

He tono nā



Te Rūnanga o NGĀI TAHU

ki te

MINISTRY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

e pā ana ki te

DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS

August/Ākuhata 2018

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
2.	TE RŪNANGA O NGĀI TAHU	3
3.	TE RŪNANGA INTERESTS IN THE DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS.....	4
	SCHEDULE ONE: TE RŪNANGA SUBMISSION POINTS ON DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS.....	7
	APPENDIX ONE: TEXT OF CROWN APOLOGY	27
	APPENDIX TWO: NGĀI TAHU TAKIWĀ.....	29

Contact person

Rebecca Clements | Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (“**Te Rūnanga**”) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft National Planning Standards (“**the Standards**”).
- 1.2. Te Rūnanga would like to acknowledge the Minister for the Environment for the opportunity to make a submission. Te Rūnanga is invested in creating a planning system that is easy for whānau to engage with, whilst also ensuring that Ngāi Tahu values are present and enabled throughout planning documents.
- 1.3. Te Rūnanga supports the intent of the National Planning Standards. There are twenty-two district councils, four regional councils and two unitary authorities within the Ngāi Tahu takiwā. Therefore the intention of these Standards, to make moving between different district and regional plans simpler, and the mandatory inclusion of points of Ngāi Tahu rights and interest in these Standards, are welcomed by Ngai Tahu whānau.
- 1.4. Whilst Te Rūnanga support the intention of the Standards, there is some concerns around the current form and content of the Standards. Te Rūnanga has concerns regarding:
 - The Regional Planning Standards, particularly the issue and catchment approaches
 - A number of definitions
 - The integration of iwi values throughout standardised Plans
 - Matters regarding wāhi tapu and cultural heritage
 - The ability to acknowledge iwi and hapū variations within standardised Plans, including use of local dialect.
- 1.5. Te Rūnanga welcomes the opportunity to comment on areas of particular relevance and significance to Ngāi Tahu. As the Treaty Partner, Te Rūnanga expects direct engagement on these issues.

2. TE RŪNANGA O NGĀI TAHU

- 2.1. This response is made on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Te Rūnanga). Te Rūnanga is statutorily recognised as the representative tribal body of Ngāi Tahu whānui and was established as a body corporate on 24th April 1996 under section 6 of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (the Act).
- 2.2. We note for the Ministry the following relevant provisions of our constitutional documents:

Section 3 of the Act States:

“This Act binds the Crown and every person (including any body politic or corporate) whose rights are affected by any provisions of this Act.”

Section 15(1) of the Act states:

“Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu shall be recognised for all purposes as the representative of Ngāi Tahu Whānui.”
- 2.3. The Charter of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu constitutes Te Rūnanga as the kaitiaki of the tribal interest.

- 2.4. Te Rūnanga respectfully requests that the Ministry accord this response the status and weight due to the tribal collective, Ngāi Tahu whānui, currently comprising over 60,000 members, registered in accordance with section 8 of the Act.
- 2.5. Notwithstanding its statutory status as the representative voice of Ngāi Tahu whānui “for all purposes”, Te Rūnanga accepts and respects the right of individuals and Papatipu Rūnanga to make their own responses in relation to this matter.

3. TE RŪNANGA INTERESTS IN THE DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS

- 3.1. Te Rūnanga notes the following interests:

Treaty Relationship

- Te Rūnanga have an expectation that the Crown will honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the principles upon which the Treaty is founded.

Kaitiakitanga

- In keeping with the kaitiaki responsibilities of Ngāi Tahu whānui, Te Rūnanga has an interest in ensuring sustainable management of natural resources, including protection of taonga and mahinga kai for future generations.
- At all times, Te Rūnanga is guided by the tribal whakataukī:
“Mō tātou, ā, mō ngā uri ā muri ake nei” (for us and our descendants after us).

Tohungatanga

- Te Rūnanga welcomes innovation and change where it provides improved outcomes for Ngāi Tahu whānui.

Manaakitanga

- Te Rūnanga has a responsibility to promote the wellbeing of Ngāi Tahu whānui and ensure that the management of Ngāi Tahu assets and the wider management of natural resources supports the development of iwi members.

Rangatiratanga

- Te Rūnanga expects that any changes to current practice will entrench and extend the ability for Ngāi Tahu whānui to express their rangatiratanga within their takiwā.

- 3.2. The Act provides for Ngāi Tahu and the Crown to enter into a new age of co-operation. An excerpt of the Act is attached as **Appendix One**, as a guide to the basis of the post-Settlement relationship which underpins this response.
- 3.3. The Crown apology to Ngāi Tahu recognises the Treaty principles of partnership, active participation in decision-making, active protection and rangatiratanga.
- 3.4. With regards to the Ngāi Tahu takiwā, Section 5 of the Act statutorily defines those areas “south of the northern most boundaries described in the decision of the Māori Appellate Court”, which in effect is south of Te Parinui o Whiti on the East Coast and

Kahurangi Point on the West Coast of the South Island (see map attached in **Appendix Two**).

