly

regarding the range of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that can be considered under the PDP. The proposed rewording of SASM-O3 is as follows:

SASM-O3	Recognise and provide for the mātauranga and rangatiratanga of mana whenua in decision-making relating to impacts of activities on the following Ngāi Tahu cultural values: a) Kaitiakitanga; b) Whakapapa; c) Mauri; d) Manaakitanga; e) Wairua; f) Whanaungatanga; g) Utu; h) Mātauranga; i) Te Reo Māori; j) Ki uta ki tai; and k) Mahinga kai.
---------	---

92. This amendment creates a set list of relevant Ngāi Tahu cultural values, which improves certainty for plan users. An explanation of these values still appears in the MW chapter to assist plan-users to understand their meaning. This amendment, combined with the suite of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc amendments already accepted across other chapters responds in part to concerns about the uncertainty within the PDP SASM approach, as well as FS20.030.

93. McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station [S104.029], Farm Manager: Wantwood Station [S105.029], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.029] (supported by further submissions from Transpower New Zealand Limited [FS30.026; FS30.049]) specifically request that a list of ‘high-risk activities’ that require cultural assessment be included in the PDP. Whilst the SASM chapter already includes a note listing which chapters include provisions related to SASM matters, I acknowledge that plan-users may benefit from more explicit guidance. To address this matter, as well as the general misconceptions that SASM restrictions apply to the entire Gore District, a new provision has been proposed for the Mana Whenua Chapter via Hokonui Rūnanga and Council’s joint response to Minute 15. It reads as follows:

MW-P1	Impacts on relevant Ngāi Tahu cultural values are generally considered when undertaking the following types of activities: a) Activities in close proximity to rivers or streams; b) Land disturbance (earthworks) above permitted activity levels, or with heightened sedimentation risks; c) Some activities breaching bulk, location, or height standards; d) Some activities within a zone that do not hold a Permitted activity status, including unanticipated activities; e) Some activities within ONF/L overlays;
-------	---

	f) Some permanent structures in the NOSZ; g) Temporary activities with extended durations, or potential to cause long-term environmental effects; h) Some activities breaching maximum noise limits; i) Significant expansion to existing infrastructure; j) Some telecommunications infrastructure; k) New roads that don't meet standard design requirements; l) Large-scale quarrying activities; m) Subdivision in Development Area 1 and 2, or impacting notable trees; n) Tikanga-related activities, including some activities in the MPZ; and o) Major events that don't comply with event standards for FDZ.
--	--

94. The intent of MW-P1 is to provide transparency and certainty for landowners. It does this by clarifying two key points. Firstly, it clarifies that Ngāi Tahu cultural values are only considered when an activity requires a resource consent. This means that if an activity is Permitted within a Zone (and therefore does not require a resource consent), there is no requirement for any consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values to take place regardless of the location the activity is occurring.

95. Secondly, this proposed policy specifies the general types of activities that plan-users can expect to see Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related matters of discretion attached to. This list groups multiple activities together by theme, and therefore does not individually list every relevant activity in the PDP. This is partially for conciseness (for example, there are multiple provisions related to activities near waterways that may require consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values), and partially because there are many instances where individual activities still would not require any consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values (i.e. when they meet the threshold for a Permitted activity). Instead, it provides plan-users with an increased level of certainty for the types of Restricted-Discretionary or Discretionary activities that may require applicants to consider impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values.

96. I note, however, that this certainty is already present in the PDP as individual activity rules stipulate whether impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are a matter of discretion or not. MW-P1 does not alter these provisions. Rather, it summarises them to further support plan-users to understand the new approach to SASM in the PDP, acknowledging that it may be confusing at first for those accustomed to a different approach.

97. When considering submitter concerns regarding their uncertainty as to where in the District Ngāi Tahu cultural values must be considered, I query if this uncertainty is a result of the SASM approach itself, or the fact that it is a change from what some submitters are used to. Under the PDP approach, certainty is provided by the activity that is being proposed – not by the location of the activity as some plan users may be more used to seeing. Whilst the approach is different, I do not consider it to be fundamentally less certain. For example, if you can undertake your activity as a Permitted activity, then, no matter where in the district you are, you will never need to consider Ngāi Tahu cultural values as part of your process. If you cannot

meet the Permitted activity standards, but ‘impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values’ is not a matter of discretion, then you won’t have to consider these as part of the application either irrespective of where you are located. If you require a resource consent to undertake your activity and ‘impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values’ is a matter of discretion (or, if your activity is Discretionary/Non-Complying) then, no matter where you are located, you may need to consider these as part of your resource consent application.

98. I acknowledge that plan users may experience uncertainty as they move from the Operative plan to the PDP, however, based on my explanation above and the additional clarity provided by the proposed new MW-P1, I am confident that plan-users will quickly adapt to the new provisions.
99. Stoney Creek [S3.001], Trudy Bokser [S113.001], Nathan Bokser [S116.001], Greg Bokser [S117.001], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.001], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.003], Karen Temple [S19.003], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.003], Helen McIntosh [S24.003], John Baynes [S68.005], Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.037], Hamish Wier [FS5.33], and Transpower New Zealand Limited [FS30.084; FS30.086; FS30.055; FS30.009; FS30.064; FS30.044; FS30.074; FS30.034; FS30.039; FS30.062; FS30.031] all express a concern that the PDP approach to managing SASM will create additional and unnecessary bureaucracy and cost for landowners – particularly farmers. I do not consider this to be the case. My reasoning for this can be found above in Section 6.4.2, para. 55-60.⁶
100. I acknowledge the perspectives of Jet Boating NZ [S64.024] and their supporting further submission from Stoney Creek [FS25.003]. I direct them to **Appendix D** where a number of provisions have been proposed for inclusion in the MW chapter that may address their concerns. I also encourage the submitter to provide their feedback on these changes via evidence so that they can continue to be involved in the process, as they have expressed a desire for this in their submission.
101. I acknowledge the submissions of Southland District Council [S146.034], McNabb Management [S103.031], and Department of Conservation [S109.046]. Whilst all three have requested no changes be made, I note that the changes made do not impact the reasons they stated for supporting the chapter as drafted. Therefore, I consider the recommended amendments to still be consistent with their submission points.

6.5.3. Recommendation

102. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that:
- SASM-O1 be deleted and replaced with a new objective MW-O2 (as proposed in the joint Hokonui Rūnanga and Council response to Minute 15);

⁶ Whilst the submissions discussed in this section are not lodged by Stoney Creek, they raise the same concerns, hence why the reasoning in this sections assessment is applicable to the Stoney Creek-led group of submitters and further submitters.

- SASM-O3 be amended as per para. 91 and **Appendix A**;
- A new policy, MW-P1 be added to the MW chapter (as proposed in the joint Hokonui Rūnanga and Council response to Minute 15);
- Consequential renumbering of objectives; and
- That the Hokonui Rūnanga proposal to replace the SASM chapter with a more bespoke *NTCV – Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter be considered via supplementary evidence to allow submitters to comment on this proposal via their evidence.

103. 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

104. The following evaluates my recommendation to delete SASM-O1 and amend SASM-O3 as described above under section 32AA of the RMA⁷:

Effectiveness and efficiency

105. The recommended amendments will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner. The amendments to SASM-O3 provide additional clarity to plan users by confirming the scope of this objective, which improves the ability for the objective to be administered in a consistent and clear manner.

106. The deletion of SASM-O1 is in direct response to submissions that indicate the objective is creating significant confusion for plan users about how the PDP would be administered. By removing this objective (and replacing it with a similar objective in the MW chapter), the intent of the SASM chapter is clearer, which is likely to make administering the PDP more effective and efficient.

Costs and benefits

107. 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

108. There is a risk that mana whenua will have reduced scope to discuss their cultural values, based on the amendments to SASM-O3. However, mana whenua have expressed their support for this amendment through their response to Minute 15. The risk of not acting is that plan users

⁷ Amendments to the MW chapter are justified separately in the S32AA assessment included in the joint Hokonui Rūnanga and Council response to Minute 15 (attached as **Appendix D**)

continue to feel uncertain of what sits within the scope of 'Ngāi Tahu cultural values' that must be considered in decision-making under the PDP.

109. There is a risk that by removing SASM-O1 the underlying Ngāi Tahu worldview that underpins this chapter could be obscured, which could create a disconnect between the objectives and policies within the PDP. This can be mitigated, however, by including the proposed new objective, MW-O2, in the MW chapter. MW-O2 addresses similar themes to SASM-O1, but frames them at a strategic level instead of linking them only to the SASM chapter. The risk of not acting is that misconceptions around the entirety of Gore District being classified as a SASM location may be more difficult to correct.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

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

6.6. SASM – Overview and Purpose

6.6.1. Matters raised by submitters – Overview and purpose

111. The SFF submission [S126.075] supports this section in part, subject to the correction of a typo within the text. Five other submitters - Kevin Robertson [S115.076], Ronald Crispin [S60.078], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.087], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.088], and John Baynes [S68.196] - noted their support for matters raised in the SFF submission, which includes point S126.075.
112. Greenbriar Ltd [S128.020] support the section and seek it be retained as drafted. This is because they consider it to clearly identify that all areas are significant, which accurately reflects the provisions that follow in the chapter.
113. ES [S85.100] oppose this section in part because they do not consider it to adequately “outline the narrative approaches (not just limited to Apiti Hono Tatai Hono [sic]) mana whenua can use to inform cultural significance”. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.009] further submitted in partial support of S85.100. They highlight that the Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono approach is not reflective of “using narrative to identify culturally significant sites”. They do, however, agree that the PDP should include, “a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.”
114. The scope of S139.093 (Hokonui Rūnanga Inc) and S103.031 (McNabb Management Ltd) also indicate these submitters support for this section as originally drafted.

6.6.2. Assessment

115. Whilst Greenbriar Ltd [S128.020], Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093], and McNabb Management Ltd [S103.031] all request this section is retained as drafted, I recognise the benefit of correcting the typo highlighted by the SFF-led submitters [S126.075; S115.076; S60.078; S143.087; S148.088; S68.196]. I agree that it should be amended.

116. I also recognise the relief sought by ES [S85.100]. I note, however, that mana whenua (by way of FS20.009) consider ES's relief to be reflective of their misunderstanding of Ngāi Tahu cultural concepts. Therefore, I consider it appropriate to take mana whenua advice on this matter and reject this part of ES's submission point.

6.6.3. Recommendation

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

- The typo identified collectively by S126.075, S115.076, S60.078, S143.087, S148.088, and S68.196 be corrected as shown in **Appendix A**

118. 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

119. The following evaluates the recommendations to correct the typo identified by several submitters under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

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

Costs and benefits

121. The benefits of the proposal are that the PDP is interpreted in a clear manner. There are no apparent costs with the proposal.

Risk of acting or not acting

122. There is the potential for the Plan to contain grammatical errors if the proposed amendment is not made.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

123. 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. SASM-O1

6.7.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-O1

124. The SFF submission [S126.076] opposes this objective as they do not agree with the approach it reflects. They do not consider it appropriate for this objective to recognise that all land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within the Gore District are areas of cultural significance on the grounds that it causes "a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district". Instead, they seek rewording that narrows the scope of this policy to individually

- mapped sites. They also seek rewording to narrow the scope of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that can be considered in decision-making to only those listed in MW-2.3 Five other submitters - Kevin Robertson [S115.077], Ronald Crispin [S60.079], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.088], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.089], and John Baynes [S68.197] - noted their support for matters raised in the SFF submission, which includes S126.075.
125. Transpower New Zealand Limited lodged a further submission in support of five of the six submissions above, citing their shared preference for individually mapped sites to be included in the PDP [FS30.079; FS30.048; FS30.068; FS30.073; FS30.006]. Stoney Creek also further submitted in support of the leading SFF submission, as they also consider SASM-O1 to create uncertainty for landowners [FS25.006]. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.023 to S126.076], however, , state that, “it is not the role of a third party to tell mana whenua what is of value to them or how to understand or express their relationship with the whenua and wai of their takiwā”. They consider that the relief sought by S126.076 would fail to achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement.
126. Stoney Creek [S3.002] also opposes SASM-O1, and seeks identical wording amendments to SFF [S126.076]. They raise similar issues, citing uncertainty for plan users and a concern that engaging with mana whenua for “day-to-day farm activities” would be burdensome. Ten other submitters – Trudy Bokser [S113.002], Nathan Bokser [S116.002], Greg Bokser [S117.002], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.002], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.004], Karen Temple [S19.004], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.004], Helen McIntosh [S24.004], John Baynes [S68.006], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.038] - noted their support for matters raised in the Stoney Creek submission, which includes S3.001.
127. Transpower New Zealand Limited also further submitted in support of all eleven submission above, citing their shared preference for individually mapped sites to be included in the PDP [FS30.085; FS30.087; FS30.056; FS30.0010; FS30.065; FS30.045; FS30.075; FS30.035; FS30.040; FS30.063; FS30.032]. SFF also further submitted in support of S3.002, as they also consider SASM-O1 to create uncertainty for plan users [FS17.004]. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.032], however, opposed S3.002 in part, stressing that, “it is not the role of a third party to tell mana whenua what is of value to them or how to understand or express their relationship with the whenua and wai of their takiwā”. FS20.032 considers that the relief sought by S3.002 would fail to achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. They do, however, agree that the PDP should include “a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.”
128. Oakland Farming Ltd [S153.001] and Alan Taylor [S142.001] also oppose SASM-O1. Hamish Weir [S74.001] opposes it in part and Port Blakey Limited [S138.006] supports it in part. All four, however, share similar concerns about the increased burden they perceive this approach to put on farmers. Specifically, they are concerned that the approach will require farmers to acquire more resource consents for essential farming activities, and engage with mana whenua more. They also consider that the broad nature of SASM-O1 will create uncertainty for landowners/farmers. Oakland Farming Ltd [S153.001] and Alan Taylor [S142.001] both seek the same amendments as SFF [S126.076] and Stoney Creek [S3.002], with Hamish Weir [S74.001] also seeking similar rewording. Port Blakey Limited [S138.006], however, only seeks to be involved in discussions relating to this provision going forward.

129. Transpower New Zealand Limited lodged further submissions in support of Oakland Farming Ltd [S153.001], Alan Taylor [S142.001] and Hamish Weir [S74.001], citing their shared preference for individually mapped sites to be included in the PDP [FS30.057; FS30.001; FS30.033]. Stoney Creek Station Ltd also further submitted in support of Hamish Weir [S74.001] and Port Blakey Limited [S138.006], as they also consider SASM-O1 to create uncertainty for landowners [FS25.004; FS25.005].

130. The scope of S139.093 (Hokonui Rūnanga Inc) and S103.031 (McNabb Management Ltd) indicate these submitters support SASM-O1 as originally drafted. No specific reason for this support is provided.

6.7.2. Assessment

131. I do not support the relief sought by the majority of submitters and further submitters: that is, that the PDP should be amended in order for map-based SASM approach to be adopted.⁸ My assessment of this relief has been discussed above in Section 6.5.2, para. 88. In short, I do not recommend that the PDP adopt a map-based SASM approach, and I agree with the issues raised by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc in FS20.023 and FS20.032.⁹

132. As part of my assessments in Section 6.5.2, however, I recommended that SASM-O1 be deleted and a new provision, MW-O2, be added to the MW chapter in its place. My reasoning for this can be found above at Section 6.5.2, para. 83-87. I recognise the broad supportive submissions of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139.093] and McNabb Management Ltd [S103.031], however, on balance – and particularly considering the broad nature of these two ‘catch-all’ submission points and the comments made by Hokonui Rūnanga in response to Minute 15 - I consider it more beneficial to the overall integrity and legibility of the Plan to make these changes despite their recommendation to retain this provision as drafted.

6.7.3. Recommendation

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

- SASM-O1 be deleted and replaced with a new policy, MW-O2 (as proposed in the Council response to Minute 15);

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

⁸ The following submissions and further submissions seek this relief: S153.001, S142.001, S126.076, S3.002, S115.077, S60.079, S143.088, S148.089, S68.197, S113.002, S116.002, S117.002, S118.002, S18.004, S19.004, S20.004, S24.004, S68.006, S127.038, S153.001, S142.001, S74.001, S138.006, FS30.079, FS30.048, FS30.068, FS30.073, FS30.006, FS25.006, FS30.085, FS30.087, FS30.056, FS30.010, FS30.065, FS30.045, FS30.075, FS30.035, FS30.040, FS30.063, FS30.032, FS17.004, FS30.057, FS30.001, FS30.033, FS25.004 and FS25.005.

⁹ FS20.023 and FS20.032 are identical to the issues Hokonui Runanga Inc raised in further submissions against the SFF and their associated submitters in para 88.

6.7.4. Section 32AA Evaluation

135. The following evaluates my recommendation to delete SASM-O1 under section 32AA of the RMA.¹⁰

Effectiveness and efficiency

136. The deletion of SASM-O1 is in direct response to submissions that indicate the objective is creating significant confusion for plan users about how the PDP would be administered. By removing this objective (and replacing it with a similar objective in the MW chapter), the intent of the SASM chapter is clearer, which is likely to make administering the PDP more effective and efficient.