4. TE RŪNANGA POSITION

- 4.1 Te Rūnanga support the National Planning Standards in principle however some specific amendments and additions are sought. These are discussed briefly below, and are listed in the attached **Schedule One**.
- 4.2 Overall, Te Rūnanga supports the intent of the National Planning Standards, particularly the standardisation of zone names and map tools, plan sections, numbering/abbreviations, and digital availability (provided that hard copy availability is also maintained). These will be of use to Ngāi Tahu whānau and other parties who work across multiple regional and district plans that exist within the Ngāi Tahu takiwā.
- 4.3 Te Rūnanga also support the mandatory addressing of management arrangements from Treaty settlement and post-Treaty settlement agreements, statutory acknowledgements, cultural landscapes, and formal relationships agreements between tangata whenua and a local authority including Mana Whakahono-a-Rohe/iwi participation arrangements, co-management agreements, joint management agreements and transfer of powers within the Standards. This ensures that all councils must recognise these arrangements, therefore lessening the need for Ngāi Tahu to fight for adequate acknowledgment on a plan by plan basis.
- 4.4 Whilst Te Rūnanga support the inclusion of the Tangata Whenua section, it also raises concerns that councils may incorrectly consider that this section is the extent of their responsibilities to recognise for Ngāi Tahu whānau values within a plan. Te Rūnanga consider it vital that the Standards explicitly direct councils to weave iwi values throughout planning documents, so that councils have clarity about their responsibilities in plan writing processes with iwi. Furthermore, Te Rūnanga has concerns with the name of this section – *Tangata Whenua* – and recommends further consultation with whānau to find a culturally appropriate name for this section.
- 4.5 Te Rūnanga support the decision to remove all Te Reo Māori terms from the list of standard definitions, as well as the proposed process of defining these terms locally on a plan by plan basis. Te Rūnanga continues to have concerns however around the inclusion of Te Reo Māori terms that have been defined within the Resource Management Act 1991. This is on the basis that these definitions do not accommodate for iwi variation, or local understandings of these concepts. Further to this, Te Rūnanga also have concerns around a number of other definitions within the Standard Definitions – particularly those that define natural features, as these definitions do not provide enough specificity to be of use within a local context.
- 4.6 Te Rūnanga also has concerns regarding how wāhi tapu have been addressed within the Standards. Whilst Te Rūnanga supports their recognition, the requirement to identify their location and contents is culturally inappropriate. Te Rūnanga also considers it inadequate to only have a point marker for sites of significance to Māori, as most sites of significance cover an extended area - such as a lake or extent of a pā site - as opposed to a small, contained point.
- 4.7 Te Rūnanga opposes the way cultural heritage has been addressed and defined within the Standards. Cultural heritage has been included under the wider heading of Historic Heritage, which is misleading as Ngāi Tahu culture is ever evolving and alive within modern times as well as being present throughout history. This issue is also reflected in the definition of historic heritage (in which cultural heritage is listed as a sub-set of

historic heritage), as it also reflects the incorrect assumption that Ngāi Tahu culture is confined to the past, and does not have a modern element.

- 4.9 Finally, Te Rūnanga have serious concerns regarding the structure of the Regional Planning Standards, and recommend that they be deferred to a later set of standards. Te Rūnanga consider that both the theme and catchment options for addressing matters within a regional plan have major flaws that would result in repetition and re-litigation of points throughout the plan, as well as gaps where significant issues would not comfortably fit in any chapter as listed in the draft. For this reason Te Rūnanga consider these Standards to not yet be fully developed enough for inclusion in this set of Standards, and recommend further work with pilot regional councils and other special interest working groups.

SCHEDULE ONE: TE RŪNANGA SUBMISSION POINTS ON DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
S-RPS	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua [general comment]	-	Support in part	<p>Te Rūnanga supports the intention of the Tangata Whenua section however there is a serious concern that councils will incorrectly assume that this section is the extent of their responsibility to meeting the needs of whānau/hapū/iwi within a plan – which is incorrect</p> <p>Whilst the companion document to the Standards clearly states that there is an expectation for councils to weave whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout their plan, this is not reflected in the wording of the Standards</p> <p>Te Rūnanga is aware that this companion document is not legally binding, therefore this omission from the Standards themselves is concerning</p> <p>Te Rūnanga strongly supports the integration of whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout planning documents, and strongly opposes the segregation of all whānau/hapū/iwi issues into a single section (which is how the Standards, when read in their entirety, currently direct plans to be written)</p>	<p>Retain TW as drafted (unless directed by a further submission point within this schedule)</p> <p>Redraft Standards to more overtly direct plan-makers to integrate whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout all sections of the plan</p>
S-RPS		[Title] Tangata Whenua	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers tangata whenua to be an inappropriate title for this section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”</p> <p>The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights</p>	<p>Amend title to: Part 2 – Mana Whenua</p>
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Recognition of iwi and hapū	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title</p>	<p>Amend sub-heading to: Recognition of hapū and iwi</p>
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Sub-heading] Tangata whenua – local authority relationships	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers the term “tangata whenua” to be inappropriate for this sub-section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”.</p> <p>The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights</p>	<p>Amend sub-heading to: Mana whenua – local authority relationships</p>

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Iwi and hapū planning documents	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Amend sub-heading to: Hapū and iwi planning documents
	Part 4 - Themes	Air quality Coastal Environment Landscape, landforms and natural character Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity Environmental risk Historic heritage Infrastructure and energy Land Water Special Topics	Support in part	Te Rūnanga consider that river, lakes and wetland issues are of a prevalence and utmost importance that they there is an option for these to be a special topic where they do not sit comfortably within the water theme	Add rivers theme Add wetlands theme
S-RP	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua [general comment]	-	Support in part	Te Rūnanga supports the intention of the Tangata Whenua section. However there is a serious concern that councils will incorrectly assume that this section is the extent of their responsibility to meeting the needs of whānau/hapū/iwi within a plan – which is incorrect Whilst the companion document to the Standards clearly states that there is an expectation for councils to weave whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout their plan, this is not reflected in the wording of the Standards Te Rūnanga is aware that this companion document is not legally binding, therefore this omission from the Standards themselves is concerning Te Rūnanga strongly supports the integration of whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout planning documents, and strongly opposes the segregation of all whānau/hapū/iwi issues into a single section (which is how the Standards, when read in their entirety, currently direct plans to be written)	Retain TW as drafted (unless directed by a further submission point within this schedule) Redraft Standards to more overtly direct plan-makers to integrate whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout all sections of the plan
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Title] Tangata Whenua	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers tangata whenua to be an inappropriate title for this section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”	Amend title to: Part 2 – Mana Whenua

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
				The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights	
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Recognition of iwi and hapū	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Amend sub-heading to: Recognition of hapū and iwi
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Sub-heading] Tangata whenua – local authority relationships	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers the term “tangata whenua” to be inappropriate for this sub-section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua” The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights	Amend sub-heading to: Mana whenua – local authority relationships
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Iwi and hapū planning documents	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Amend sub-heading to: Hapū and iwi planning documents
	Part 4 - Themes	Air quality Coastal Environment Landscape, landforms and natural character Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity Environmental risk Historic heritage Infrastructure and energy Land Water Special Topics	Oppose	Te Rūnanga consider these themes to be underdeveloped, and do not believe that they will be workable in a practical context Many key issues such as farming and river issues do not fit comfortably into any one theme, which will likely create both duplication provisions, and risk of key issues falling between the cracks	Defer S-RP to a later set of National Planning Standards, and further develop alongside pilot regional councils
	Part 5 - Catchments	-	Oppose	Although Catchment approaches relate closely to the Ngāi Tahu value of Ki Uta Ki Tai, in this context Te Rūnanga consider that this approach, given the structure of the higher level themes could potentially result in issues that can be addressed across a	Defer S-RS to a later set of National Planning Standards, and further develop alongside pilot regional councils

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
				<p>region being re-litigated between individual catchments, and inconsistencies between interrelated catchments</p> <p>Te Rūnanga is also uncertain as to why these catchments are not referred to as Freshwater Management Units which are required under the NPS-FW</p>	
S-DP	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua [general comment]	-	Support in part	<p>Te Rūnanga supports the intention of the Tangata Whenua section. However there is a serious concern that councils will incorrectly assume that this section is the extent of their responsibility to meeting the needs of whānau/hapū/iwi within a plan – which is incorrect</p> <p>Whilst the companion document to the Standards clearly states that there is an expectation for councils to weave whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout their plan, this is not reflected in the wording of the Standards. Te Rūnanga is aware that this companion document is not legally binding, therefore this omission from the Standards themselves is concerning</p> <p>Te Rūnanga strongly supports the integration of whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout planning documents, and strongly opposes the segregation of all whānau/hapū/iwi issues into a single section (which is how the Standards, when read in their entirety, currently direct plans to be written)</p>	<p>Retain TW as drafted (unless directed by a further submission point within this schedule)</p> <p>Redraft Standards to more overtly direct plan-makers to integrate whānau/hapū/iwi values throughout all sections of the plan</p>
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Title] Tangata Whenua	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers tangata whenua to be an inappropriate title for this section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”</p> <p>The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights</p>	<p>Amend title to:</p> <p>Part 2 – Mana Whenua</p>
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Recognition of iwi and hapū	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title</p>	<p>Amend sub-heading to:</p> <p>Recognition of hapū and iwi</p>
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Sub-heading] Tangata whenua – local authority relationships	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers the term “tangata whenua” to be inappropriate for this sub-section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”</p> <p>The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights</p>	<p>Amend sub-heading to:</p> <p>Mana whenua – local authority relationships</p>

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Iwi and hapū planning documents	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Amend sub-heading to: Hapū and iwi planning documents
	Part 4 – District-wide Matters <i>Community Values</i>	[Section title] Sites of Significance to Māori	Oppose	Te Rūnanga consider the name “sites of significance to Māori” to be too generic	Amend section title to: Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua
	Part 5 – Area-Specific Matters Special Purpose Zones	[Zone name] Māori Cultural Zone	Oppose	Te Rūnanga does not consider the term “cultural” appropriate for the name of this zone as it carries connotations that don’t reflect the true nature of the zone and the activities anticipated to occur within it	Amend zone name to: Māori Purpose Zone
S-CP	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Title] Tangata Whenua	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers tangata whenua to be an inappropriate title for this section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua”. The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights	Amend title to: Part 2 – Mana Whenua
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Recognition of iwi and hapū	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title.	Amend sub-heading to: Recognition of hapū and iwi
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[Sub-heading] Tangata whenua – local authority relationships	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers the term “tangata whenua” to be inappropriate for this sub-section. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua” The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights	Amend sub-heading to: Mana whenua – local authority relationships
	Part 2 – Tangata Whenua	[sub-heading] Iwi and hapū planning documents	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Amend sub-heading to: Hapū and iwi planning documents
	Part 4 – Region-wide Matters <i>Community Values</i>	[Section title] Sites of Significance to Māori	Oppose	Te Rūnanga consider the name “sites of significance to Māori” too generic	Amend section title to: Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
	Part 6 – Area-Specific Matters Special Purpose Zones	[Zone name] Māori Cultural Zone	Oppose	Te Rūnanga does not consider the term “cultural” appropriate for the name of this zone as it carries connotations that don’t reflect the true nature of the zone and the activities anticipated to occur within it	Amend zone name to: Māori Purpose Zone
S-IGP	S-INTRO(6)	If the following matters are addressed in the policy statement/plan, they must be included in the Region and its Resources, or Description of Region or Description of the District (as relevant for the policy statement or plan) section: a. key information about the region and/or district that is of relevance from a resource management perspective.	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it important that mana whenua be referenced in this first section of the Plan, The mana whenua are part of the fabric of the environment and cannot be separated from it, therefore it is right to reference them alongside the other key information about the region	Amend to read: ... a. key information about the region and/or district that is of relevance from a resource management perspective. <u>b. naming of mana whenua groupings within the jurisdiction of the Plan</u>
	S-HPW 7(c)	If the following matters are to be addressed in the policy statement/plan, they must be located in the Statutory Context section: ... c. a list of all other plans that are important to the context or content of the plan; eg, urban development strategies, regional spatial plans (RMA section 74(2)(b)).	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it useful to include Iwi Management Plans within this list, so as to include all relevant information in one place for user ease of use	Amend to read: ... c. a list of all other plans that are important to the context or content of the plan; eg, urban development strategies, regional spatial plans (RMA section 74(2)(b)), <u>Iwi Management Plans</u> .
	S-HPW(8)(a)	If the following matters are to be addressed in the policy statement/plan, they must be located in the General approach section: a. an explanation of the approach taken around integrated management ...	Support in part	In the interests of integrating hapū/iwi values throughout the Standards, Te Rūnanga consider it important to include a directive to acknowledge traditional management practices or values in this Standard (e.g.. ki uta ki tai management, Te Mana o Te Wai)	Amend to read: a. an explanation of the approach taken around integrated management, <u>including (where relevant) hapū/iwi management values and/or practices</u>