Costs and benefits

137. 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

138. There is a risk that by removing SASM-O1 the underlying Ngāi Tahu worldview that underpins this chapter could be obscured, which could create a disconnect between the objectives and policies within the PDP. This can be mitigated, however, by including the proposed new objective, MW-O2, in the Mana Whenua chapter. MW-O2 addresses similar themes to SASM-O1, but frames them at a strategic level instead of linking them only to the SASM chapter. The risk of not acting is that misconceptions around the entirety of Gore District being classified as a SASM location may be more difficult to correct.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

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

6.8. SASM-P1

6.8.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-P1

140. SFF [S126.077] opposes this policy for two reasons. Firstly, they are concerned that it does not recognise existing use rights under S10 of the RMA.¹¹ Secondly, they seek clarity around exactly

¹⁰ Note: This S32AA mirrors the S32AA under Section 6.5.4, where it also evaluates the deletion of SASM-O1.

¹¹ S10(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 reads:

“Land may be used in a manner that contravenes a rule in a district plan or proposed district plan if—

(a) either—

(i) the use was lawfully established before the rule became operative or the proposed plan was notified; and

which Ngāi Tahu cultural values this policy applies to. The submitter has therefore proposed the following amendments to SASM-P1 to address these concerns:

SASM-P1	New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated
---------	---

141. Five other submitters - Kevin Robertson [S115.078], Ronald Crispin [S60.080], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.089], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.090], and John Baynes [S68.198] - noted their support for matters raised in the SFF submission, which includes S126.077.

142. Stoney Creek further submitted in support of S126.077, as it aligns with their own submission [FS25.007]. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.024], however, have further submitted in opposition of S126.077. They consider SFF's concerns and relief unclear, and highlight that plan provisions do not need to provide for matters covered under S10 of the RMA as they apply by default in this context.

143. Stoney Creek [S3.003] also opposes SASM-P1, sharing SFF's concern around recognition of s10 of the RMA. They seek the same wording amendments as S126.077, along with the following new wording that does not appear to relate to their concerns raised under this submission point:

“Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.”

144. Ten other submitters – Trudy Bokser [S113.003], Nathan Bokser [S116.003], Greg Bokser [S117.003], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.003], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.005], Karen Temple [S19.005], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.005], Helen McIntosh [S24.005], John Baynes [S68.007], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.039] - noted their support for matters raised in the Stoney Creek submission, which includes S3.003. SFF also further submitted in support of S3.003, citing its alignment with their own position [FS17.006].

145. The scope of S139.093 (Hokonui Rūnanga Inc) and S103.031 (McNabb Management Ltd) indicate these submitters support for SASM-P1 as originally drafted. No specific reason for this support is provided.

(ii) the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to those which existed before the rule became operative or the proposed plan was notified:

(b) or—

(i) the use was lawfully established by way of a designation; and

(ii) the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to those which existed before the designation was removed.”

6.8.2. Assessment

146. I disagree with SFF [S126.077], Stoney Creek [S3.003], and their associated submitters and further submitters that this policy does not recognise existing use rights under S10 of the RMA.¹² Instead, I agree with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.024] that S10 of the RMA already applies in this context due to it being a higher order document. Therefore, I do not support adding the word “new” to the beginning of SASM-P1.
147. I do, however, agree that the wording of SASM-P1 creates confusion around the scope of the policy. I also agree that some of the amendments proposed by the submitters would address their concern. In light of the recommended changes to SASM-O3 (see Section 6.5.2, para 91-92) though, I consider it more appropriate to reference SASM-O3, as opposed to MW-2.3 in this policy. Both provisions set out a list of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that are relevant to the PDP. By switching this reference from MW-2.3 to SASM-O3 however, the Chapter becomes easier for plan users to navigate. This is because the reader is now being directed to information within the same chapter instead of having to seek information from a different part of the PDP.
148. I note that Hokonui Rūnanga Inc. [FS20.024] opposes the amendments sought in submissions on the grounds that “the submitters concerns and the changes they want are unclear”, and support SASM-P1 as drafted in S139.093. McNabb Management Limited [S103.031] also supports the provisions as drafted. However, S139.093 and S103.031 do not specify why the submitters seek SASM-P1 be retained as drafted, therefore it is difficult to weigh their perspectives against that of the other submitters. I also disagree that S126.077 is “unclear”, as FS20.024 argues. Rather, I agree that it is reasonable to clarify that, in the context of this policy, the list of Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW-2.3 is exhaustive.
149. I do not support the additional amendments sought by Stoney Creek [S3.003] and their associated submitters and further submitters.¹³ Their request for the benefits of an activity to be regarded as part of avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values creates confusion within the policy. It also implies that the Council responsibility to manage adverse impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values – matters that must be recognised and provided for under S6(e) of the RMA – could be “outweighed” by other benefits. This is incorrect.
150. I also consider this addition redundant as, in practice, the Submitters’ example of ‘positive pest control outcomes’ would likely be considered a positive influence on Ngāi Tahu cultural

¹² Associated submitters and further submitters are as follows: Kevin Robertson [S115.078], Ronald Crispin [S60.080], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.089], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.090], John Baynes [S68.198; S68.007] Trudy Bokser [S113.003], Nathan Bokser [S116.003], Greg Bokser [S117.003], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.003], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.005], Karen Temple [S19.005], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.005], Helen McIntosh [S24.005], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.039], Stoney Creek [FS25.007], SFF [FS17.006].

¹³ The “associated submitters and further submitters” in this context are as follows: Trudy Bokser [S113.003], Nathan Bokser [S116.003], Greg Bokser [S117.003], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.003], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.005], Karen Temple [S19.005], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.005], Helen McIntosh [S24.005], John Baynes [S68.007], Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.039], SFF [FS17.006].

values – or at least, not an adverse impact. The HS3 cultural evidence of Mr Terry Nicholas emphasised that, from the perspectives of Hokonui Rūnanga as mana whenua, many of their Ngāi Tahu cultural values are interpreted in ways that incentivise development wherever possible. Therefore, it is sensible to assume that the considerations the submitters are seeking would likely occur under the policy as drafted.

151. Therefore, I support amending SASM-P1 to read:

SASM-P1	Use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those listed in MW-2.3~~ SASM-O3 , are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
---------	---

152. If the amendments to SASM-O3 (proposed in Section 6.5.3) are rejected by the Panel, then I would recommend the reference to this provision be swapped out for MW-2.3 as originally requested by submitters.

6.8.3. Recommendation

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

- SASM-P1 be reworded as per para. 151 and **Appendix A**.

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

6.8.4. Section 32AA Evaluation

155. The following evaluates my recommendation to amend SASM-P1 under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

156. The recommended amendments will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner. The amendments to SASM-P1 provide clarity to plan users by confirming the scope of this policy. This improves the ability for the objective to be administered in a consistent and clear manner.

Costs and benefits

157. 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

158. There is a risk that mana whenua will have reduced scope to discuss their cultural values, based on the amendments to SASM-P1. However, mana whenua have expressed their

support for this amendment through informal conferencing. The risk of not acting is that plan users continue to feel uncertain of what sits within the scope of 'Ngāi Tahu cultural values' that must be considered in decision-making under the PDP.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

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

6.9. SASM-P2

6.9.1. Matters raised by submitters – SASM-P2

160. Stoney Creek [S3.004] opposes this policy for the same reasons that they oppose SASM-O1 and has therefore proposed amendments to SASM-P2 that align this policy with their proposed amendments to SASM-O1. These amendments refocus the policy on individually mapped SASM sites, narrow the scope of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that can be considered under SASM provisions, and “take into account any benefits of the proposal”.

161. Ten other submitters – Trudy Bokser [S113.004], Nathan Bokser [S116.004], Greg Bokser [S117.004], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.004], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.006], Karen Temple [S19.006], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.006], Helen McIntosh [S24.006], John Baynes [S68.008], and Peters Farm Ltd: Karen Peters [S127.040] - noted their support for matters raised in the Stoney Creek submission, which includes S3.004. SFF also further submitted in support of S3.004, citing its alignment with their own position [FS17.007].

162. SFF [S126.078] opposes SASM-P2 because they consider its wording regarding Ngāi Tahu and their relationship with the natural environment to be too broad. To remedy this, SFF have proposed almost identical amendments to S3.004 – that is, amendments refocusing the policy on individually mapped sites, and a narrowing of the scope of Ngāi Tahu cultural values that can be considered under this policy.

163. Five other submitters - Kevin Robertson [S115.079], Ronald Crispin [S60.081], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.090], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.091], and John Baynes [S68.199] - noted their support for matters raised in the SFF submission, which includes S126.078. Stoney Creek further submitted in support of S126.078, as it aligns with their own submission [FS25.008]. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.025], however, have further submitted in opposition of S126.078. They consider SFF's concerns and relief unclear, and highlight that plan provisions do not need to provide for matters covered under S10 of the RMA as they apply by default in this context.¹⁴

164. The scope of S139.093 (Hokonui Rūnanga Inc) and S103.031 (McNabb Management Ltd) indicate these submitters support for SASM-P2 as originally drafted. No specific reason for this support is provided.

¹⁴ It is noted that s10 issues are not raised by SFF in S126.078.

6.9.2. Assessment

165. All of the submission points on this policy relate to matters previously discussed in this S42A report. For conciseness, my assessments will largely refer back to previous sections for their reasoning.
166. I reject in part the multiple submission points seeking to amend the wording of SASM-P2.¹⁵ In particular, I reject the rewording that adds references to mapped Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. This is because there are no mapped Sites of Significance to Māori within the PDP. This matter is discussed more fully in Section 6.5.1, para. 88.
167. I do, however, support in part the rewording that clarifies the Ngāi Tahu cultural values relevant to this policy, subject to amending references in the policy from MW2.3 to SASM-O3. My reasoning is outlined in Section 6.8.2, para 147-148.¹⁶
168. Additionally, I reject the rewording specific to the Stoney Creek-led submission and further submissions relating to their existing use rights argument. Instead, I support in part the further submission of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.025]. This matter is discussed above in Section 6.8.2., para. 146.¹⁷
169. Therefore, I recommend amending SASM-P2 as follows:

SASM-P2	The impact of proposed activities on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment listed in SASM-O3~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.
---------	---

170. If the amendments to SASM-O3 (proposed in Section 6.5.3) are rejected by the Panel, then I would recommend the reference to this provision be swapped out for MW-2.3 as originally requested by submitters.

6.9.3. Recommendation

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

- SASM-P2 be amended as per para. 169 and **Appendix A**.

¹⁵ Stoney Creek [S3.004; FS25.008], Trudy Bokser [S113.004], Nathan Bokser [S116.004], Greg Bokser [S117.004], AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust [S118.004], Reaby Downs Farm Ltd [S18.006], Karen Temple [S19.006], Sarah and Peter Barclay [S20.006], Helen McIntosh [S24.006], John Baynes [S68.008; S68.199], Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters [S127.040], SFF [S126.078; FS17.007], Kevin Robertson [S115.079], Ronald Crispin [S60.081], Rural Ratepayers Group [S143.090], Alistair & Bernadette Hunt [S148.091].

¹⁶ FS20.025 is identical to FS20.024, discussed in Section 6.8.2, para 146. The analysis of FS20.024 is also applicable FS.20.025.

¹⁷ FS20.025 carries the same argument as FS20.024, which is also assessed in this section.

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

6.9.4. Section 32AA Evaluation

173. The following evaluates my recommendation to amend SASM-P2 under section 32AA of the RMA.

Effectiveness and efficiency

174. The recommended amendments will enable GDC to effectively administer the PDP in a clear and consistent manner. The amendments to SASM-P2 provide clarity to plan users by confirming the scope of this policy. This improves the ability for the objective to be administered in a consistent and clear manner.

Costs and benefits

175. 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

176. There is a risk that mana whenua will have reduced scope to discuss their cultural values, based on the amendments to SASM-P2. However, mana whenua have expressed their support for this amendment through informal conferencing. The risk of not acting is that plan users continue to feel uncertain of what sits within the scope of 'Ngāi Tahu cultural values' that must be considered in decision-making under the PDP.

Conclusion as to the most appropriate option

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

6.10. SASM- Additional provisions sought

6.10.1. Matters raised by submitters – additional provisions sought

178. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga [S123.027] recognise the PDP approach to addressing SASM matters has been developed with mana whenua, however they still recommend adding additional layers of protection to areas of "significant cultural value" using targeted provisions at individually identified sites. This, they consider, would more appropriately reflect the principles of Te Tiriti. They also raise a concern that the PDP SASM approach will create an administrative burden for GDC, and that further detail is required to explain how GDC and mana whenua will manage this increased workload. Further submissions from Stoney Creek [FS25.009] and Transpower New Zealand Limited [FS30.037] support S123.027.

179. Environment Southland [S85.101] lodged a supportive submission. However, they still requested relief, stating, "mana whenua need objectives and policies to support the

identification of cultural areas of significance”. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [FS20.010] lodged a further submission in partial support of S85.101. They clarified that the Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono approach is not reflective of “using narrative to identify culturally significant sites” (as quoted from S85.101 commentary), but agreed that the PDP should include, “a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.”

6.10.2. Assessment

180. S123.027 closely reflects matters Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga raised in *HS3 – Mana Whenua*. For consistency, S123.027 (and its associated further submissions, FS25.009 and FS30.037) will be responded to similarly to how they were in the *Mana Whenua S42A Report*.
181. As part of drafting the PDP, GDC worked closely with mana whenua to understand their perspectives on best practice protection for ‘sites of cultural significance’ to Māori. GDC were directed towards *Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono: Ngā Whenua o Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku – Stage 1 Southland Cultural Landscape Assessment Study*. This report outlined a mana whenua perspective that all parts of their takiwā held cultural significance to them, and therefore mapping individual ‘sites of cultural significance’ was both inappropriate and redundant. This perspective contradicts the relief Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and their further submitters are seeking.
182. I consider mana whenua to be best placed to decide how their relationship with their takiwā and their associated kaitiaki responsibilities are interpreted within an RMA framework based on my interpretation of S6(e), S7, and S8. Therefore, I consider supporting the preferences of mana whenua in this context to be a more appropriate reflection of Te Tiriti principles than the relief sought by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga [S123.004] and their associated further submitters (FS25.009 and FS30.037).
183. I also recognise the concern raised by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga [S123.004] and their associated further submitters (FS25.009 and FS30.037) regarding the administrative burden they perceive the PDP SASM approach may cause. I note that the current wording of the MW chapter confirms that a process will be developed in line with the Charter of Understanding GDC hold with Hokonui Rūnanga, which confirms the framework, but places the process itself outside of the plan. This allows the process – of which one is already in place for processing resource consents under the operative Gore District Plan - to be adapted over time as best practice evolves. It is also worth noting that the way decision-makers incorporate information on the cultural impacts of a proposed activity is unchanged by the SASM approach taken in the PDP. This approach is set out in the RMA, and is therefore not specific to this plan or district.
184. Finally, I acknowledge the supportive submission of ES [S85.101]. I note, however, that mana whenua (by way of FS20.010, lodged by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc) consider their relief to be, in part, reflective of their misunderstanding of Ngāi Tahu cultural concepts. Therefore, I consider it appropriate to align with mana whenua on this matter and reject this part of S85.101. This submitter also requests that objectives and policies be drafted to allow for specific sites of cultural significance to be identified. As already discussed, mana whenua have advised that this approach is inappropriate. Therefore, this relief is also rejected.

6.10.3. Recommendation

185. I recommend, for the reasons given above, that no changes be made.
186. It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part or rejected as shown in **Appendix B**.

7. Consequential and Minor Amendments

187. Clause 10(2)b of the RMA allows decisions on the PDP to include matters relating to consequential alterations to the PDP which are necessary, relevant or arising from submissions. Consequential amendments to the Mana Whenua and SASM chapter may be required based on Minute 15 matters raised in this Section 42A report.

8. Conclusions

188. This report has provided an assessment of submissions received on the SASM chapter of the PDP. It has also considered a subsequent proposal from Hokonui Rūnanga Inc [S139], and referred to several matters related to Minute 15 of the Hearings Panel.
189. Submissions were generally unsupportive of the approach the PDP has taken to managing SASM, with many seeking a return to a more traditional 'mapped sites' approach. Many submitters also expressed confusion around the SASM approach proposed, and concern around the level of restriction or additional bureaucracy it may create for landowners (particularly farmers), Council, and mana whenua. Further submissions from Hokonui Rūnanga Inc, however, reiterated mana whenua preference for a non-mapped SASM approach based on their perspective that mapping individual sites as 'significant' is inconsistent with their worldview. Several submitters also supported the PDP SASM approach based on its alignment with Ngāi Tahu world views.
190. As such, I have rejected relief where it specifically seeks mapped sites be included within the PDP. This is because, generally speaking, mana whenua perspectives should be prioritized when deciding how impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values should be appropriately managed within an RMA context.
191. I have, however, supported amendments to objectives and policies that clarify the function and scope of the SASM approach. I have also recommended the deletion and amendment of some provisions for the same reasons. I consider these changes to strike a balance between the desire many submitters expressed for more certainty, and the position mana whenua hold regarding the mapping of individual SASM locations.
192. In relation to the Hokonui Rūnanga Inc proposal to replace the SASM chapter with their proposed *NTCV – Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values* chapter, I have reserved my recommendation until evidence on this chapter is received. This is to ensure the perspectives of other submitters can be fully considered.

193. I consider that the submissions on the SASM Chapter 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**.

194. 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:

- Minor grammatical corrections in the Overview and Purpose section;
- The deletion of SASM-O1;
- Amendments to several provisions to clarify the specific Ngāi Tahu cultural values relevant to decision-makers under this chapter; and
- Consequential renumbering of Objectives.

195. These changes should be considered in conjunction with the changes recommended for the Mana Whenua Chapter via the Hokonui Rūnanga and Council joint response to Minute 15, shown in **Appendix D**.

196. 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 – Track Changed Amendments

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori - SASM

Overview and Purpose

To ask how significant a specific site or area is for Ngāi Tahu whānui is a meaningless and redundant question. All landscapes and elements of the natural environment are significant, given that within a Ngāi Tahu worldview all landscapes hold stories, histories, and whakapapa links to atua Māori (deities). For this reason, no specific sites or areas of 'significance' to Māori are singled out and listed within the Gore District Plan, as this implies that non-listed sites and areas are places that Ngāi Tahu do not hold a relationship with. Instead, all lands, waters, and natural features within Gore District are recognised as culturally significant to Ngāi Tahu whānui - just at different intensities and for varied reasons. These reasons could include Māori concepts such as mana, tapu or mauri; relationships with Ngāi Tahu deities or creation narratives, historic events or cultural practices, sites recognised as part of the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998, or contemporary Māori expressions of rangatiratanga or kaitiakitanga.

The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations. This allows decisions and, where relevant, controls to be meaningful and tailored to the relevant Ngāi Tahu cultural values that are being impacted. Where an activity (or approach to undertaking an activity) does not impact place-based Ngāi Tahu cultural values, then it will be enabled in the Plan, regardless of the location. For more information on Ngāi Tahu cultural values within the Gore District, please refer to the MW – Mana Whenua chapter.

The SASM chapter consists of overarching objectives and policies that direct the ways the Gore District Plan recognises and protects the historic and contemporary relationship of Māori with the natural environment and places where cultural practices are undertaken within the Gore District. The rules that enable this recognition and protection are attached to specific activities throughout relevant chapters of this plan, and reinforced with objectives and policies that refer to the underlying relationship that Ngāi Tahu hold with the natural environment, or references to the practicing of Māori cultural activities. As indicated in other chapters, the below objectives and policies apply to activities throughout the district.

Objectives

~~SASM-O1 All land, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are afforded appropriate considerations in relation to their management, development, and use.~~

~~SASM-O2~~ Traditional and contemporary mana whenua and tangata whenua relationships with land, waterbodies, natural features, and cultural structures are recognised, retained, ~~SASM-O1~~ and strengthened.

~~SASM-O3~~ Recognise and provide for the mātauranga and ~~rangatiratanga-kaitiakitanga~~ of mana whenua in decision-making relating ~~to~~ impacts ~~of activities~~ on ~~the following Ngāi Tahu cultural values:~~

~~SASM-O2~~
a) ~~Kaitiakitanga;~~

- b) Whakapapa;
- c) Mauri;
- d) Manaakitanga;
- e) Wairua;
- f) Whanaungatanga;
- g) Utu;
- h) Mātauranga;
- i) Te Reo Māori;
- j) Ki uta ki tai; and
- k) Mahinga kai.

~~the underlying relationship Ngāi Tahu hold with the natural environment.~~

Policies

- SASM-P1 Use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in ~~MW-2.3-SASM-O2~~, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- SASM-P2 The impact of proposed activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values ~~listed in SASM-O2, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.
- SASM-P3 Mātauranga relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values is cared for as a taonga by Hokonui Rūnanga, and shared with Gore District Council on a case-by-case basis, as needed to support Council decision-making
- SASM-P4 The ability for Māori to engage in cultural practices in culturally appropriate places is recognised and provided for.
- SASM-P5 Where appropriate, Ngāi Tahu cultural values and histories are incorporated into urban design of publicly accessible spaces.

Notes

Note 1	Provisions in Other Chapters
--------	------------------------------

The objectives and policies in this chapter apply to the provisions of other chapters in the District Plan, including the following:

- Energy
- Infrastructure
- Transport
- Hazardous Substances
- Natural Hazards
- Public Access
- Zones – Setbacks from Streams, Reserve Land, buildings in Rural Zones exceeding height and coverage controls, and activities in the Natural Open Space Zone and Field Days Zone.
- Subdivision
- Activities on Surface of Water
- Earthworks
- Noise
- Temporary Activities
- Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity
- Natural Features and Landscapes

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
S103	McNabb Management Ltd	S103.031	Whole Plan	Support in part	I support all provisions in the proposed plan as notified except for the amendments requested to the above provisions	Support in part except requested amendments	Accept in part	Pg. 17, para. 63; Pg. 24, para. 101; Pg. 26, para. 115; Pg. 29, para. 132; Pg. 32, para. 148; Pg. 35, para. 167.
S101	Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.103	Whole Plan	Support in part	The specific provisions of the proposal that transpowers 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 Transpowers submission, and decisions sought in relation to the PDP are set out in Appendix A of the submission.	Support in part the PDP as it relates to the National Grid	Accept in part	Pg. 17, para. 63
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 stated provisions, as set out in the submissions table and schedule and form part of the submission.	Retain provisions as notified, except for those which have been submitted against as part of Hokonui Runanga's submission	Accept in part	Pg. 17, para. 63; Pg. 26, para. 115; Pg. 29, para. 132; Pg. 32, para. 148; Pg. 35, para. 167
S136	Jenny Campbell	S136.001	Whole plan	Not stated	No reasoning provided	All environmental decisions made in consultation with Tangata Whenua	Accept	Pg. 17, para. 63
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.175	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site.' The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as 'triggers' for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan's approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as 'high risk' and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc.	FS20.021	Whole plan	Oppose S126.175	The submitters reasoning the private property rights are paramount is erroneous in law; and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement	Disallow S126.175	Accept	Pg. 16, para. 61
S115	Kevin Robertson	S115.176	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site.' The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as 'triggers' for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan's approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as 'high risk' and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.178	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site.' The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as 'triggers' for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan's approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as 'high risk' and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.187	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site.' The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as 'triggers' for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan's approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as 'high risk' and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62
S148	Alistair & Burnadette Hunt	S148.188	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site.' The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					resource consent applications acting as ‘triggers’ for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan’s approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as ‘high risk’ and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities		
S68	John Baynes	S68.296	Whole plan	Not stated	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a ‘site.’ The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as ‘triggers’ for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan’s approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See page 3/4 and Appendix A for complete submission	We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values (Appendix 1). We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as ‘high risk’ and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the councils intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day-to-day primary production activities	Reject	Pg. 14-17, para. 51-62
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Does not support the entire district being SASM. This creates enormous uncertainty and bureaucracy. Landowners need to be able to make plans for development without the risk of being surprised at the consenting stage.	SASM to be identified and public knowledge before restrictions are applied to them.	Reject	Pg. 19-24, para. 80-98
FS17	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS17.003	SASM - General	Support S148.003	Federated Farmers supports the submitter’s requests as this aligns with our submission points	Allow S148.003	Reject	Pg. 19-24, para. 80-98
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.002	SASM - General	Support S148.003	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S148.003	Reject	Pg. 19-24, para. 80-98

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.001	SASM - General	Support S148.003	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners	Allow S148.003	Reject	Pg. 19-24, para. 80-98
S109	Department of Conservation	S109.046	SASM - General	Support	The D-G supports the provisions provided in the plan to recognise the relationship of Māori with the natural environment and the practicing of Māori cultural activities and application of these objectives and policies throughout the district.	Retain as notified	Support in part	Pg. 24, para. 101
S59	Adrienne Crispin	S59.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Does not agree with Councils approach that areas of significance to Māori be incorporated as it only causes division.	SASM should not be included in the plan	Reject	Pg. 19, para. 79
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Does not agree with inclusion of Areas of Significance to Māori in the plans. Concerned that it will cause more division.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori should not be included in the plan.	Reject	Pg. 19, para. 79
S104	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	S104.029	SASM - General	Amend	Creates uncertainty for plan users by classifying the entire district as SASM, instead of identifying specific sites and areas. The s32 report mentions resource consent triggers for high-risk activities, but these are not specified. All activities regardless of their risk level will, therefore, require an assessment of cultural effects.	Remove uncertainty for plan users by clarifying why the entire district has been identified as a SASM. Provide a list of high-risk activities for which an assessment of cultural effects is required.	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.030	SASM - General	Support S104.029 in part	Hokonui Runanga Inc do not adhere to the concept of identifying specific sites as culturally significant; all the whenua and wai of its takiwā is important to them. However, we agree, the Gore District Plan should include a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.	Allow S104.029 in part	Accept in part	Pg. 21-22, para. 88-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.049	SASM - General	Support S104.029	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S104.029	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.002	SASM - General	Support S104.029	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners	Allow S104.029	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98
S146	Southland District Council	S146.034	SASM - General	Support	None specified.	None specified.	Accept in part	Pg. 24, para. 101

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S3	Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.001	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS5	Hamish Weir	FS5.033	SASM - General	Support S3.001	[None provided]	Allow S3.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.031	SASM – General	Oppose S3.001	The submitters reasoning the private property rights are paramount is erroneous in law; and fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow S3.001	Accept	Pg. 21, para. 88
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.084	SASM - General	Support S3.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S3.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S23	Mataura Marae	S23.007	SASM - General	Support	The submitter supports the approach taken to recognising Sites of Significance to Māori. This bespoke approach enables impacts on sites relevant mātāwaka to be considered alongside sites of significance to mana whenua, which better enables Council to meet its obligations to all Māori living within their district. Whilst Mataura Marae may not be directly involved in these assessments, through our relationship with mana whenua and the flexibility of the approach in the PDP, we are confident that our values will be considered more often than they would be under the approach used in the operative Plan.	Retain as drafted.		
S64	Jet Boating NZ	S64.024	SASM - General	Neutral	JBNZ holds the perspective that waterways should be shared and enjoyed responsibly, with appropriate controls and management to avoid adverse effects. The GDP should facilitate, not restrict, waterway activities, and potential impacts should be mitigated. As per the submitters	The submitter requests the SASM and Mana Whenua chapters be considered for the reasons set out in the submission relating to consultation requirements.	Accept in part	Pg. 24, para. 100-101

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					interpretation of SASM, the submitter is mindful that recreational jet boating will come under the above given waters are considered SASM, this consideration is not opposed in principle. However, it emphasises fair and reasonable evaluation of its impact on specific Māori cultural and spiritual values relating to the specific waterway. The submitter has concern around engagement with mana whenua for all recreational jetboating activities, and in doing so being subject to the formality, effort and expense associated with any application for land use consent. Listing all land, water and natural features as SASM, this chapter and MW chapters appear to require full and formal involvement of mana whenua for all applications, which will remove any exercise of Council discretion. The submitter questions whether this is necessary and appropriate in all situations. If effective and streamlined procedures are established for initiating early consultations with hokonui runanga, followed by their subsequent involvement in applications for land use consents, and similar processes then concerns may be allayed. Furthermore, there is a proposal indicating that only activities deemed "hi-risk" might prompt comprehensive and formal consultation with and participation by hokonui runanga. If this criterion is adopted, it would be beneficial to establish a clear definition or qualification for what constitutes "hirisk." Additionally, it can be inferred that applications categorised as not "hi-risk" would not entail full participation in the process by Hokonui runanga.			
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.003	SASM – General	Support S64.024 in part	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners.	Allow S64.024	Accept in part	Pg. 24, para. 100-101
S105	Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	S105.029	SASM - General	Amend	Creates uncertainty for plan users by classifying the entire district as SASM, instead of identifying specific sites and areas. The s32 report mentions resource consent triggers for high-risk activities, but these are not specified. All activities regardless of their risk level will, therefore, require an assessment of cultural effects.	Remove uncertainty for plan users by clarifying why the entire district has been identified as a SASM. Provide a list of high-risk activities for which an assessment of cultural effects is required.	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.026	SASM - General	Support S105.29	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By	Allow S105.29	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S127	Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters	S127.029	SASM - General	Amend	Creates uncertainty for plan users by classifying the entire district as SASM, instead of identifying specific sites and areas. The s32 report mentions resource consent triggers for high-risk activities, but these are not specified. All activities regardless of their risk level will, therefore, require an assessment of cultural effects.	Remove uncertainty for plan users by clarifying why the entire district has been identified as a SASM. Provide a list of high-risk activities for which an assessment of cultural effects is required.	Accept in part	Pg. 19-24, para 80-98
S113	Trudy Bokser	S113.001	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.086	SASM - General	Support S113.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S113.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S116	Nathan Bokser	S116.001	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.055	SASM - General	Support S116.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S116.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S118	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.001	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.009	SASM - General	Support S118.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S118.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S18	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.			
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.064	SASM - General	Support S18.003	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S18.003	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S19	Karen Temple	S19.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.044	SASM - General	Support S19.003	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S19.003	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S20	Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites,	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.			
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.074	SASM - General	Support S20.003	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S20.003	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S24	Helen McIntosh	S24.003	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.034	SASM - General	Support S24.003	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S24.003	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S68	John Baynes	S68.005	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.			
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.039	SASM - General	Support S68.005	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S68.005	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S127	Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters	S127.037	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.062	SASM - General	Support S127.037	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S127.037	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S117	Greg Bokser	S117.001	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.			
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.031	SASM - General	Support S117.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S117.001	Reject	Pg. 19-22, para. 80-92
S128	Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.020	SASM-Overview	Support	Overview identifies that all areas significant. Objectives and provisions in lines with that	No amendments required	Accept in part	Pg. 26, para. 115
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.075	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115
S85	Environment Southland	S85.100	SASM-Overview	Oppose in part	This section of the plan does not outline the narrative approaches (not just limited to Apiti [sic] Hono Tatai [sic] Hono) mana whenua can use to inform cultural significance.	Mention needed of Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono and other narrative approaches to identifying sites of cultural importance.	Reject	Pg 27, para. 116
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.009	SASM-Overview	Support S85.100 in part	The submitter appears to have misunderstood that Apiti [sic] Hono Tati [sic] Hono is not using narrative to identify culturally significant sites. All whenua and wai is culturally important. However, we agree, the Gore District Plan should include a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.	Allow S85.100 in part	Accept	Pg 27, para. 116
S115	Kevin Robertson	S115.076	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.078	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.		
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.087	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.088	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115
S68	John Baynes	S68.196	SASM-Overview	Support in part	Typo to be amended.	Amend Overview: The Gore District Plan manages the impacts of high-risk activities on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, as opposed to restricting a wide range of activities at specific locations.	Accept	Pg 26, para. 115
S153	Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.001	SASM-O1	Oppose	Concerned that a broad approach creates uncertainty as to what activities will require consultation with mana whenua. Need for iwi consulting in everyday farm tasks will hinder farming operations.	SASM should be identified and mapped in the planning maps. SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use.	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.057	SASM – O1	Support S153.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule	Allow S153.001	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S142	Alan Taylor	S142.001	SASM-O1	Oppose	The submitter acknowledges the significance of land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within the Gore District to Mana Whenua/ Tangata Whenua but are concerned that a broad approach creates uncertainty for plan users when identifying what activities require consultation with mana whenua. With the entire district classified as SASM this will result in day-to-day farming operations such as fencing that may require resource consent, consulting with rūnanga. Significantly increasing time, cost and workload associated with consenting. It will hinder the ability to undertake essential activities required to manage a farming operation.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps. SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process.	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.001	SASM – O1	Support S142.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S142.001	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S74	Hamish Weir	S74.001	SASM-O1	Oppose in part	The objective would effectively place an overlay over the entire district, leading to increased costs and uncertainty in the RMA process. Identifying sites will remove uncertainty and provide clarity.	The objectives wording should be modified as follows; All Identified land, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are afforded appropriate considerations in relation to their management, development, and use.	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.033	SASM – O1	Support S74.001	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions	Allow S74.001	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.004	SASM – O1	Support S74.001	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners	Allow S74.001	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S138	Port Blakely Limited	S138.006	SASM-O1	Support in part	Recognises that tangata whenua and Ngāi Tahu consider all elements of the environment are culturally significant to them. This approach is inherently uncertain and unclear for other landowners.	Port Blakely would like to be part of this conversation going forward	Accept in part	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.005	SASM – O1	Support S138.006	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners	Allow S138.006	Accept in part	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S3	Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.002	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use.	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.032	SASM-O1	Oppose S3.002 in part	The decision requested will not achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. It is not the role of a third party to tell mana whenua how to understand or express their relationship with the whenua and wai of their takiwā. However, we agree, the Gore District Plan should include a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules	Disallow S3.002 in part	Accept	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS17	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS17.004	SASM-O1	Support S3.002	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought as the submitter seeks similar relief to that of Federated Farmers. The approach creates uncertainty for plan users as to when consultation with mana whenua is required	Allow S3.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.085	SASM – O1	Support S3.002	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions	Allow S3.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.076	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.023	SASM – O1	Oppose S126.076	The decision requested fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. It is not the role of a third party to tell mana whenua what is of value to them or how to understand or express their relationship with the whenua and wai of their takiwā. However, we agree, the Gore District Plan should include a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.	Disallow S126.076	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.079	SASM – O1	Support S126.076	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S126.076	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.006	SASM – O1	Support S126.076	Agrees with this submission that the SASM chapter as drafted creates uncertainty for landowners	Allow S126.076	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S113	Trudy Bokser	S113.002	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what	Amend SASM- 01 to read:	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use		
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.087	SASM – O1	Support S113.002	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S113.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S116	Nathan Bokser	S116.002	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.056	SASM – O1	Support S116.002	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule	Allow S116.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S118	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.002	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.010	SASM – O1	Support S118.002	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S118.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S18	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.004	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.065	SASM – O1	Support S18.004	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to	Allow S18.004	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S19	Karen Temple	S19.004	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.045	SASM – O1	Support S19.004	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S19.004	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S20	Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.004	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.075	SASM – O1	Support S20.004	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions	Allow S20.004	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission			
S24	Helen McIntosh	S24.004	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.035	SASM – O1	Support S24.004	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S24.004	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S68	John Baynes	S68.006	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.040	SASM – O1	Support S68.006	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S68.006	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S127	Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters	S127.038	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.063	SASM – O1	Support S127.038	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S127.038	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S115	Kevin Robertson	S115.077	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use		
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.048	SASM – O1	Support S115.077	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S115.077	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.079	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.068	SASM – O1	Support S60.079	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S60.079	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.088	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All-Those~~ lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use		
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.073	SASM – O1	Support S143.088	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S143.008	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.089	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.006	SASM – O1	Support S148.089	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S148.089	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S68	John Baynes	S68.197	SASM-O1	Oppose	SFF does not agree with the approach to consider all 'land, waterbodies, natural features and marae within Gore District as	Amend SASM- 01 to read:	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					site and areas of cultural significance. Farmers have a right to know what is on their land so they can plan for current and future land use. The approach proposed in the PDP creates a high level of uncertainty for all landowners in the district.	~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use		
S117	Greg Bokser	S117.002	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is ds also unclear what "appropriate considerations" (as referred to in Objective SASMO1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM- 01 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.032	SASM – O1	Support S117.002	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to ‘specified areas’ as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S117.002	Reject	Pg. 29, para. 131-132
S3	Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.003	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
FS17	Southland Federated Farmers	FS17.006	SASM-P1	Support S3.003	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought as the submitter seeks similar relief to that of Federated Farmers	Allow S3.003	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
	of New Zealand							
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.077	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.024	SASM-P1	Oppose S126.077	The submitters concerns and the changes they want are unclear on this point. The plan does not need to provide for matters covered by s10 of the RMA; that is the purpose of s10.	Disallow S126.077	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.007	SASM-P1	Support S126.077	Aligns with Stoney Creek's submission	Allow S126.077	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S113	Trudy Bokser	S113.003	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S116	Nathan Bokser	S116.003	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S118	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.003	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S18	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.005	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S19	Karen Temple	S19.005	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New use , subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S20	Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.005	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New use , subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S24	Helen McIntosh	S24.005	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New use , subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S68	John Baynes	S68.007	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New use , subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S127	Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters	S127.039	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New use , subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S115	Kevin Robertson	S115.078	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
					should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.			
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.080	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.089	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.090	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S68	John Baynes	S68.198	SASM-P1	Oppose	It is important to protect existing use rights therefore this policy requires an amendment. S 10 of the RMA discusses existing uses in relation to land protected and SFF request the policy represents this. The policy also implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address.	Amend SASM-P1: New use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152
S117	Greg Bokser	S117.003	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New u se, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values, ~~including those~~ listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have	Reject in part	Pg. 32-33, para. 146-152