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
	S-INTER(14)	If abbreviations are to be provided in district plans, they must be located in the Abbreviations section, using Table 11: Abbreviation table in the form below.	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it important to clarify that this standard relates to Regional Policy Statements and Regional Plans, as well as District Plans	Amend to read: ... If abbreviations are to be provided in <u>policy statements and/or district</u> plans, they must be located in the Abbreviations section, using Table 11: Abbreviation table in the form below.
	S-INTER(19)	If Te Reo Māori terms are to be provided in policy statement/plans, they must be located in the Glossary of te reo Māori terms, in the form below ...	Support in part	Whilst Te Rūnanga supports the removal of Te Reo Māori terms from the standard definitions as listed in the Standards, we consider it unnecessary have Te Reo terms in their own glossary. This will likely cause confusion for the plan reader who will likely refer to the definitions section for all word definitions regardless of language	Remove S-INTER standards 18, 19, 20, and 21 so as to locate Te Reo Māori terms within the main definitions list
S-TW	General	Use of phrases “iwi/hapū”, and “iwi and hapū”	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this wording inappropriate as it is understood that Māori kinship structures follow a “bottom-up” structure, as opposed to a “top down” structure as indicated in the current title	Reorder phrasing to: “ Hapū/iwi ” and “ hapū and iwi ”
	General	Use of phrase “tangata whenua”	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers the term “tangata whenua” to be inappropriate for the context it has been used in these Standards. This is based on the Ngāi Tahu understanding of the definition of “tangata whenua” The term “mana whenua” is considered more appropriate as this relates to the individuals who hold mana whenua rights, as opposed to tangata whenua who may be of the place, but not holders of mana whenua rights	Replace phrase “tangata whenua” with “ mana whenua ” throughout these Standards
	S-TW(3)	3 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in Recognition of iwi/hapū chapter: ... - An explanation of how iwi and hapū values have been considered when preparing the Plan, or	Support	Te Rūnanga considers it vital that hapū and iwi values are reflected throughout policy statements and plan, therefore we support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		are reflected in the plan			
	S-TW(3)	<p>3 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in Recognition of iwi/hapū chapter:</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An overview of the outcome of resource management arrangements from treaty settlement and post-treaty settlement agreements 	Support	Te Rūnanga consider it both important and useful for this information to be formally recognised within policy statements and plans, so therefore support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted
	S-TW(3)	<p>3 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in Recognition of iwi/hapū chapter:</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A list and explanation of what the statutory acknowledgments for this district and region are. Where possible this should include a link to the relevant statutory acknowledgment legislation 	Support	Te Rūnanga consider it both important and useful for this information to be formally recognised within policy statements and plans, so therefore support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted
		3 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in	Support	Te Rūnanga considers it vital that hapū and iwi values are reflected throughout policy statements and plan, therefore we support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>Recognition of iwi/hapū chapter:</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A brief explanation of how statutory acknowledgments affect the plan and/or how statutory acknowledgments are reflected in specific Objectives, Policies, and Methods, including rules (if any) 			
	S-TW(4)	<p>4 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in the Tangata whenua-local authority relationships chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a list of any formal relationship agreements between tangata whenua and a local authority. These formal relationship agreements may include any memoranda of understanding, mana whakahono a rohe/iwi participation arrangements, co-management agreements, joint management agreements and transfer of powers under RMA 1991 section 33, as they relate to resource management functions 	Support	Te Rūnanga consider it both important and useful for these types of formal relationship agreements to be formally recognised within policy statements and plans, so therefore support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted
	S-TW(5)	<p>5 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in the</p>	Support	Te Rūnanga supports this directive on the grounds of providing clarity and ease of access for plan users	Retain as drafted

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>Iwi and hapū planning documents chapter:</p> <p>- a list of iwi and hapū planning documents lodged with a local authority. Where possible this should include a link to planning documents</p>			
	S-TW(5)	<p>5 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in the Iwi and hapū planning documents chapter:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- a description of how the local authority has taken the iwi/hapū planning documents into account in the plan</p>		Te Rūnanga considers it vital that hapū and iwi values are reflected throughout policy statements and plan, therefore we support this direction within the Standards	Retain as drafted
	S-TW(5)	<p>5 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in the Iwi and hapū planning documents chapter:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- a flowchart of how iwi and hapū planning documents are used</p>	Support in part	Whilst Te Rūnanga supports the intent of this directive, we have concerns around its practicality. A flow chart seems to be an oddly specific form of explaining how the document is used, and may obstruct clear explanations in other forms. For this reason, we consider that a less prescriptive method of explaining this be adopted	Amend wording to: ... - an flowchart explanation of how iwi and hapū planning documents are used
	S-TW(6)	Use of term "consultation"	Oppose	Te Rūnanga consider the term 'consultation' out dated as it refers to a level of co-operation between Crown and hapū/iwi that is far below what is now expected. The term 'engagement' is more representative of the relationship that hapū/iwi expect from the Crown in modern times, as this denotes a more equal, two-way process that the outdated practice of consulting	Replace all references to 'consultation' to reference to 'engagement'