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.		
S3	Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.004	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
FS17	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS17.007	SASM-P2	Support S3.004	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. A similar point was made in our submission. The proposed wording supports the FFNZ position that Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) must be identified, mapped and included in the Plan	Allow S3.004	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S126	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.078	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.025	SASM-P2	Oppose S126.078	The submitters concerns and the changes they want are unclear on this point. The plan does not need to provide for matters covered by s10 of the RMA; that is the purpose of s10.	Disallow S126.078	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.008	SASM-P2	Support S126.078	Aligns with Stoney Creek's submission	Allow S126.078	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S113	Trudy Bokser	S113.004	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S116	Nathan Bokser	S116.004	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.		
S118	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.004	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S18	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.006	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S19	Karen Temple	S19.006	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S20	Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.006	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S24	Helen McIntosh	S24.006	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, ~~and their underlying relationship with the natural environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
S68	John Baynes	S68.008	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S127	Peters Farm Ltd - Karen Peters	S127.040	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S115	Kevin Robertson	S115.079	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S60	Ronald Crispin	S60.081	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S143	Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.090	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S148	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.091	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
						~~environment~~ is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.		
S68	John Baynes	S68.199	SASM-P2	Oppose	The policy implies that there may be other cultural values other than what is listed in MW-2.3. However, this does not appear to be the intention as the MW chapter specifically lists and defines the cultural values. The wording should be amended to provide clarity that it is only the values listed in MW-2.3 which the policy seeks to address	Amend SASM-P2: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Maori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values listed in MW2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.	Accept in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S117	Greg Bokser	S117.004	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.	Reject in part	Pg. 35, para. 165-170
S123	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	S123.027	SASM-Additional provisions sought	Support in part	HNZPT notes that, in consultation with Hokonui Rūnanga, Gore District Council have elected not to schedule specific Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, but rather, where an activity (or approach to undertaking an activity) does not impact placebased Ngāi Tahu cultural values, then it will be enabled in the GDP, regardless of the location. HNZPT advocates for the identification and scheduling of wāhi tupuna. Protection of taonga, including wāhi tapū, wāhi tūpuna and whakapapa, is a key principle of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Cultural landscapes, maunga and awa, are the heart of iwi, hapū and hapori identity, mātauranga Māori, and wellbeing and must be protected as part of the fulfilment of the principles of Te Tiriti. The proposed approach involves control of activities that are likely to have adverse effects on the district's landscapes and natural environment in general, however, HNZPT recommends that additional layers of protection are afforded to areas of significant cultural value through their identification and targeted provisions. Should the current approach remain, an increased level of processing time and resource can be anticipated at the consenting stage. HNZPT recommends that the criteria and process for consultation with Hokonui Rūnanga is clearly stated and agreed to by both parties, to ensure all involved understand the circumstances under which they will be consulted with and how this will factor into any decision making.	Add Identification, scheduling and rules for Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Reject	Pg. 37, para. 180-183

Submission No.	Submitter name	Submission Point	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	S42A Recommendation	S42A Assessment Reference
FS30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS30.037	SASM-Additional provisions sought	Support S123.027	Transpower supports the submission and similarly considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that are subject to provisions, including rules, in the Proposed Plan are clearly identified so that the locations where the relevant provisions apply is clear in order to provide certainty to plan users. It is considered that an appropriate evaluation of such sites must be undertaken to confirm that the extent of regulation applied to the sites is tested in terms of necessity and appropriateness. By way of example, Transpower is of the view that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori must be identified in order for Rule INFR-R9 to be confined to 'specified areas' as opposed to the whole District. Allow the submission	Allow S123.027	Reject	Pg. 37, para. 180-183
FS25	Stoney Creek Station Ltd	FS25.009	SASM-Additional provisions sought	Support S123.027 in part	Agrees with this submission that sites of significance should be identified and scheduled	Allow S123.027 in part	Reject	Pg. 37, para. 180-183
S85	Environment Southland	S85.101	SASM-Additional provisions sought	Support	Objectives and policies need to set up a framework for mana whenua to identify matters of cultural importance, either through Apiti Hono Tatai Hono or other narrative or matauranga [sic] approaches.	Mana whenua need objectives and policies to support the identification of cultural areas of significance.	Reject	Pg. 37, para. 184
FS20	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	FS20.010	SASM-Additional provisions sought	Support S85.101 in part	The submitter appears to have misunderstood that Apiti [sic] Hono Tati [sic] Hono is not using narrative to identify culturally significant sites. All whenua and wai is culturally important. However, we agree, the Gore District Plan should include a more explicit land classification approach whereby mana whenua identify the values associated with each part of the takiwā and can have more tailored policies and targeted rules.	Allow S85.101 in part	Accept	Pg. 37, para. 184

Appendix C – Analysis of “91 Day-to-day Primary Production Activities” List as provided by SFF Submission

Note: This analysis has been undertaken based of the notified version of the PDP. It does not reflect any alterations that may have been directed by the Hearings Panel through Decisions on chapters already heard.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
1. ENRG-S1	Small scale wind turbines in GRUZ, RULZ, SETZ, GIZ & LIZ - Height - Max number per site - Size - Setbacks	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Three matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the three (alongside other matters).
2. ENRG-S2	Small scale hydro turbines in GRUZ, RULZ, SETZ, GIZ & LIZ - Max GFA	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
3. ENRG-S4	Exploratory wind generation masts in GRUZ - Setbacks - Activity duration - Removal requirements	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
4. INFR-R3	Operation, maintenance, replacement, upgrade, repair or removal of existing above ground level infrastructure and access tracks.	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Eight matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.
5. INFR-R8	Telecommunications lines, cabinets, poles and new antennas regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted activity standards in Regulations 20, 21, 22, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 or 37 of the NESTF and are not expressly provided for as a controlled activity in Part 3 of the NESTF in all zones	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
6. INFR-S2	Height of Infrastructure in all zones - Maximum height - Includes exemptions for masts or poles for navigation, meteorology, electricity distribution or telecommunications, antennas for telecommunication and radio communication, lines and support structures	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
7. INFR-S3	Height of Poles and Masts in all zones	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
	Minimum Setbacks from Rivers and Stream in all zones	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
8. INFR-S5				Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
9. INFR-S6	Footprint of buildings and structures in all zones - Max footprint	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
10. INFR-S7	Antennas, Small Cells and ancillary equipment in all zones - Max surface area - Max width - Max volume	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
11. TRANS-S10	Road design requirements in all zones - Minimum dimensions - Passing provisions - Lighting - Cycle land provision - Footpath design - Gradient - Drainage - Pedestrian links	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Six matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the six.
12. NH-R1	The maintenance of existing defences against water in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Two matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the two.
13. NH-R2	Buildings used for sensitive activities within areas subject to actual or potential inundation in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Three matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the three (alongside other matters).
14. NFL-R2	Tree planting, other than plantation forestry within an identified ONF/L in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Two matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the two.
15. NFL-R3	Land disturbance and Earthworks within an identified ONF/L in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Three matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the three.
16. NFL-R4	Maintenance of critical infrastructure, existing roads, farm tracks, walking and cycling trails within an identified ONF/L in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Two matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the two.
17. NFL-R5	Fences within an identified ONF/L in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Two matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the two.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
18. NFL-R6	Indigenous Vegetation Clearance within an identified ONF/L in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Two matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the two.
19. NFL-R6 *Numbering issue in PDP	New Roads, farm tracks, walking and cycling tracks within an identified ONF/L in any zone	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Four matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the four.
20. SUB-R5	All other subdivision outside of Development Areas	N - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Fourteen matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the fourteen (alongside other matters).
21. SUB-R6	Subdivision in Gore South Industrial Development Area	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	No* *Rule has conditions impacting whether activity becomes discretionary or non-complying. <u>None</u> consider Ngāi Tahu cultural values.	Sixteen matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the sixteen (alongside other matters).
22. SUB-R7	Subdivision in Gore West Residential Development Area	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	No* *Rule has conditions impacting whether activity becomes discretionary or non-complying. <u>None</u> consider Ngāi Tahu cultural values.	Nineteen matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the nineteen (alongside other matters).
23. SUB-R9	Subdivision of notable trees - Land on which a listed notable tree resides	N (Restricted Discretionary)	N/A	Three matters of discretion. There are <u>no references</u> to effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. There are, however, references to the cultural values of Māori communities more broadly in one matter of discretion.
24. EW-R1	Land disturbance for the construction of fences in any zone, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
25. EW-R2	Test pits or boreholes necessary as part of a geotechnical assessment in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
26. EW-R3	Installing septic tanks and associated drainage fields in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
27. EW-R4	Disposal of spoil from drain clearance work within the site the drain is located in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
28. EW-R5	Replacement, removal and installation of underground storage tanks in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
29. EW-R6	Service connections in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
30. EW-R7	Digging of dead holes and farm rubbish pits in GRUZ, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Nine matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the nine.
31. EW-R8	Earthworks for silage pits in GRUZ, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Nine matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the nine.
32. EW-R9	Earthworks for the construction, maintenance and repair or upgrade of a farm track in GRUZ, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Nine matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the nine.
33. EW-R10	Earthworks for the construction, upgrade or maintenance and repair of the transport network and recreational walking and cycling tracks in any zone, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the ten.
34. EW-R11	Earthworks and land disturbance for network utilities, including associated vehicle access tracks in any zone, excluding Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the ten.
35. EW-R13	Earthworks and land disturbance within areas subject to Natural Hazards (Flooding)	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
36. EW-R14	Earthworks and land disturbance not otherwise provided for in all zones	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the ten.
37. EW-S1	Cut depth and fill height of earthworks	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Six matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the six.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
38. EW-S2	Unretained batters - Max steepness - Restricted soil types - Max bench width - Proximity to kerb or footpath	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Six matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the six.
39. EW-S3	Setbacks from rivers and streams	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
40. EW-S4	Instability of Land - Max slope angle for location of earthworks	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
41. EW-S5	Erosion, sediment, and dust control - Compulsory actions for controlling erosion, sediment loss, and dust	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
42. EW-S6	Site Reinstatement - Max timeframe (six months)	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Eight matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.
43. EW-S7	Accidental Discovery Protocol - Process for accidental discovery of human remains, archaeological site, taonga tūturu - Protected objects	N/A - Built form standard	Yes Standard requires an Accidental Discover Protocol be adopted, which reflects Ngāi Tahu cultural values (as well as historic heritage legal requirements)	N/A
44. NOISE-R4	Noise from temporary military training and emergency services training activities involving fixed (stationary) noise sources in GRUZ	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five (alongside other matters).
45. NOISE-R5	Noise from temporary military training and emergency services training activities involving mobile noise sources in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five (alongside other matters).
46. NOISE-R10	Noise from Temporary Events in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five (alongside other matters).
47. SIGN-R6	Cultural Markers in MPZ or OSRZ	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Relevance of Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
48. SIGN-S1	Requirements for Signs (including cultural markers) erected on or adjacent to a road or railway	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Six matters of discretion. Relevance of Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the six.
49. TEMP-R4	Commercial filming including any ancillary temporary building or structure in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
50. TEMP-R5	Temporary Military Training in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
51. TEMP-R7	Emergency services training activity in any zone	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
52. LLRZ-S7	Setback to rivers and streams	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
53. GRZ-R9	Retirement Village in the GRZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Eight matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.
54. GRZ-R10	Community facility in GRZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the ten.
55. GRZ-R11	Comprehensive Residential Development in GRZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Eight matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.
56. GRZ-R12	Healthcare Activity in GRZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Nine matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the nine.
57. GRZ-S7	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in GRZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
58. MRZ-R9	Retirement Village in MRZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Eight matters of discretion.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
				Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.
59. MRZ-R10	Community facility in MRZ except Hospital Precinct	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the ten.
60. MRZ-S6	Setbacks to rivers and streams	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
61. GRUZ-R3	Quarrying Activities in the GRUZ except Historic Heritage sites, Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Eleven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eleven.
62. GRUZ-S3	Building Size in GRUZ - Max floor size	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Six matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the six.
63. GRUZ-S7	Setbacks from stream and river for all activities in GRUZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
64. RLZ-S5	Building Size in RLZ - Maximum floor size	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the seven.
65. RLZ-S7	Setback from rivers and streams of activities in RLZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
66. SETZ-S7	Setback from rivers and streams of activities in SETZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
67. NCZ-S5	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in NCZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
68. LCZ-S6	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in LCZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
69. MUZ-S5	Setbacks to streams and rivers of activities in MUZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
				Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
70. TCZ-S6	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in TCZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
71. LIZ-R5	Retail Activity in the Large Format Retail Precinct	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five (alongside other matters).
72. LIZ-S5	Setbacks to streams and rivers of activities in LIZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
73. GIZ-S5	Setbacks to streams and rivers of activities in GIZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
74. NOSZ-R6	Visitor Accommodation Activity in the NPSZ	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Three matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the three (alongside other matters).
75. NOSZ-R7	Rural Commercial Recreation Activity in the NPSZ	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Three matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the three (alongside other matters).
76. NOSZ-R8	Commercial Activity in the NPSZ	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five (alongside other matters).
77. NOSZ-R11	Building Activity in the NOSZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on, or relationship with, Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>three</u> of the ten (alongside other matters).
78. NOSZ-R12	Education Facility in the NOSZ	No - Restricted Discretionary activity	N/A	Ten matters of discretion. Effects on, or relationship with, Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>three</u> of the ten (alongside other matters).
79. NOSZ-S1	Height of buildings or structures in NOSZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
	Setbacks from rivers and streams of activities in NOSZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
80. NOSZ-S4				Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
81. SARZ-S1	Height of building or structure in SARZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
82. SARZ-S5	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in SARZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
83. AIRPZ-S4	Setbacks to streams and rivers of activities in AIRPZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
84. SARZ-S5 * Duplicate of activity 82	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in SARZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
85. AIRPZ-S4 * Duplicate of activity 83	Setbacks to streams and rivers of activities in AIRPZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
86. MPZ-S1	Height of buildings within an MPZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
87. MPZ-S5	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in MPZ 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).	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on, or relevance of, Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>three</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
88. CCZ-S2	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in CCZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion.