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
	S-TW(6)	6 If the following matters are addressed in policy statements and plans, they must be located in the consultation chapter: ... – a flowchart of consultation processes used or supported	Support in part	Whilst Te Rūnanga supports the intent of this directive, we have concerns around its practicality, as different papatipu rūnanga, hapū and iwi (of which there may be multiple in the jurisdiction of a single policy statement or plan) will have different preferred methods of engagement. This may also change depending on what the issue is (i.e. water issues or earthworks issues). For this reason, we consider that a less prescriptive method of explaining this be adopted	Amend wording to: ... – an explanation flowchart of consultation processes used or supported
S-DWM	S-NEV(6)(c)	6 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in the Coastal environment section: ... c. objectives, polices and methods, including rules (if any) that will ensure the live supporting capacity of these systems are safeguarded	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it appropriate to reference both the life supporting capacity of a system, as well as its mauri – as protection of mauri links to Te Mana o Te Wai. It also supports the integration of iwi values throughout planning documents affected by these Standards	Amend wording to: c. objectives, polices and methods, including rules (if any) that will ensure the live supporting capacity and mauri of these systems are safeguarded
	S-NEV(7)(c)	7 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in landscape, landforms and natural character section: ... c. objectives, polices and methods, including rules (if any) that will ensure the live supporting capacity of these systems are safeguarded	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it appropriate to reference both the life supporting capacity of a system, as well as its mauri , as this supports the integration of iwi values throughout planning documents affected by these Standards	Amend wording to: c. objectives, polices and methods, including rules (if any) that will ensure the live supporting capacity and mauri of these systems are safeguarded
	S-ER(13)(b)	13 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in the hazardous substances and contaminated sites section:	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it appropriate to reference cultural health alongside human and ecological health as this supports the integration of iwi values throughout the Standards	Amend to: ... b. provisions relating to the use, storage and disposal of hazardous substances on land and in the coastal marine area as that presents a specific risk to human or ecological or cultural health and prosperity

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		... b. provisions relating to the use, storage and disposal of hazardous substances on land and in the coastal marine area as that presents a specific risk to human or ecological health and prosperity			
	S-CV(18)(b)	18 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in the Sites of significance to Māori section: ... b. sites of significance to Māori that have been identified through an agreed process with tangata whenua, including any Māori Cultural Landscapes	Support in part	Te Rūnanga strongly supports the explicit mention of Māori Cultural Landscapes within the Standards, as these are an important management tool for hapū and iwi that not all councils have been aware of. We do however consider their inclusion exclusively in this section to be unhelpful to the plan reader, as they also have strong links to S-NEV <i>Landscapes, landforms and natural character</i> . As cultural landscapes are a type of landscape it is sensible to include reference them in <i>S-NEV Landscapes, landforms and natural character</i> section as well, as this is would then sit them alongside other landscape tools Te Rūnanga also considers the use of the term “tangata whenua” inappropriate, and for reasons already stated within this response recommend substituting the term “mana whenua”	Amend S-CV(18)(b) to: b. sites of significance to Māori that have been identified through an agreed process with tangata mana whenua, including any Māori Cultural Landscapes Add new directive to S-NEV(7): 7 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in landscape, landforms and natural character section: ... <u>d. Reference to Māori Cultural landscapes, with link to full objectives, policies and methods, including rules (if any) in S-CV(18)(b)</u>
	S-CV(18)(d)	18 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in the Sites of significance to Māori section: ... d. cross referencing to the schedules chapter that a list of the specific location of areas and sites of significance to Māori identified as requiring management, with a description of why or what in each area or site requires management	Oppose	Te Rūnanga consider it inappropriate to require whānau/hapū/iwi to publically identify in a Plan the specific location of sites of cultural significance, along with the contents of these sites. This is because in many cases these sites are tapu and making their location public puts both the sites themselves at risk, and the people who visit them without adhering to appropriate tikanga. Publically sharing the reasons for them being deemed a site of significance is also culturally inappropriate as these reasons are often related to closely protected tribal histories that are not only not public knowledge within the wider community, but often not public knowledge within the hapū/iwi as well. There have also been instances where members of the public have actively explored sites of cultural significance once finding out the contents of them (i.e. burial sites, or wāhi taonga), which puts these sites potentially at greater risk than if they were not listed at all	Amend S-CV(18)(d) to: ... d. cross referencing to the schedules chapter that a list of the specific location of areas and sites of significance to Māori identified as requiring management, with a description of why or what in each area or site requires management