Plan provisioned concern identified by SFF in Appendix 1 of S126	Description of provision	Is this a Permitted Activity under the PDP?	Is there a Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related condition influencing whether the activity is classed as permitted activity?	When this activity requires a resource consent, how many matters of discretion are there alongside matters relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values?
				Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
89. FDZ-S5	Setbacks to rivers and streams of activities in FDZ	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Seven matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>two</u> of the seven (alongside other matters).
90. FDZ-S6	Events - Plans & infrastructure required for large events over 2500 people	N/A - Built form standard	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Five matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the five.
91. DEV2-R2	New buildings, structures, earthworks, and land disturbance in General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone Covered by DEV2 - Except land within Hazard Area 1 and Hazard Area 2	Yes – Permitted Activity	No Ngāi Tahu cultural values-related permitted activity conditions	Eight matters of discretion. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values are referenced in <u>one</u> of the eight.

Appendix D – Hokonui Rūnanga and Council Joint Response to Minute 15 of the Hearings Panel

Before the Hearing Panel

Under	the Resource Management Act 1991
In the matter of	Hearing of Submissions and Further Submissions on the Proposed Gore District Plan

Minute 15 response: Mana whenua and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapters

29/10/2024

Applicant's solicitors:

Michael Garbett | Shelley Chadwick
Anderson Lloyd
Level 12, Otago House, 477 Moray Place, Dunedin 9016
Private Bag 1959, Dunedin 9054
DX Box YX10107 Dunedin
p + 64 3 477 3973
michael.garbett@al.nz | shelly.chadwick@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Minute 15 directions

- 1 The Hearings Panel for the hearing of submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Gore District Plan (PDP) issued Minute 15 on 6 August 2024, which made directions concerning the Mana Whenua Chapter of the PDP, and the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter of the PDP.
- 2 The Minute included the following directions:

Direction 1

The s42A reporting officer and planning experts representing Hokonui Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu confer in relation to the following:

- (i) scope for introducing context and process-related provisions to the Mana Whenua chapter;
- (ii) utilisation of text contained in the Mana Whenua chapter to form context and process-related provisions for that chapter;
- (iii) transfer of context and process-related provisions contained in the SASM chapter to the Mana Whenua chapter;
- (iv) drafting of context and process-related provisions based on (ii) and (iii), also considering available examples in other plans that have utilised the National Planning Standards directions (e.g. Otago Regional Policy Statement); and
- (v) a s32AA assessment of any drafted provisions.

Direction 2

Hokonui Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu planning experts consider the Panel re-drafting of proposed Policy SASM-PXX in the first instance, and then confer with the s42A reporting officer regarding:

- (i) the extent to which the re-drafted policy would satisfy relief sought by Hokonui Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu; and
- (ii) the location of this policy within the plan, with reference to (1) above.

- 3 An initial meeting of the planning experts (the Parties) was held on 9 September 2024 to discuss the above directions. The attendees were:

- (a) Amy Beran, on behalf of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc
 - (b) Courtney Bennett, on behalf of Gore District Council
- 4 The Parties met again on 26 September 2024 and 4 October 2024 to continue discussing these matters, and further discussions were had via email in the days following each meeting. At the October 2024 meeting, Ms Beran advised Ms Bennett that, in light of concerns raised by other submitters and meetings held with Southland Federated Farmers Southland, Hokonui Rūnanga had reconsidered some aspects of the PDP SASM approach. They now wished to explore replacing the SASM chapter with a bespoke cultural values chapter (titled 'NTCV - Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values') that clarifies the PDP's move away from a more traditional SASM approach. Instead, the NTCV chapter will focus on how the PDP enables consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values in relation to activities undertaken across the district without designating any areas as SASM.
- 5 Whilst this matter will be further detailed in Ms Beran's evidence, Ms Beran understands that Hokonui Rūnanga are concerned that the inclusion of a SASM chapter is creating unnecessary confusion for plan users (as indicated in the submissions), given there are no SASM in the PDP. A SASM chapter does not reflect how mana whenua are seeking to have their relationship with the entire district provided for in the PDP as it implies there will be geographic delineation of particularly significant sites to mana whenua in the district. At this point in time, mana whenua have no interest in pursuing such an approach. Further, in the absence of any SASM, mana whenua are not seeking to apply a 'blanket' protection over the entire district. Ms Beran understands Hokonui Rūnanga want to be clear that the approach to providing for Ngāi Tahu cultural values across the district does not create additional consenting requirements and is not about managing particular sites in the district (as is expected with a SASM approach).
- 6 The Hearings Panel proposed that the outputs of this meeting might be circulated in advance of the exchange of evidence for the SASM hearing, and the Gore District Council, Hokonui Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu have agreed this would be a helpful approach.
- 7 Issues not specifically addressed and/or further detailed analysis of the matters set out in this Summary will be included in the evidence to be provided in advance of the hearing.

Summary of issues discussed

Direction 1

Direction 1(i) Scope for introducing context and process related provisions to the Mana Whenua chapter

8 Ms Bennett and Ms Beran have jointly agreed to defer the matter of scope for the work undertaken under Direction 1 to legal counsel acting for both Gore District Council and Hokonui Rūnanga. It is understood that this matter will be addressed in the legal submissions for Council and Hokonui Rūnanga respectively.

1(ii) Utilisation of text contained in the Mana Whenua chapter to form context and process-related provisions for that chapter

9 After reviewing the PDP Mana Whenua chapter, both Ms Beran and Ms Bennett consider it feasible to draft a suite of context and process-related provisions for this chapter that align with its current content. They agreed that the most sensible approach would be to include a suite of objectives and policies at the end of the MW chapter that reflect the key themes of the following chapter sections:

- a) Section 2: Recognition of hapū and iwi
- b) Section 3: Mana Whenua – Local Authority relationships
- c) Section 4: Hapū and iwi planning documents
- d) Section 5: Involvement and Participation with Mana Whenua

10 Upon reviewing the existing text in these sections, however, both Parties agree that there is limited scope to utilise or repurpose existing text to form the provisions described in this Direction. This is because the existing text is predominantly descriptive in nature. Whilst some text does provide direction that could be converted to provisions (e.g. 4.1. Accidental Discovery Protocols), other sections such as accounts of Ngāi Tahu history and worldviews do not include directive content. This would therefore require additional text to be added to this chapter.

11 The proposed provisions are included below in para. 27.

12 In addition, Ms Beran has proposed several minor amendments to the MW chapter, which include:

- Removing and/or simplifying text to improve the chapters readability;

- Consequential amendments (i.e. to allow reference to the new provisions in the chapter and remove content that is no longer relevant); and
- Grammatical updates for consistency across the chapter.

13 A copy of the proposed revisions to the chapter (shown as track changes) is contained in Appendix One and an evaluation of the proposed amendments is provided at para. 36-41 below.

1(iii) Transfer of context and process-related provisions contained in the SASM chapter to the Mana Whenua chapter

14 This matter was discussed at length. Both Parties agreed that there is value in introducing some high-level SASM-related provisions to the MW chapter, but they had differing views on how this should impact the SASM chapter.

15 Both Parties consider it possible to include provisions explaining the bespoke SASM approach taken by the PDP to the MW chapter. This would provide high level context and process direction to plan users on the scope of provisions in the SASM chapter.

16 Ms Beran and Ms Bennett both agree that including provisions of this nature in the MW chapter will likely require consequential amendments to be made to the SASM chapter to ensure that there is no duplication or contradictions that would reduce the usability or conciseness of the Plan. Additionally, amendments to several other Plan chapters may be required to ensure that the links between the SASM-related provisions embedded throughout the Plan still function as intended.

17 The Parties, however, have differing views on to what extent the SASM chapter should be amended; with Ms Bennett proposing it be retained with minor amendments, and Ms Beran proposing its removal in its entirety in place of a new 'Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values' chapter.

18 Ms Bennett supports the inclusion of some SASM-related provisions in the MW chapter on the proviso that the integrity of the SASM chapter is protected. From Ms Bennett's perspective, the SASM chapter plays an important role in both the PDP, and in connecting the management of Ngāi Tahu cultural values back to higher order documents.

19 Based on this view, Ms Bennett considers the most appropriate way to split provisions between the SASM and MW chapters is to focus the SASM chapter on how Ngāi Tahu cultural values are managed at a functional level (i.e. provisions that relate directly to resource consenting decisions). This would

leave provisions focusing on strategic matters, or why Ngāi Tahu cultural values are managed in this way, to be addressed in the MW chapter. Specifically, Ms Bennett considers it appropriate to move SASM-O1 from the SASM chapter to the MW chapter, subject to minor wording amendments. This recommendation is discussed in more detail in the HS8 SASM Hearing Report.

- 20 Ms Beran holds a different view on this matter. As outlined at para. 4 & 5 above, at the direction of Hokonui Rūnanga, Ms Beran has been exploring the option of replacing the SASM chapter with a 'cultural values' chapter (titled 'NTCV - Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values'). This chapter aims to clearly explain mana whenua relationships and duties associated with the district, and at a practical level, set out in plain language when resource consent applicants need to consider Ngāi Tahu cultural values.
- 21 A key concern raised by Hokonui Rūnanga is that attempting to make the approach taken in the PDP behave like a SASM approach is not appropriate, as fundamentally mana whenua have no interest (at this point in time) in pursuing a 'sites of significance' approach. This is because a geographic delineation approach does not support mana whenua holistic relationships with te taiao (the environment). From a planning perspective, Ms Beran agrees with Hokonui Rūnanga that, where provisions that appear like a SASM approach cause confusion and uncertainty for plan users, these need to be tested against alternative approaches that may be clearer.
- 22 Based on Hokonui Rūnanga revised direction, Ms Beran has reviewed the National Planning Standards to see if the inclusion of an alternative cultural values chapter (instead of a SASM chapter) is a feasible option. She found that, under Section 7 District-wide Matters Standard, Direction 18 allows for the inclusion of additional chapters (under 'historic and cultural values' chapter) to address other historical and cultural values on a district-wide basis. Further, the inclusion of a SASM chapter is not a mandatory requirement¹⁸ and the matters outlined in Direction 17 only need to be located in the SASM chapter if they are addressed. Ms Beran notes that the notified SASM chapter only addresses one of the matters outlined in Direction 17, being provisions to manage SASM, which are all overarching in nature and do not directly relate to specific sites of significance in the district.
- 23 As part of her review of the National Planning Standards, Ms Beran sought guidance from several supporting documents published by the Ministry for the

¹⁸ Section 4 District Plan Structure Standard, mandatory direction 3 states 'unless otherwise specified, chapters and sections that are grey in table 4 must be included if relevant to the district plan, in the order shown.' In table 4, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori is shown in grey text.

Environment (MfE)¹⁹ to better understand the sites of significance approach (SASM). She found several references to the identification process for SASM, which, in her opinion, appears to be a key component of a SASM approach. Notable references found in these documents are as follows;

*‘sites and areas of significance to Māori are distinguishable from historic heritage as they **require a particular process of identification** (emphasis added) and may require ongoing management, rather than protection’.*²⁰

*‘it is our clear expectation that tangata whenua would have been involved in any such [identification] process. This will help to ensure that **sites are accurately identified** (emphasis added), and that knowledge is not shared unintentionally’.*²¹

- 24 Overall, it is Ms Beran’s opinion that there is the ability to replace the current SASM with a bespoke cultural values chapter under the National Planning Standards. Based on her review of relevant MfE supporting documents, she also considers it to be a more appropriate way to convey to plan users the approach that has been taken in the PDP for managing Ngāi Tahu cultural values across the district in resource consenting processes (i.e. utilising ‘matters of discretion’ attached to activity rules, as opposed to managing values associated with sites).
- 25 Further, through the work undertaken in response to this Minute, Ms Beran considers that the remaining provisions intended for the notified SASM chapter are generally broad enough (i.e. given they do not directly relate to the protection or management of specific SASM in the district), to be transferred across to the proposed cultural values chapter. She considers that they would provide overarching direction to the relevant provisions in other chapters of the PDP that enable consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values throughout the district (particularly controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules where specific Ngāi Tahu cultural values matters of discretion are attached). However, Ms Beran considers that several small consequential amendments are required to the notified SASM provisions to allow this proposed retrofit.
- 26 A copy of the proposed ‘Ngāi Tahu cultural values chapter’, which is supported by Hokonui Rūnanga, is contained in **Appendix Two**, for the panel’s

¹⁹ The National Planning Standards guidance for District Plans Structure and Chapter Standards and 2E Chapter Standards recommendations on submissions report for the first set of National Planning Standards, 2019

²⁰ The National Planning Standards guidance for District Plans Structure and Chapter Standards, Historical and cultural values, page 8

²¹ 2E Chapter Standards recommendations on submissions report for the first set of National Planning Standards 5.5.3 Analysis, amendments to ‘sites of significance to Māori’ section, Page 43

consideration and an evaluation of the proposed replacement chapter is provided at para. 43 below.

1(iv) Drafting of any context and process-related provisions, including consideration of any context and process-related provisions based on considering available examples in other plans that have utilised the National Planning Standards directions (e.g. Otago Regional Policy Statement)

27 The Parties jointly propose the following provisions for inclusion at the end of the MW chapter:

MW-O1	Resource management in the Gore District reflects the collaborative and transparent working relationship between Council and mana whenua, prioritising the prosperity of the district, alongside the ability for mana whenua to exercise their rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga responsibilities.
MW- O2	Resource management decisions in the Gore District reflect the relationships mana whenua hold with all land, waterbodies, natural features, and their affiliated cultural developments (such as marae, urupā, Māori Purpose Zones) within the district.
MW-P1	Impacts on relevant Ngāi Tahu cultural values are generally considered when resource consent is required for the following types of activities: a) Activities in close proximity to rivers or streams; b) Land disturbance (earthworks) above permitted activity levels, or with heightened sedimentation risks; c) Some activities breaching bulk, location, or height standards; d) Some activities within a zone that do not hold a permitted activity status, including unanticipated activities within a prescribed zone; e) Some activities within ONF/L overlays; f) Some permanent structures in the NOSZ; g) Temporary activities with extended durations, or potential to cause long-term environmental effects; h) Some activities breaching maximum noise limits; i) Significant expansion to existing infrastructure; j) Some telecommunications infrastructure; k) New roads that don't meet standard design requirements;

	l) Large-scale quarrying activities; m) Subdivision in Development Area 1 and 2, or impacting notable trees; n) Tikanga-related activities, including some activities in the MPZ and the installation of cultural markers; o) Major events that don't meet event standards requirements for FDZ.
MW-P2	Council will maintain or establish processes that: a) Give effect to the Charter of Understanding held between Council and Hokonui Rūnanga; b) Enable Hokonui Rūnanga to actively contribute to decision-making in an efficient manner from the earliest stage practicable; and c) Where appropriate, facilitate efficient and effective processes for resource consent applicants to engage with Hokonui Rūnanga in a best practice manner, including by actively encouraging pre-application engagement.
MW-P3	Where Ngai Tahu values must be considered, mātauranga Māori and mana whenua perspectives will be incorporated into decision-making by: a) Taking into account relevant iwi and hapū planning documents; and b) Requiring an Accidental Discovery Protocol to be adopted as part of earthworks-related resource consents (see MW-4.1); and c) Considering advice received from Hokonui Rūnanga regarding potential impacts of activities, such as those listed in MW-P1, on Ngāi Tahu values, and potential mitigation options

Table 1- MW chapter agreed provisions

28 Ms Bennett and Ms Beran did not reach agreement on the provisions contained in table 2 below, which are proposed by Ms Beran and supported by Hokonui Rūnanga (as co-author of the chapter). The additional provisions (methods) are intended to assist with the practical implementation of the policies proposed in the MW chapter. Given the level of detail contained in each provision and the linkage to the policies in the MW chapter, Ms Beran considers that they should be included as methods (rather than additional policies). Regarding proposed method, MW-M1 (cultural impact assessment requirements), Ms Beran notes that Hokonui Rūnanga specifically raised this matter with her and as a result, this provision seeks to provide clear guidance to resource consent applicants

as to when a cultural impact assessment could be required from Hokonui Rūnanga.