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
				In Canterbury a “silent file” system is used which indicates publically the general location of a site, but not its specific position within that location, or the reason it has been identified as a silent file. This allows kaitiaki whānau to protect the tapu of these sites, and ensures that they are protected from those who may want to visit these sites for reasons that are not culturally appropriate. This provision as drafted would not allow for this approach to continue which is unacceptable to Te Rūnanga	
		<p>18 If the following matters are addressed in combined plans or district plans, they must be located in the Sites of significance to Māori section:</p> <p>...</p> <p>e. sub-headings or descriptions of the sites; e.g., wahi tapu, wahi tipuna, statutory acknowledgement, customary rights, historic site and other culturally important sites and areas</p>	Support in part	Whilst Te Rūnanga can see the merit in grouping similar sites together, we consider the groups themselves to be a matter that should be mutually agreed between the council and mana whenua. This will better allow for protection of cultural information, expression of local values and dialects, and more tailored – and therefore useful – groupings to occur	<p>Amend to:</p> <p>...</p> <p>e. sub-headings or descriptions of the sites agreed to through a process with mana whenua; e.g., wāhi tapu, wāhi tipuna, statutory acknowledgement, customary rights, historic site and other culturally important sites and areas</p>
S-ASM	S-Zones(8) Māori Cultural Zone	<p><i>Māori cultural zone</i></p> <p>The purpose of the Māori cultural zone is to enable a range of activities which specifically meet Māori cultural needs including but not limited to residential and commercial activities.</p>	Support in part	<p>Te Rūnanga supports the purpose statement for the Māori Cultural Zone , particularly the confirmation that commercial activities are part of meeting cultural needs (and are therefore permitted within this zone)</p> <p>Te Rūnanga does however consider the name “Māori Cultural Zone” inappropriate for this zone, as the term cultural has other connotations that do not match its use within this context</p>	<p>Retain purpose statement as drafted</p> <p>Amend zone title to: “Māori Purpose Zone”</p>
F-1	F-1(d) Plan accessibility and functionality	<p>2 All policy statements and plans prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991 can be accessed in no more than three clicks (three pages/pop ups) from the local authority homepage (one click from the home page is strongly preferred).</p> <p>3 All plans and policy statements are hosted on</p>	Support	<p>Te Rūnanga fully supports the mandatory move towards ePlans as they will make accessing and using plans more user friendly for both whānau and technicians.</p> <p>Te Rūnanga does however continue to see value in having hard copy plans available for whānau members who may struggle with digital formats (e.g. kaumātua), and those who do not have internet access</p>	<p>Amend F-1(d)(3) to:</p> <p>3 All plans and policy statements are hosted on local authority websites via a commonly named ‘District Plan’ or ‘Regional Policy Statement and Plans’ landing page, and available in hard copy at local libraries and/or council buildings, or on request</p>

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>local authority websites via a commonly named 'District Plan' or 'Regional Policy Statement and Plans' landing page.</p> <p>4 All regional policy statements and plans on local authority websites must comply with Department for Internal Affairs' Web Accessibility Standard 1.0 and Web Usability Standard 1.2 or their successors.</p> <p>5 Local authorities must provide hyperlinks to their plans and regional policy statements to the Ministry for the Environment and inform the Ministry for the Environment if the hyperlink changes.</p> <p>6 Ensure that policy statements and plans contain information on when they were last updated.</p> <p>7 Provide a 'note' within any district or regional plan rule (and hyperlink to relevant plan) that clarifies an activity may also require consent from another plan (eg, note and hyperlink from a regional plan rule relating to earthworks to relevant district plan chapters relating to earthworks).</p> <p>8 Links are provided between significant planning provisions (eg, hyperlinks within the policy statement/plan, the use of tabulation, or bookmarking).</p>			

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>9 Plans and regional policy statements support key word search functionality.</p> <p>10 Legal status of provisions must be displayed (including in downloaded or printed format)</p> <p>11 All versions of the current plan since first becoming operative must be available from the local authority website.</p> <p>12 A copy of all previous plans under the RMA both at the time they first became operative and the final version before being superseded by the replacement plan must be available from the local authority website (in PDF format).</p>			
F-2	Table 21: Zone colour palette table	<i>[see table 21 on p54 of draft National Planning Standards]</i>	Support in part	Te Rūnanga supports the standardisation of zone colour palettes through the Standards. However, Te Rūnanga supports better alignment of these colours with the Land Based Classification Standards. Where a base colour needs to be split across a spectrum to denote variations (e.g. density) these need to be sufficiently distinct. In the draft Standards zones such as low-density residential and medium density residential are too similar	<p>Closer alignment of colours to Land Based Classification Standards</p> <p>Further development to ensure that all colours are distinct from each other.</p>
	Table 21: Zone colour palette table	<i>[see table 21 on p54 of draft National Planning Standards]</i>	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers it appropriate to develop unique colours for Special Purpose Zones so that different SPZs can have their own colours. This is for ease of use by the plan user in situations where a Plan has multiple different SPZs	List SPZs as having no set colour within Table 21
	Table 22: Symbol table	Sites of significance to Māori Geometry point	Support in part	<p>Te Rūnanga considers the term Sites of significance to Māori to be too general, and considers Sites of significance to iwi a better reflection of the locations this tool will show</p> <p>Te Rūnanga considers it appropriate to include a polygon option for sites of significance to Māori, as the majority of sites of cultural significance cover an area as opposed to being an</p>	<p>Amend name to: “Sites of significance to iwi”</p> <p>Include a polygon option for representing sites of significance to Māori</p>

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
				<p>individual point e.g. lakes, battle sites, cultural landscapes, pā sites</p> <p>It is recommended that sites of significance to Māori be treated similar to how places of historic value have been treated within the symbol table – that is by having both a polygon option and a geometry point option</p>	
F-5	Table 26: Rule table	<i>[see table in Standards]</i>	Support	Te Rūnanga supports the table format for rules within the Standards based on their ease of use and legibility	Retain as drafted
CM-1	Mandatory directions 3(d)	d. Policy statements and plans may include locally defined terms that are not synonyms of a term in the Definitions table.	Oppose in part	<p>Te Rūnanga considers it important for hapū and iwi to be able to use their local dialect within planning documents within their takiwā (regions). The use of reo-a-iwi (local dialect) is an important expression of rangatiratanga, and mana whenua rights</p> <p>The definitions as drafted, when read alongside CM-1(3)(d) would restrict plan writers to using the Te Reo terms within the standard definitions (i.e. kaitiakitanga, mana whenua, tangata whenua) strictly as listed. However, these terms are not universal. For example, Southern Ngāi Tahu hapū use the term kaitiakitaka as opposed to kaitiakitanga, and would be barred from using this term within plans under CM-1(3)(d), as it is a synonym of kaitiakitanga</p>	<p>Amend CM-1(3)(d) to:</p> <p>Policy statements and plans may include locally defined terms that are not synonyms of a term in the Definitions table.</p>
	Definition - Bed	<p>has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA</p> <p>means—</p> <p>(a) in relation to any river—</p> <p>(i) for the purposes of esplanade reserves, esplanade strips, and subdivision, the space of land which the waters of the river cover at its annual fullest flow without overtopping its banks;</p> <p>(ii) in all other cases, the space of land which the waters of the river cover at its fullest flow without overtopping its banks; and</p> <p>(b) in relation to any lake, except a lake controlled by artificial means,—</p>	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga recognise that this is an RMA definition. However, it considers this definition to be inadequate as it is not specific enough to provide any guidance in practical situations. Councils have sought to clarify bed both through rules and sub-definitions. Te Rūnanga also understands that by making this definition any more specific it may not be applicable nation-wide, as natural features are not standard in their form. For this reason Te Rūnanga considers the most practical solution is to remove this entry from the standard definitions and revisit in a future amendment to the Standards, once the full implications have been assessed</p>	Remove definition from list of standard definitions and revisit in a future Standard once the full implications are assessed.