- 29 MW-M2 is intended to signal to plan users that information resources regarding the consultation process with rūnanga and how the PDP provides for Ngāi Tahu cultural values will be available to further assist with implementation of the PDP provisions, while MW-M3 encourages education training opportunities for Council staff to build on their cultural competency as a way to enable consistent administration of the PDP and build on the relationships between Council and Rūnanga. Ms Beran notes that the option of developing potential information resources for the general public was openly discussed by the panel at the mana whenua chapter hearing (HS3) and understands it is a matter that Hokonui Rūnanga is currently undertaking work on internally (i.e. developing resources for the rūnanga website).
- 30 Ms Beran understands that at the time of drafting this response, Ms Bennett holds concerns that introducing a new type of provision (methods) could create confusion for plan users and considers the below matters should sit outside the PDP, in a different document (such as a formal agreement process between Council and Rūnanga, or publicly available educational resources). Ms Bennett also considers that some of the proposed methods create duplication with the agreed proposed policies. For these reasons, Ms Bennett considers it more appropriate to incorporate some aspects of the proposed methods into policies in the interests of plan conciseness and legibility. Ms Bennet also notes that methods are not considered at the time of resource consent while policies are which is particularly relevant to proposed MW-M1 relating to resource consent requirements.
- 31 For the reasons outlined in para. 28, Ms Beran considers it necessary to include these provisions as methods. In terms of the potential to create confusion for plan users, given the unique nature of the MW chapter, being the only introductory chapter in the PDP that solely contains process and context focused provisions, Ms Beran does not agree that the methods will create confusion but instead will provide more certainty to plan users as to how the policies will be implemented and provides practical direction to Council and Rūnanga implementing the provisions.

MW-M1	Cultural Impact Assessment Requirements Where resource consent is required for any activity identified in MW-P1 and impacts on Ngai Tahu Values need to be considered, Hokonui Rūnanga will consider the following key matters in
-------	---

	determining the appropriateness of preparing a Cultural Impact Assessment report: - The application is for a large, intensive or complex project. - The activity is not anticipated at the proposed location or zone and may be precedent setting. - The application does not include sufficient information to determine potential impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. - New or additional research is required to determine impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. Cultural impact assessment reports are an effective means of providing cultural input, mainly with respect to resource consent applications under the RMA. Such reports can form part of a resource consent application's assessment of environmental effects. While reports may be requested by an applicant as part of pre-resource consent consultation or a resource consent assessment of effects, it is Hokonui Rūnanga that will advise if a cultural impact assessment is required. The costs associated with preparing the report are met by the applicant.
MW-M2	Information Resources The Council and Hokonui Rūnanga will work together to develop information resources (such as a information brochure and/or a website page), to communicate to plan users (including resource consent applicants): - the approach that has been taken in the Plan to recognise and provide for mana whenua values held within the Gore district; and - the process for resource consent applicants to engage with Hokonui Runanga.
MW-M3	The Council will encourage staff to undertake education and training programmes to improve awareness and knowledge of tikanga and mana whenua relationships and associations with the district, including in: - Accidental discovery protocol; - Ngāi Tahu cultural values; - Te taiao matters of interest to mana whenua; - Iwi Management Plans.

Table 2- MW provisions requested by Ms Beran and Hokonui Rūnanga

1(v) A s32AA assessment of any drafted provisions

- 32 The following evaluates the process and context related provisions proposed to be included in the MW chapter by Ms Bennett and Ms Beran under section 32AA of the RMA:

Context and Process Provisions MW Chapter

- 33 The proposed new provisions provide certainty for plan users, including resource consent applicants, in terms of how the content in the chapter is applied throughout the PDP. Another benefit of the changes sought is that decision makers have clearer direction when making decisions on resource consent applications that impact Ngāi Tahu cultural values, enabling more efficient and effective decision-making processes. The provisions also provide clear direction to plan users as to how Council and Rūnanga will work together to establish processes that implement the matters covered in the chapter (which flow into the other chapters). Overall, the proposed provisions are considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
- 34 The following evaluates the additional provisions (methods) sought by Ms Beran and Hokonui Rūnanga (as co-author of the chapter) for inclusion in the MW chapter, under section 32AA of the RMA:

Methods

- 35 The inclusion of the new methods will assist with the practical implementation of the policies in the chapter, enabling Council to consistently administer the MW chapter provisions. As an example, MW-M1 provides certainty to resource consent applicants and decision makers (that need to consider Ngāi Tahu cultural values), instances when more robust consultation may be required with Runanga (by way of a cultural impact assessment), thereby enabling more efficient resource consenting processes. Overall, the proposed provisions are considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
- 36 The following evaluates the minor revisions sought by Ms Beran to the MW chapter, under section 32AA of the RMA:

Overview

- 37 The proposed amendments remove wording that sets out the prescribed requirements of the National Planning Standards (for the MW chapter) and replaces it with a condensed summary that sets out the intent of the chapter and key sections contained in it. The benefits of the changes sought to this section is that plan users (including decision makers) have clearer direction and certainty about the content covered off in the chapter and its location and provides reference to relevant chapters (including Ngāi Tahu cultural values chapter), to support consistent administration of the PDP.

Accidental Discovery Protocol

- 38 The proposed additional text provides contact information for Hokonui Rūnanga at the beginning of the section so that plan users know to contact the Rūnanga should any potential discovery be made. Whilst the notified chapter sets out in detail the ADP process, providing contact details upfront encourages plan users to seek direct assistance from the Rūnanga if there is any uncertainty about the ADP or other related matters.

Removal of duplicated or outdated content

- 39 The proposed amendments to part 2 of the chapter include removing the explanation provided for the term ‘mana whenua’ which is considered to be duplicated content, noting similar explanations are provided at sections 2.2 and 2.4.2 and the PDP also includes a definition for ‘mana whenua’. Further changes sought includes removing the example provided under section 2.4 as it refers to the SASM chapter which is proposed to be replaced by a new bespoke cultural values chapter (as outlined above) and would be outdated content if the SASM chapter is replaced. The changes sought will provide greater guidance to plan users and ensure that PDP provisions are correctly interpreted by removing potential confusion created through the duplicated and outdated content.

Replacing use of first-person pronouns and addition to Mātaaitai content

- 40 The chapter includes the pronoun ‘our’ throughout sections 2 and 3, which implies that these sections of the chapter have been written in the first person (but not the other parts of the chapter). This is inconsistent with the writing style used in other parts of the chapter as well as other chapters of the PDP. The removal and replacement of ‘our’ with more consistent language (e.g. the) improves readability and overall interpretation of the chapter. At section 2.4.1, the chapter includes an explanation of the freshwater mātaaitai that applies to the Mātaura River but misses relevant references to sections of the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act (NTCSA) that recognise Ngāi Tahu rights and interests in customary fisheries. It is considered that this omission needs to be addressed as the NTCSA is applicable to the freshwater mechanism (sections 297-311) and therefore should be outlined to plan users.
- 41 Overall, the requested changes are considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
- 42 The following evaluates the proposed replacement ‘Ngāi Tahu cultural values’ chapter (instead of the SASM chapter), under section 32AA of the RMA:

New Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values Chapter

- 43 The proposed cultural values chapter will remove existing ambiguity associated with the notified SASM chapter (as indicated in submissions and feedback received from plan users) and will clarify the approach taken in the plan (to recognise and provide for Ngāi Tahu cultural values in resource consenting), being a whole of district approach that enables the consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values through matters of discretion attached to controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules. The change will also remove the complexities that come with trying to apply a sites of significance approach across the entire district, when fundamentally the SASM approach involves identification and management of particular sites or areas (larger sites). The new chapter will also enable consistent administration of the PDP by avoiding uncertainty on how the provisions in the chapter support provisions in other chapters (including activity rules) across the PDP and assist with more efficient and effective decision making. Overall, the inclusion of the new cultural values chapter is considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

Consequential amendments

- 44 As a consequence of the proposed replacement of the SASM chapter with the Ngāi Tahu cultural values chapter, several small changes are proposed in relation to objective 1 and policy 4. Regarding objective 1 (currently objective 2 in the notified SASM chapter), the removal of the term 'tangata whenua' is proposed to give clarity and certainty to plan users (including decision makers) that the chapter is focused on enabling mana whenua values across the district and no other group. In addition, the use of the term 'tangata whenua' in the PDP and the different rights and responsibilities held by 'mana whenua' and 'tangata whenua' was explored in detail through evidence made on the MPZ and also at the respective hearing, with agreement reached by both Ms Bennett and Ms Beran, that a clear distinction between the two groups needs to be conveyed in the PDP. As such, it is considered that removing 'tangata whenua' from the objective is also a consequential amendment following the outcomes reached at the MPZ hearing. The reasons for the amendment proposed to policy 4 are similar, as the more generic term 'Māori' has been replaced by 'mana whenua' for all the same reasons outlined above. Overall, the amendments will enable consistent administration of the PDP and remove any ambiguity. As such the changes are considered to be a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

Direction 2

2(i) The extent to which the re-drafted policy would satisfy relief sought by Hokonui Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

The Panel has identified potential to streamline the policy wording as follows:

The Council will:

A. Work with Hokonui Rūnanga to continue cultural assessment work across the district, utilising tools preferred by Hokonui Rūnanga; and

B. Consider any request of Hokonui Rūnanga for a plan change incorporating outcomes of cultural assessment undertaken in accordance with A.

46 Ms Beran notes that the policy contained in Minute 15 is not the most recent version of the provision, which was further revised and agreed on by both Hokonui Rūnanga and Council prior to the commencement of the MW chapter hearing (held in July 2024). For completeness, the latest proposed policy is as follows:

(i) The Council will:

A. Work with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc to:

- 1. facilitate the continuation of cultural assessment work across the district.*
- 2. Investigate opportunities to develop additional cultural landscape tools as part of the assessment work.*
- 3. Prepare an evaluation report pursuant to section 32 RMA in relation to the additional cultural landscape tools arising from the cultural assessment work described 1. and 2.*

B. Consider whether it is necessary to prepare and notify a plan change incorporating outcomes of the assessments and investigations in A. above to ensure the PDP provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

C. Use an Āpiti Hono Tātai Hono Approach for A. above.

47 Ms Beran discussed the proposed future work policy (including proposed streamlined rewording) in detail with Hokonui Rūnanga during a meeting held on 23 October 2024. From these discussions, Hokonui Rūnanga has given Ms Beran clear direction that in light of the substantive work that

is currently being progressed (in relation to both the MW chapter and SASM chapter), mana whenua has had a change in position in regard to the proposed policy in the PDP, as instead of continuing to support its inclusion, Hokonui Rūnanga now supports the introduction of the new cultural values chapter (in place of the SASM chapter) along with the changes sought to the mana whenua chapter, as being the most appropriate way to recognise and provide for mana whenua rights and interests in the PDP.

- 48 In addition, Hokonui Rūnanga have advised Ms Beran that mana whenua are committed to further building on the relationship they have recently established with the local farming community (through Federated Farmers Southland) and as an act of good faith, Hokonui Rūnanga has sought to address the communities' concerns regarding the uncertainty associated with the policy by no longer pursuing the policy in the PDP. Should in the future, it be determined that the proposed approach to manage Ngāi Tahu cultural values in the PDP is not the most appropriate, Ms Beran understands that Hokonui Rūnanga will utilise the existing relationship it holds with Council (i.e. through the Charter of Understanding) to collaboratively work together to find an appropriate solution.

Direction 2(ii) the location of this policy within the plan, with reference to comments on Direction 1 above.

- 49 As outlined above, Hokonui Rūnanga has changed its position on the requested policy and as a result, is no longer seeking its inclusion in the PDP. As such, consideration of this matter is no longer relevant.

29 October 2024



Expert name



Expert name

Appendix One (of Appendix D) – Hokonui Rūnanga Proposed amendments to PDP MW – Mana Whenua Chapter

MANA WHENUA - MW

1. Overview

The content of this Chapter has been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Standards to include:

1. ~~Recognition of hapū and iwi~~

- ~~(a) A history of the hapū or iwi within the District;~~
- ~~(b) The relationship of hapū or iwi with their takiwā;~~
- ~~(c) Environmental management perspectives and values of hapū or iwi;~~
- ~~(d) A description of resources of significance to tangata whenua or mana whenua;~~
- ~~(e) Where agreed with the iwi authorities, a list of relevant iwi authorities. Where possible this should include links to iwi authority websites;~~
- ~~(f) where agreed with iwi authorities, a description of the relationship of hapū or iwi with ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga, and interests in resource management~~
- ~~(g) An explanation of how hapū or iwi values have been considered when preparing the Policy Statement or Plan, or are reflected in the Policy Statement or Plan;~~
- ~~(h) An overview of resource management arrangements from any Treaty settlement and post-Treaty settlement agreements;~~
- ~~(i) A list of any Statutory Acknowledgements for the District and Region, and a brief explanation of how they affect the Policy Statement or Plan and are reflected in Policy Statement or Plan Provisions. Where possible this should include a link to the relevant Statutory Acknowledgement Legislation;~~

2. ~~Tangata whenua/mana whenua – Local Authority relationships~~

- ~~(a) A list of formal relationships agreements between tangata whenua/mana whenua and the Local Authority as they relate to resource management functions. These may include memoranda of understanding, mana whakahono a rohe or iwi participation arrangements, co-management agreements,~~

~~joint management agreements, or transfer of powers under RMA section 33. Where agreed with tangata whenua/mana whenua this list should include links to these relationship agreement documents;~~

~~3. — Hapū and iwi planning documents~~

~~(a) — A list of hapū or iwi planning documents lodged with the Local Authority. Where agreed with tangata whenua/mana whenua this should include links to the planning documents;~~

~~(b) — A description of how the Local Authority has taken the hapū or iwi planning documents into account in the Policy Statement or Plan;~~

~~(c) — An explanation of how hapū or iwi planning documents are used;~~

~~(d) — If relevant and agreed, parts of the hapū or iwi planning documents;~~

~~4. — Involvement and participation with tangata whenua/mana whenua~~

~~(a) — Any specific involvement and participation or RMA consultation processes with tangata whenua/mana whenua: required by the RMA, in relationship agreements, or in hapū or iwi planning documents;~~

~~(b) — A description of best practice involvement, participation or RMA consultation processes with hapū or iwi, as agreed with specific hapū or iwi. This may include a link or reference to external best practice processes documents;~~

~~(c) — An explanation of the purpose of any involvement, participation or RMA consultation processes; and~~

~~(d) — How the involvement, participation or RMA consultation processes are given effect to.~~

~~This chapter contains no objectives, policies, rules or standards so is given effect to throughout the other chapters of the District Plan.~~

~~This introductory chapter provides a location for context and process-related mana whenua provisions, while all other mana whenua provisions are located throughout the Gore District Plan²².~~

~~For example, the Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values Chapter contains overarching provisions that direct the ways in which other chapters in the Plan provide for Ngāi Tahu~~

²² 6. Introduction and General Provisions, Standard 25. The provisions under the mana whenua heading must only include context and process related provisions. Other mana whenua provisions must be integrated throughout the policy statement or plan where the local authority determines it is appropriate, and 1. Foundation Standard, Mandatory Direction 5. Mana whenua content must be integrated throughout the policy statement or plan where the local authority determines it appropriate.

cultural values in the resource consenting process and contains practical information for consent applicants regarding when activities undertaken in the district need to consider the impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. In addition, the Māori Purpose Zone Chapter enables a range activities to be undertaken in established Māori Purpose zones in recognition of mana whenua customs, traditions and relationships with the district and to provide for their wellbeing.

Hokonui Rūnanga co-drafted the content of this chapter with Gore District Council to ensure that their interests are accurately reflected in this chapter.

This chapter contains the following sections, with accompanying provisions located at the end of the chapter:

- Recognition of hapū and iwi
- Mana whenua- Local Authority relationships
- Hapū and Iwi planning documents
- Involvement and participation with mana whenua.

The provisions contained in this chapter provide plan users with guidance on the way in which in which mana whenua values and interests are provided for and protected in resource management processes.