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>(i) for the purposes of esplanade reserves, esplanade strips, and subdivision, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its annual highest level without exceeding its margin;</p> <p>(ii) in all other cases, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its highest level without exceeding its margin; and</p> <p>(c) in relation to any lake controlled by artificial means, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its maximum permitted operating level; and</p> <p>(d) in relation to the sea, the submarine areas covered by the internal waters and the territorial sea</p>			
	Definition - drain	means any artificial watercourse, open or piped, that is designed and constructed, or used, for the purpose of the drainage of surface or subsurface water	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga has serious concerns with this definition of a drain. Particularly in the South Island context many historic drains have become naturalised over time and are now habitat for taonga species such as tuna (eels). Many drains are also natural waterways that have been straightened – so whilst they are currently used as drains, they are in fact a natural watercourse. The current definition does not provide for either of these scenarios which will negatively impact whānau ability to act as kaitiaki for taonga species that live in these drains.</p>	Remove definition from list of standard definitions and revisit in a future planning standard once the full implications are assessed.
	Definition - earthworks	means any land disturbance that changes the existing ground contour or ground level	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga considers that this definition as drafted creates unintended loopholes i.e. if earthworks are undertaken that only temporarily change the ground contour or ground level</p> <p>Te Rūnanga also questions if this definition will be overly restrictive for day-to-day activities such as recreational gardening activities, or holes for fence posts</p>	Amend definition to: means any land disturbance that changes <u>either permanently or temporarily</u> the existing ground contour or ground level
	Definition – fertilizer	(a) means any substance or biological compound that is—	Support in part	Te Rūnanga considers minor rewording is needed to this definition to remove loopholes	Amend to read: (a) means any substance or biological compound that is—

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		<p>(i) applied to plants or soils, whether in solid or liquid form; and</p> <p>(ii) supports or sustains the growth, productivity or quality of soils, plants or, indirectly, animals; but</p> <p>(b) does not include livestock and human effluent, or pathogens</p>			<p>(i) applied to plants or soils, whether in solid or liquid form; and</p> <p>(ii) supports or sustains the growth, productivity or quality of soils, plants or, indirectly, animals; but</p> <p>(b) does not include livestock and/or human effluent, or pathogens</p>
	Definition - greywater	means untreated liquid waste from sources such as household sinks, basins, baths, showers and similar appliances but does not include any sewage	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers that this definition as drafted creates unintended loopholes as it addresses the way the waste liquid enters the wastewater system – not the contents of the wastewater	<p>Amend definition to:</p> <p>means untreated liquid waste from sources such as household sinks, basins, baths, showers and similar appliances but does not include any sewage <u>or industrial waste.</u></p>
	Definition – historic heritage	<p>(a) means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:</p> <p>(i) archaeological:</p> <p>(ii) architectural:</p> <p>(iii) cultural:</p> <p>(iv) historic:</p> <p>(v) scientific:</p> <p>(vi) technological; and</p> <p>(b) includes—</p> <p>(i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and</p> <p>(ii) archaeological sites; and</p>	Oppose	<p>Te Rūnanga strongly opposes this definition of historic heritage on the grounds that it includes cultural heritage and sites of significance to Māori under this umbrella</p> <p>Sites of significance to Māori and cultural heritage are not associated with the past in the same way historic heritage is</p> <p>Sites of significance to Māori and cultural heritage are living places of continual iwi engagement that have historic, present, and future relevance to iwi</p> <p>By including them under the heading of historic heritage this disregards their present and future</p> <p>Te Rūnanga is aware that this is an RMA definition, but does not consider this a reason for not being able to use an alternative, correct, definition within the Standards</p>	Remove reference to Sites of significance to Māori and cultural heritage from historic heritage definition, and include a separate definition for Sites of significance to Māori, and cultural heritage

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		(iii) sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; and (iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources			
	Definition - Lake	means a body of fresh water which is entirely or nearly surrounded by land	Oppose	Te Rūnanga recognise that this is an RMA definition however, it considers this definition to be inadequate as it is not specific enough to provide any guidance in practical situations. Councils have sought to clarify bed both through rules and sub-definitions Te Rūnanga also understands that by making this definition any more specific it may not be applicable nation-wide, as natural features are not standard in their form. For this reason Te Rūnanga considers the most practical solution is to remove this entry from the standard definitions and revisit in a future amendment to the Planning Standards, once the full implications have been assessed	Remove definition from list of standard definitions and revisit in a future planning standard once the full implications are assessed.
	Definition - river	means a continually or intermittently flowing body of fresh water; and includes a stream and modified watercourse; but does not include any artificial watercourse (including an irrigation canal, water supply race, canal for the supply of water for electricity power generation, and farm drainage canal)	Oppose	Te Rūnanga recognise that this is an RMA definition. However, it considers this definition to be inadequate as it is not specific enough to provide any guidance in practical situations. Councils have sought to clarify bed both through rules and sub-definitions Te Rūnanga also understands that by making this definition any more specific it may not be applicable nation-wide, as natural features are not standard in their form Te Rūnanga considers the most practical solution is to remove this entry from the standard definitions and revisit in a future amendment to the Planning Standards, once the full implications have been assessed	Remove definition from list of standard definitions and revisit in a future planning standard once the full implications are assessed
	Definition - stormwater	means water from natural precipitation (including any contaminants it contains) that flows over land or structures (including in a network), to a waterbody or the coastal marine area.	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this definition inadequate as it provides to many loop holes. For example, not all stormwater enters a waterbody or the coastal marine area (i.e. stormwater that is disposed to land). In addition to this, not all stormwater flows over land or structures – some flows through land, or over other surfaces such as carparks	Redraft to close loopholes
	Definition – tangata whenua	in relation to a particular area, means the iwi, or hapū,	Oppose	Te Rūnanga considers this definition incorrect as not all tangata whenua are also mana whenua. These two terms are not	Redraft with guidance from appropriate experts

Section	Reference	Current Form	Te Rūnanga Position	Justification	Relief Sought
		that holds mana whenua over that area		interchangeable and have their own meanings when used to refer to a group of people Te Rūnanga is aware that this is an RMA definition, but does not consider this a reason for not being able to use an alternative, correct, definition within the Standards	
	Definition - wetland	includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are adapted to wet conditions	Oppose	Te Rūnanga recognise that this is an RMA definition however, it considers this definition to be inadequate as it is not specific enough to provide any guidance in practical situations Councils have sought to clarify bed both through rules and sub-definitions. Te Rūnanga also understands that by making this definition any more specific it may not be applicable nation-wide, as natural features are not standard in their current form Te Rūnanga considers the most practical solution is to remove this entry from the standard definitions and revisit in a future amendment to the Planning Standards, once the full implications have been assessed	Remove definition from list of standard definitions and revisit in a future planning standard once the full implications are assessed.

APPENDIX ONE: TEXT OF CROWN APOLOGY

The following is text of the Crown apology contained in the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.

Part One – Apology by the Crown to Ngāi Tahu

Section 6 Text in English

The text of the apology in English is as follows:

- 1 The Crown recognises the protracted labours of the Ngāi Tahu ancestors in pursuit of their claims for redress and compensation against the Crown for nearly 150 years, as alluded to in the Ngāi Tahu proverb ‘He mahi kai takata, he mahi kai hoaka’ (‘It is work that consumes people, as greenstone consumes sandstone’). The Ngāi Tahu understanding of the Crown’s responsibilities conveyed to Queen Victoria by Matiaha Tiramorehu in a petition in 1857, guided the Ngāi Tahu ancestors. Tiramorehu wrote:

“This was the command thy love laid upon these Governors ... that the law be made one, that the commandments be made one, that the nation be made one, that the white skin be made just equal with the dark skin, and to lay down the love of thy graciousness to the Māori that they dwell happily ... and remember the power of thy name.”

The Crown hereby acknowledges the work of the Ngāi Tahu ancestors and makes this apology to them and to their descendants.

- 2 The Crown acknowledges that it acted unconscionably and in repeated breach of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in its dealings with Ngāi Tahu in the purchases of Ngāi Tahu land. The Crown further acknowledges that in relation to the deeds of purchase it has failed in most material respects to honour its obligations to Ngāi Tahu as its Treaty partner, while it also failed to set aside adequate lands for Ngāi Tahu’s use, and to provide adequate economic and social resources for Ngāi Tahu.
- 3 The Crown acknowledges that, in breach of Article Two of the Treaty, it failed to preserve and protect Ngāi Tahu’s use and ownership of such of their land and valued possessions as they wished to retain.
- 4 The Crown recognises that it has failed to act towards Ngāi Tahu reasonably and with the utmost good faith in a manner consistent with the honour of the Crown. That failure is referred to in the Ngāi Tahu saying ‘Te Hapa o Niu Tireni!’ (‘The unfulfilled promise of New Zealand’). The Crown further recognises that its failure always to act in good faith deprived Ngāi Tahu of the opportunity to develop and kept the tribe for several generations in a state of poverty, a state referred to in the proverb ‘Te mate o te iwi’ (‘The malaise of the tribe’).
- 5 The Crown recognises that Ngāi Tahu has been consistently loyal to the Crown, and that the tribe has honoured its obligations and responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi and duties as citizens of the nation, especially, but not exclusively, in their

active service in all of the major conflicts up to the present time to which New Zealand has sent troops. The Crown pays tribute to Ngāi Tahu's loyalty and to the contribution made by the tribe to the nation.

6. The Crown expresses its profound regret and apologises unreservedly to all members of Ngāi Tahu Whānui for the suffering and hardship caused to Ngāi Tahu, and for the harmful effects which resulted to the welfare, economy and development of Ngāi Tahu as a tribe. The Crown acknowledges that such suffering, hardship and harmful effects resulted from its failures to honour its obligations to Ngāi Tahu under the deeds of purchase whereby it acquired Ngāi Tahu lands, to set aside adequate lands for the tribe's use, to allow reasonable access to traditional sources of food, to protect Ngāi Tahu's rights to pounamu and such other valued possessions as the tribe wished to retain, or to remedy effectually Ngāi Tahu's grievances.
7. The Crown apologises to Ngāi Tahu for its past failures to acknowledge Ngāi Tahu rangatiratanga and mana over the South Island lands within its boundaries, and, in fulfilment of its Treaty obligations, the Crown recognises Ngāi Tahu as the tangata whenua of, and as holding rangatiratanga within, the Takiwā of Ngāi Tahu Whānui.

Accordingly, the Crown seeks on behalf of all New Zealanders to atone for these acknowledged injustices, so far as that is now possible, and, with the historical grievances finally settled as to matters set out in the Deed of Settlement signed on 21 November 1997, to begin the process of healing and to enter a new age of co-operation with Ngāi Tahu.”

APPENDIX TWO: NGĀI TAHU TAKIWĀ