Note on dialect: In Ngāi Tahu/ Kāi Tahu dialect, 'k' is used interchangeably with 'ng'. This Plan has predominantly used the 'ng' spelling of words (e.g. mahinga kai), but it is also common and correct to see and use the 'k' spelling (e.g. mahika kai).

2. Recognition of hapū and iwi

2.1 Pepeha

Ko aku waka whakairo ko Takitimu ko Uruao

Kei runga ko Ōparure

Kei raro ko Mātaura e rere ki te moana o te Ara a Kiwa Ko Maruawai taku whenua taurikura e takoto nei

Takoto mai ko Matamata, te mōkai tapu ō Rakitauneke, te taniwha

Ko Te Au-nui Pihapha Kanakana te rere

Ko Hoka-nui, Kowhaka-ruru, Tarahau-kapiti ngā puke Ko Tūtemakohu raua ko Te Rakitauneke ngā tīpuna

Tū mai ko O Te Ika Rama, te whakaruruhau o te mano

Tēnei te reo ō Waitaha, Ngāti Māmoe, Ngāti Kuri, Ngāi Tahu ngā iwi

~~The term ‘mana whenua’ refers to a specific Māori kinship group who have customary authority over, and a responsibility to, a particular geographic area and its resources. Mana whenua have a deep relationship with their natural environment, and specific rights and responsibilities to contribute to environmental decision-making, entrenched in tikanga Māori, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and various legislation. It is this relationship and right that obligates mana whenua to advocate for and protect their natural environment. In the context of the Gore District, Ngāi Tahu whānui are recognised as mana whenua, and are represented locally by Hokonui Rūnanga.~~

2.2 Ngāi Tahu Whānui, Hokonui Rūnanga, and the Gore District

Ngāi Tahu – and by extension, Hokonui Rūnanga - has centuries’ long customary associations, rights, relationships and interests in the Gore District and its taonga/resources. These relationships are both historical and contemporary, and include whakapapa, place names, mahinga kai, tribal economic development, and landholdings. ~~In our takiwā (area)~~ Within the district, Hokonui Rūnanga represent *mana whenua*, so exercise rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga for the taiao (*environment*), and those species that live within it, in formal processes, and support whānau members to exercise these rights and responsibilities in other contexts.

Ngāi Tahu ~~have a long history and relationship with the region spanning centuries~~ historic relationship with the district included extended periods of settled occupation (e.g. Tutarau) coupled with seasonal practices (e.g. at Te Au Nui Pihapiha Kanakana/Mataura Falls). Tūpuna and their histories are eternally acknowledged in - in the form of wāhi ingoa, or place names that remain in the landscape. This connection also spans a continuum of time and whakapapa with metaphysical and physical elements binding ~~us~~ Ngāi Tahu whānui with the land, *waters*, and taonga/resources of the region. Hapū and whānau retain historical and contemporary links with mahinga kai sites in the region, especially where customary practices can be continued.

Ngāi Tahu history cloaks the landscape, comprising of many memories and layers that evolve with each generation. These memories build the collective connection to place, as well as associated cultural heritage and identity. This history is not static – it grows with each day. One place of particular importance is the Hokonui Hills. The Hokonui Hills tell the story of the tupuna Te Rakitauneke, the Kāti Māmoe chief whose famous taniwha/spiritual guardian Matamata now forms the profile of the Hokonui Hills. Matamata formed the Hokonui Hills after he turned to stone on learning of the death of Te Rakitauneke. Another is Te Au Nui Pihapiha Kanakana/Mataura Falls. Whilst Paroparo Te Whenua, a historic Kāti Māmoe rangitira/leader, camped near Haumuri (modern-day Croydon Bush) it rained heavily, causing the Mataura River to flood. After the flood had receded, Paroparo Te Whenua noticed birds gathering at Te Au Nui Pihapiha Kanakana. He sent some of his people to investigate, and they found that the birds were feasting on a large number of kanakana/lamprey eels that had been left stranded by the receding flood waters. Since that time, generations of Waitaha, Kāti Māmoe, and Ngāi Tahu have gathered kanakana for their whānau from Te Au Nui Pihapiha Kanakana. Tutarau Māori Reserve also holds an important place in the landscape due to its status as an historic kaik/settlement and battle site.

Many important taonga tuku iho, sites, ara tawhito, and resources cross the region, and regardless of the condition they may now be in, or the value on which the wider community places on them, they remain important to Ngāi Tahu identity and ~~our~~ sense connection and relationship with place. Cultural and economic redress from the Ngāi Tahu Treaty Settlement in 1998, O Te Ika Rama Marae, and the establishment of the first *freshwater* mātaītai in New Zealand at Mātaura, continue to build the modern history of Ngāi Tahu in the region - as do ~~our~~ long-standing Ngāi Tahu residents, and the contributions Hokonui Rūnanga make to the wider community.

2.3 Mana Whenua and Te Taiao Cultural Values

Hokonui Rūnanga hold a range of overarching values for environmental decision-making. These overarching values are grounded in Ngāi Tahu cultural values. Some of these are listed below:

Kaitiakitanga: Kaitiakitanga governs the way humans interact with ecosystems. The notions of reciprocity and maintaining balance within nature underpin Ngāi Tahu uses and practices. Balance requires respect to be shown when interacting with the *environment* and use of the resource (within limits) afforded by healthy ecosystems. Ngāi Tahu whānui continue to have a duty to protect the natural world they are part of. Hokonui Rūnanga, as kaitiaki, work actively to ensure that ecological, spiritual, cultural, and mahinga kai values of ~~the our~~ takiwā are upheld and sustained for future generations.

Whakapapa: In a Māori worldview, everything has its own whakapapa (genealogy). Whakapapa is about the relationships between all life forms and phenomena, as well as to people and atua (deities). Whakapapa describes bonds, relationships, and connections: the linking of all things. No distinction is made between the inanimate and the animate, or between abiotic and biotic. Māori relationships with the world are part of this indivisible whakapapa linkage. For Hokonui Rūnanga, *water* is the medium flowing through the takiwā that makes these connections. Whakapapa is also central to mahinga kai activities, which like many other activities, are built around collective action when using sites.

Mauri: Mauri is a central component of Māori perspectives on the *environment*. It can be defined as the life principle, life supporting capacity, or life force present in all things. Protecting the mauri of a resource is a fundamental management principle for Māori. Hokonui Rūnanga treasure the mauri of *freshwater*, land, and other resources, and experience cultural harm, offence, and distress when that mauri is degraded. The overuse, depletion, or destruction of natural resources leads to a diminishment of mauri. This is unacceptable to us. Any alteration of the natural *environment*, including impacts on flora and fauna, *water*, or earth will have an effect on their mauri. Mauri was historically protected through application of a complex system of specific cultural and spiritual practices, customs, and rules that were developed to manage and control the interactions between people and the natural world. The protection of the mauri of the *environment* is vital to Hokonui Rūnanga.

Manaakitanga: Showing manaaki (looking after visitors) is a key expression of Māori identity. Having the ability to manaaki visitors by supplying kai (food) sourced from our takiwā is a major part of this expression. This means that the communal activities of fishing, eeling, and gathering other resources are acts that reinforce our identity. Conversely, the inability to manaaki guests and sustain relationships can lead to a loss of identity. Sustaining *waters*, lands, and resources - and thereby enabling *mana whenua* to manaaki others - is a strong driver for the participation of Hokonui Rūnanga in environmental

management. Manaakitanga also includes caring and providing for those who live within ~~the our~~ takiwā, including mātāwaka Māori communities and their ability to engage in cultural practices whilst living in the Gore District.

Wairua: Whānau use different methods to feel spiritually connected with ~~the our~~ takiwā. Gathering kai with whānau at traditional fishing places that ~~have been identified we know were named~~ by ~~our~~ tipuna and utilised by successive generations of ~~our~~ whānau is one way. Being able to contribute delicacies that ~~our the~~ takiwā is renowned for to cultural events, and to manaaki guests can also bring that connection. Conversely, being denied these opportunities can impact the spiritual wellbeing of ~~our~~ whānau.

Whanaungatanga: Whanaungatanga refers to the kinship, connectedness, and inter-dependence between all things within the natural world - including people. Whanaungatanga in its broadest context could be defined as the interrelationship with ancestors, whānau, hapū, and iwi, as well as the natural resources within the takiwā of Hokonui Rūnanga. *Sustainable management* seeks to sustain the health, wealth, and well-being of the natural *environment* while sustaining communities dependent upon it. Whanaungatanga is pervasive, and highlights the fact that relationships are everything. Therefore, having environmental management processes that provide for interrelationships is imperative for Hokonui Rūnanga.

Utu: Utu is sometimes referred to as the principle of reciprocity or equivalence, with some regarding its main purpose as maintaining relationships. In relation to a specific issue, utu can be thought of as restoring balance and thereby maintaining whanaungatanga. There are many pathways and responses by which utu is put into practice. Hokonui Rūnanga seek to explore the practice of utu in relation to environmental issues which may provide means of restoring balance in relationships and acknowledging the obligations on this generation to seek mutual benefits to achieve improved environmental outcomes.

Mātauranga: Interacting with the *environment* serves the functions of passing on traditional knowledge from one generation to the next. Mātauranga is developed and transmitted using natural resources, such as the practices of resource management, harvesting, and preparation. For example, a great deal of knowledge is needed to obtain kai: knowledge of techniques as well as ecosystems is vital. If populations of species and resources decline because of degraded *environments*, knowledge of the techniques of gathering these foods, along with the associated ecological and cultural knowledge, and the process of gathering, will likely also begin to disappear.

Te Reo Māori: Language use is instrumental to a culture. For Ngāi Tahu, this is reflected in the stories, waiata, and te reo Māori that pertain to uses and relationships with the *environment*. Te reo Māori contains knowledge and is another expression of culture and identity. Hokonui Runanga are actively supporting the revitalisation of te reo Māori in ~~the our~~ takiwā. ~~Again, using mahinga kai as an example, when a valued species disappears from a local ecosystem, or the activities.~~

Ki Uta Ki Tai: Ki uta ki tai is an environmental philosophy that recognises that everything is connected and must be managed as such. Ki uta ki tai reflects that *mana whenua* belong to the *environment* and are only borrowing the resources from ~~our~~ future generations that are yet to come. Ki uta ki tai is the basis of

Ngāi Tahu Iwi Management Plans (including Te Tangi a Tauira) and is recognised in the Southland Regional Policy Statement 2017 and National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020.

In line with the philosophy of ki uta ki tai, Hokonui Rūnanga consider all natural features & their associated resources to be ‘significant’. Ngāi Tahu, like other iwi, conceptualise the environment as an undivided entity. It is a cohesive system of lakes, rivers, wetlands, soils, plants, and animals (including humans), mountains and other terrestrial lands, and the relationships between them all. It is this holistic perspective that pervades mātauranga Māori: science based on observations, relationships, connections, and management practices refined over generations. For the purposes of this district plan, three broad areas and their specific significances are highlighted:

2.3.1 Wai / Water

Water is one of the most important elements within a Ngāi Tahu worldview. It gives life, can lift tapu, and links ~~the our~~ *environment* together from the mountains to the sea. Hokonui Rūnanga primary matters of interest in this area relate to *water* quality and quantity, and the current and historic mismanagement, *discharge*, and loss of pollutants into *groundwater*, *waterways*, and *wetlands*. These concerns also extend to Three Waters and their management. Hokonui Rūnanga expect transformational improvement to the management of *water* in ~~the-our~~ takiwā to recognise the paramount importance of *water*. Te Mana o Te Wai is the fundamental concept for freshwater management in New Zealand, and provides a framework for the hauora of water, people, and the environment to be protected.

2.3.2 Whenua / Land

Whenua is the embodiment of Papatūānuku – one of the primordial parents within Ngāi Tahu cosmology – and is of great significance to *mana whenua*. She is the sustainer of life, and plays a cleansing and grounding role within Ngāi Tahu tikanga. Most *land* in the Hokonui takiwā has been modified, predominantly for *primary production* which is a significant contributor to the degradation of *biodiversity*, soil, and *water*. Other *land* uses including forestry, general *earthworks*, mining, and waste and hazard management practices create similar issues. Hokonui Rūnanga supports the coupling of *land* use zoning with *land* capability to reduce the negative *effects* on soils from compaction, pollution/*contaminants*, *biodiversity* loss, and erosion. It is expected that improvements will be made across the district in *land* management practices to restore soil health with these improvements also having flow on *effects* for *water* and *biodiversity*. We also expect to see many of the systemic barriers to using Māori *land* reduced and removed, so that this land can be utilised to support whānau aspirations.

2.3.3 Mahinga Kai

Mahinga kai is an all-inclusive term that refers to the ability to access resources for harvesting, the *site* where gathering of these resources occurs, the act of gathering and using the resource, and the good health of the resource. As a result of this practical focus, mahinga kai is considered by Hokonui Rūnanga to be, in today’s language, the principal ‘environmental indicator’ in natural systems. If mahinga kai is not present, or is unsafe to harvest, then that natural system is under stress and requires remedial action. Mahinga kai was and is central to the Ngāi Tahu and Hokonui way of life. The collection and processing of

mahinga kai is an important social, cultural, environmental, and economic activity contributing to the overall well-being of Ngāi Tahu whānui. Mahinga kai practices rely on thriving and abundant *biodiversity*, safe and aesthetically pleasing places to practice, and the active transfer of knowledge between people. These attributes are dependent on the *sustainable management* of many other natural resources in the takiwā, especially waterbodies and the management of *stormwater*. Hokonui Rūnanga expect to be able to practice mahinga kai in ~~the our~~ takiwā at multiple locations that are deliberately selected for the quality of the resource and its ability to sustain itself.

2.4 Mana Whenua Recognition, & Involvement in Plan Preparation

Hokonui Rūnanga cultural values, concerns, rights and interests have been considered in preparation of the Plan through representation on the Gore District Council District Plan Review sub-committee, and through Hokonui Rūnanga co-drafting chapters of particular relevance to *mana whenua* (such as the Mana Whenua (MW), ~~Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM)~~ Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values (NTCV), and Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) chapters. Input from *mana whenua* has also been sought at a technical level on a matter-by-matter basis throughout the plan, and this input has informed the policy approach for these matters.

~~A specific example is the approach this plan has taken to acknowledging the relationships Ngāi Tahu hold with the natural environment is the SASM chapter. Instead of restricting the consideration of Ngāi Tahu cultural values to a discrete list of 'sites and Areas of Significance to Māori', the underlying relationship Ngāi Tahu hold with the natural environment is accounted for throughout the district via provisions spread throughout various chapters. These are then reinforced by objectives and policies in the SASM chapter. This ensures that this relationship is considered whenever a high-risk activity takes place—as opposed to considerations of Ngāi Tahu cultural values being restricted to selected locations. As per their Charter of Understanding Hokonui Rūnanga will provide expert advice to Council on if, and to what extent, a potential activity impacts on this relationship, and, where relevant, how a development or activity could be undertaken to be more responsive to the Ngāi Tahu cultural values that may be impacted.~~

2.4.1 Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 & Statutory Acknowledgement Areas and Mātaitai

The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998, in addition to recognising the rangatiratanga of Ngāi Tahu, includes specific provisions that provide for exercise of rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga of *mana whenua* in respect to resource management matters. The instrument established in this Act that is particularly relevant to Resource Management Act decision-making is Statutory Acknowledgements. These recognise the relationships Ngāi Tahu have with identified areas, in order to improve the effectiveness of Ngāi Tahu participation in resource management. The NTCSA 1998 also identifies certain indigenous species as taonga species - however, this list is not exclusive, and Ngāi Tahu values all indigenous species as taonga.

The Mataura River is listed under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 as a Statutory Acknowledgement Area (full listing available here: <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1998/0097/latest/DLM430875.html>). The Mataura is an important mahinga kai, noted for its indigenous fishery.

The Mataura Falls are particularly associated with the taking of kanakana (lamprey). When making decisions under the Resource Management Act 1991, Gore District Council must have regard to the statutory acknowledgement relating to the Mataura River in forming an opinion as to whether Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu is a person who may be adversely affected by the granting of a resource consent for activities within, adjacent to, or impacting directly on, the statutory area. If Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu is deemed to be potentially affected, Gore District Council must contact both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Hokonui Rūnanga.

Sections 297 to 311 of the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act include provisions recognising Ngāi Tahu rights and interests in customary fisheries and provide for involvement in the management of these resources through the Conservation Act 1987 and the Fisheries Act 1983 and 1996. The interests of Ngāi Tahu should be recognised and provided for when considering activities under the RMA that could impact on customary fisheries. Mātaitai are a mechanism under the Fisheries Act that provide for management of customary fisheries areas. Within the Gore District, the Mataura river is also home to the first freshwater mātaitai reserve in New Zealand, which centres on Te Au Nui Pihapiha Kanakana/Mataura Falls. This means that specific bylaws apply in this area under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. These are available here: <https://gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2009-go5831>

2.4.2 Relevant Iwi Authorities

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu is the mandated Iwi Authority for Ngāi Tahu whānui, and is governed by representatives from each of the 18 Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga. Papatipu Rūnanga are modern representative bodies of the Ngāi Tahu whānau and hapū who hold *mana whenua* over a particular area and their associated resources. Each Papatipu Rūnanga affiliates to a specific area, determined by natural boundaries such as mountain ranges and rivers. These areas are called takiwā and are defined in the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996. Within the boundaries of Gore District Council, Hokonui Rūnanga is the relevant Papatipu Rūnanga to engage with on matters relating to *mana whenua*. Hokonui Rūnanga are represented in district-level environmental planning processes by Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao. Their contact details are as follows:

Email: Hokonui.Office@ngaitahu.iwi.nz Phone:

032087954

Address: 140 Charlton Road, Gore 9774 Website:

<https://www.hokonuirunanga.org.nz/>

Gore District Council will engage with Hokonui Rūnanga in ways set out within the Charter of Understanding on all matters related to Ngāi Tahu cultural values and interests identified in this Plan, and will maintain regular and open communication regarding resource management matters and processes.

3. *Mana Whenua* – Local Authority relationships

Gore District Council is entering into a revitalised Te Tiriti-based relationship with Hokonui Rūnanga – their Treaty Partner. This relationship is grounded in partnership, collaboration, respect, and an acknowledgement of one another's roles, responsibilities, and mana within the region. The purpose of this relationship is to uphold each other's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, so that together, both the Council and Hokonui Rūnanga can positively contribute towards outcomes that benefit ~~the our~~ shared communities.

3.1 Formal Relationship Agreements

In 2021, Gore District Council and Hokonui Rūnanga signed a Charter of Understanding. This charter is underpinned by an agreed set of principles, understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities, and an implementation plan. As part of this Charter, Hokonui Rūnanga have the right to address any committee meeting or meeting of the full Council, and Hokonui Rūnanga will also extend invitations to Council representatives to attend Hokonui Rūnanga meetings to discuss matters relevant to the Charter and their relationship. Further to this, the Charter sets out methods for Hokonui Rūnanga to help inform Council's development of policies, plans, procedures, and have input into cultural matters at a project-specific level.

The Charter also confirms that Council will provide adequate resources to Hokonui Rūnanga to effectively facilitate their involvement in Council business as provided for in the Charter, and that both Parties will commit to, and support each others, upskilling to learn more about the other and to explore common areas of interest.

This Charter of Understanding has also been implemented through a Service Level Agreement between Gore District Council and Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao, to further cement the way both parties work together on day-to-day district planning matters.

Gore District Council is also a member of Te Rōpū Taiao, and is a signatory of its Charter of Understanding alongside Environment Southland, Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council, and the four Papatipu Rūnanga with mana whenua status in Murihiku Southland (of which Hokonui Rūnanga is one). Te Rōpū Taiao focuses on regional strategy and policy direction, and makes agreements regarding budget setting, accessing resources, and commitments for members.

4. Hapū and iwi planning documents

The following Iwi Authority-mandated planning document is relevant within the Gore district. Under sections 74(2A), and 104(1)(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991, these documents are relevant for Gore District Council to have regard to in resource consent application and district plan change processes.

- Te Tangi a Tauira: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource & Environmental Management Plan 2008

(<https://www.es.govt.nz/repository/libraries/id:26gi9ayo517q9stt81sd/hierarchy/about-us/plans-and-strategies/regional-plans/iwi-management-plan/documents/Te%20Tangi%20a%20Taura%20-%20The%20Cry%20of%20the%20People.pdf>)

This document has been taken into account during the drafting of policies within this district plan by incorporating Ngāi Tahu cultural values into the development of plan provisions.

4.1 Accidental Discovery Protocols

Hokonui Rūnanga welcomes the opportunity to assist with any possible discoveries made in the district. If in doubt, please contact the Hokonui Rūnanga office directly to report a potential discovery by phone or email, on:

032087954 or Hokonui.office@ngaitahu.iwi.nz

As stated in Te Tangi a Taura, there is the Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku Accidental Discovery Protocol. This is the process that must be followed if burial sites, or Ngāi Tahu artifacts are uncovered during *earthworks* or other activities. It is as follows:

Kōiwi accidental discovery. If Kōiwi (human skeletal remains) are discovered, then work shall stop immediately, and Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao will be advised. They will arrange a *site* inspection by the appropriate *tangata whenua* and their advisers, including statutory agencies, who will determine whether the discovery is likely to be extensive and whether a thorough *site* investigation is required. In recognition of Section 6 of the Resource Management Act (1991) and legal requirements under the Historic Places Act (1993) there is a requirement to consult the New Zealand Historical Places Trust when *archaeological sites* are disturbed without authorisation previously obtained. The New Zealand Police also need to be consulted if the discovery includes Kōiwi or human remains. Materials discovered will be handled and removed by Iwi responsible for the tikanga appropriate to their removal or preservation.

Taonga or artefact accidental discovery: Taonga or artefact material (e.g., pounamu / greenstone artefacts) other than Kōiwi will be treated in a similar manner so that their importance can be determined, and the *environment* recorded by qualified archaeologists alongside the appropriate *tangata whenua*.

In-situ (natural state) pounamu/greenstone accidental discovery: Pursuant to the Ngāi Tahu (Pounamu Vesting) Act 1997, all-natural state pounamu / greenstone in the Ngāi Tahu tribal area is owned by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. The Ngāi Tahu Pounamu Resource Management Plan provides for the following measures:

1. Any in-situ (natural state) pounamu / greenstone accidentally discovered should be reported to the Pounamu Protection Officer of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu as soon as is reasonably practicable. The Pounamu Protection Officer of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu will in turn contact the appropriate

Kaitiaki Rūnanga Papatipu; and

2. In the event that the finder considers the pounamu is at immediate risk of loss such as erosion, animal damage to the *site* or theft, the pounamu / greenstone should be carefully covered over and / or relocated to the nearest safe ground. The find should then be notified immediately to the Pounamu Protection Officer.

For further information please refer to the HNZPT Accidental Discovery Protocol

5. Involvement and Participation with Mana Whenua

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) imposes a number of statutory duties on the Gore District Council with respect to engagement with *mana whenua*, and recognition of cultural values and interests in resource management decision-making. These include:

1. Section 6(e) where persons exercising functions and powers under RMA must recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, *water*, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga;
2. Section 7 (a) where decision makers must have particular regard to kaitiakitanga;
3. Section 8 where persons exercising functions under the RMA shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi;
4. Schedule 1, clauses 3 and 3B where local authorities must consult with iwi authorities in preparing plans or plan changes; and
5. Schedule 1, clause 4A where, before notifying a proposed plan, a local authority must provide a copy to iwi authorities and have particular regard to any advice received from those iwi authorities.

In terms of sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8, engagement directly with *mana whenua* is recommended to ensure there is a shared understanding between Gore District Council and *mana whenua* of how these statutory duties are being upheld. In terms of Schedule 1 matters, there is already clear direction that Gore District Council must engage directly with *mana whenua* on these matters.

The Charter of Understanding and Service Level Agreement signed between Gore District Council and Hokonui Rūnanga gives further direction to the nature of *mana whenua* involvement and participation in Resource management at a day-to-day level. As discussed in MW-3.1, these documents confirm that Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao is the mandated organisation that Gore District Council will engage directly with on all resource management matters impacting *mana whenua*. Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao is then responsible for ensuring that their services accurately reflect the rights, interests, and aspirations of Ngāi Tahu whānui in the Gore District. The specific forms of engagement for different resource management matters will be jointly determined on a case-by-case basis, in line with both the Charter of Understanding and Service Level Agreement. Whilst the form of *mana whenua* engagement or participation may differ across various projects, the purpose always remains the same: to ensure *mana whenua* perspectives are accurately and meaningfully represented in

Council decision-making for resource management matters, as per their duties under both legislation and the Charter of Understanding.

5.1 Best Practice Engagement

Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao has published guidance on how to best engage with them on environmental matters. This guidance is applicable to both Gore District Council and the wider public and is based on a range of themes relating to meaningful Treaty-based partnership. It also includes a list of a list of Key Focus Areas for those planning to engage with Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao to adhere to. This guidance can be found on pages 15-17 of Te Kawa o Te Taiao, available here:

<https://www.hokonuirunanga.org.nz/kaupapa-taiao/te-kawa-o-te-taiao/>

Objectives

MW-O1 Resource management in the Gore District reflects the collaborative and transparent working relationship between Council and mana whenua, prioritising the prosperity of the district, alongside the ability for mana whenua to exercise their rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga responsibilities.

MW- O2 Resource management decisions in the Gore District reflect the relationships mana whenua hold with all land, waterbodies, natural features, and their affiliated cultural developments (such as marae, urupā, Māori Purpose Zones) within District.

Policies

MW-P1 The effects on relevant Ngāi Tahu cultural values are considered when resource consent is required for any of the following activities:

- d) Activities in close proximity to rivers or streams;
- e) Land disturbance (earthworks) above permitted activity levels, or with heightened sedimentation risks;
- f) Some activities breaching bulk, location, or height standards;
- g) Some activities within a zone that do not hold a permitted activity status, including unanticipated activities within a prescribed zone;
- h) Some activities within ONF/L overlays;
- i) Some permanent structures in the NOSZ;
- j) Temporary activities with extended durations, or potential to cause long-term environmental effects;

- k) Some activities breaching maximum noise limits;
- l) Significant expansion to existing infrastructure;
- m) Some telecommunications infrastructure;
- n) New roads that don't meet standard design requirements;
- o) Large-scale quarrying activities;
- p) Subdivision in Development Area 1 and 2, or impacting notable trees;
- q) Tikanga-related activities, including some activities in the MPZ and the installation of cultural markers;
- r) Major events that don't meet event standards requirements for FDZ

MW-P2 Council will maintain or establish processes that:

- s) Give effect to the Charter of Understanding held between Council and Hokonui Rūnanga;
- t) Enable Hokonui Rūnanga to actively contribute to decision-making in an efficient manner from the earliest stage practicable; and
- u) Where appropriate, facilitate efficient and effective processes for resource consent applicants to engage with Hokonui Rūnanga in a best practice manner.

MW-P3 When Ngai Tahu cultural values need to be considered, mātauranga Māori and mana whenua perspectives will be incorporated into decision-making by:

- d) Taking into account relevant iwi and hapū planning documents;
- e) Requiring an Accidental Discovery Protocol to be adopted as part of earthworks-related resource consents (see MW-4.1); and
- f) Reviewing advice received from Hokonui Rūnanga regarding potential impacts of activities, such as those listed in MW-P1 on Ngāi Tahu values, and potential mitigation options.

Methods

The following methods are practical ways in which Council will work in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga to support implementing the policies of this chapter to achieve the outcomes of the objectives.

Cultural Impact Assessment Requirement

MW- M1 Where resource consent is required for any activity identified in MW-P1 and impacts on Ngai Tahu Values need to be considered, Hokonui Rūnanga will consider the following key matters in determining the appropriateness of preparing a Cultural Impact Assessment report:

- e. The application is for a large, intensive or complex project.
- f. The activity is not anticipated at the proposed location or zone and may be precedent setting.
- g. The application does not include sufficient information to determine potential impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values.
- h. New or additional research is required to determine impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values.

Cultural impact assessment reports are an effective means of providing cultural input, mainly with respect to resource consent applications under the RMA. Such reports can form part of a resource consent application's assessment of environmental effects. While reports may be requested by an applicant as part of pre-resource consent consultation or a resource consent assessment of effects, it is Hokonui Rūnanga that will advise if a cultural impact assessment is required. The costs associated with preparing the report are met by the applicant.

Education/ Resources

MW-M2 The Council and Hokonui Rūnanga will develop information resources (such as brochures and a website page), to communicate to plan users (including resource consent applicants):

- 3. the approach that has been taken in the Plan to recognise and provide for Ngāi Tahu cultural values held within the Gore district; and
- 4. the process for resource consent applicants to engage with Hokonui Runanga.

MW-M3 The Council will encourage staff to undertake education and training programmes to improve awareness and knowledge of tikanga and mana whenua relationships and associations with the district, including in:

- 5. Accidental discovery protocol;
- 6. Ngāi Tahu cultural values;

7. Te taiao matters of interest to mana whenua;
8. Iwi Management Plans.

Appendix Two (of Appendix D) – Hokonui Rūnanga Proposed NTCV Ngāi Tahu Cultural Values Chapter

NTCV– NGĀI TAHU CULTURAL VALUES

Overview

For Ngāi Tahu whānui, all landscapes and elements of the natural *environment* are significant, given that within a Ngāi Tahu worldview all landscapes hold stories, histories, and whakapapa links to atua Māori (deities). Mana whenua therefore do not see themselves as separate from the natural world and their hauora (well-being) is linked to the hauora of te taiao (the natural environmental). Whakapapa and the duty to protect the mauri or life-supporting capacity of the whenua, awa and ecosystems, is at the heart of mana whenua identity and hauora (well-being).

Mana whenua are also users and developers of the resources within the district and hold a fundamental duty to ensure that there are opportunities for economic development and social and cultural wellbeing in Gore district. As such, Hokonui Rūnanga as rangatira takes responsibility for the well-being of Ngāi Tahu whānui and all who reside in the district. This includes supporting economic development, meaningful employment opportunities in ways which respect and restore the health of the whenua (land) and wai (water), protect remaining taonga species, wetlands, sites and landscapes and restores indigenous biodiversity.

For these reasons, Hokonui Rūnanga has opted to not include a ‘Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori’ chapter in the Plan, as listing specific sites or features within the district does not allow for consideration of the holistic relationships mana whenua hold with the district. Instead, Hokonui Rūnanga has worked together with the Council to develop this chapter which relates to the management of activities that have the potential to impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. This chapter contains overarching objectives and policies that direct the ways in which the Gore District Plan recognises and provides for Ngāi Tahu cultural values throughout the district. The below objectives and policies apply to activities throughout the district.

Information for Plan Users and Resource Consent Applicants

- Ngāi Tahu cultural values need to be considered when resource consent is required for any of the activities identified in the mana whenua chapter (refer to MW-P1).
- Where Ngāi Tahu cultural values need to be considered, this is indicated by a specific matter of discretion (e.g. that directly refers to Ngāi Tahu

cultural values), that is linked to a relevant rule (s) in other chapters of the Plan.

- **Note 1** below sets out all applicable chapters of the Plan that the provisions in this chapter link into.
- Where applicable, if an activity (as per MW-P1) can comply with the relevant permitted activity rule requirements, then Ngāi Tahu cultural values do not need to be considered regardless of the location of the activity.
- In some instances, Ngāi Tahu cultural values will need to be considered if resource consent is required for a discretionary or non-complying activity, noting that there are no restrictions on the Council's discretion for these activity types and a full assessment is required to determine whether these activities would be appropriate (in terms of the provisions of the Plan, the effects of the activity on the environment and suitability of the proposed location).
 - Refer to 'How the Plan Works' Chapter for further information on the activity classifications that apply in the District Plan.

Objectives

- NTCV-O1 Mana whenua traditional and contemporary relationships *with* land, *waterbodies*, *natural* features, and cultural structures are recognised, retained, and strengthened.
- NTCV-O2 Mātauranga Maori and rangatiratanga of mana whenua is recognised and provided for in decision-making where activities identified in MW-P1 impact on the following Ngāi Tahu cultural values:
- l) Kaitiakitanga;
 - m) Whakapapa;
 - n) Mauri;
 - o) Manaakitanga;
 - p) Wairua;
 - q) Whanaungatanga;
 - r) Utu;
 - s) Mātauranga;

- t) Te Reo Māori;
- u) Ki uta ki tai; and
- v) Mahinga kai;

Policies

- NTCV-P1 Enable land use, development and *subdivision*, where adverse *effects* on Ngāi Tahu cultural values (listed in NTCV-O2), are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- NTCV-P2 The impact of land use, development and subdivision on Ngāi Tahu cultural values (listed in NTCV-O2), is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga.
- NTCV-P3 Mātauranga relating to Ngāi Tahu cultural values is cared for as a taonga by Hokonui Rūnanga, and shared with Gore District Council on a case-by-case basis, as needed to support Council decision-making.
- NTCV-P4 The ability for mana whenua to engage in cultural practices in culturally appropriate places is recognised and provided for.
- NTCV-P5 Where appropriate, Ngāi Tahu cultural values and histories are incorporated into urban design of publicly accessible spaces.

Notes

Note 1 Provisions in Other Chapters

The objectives and policies in this chapter apply to the provisions of other chapters in the District Plan, including the following:

- Energy
- Infrastructure
- Transport
- Hazardous Substances
- Natural Hazards
- Public Access
- Zones – Setbacks from Streams, Reserve Land, buildings in Rural Zones exceeding height and coverage controls, and activities in the Natural Open Space Zone and Field Days Zone.
- Subdivision
- Activities on Surface of Water
- Earthworks
- Noise
- Temporary Activities
- Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity
- Natural Features and Landscapes