



TE RŪNANGA O
TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

26 Oketopa 2022

Miranda Cross
Greater Wellington Regional Council
100 Cuba Street, Te Aro
PO Box 11646, Wellington 6011

Kia ora Miranda,

Greater Wellington Regional Council:

**Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Regional Council
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Submission**

1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide you with our submission to Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) for the Wellington Regional Council. We are pleased to share our submission for the Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement:

- Objectives
- Policies
- Matters of consideration
- Methods to implement policies

We also have provided our '*Statement of Ngāti Toa Rangatira – Freshwater Vision*' as part of this submission.

2. Submission – OBJECTIVES

Chapter 3 Resource management issues, objectives and summary of policies and methods to achieve the objectives in the Regional Policy Statement

There are issues clause 3 of the Chapter 3 changes: Firstly, lack of Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua involvement in decision making and lack of Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori in making resource management decisions are two different matters. First generation plans do lack both of these components as the former one is about iwi engagement and transfer of powers and allowing iwi as the decision maker; the other one is about how to use the knowledge systems of iwi and Māori in giving decisions regarding resource management.

We believe the wording of Objective 3 can be strengthened even further; ‘sufficient weight’ suggests that, to date, Tangata Whenua / Mana Whenua had established processes and clear decision-making powers over the matters of Regional Policy Statement. However, iwi does not have such relationship with the Regional Policy Statement or the RPS acknowledges transfer of powers to Ngāti Toa Rangatira in the governance matters of Regional Policy Statement. We ask clause (3) to be re-drafted as suggested below:

Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua values, Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori have not been involved in decision-making, from the governance level through to the implementation. As a result, Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua values have not been provided for in resource management. This caused major disruption Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua not being able to connect with Taiaio, but also put them into a position where they were not able to perform their kaiataikitanga.

Objective 3 Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making

Mana whenua / tangata whenua values, Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori have not been given sufficient weight in decision-making, including from governance level through to the implementation. As a result, mana whenua / tangata whenua values have not been adequately provided for in resource management, causing disconnection between mana whenua / tangata whenua and the environment.

Objective 3 A

Objective 3 (2) uses the phrase ‘Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori’ have not been given sufficient weight in decision-making’. This phrase can be reworded to say: ‘Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori’ have been given limited and in some cases no weight from the governance level through the implementation.

It is encouraging to see the value of mātauranga Māori being recognised in the Objective 3 A (a). It seems this objective only recognises mātauranga as a knowledge system with evidence. The Objective 3 A (a) can be improved to recognise the resource management methodologies within mātauranga.

We recommend that there is more recognition of the significant role that Māori have of kaitiakitanga, the obligation of care and protection for the environment, and the importance for Māori to have the ability to carry out this role.

Objective A mentions ‘integrated and respectful environmental stewardship’. Does the reference to stewardship is written to mean the Crown? If this means to say kaitiakitanga, the text needs to be clear separating these. Objectives from (a) to (e) do not mention how Objective A will be implemented with Mana Whenua; an additional clause (f) could be inserted

and could mean to say: *co-designs with Mana Whenua and iwi how Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga will be used, and responds to Mana Whenua and iwi principles and values and aspirations delivering environmental outcomes.*

Objective A(e) aims to respond effectively to pressures such as, climate change. However, these are not only future pressures but pressures we currently experience. We recommend rewording this objective as to read ‘responds effectively to the current and future pressures of climate change, population growth and development.’

3.1A Climate Change

We note that there is placeholder introductory text to be coming for this Objective. This text will be crucial to express the different impacts our whānau and communities will face from Climate Change.

Objectives 3.1.A 4 and 5 are connected but yet still, they seem to be disconnected the way they are worded. Under the Objective 3.1.A 4 ‘The impacts and costs of responding to climate change will not be felt equitably.’ This is more so for iwi and Māori and needs to be clearer in the text to say, ‘...will not be felt equitably, especially iwi and Māori.’

If the policy intention of the Objective 3.1.A 4 was to highlight inequities, this can also be mentioned under the Objective 3.1.A 5. Then the Objective could reflect the inter-racial and inter-generational inequities that are generated within the Resource Management System and its decision-making mechanisms, which will in return impact more of our communities when dealing with Climate Change.

Objective CC.1

This objective is supported in part that it may not be intuitive for people to take it to next level, in terms of what the objective means and how we are supposed to give effect. This is also valid for consent planners as they take direction from higher order documents. There is Mana Whenua missing from this objective, where any decision regarding what the Objective CC.1 is trying to achieve is co-governed and co-designed with iwi and Māori. Iwi and Māori aspirations and values are not jeopardised and threatened by the said immediate, rapid, and large-scale changes.

Objective CC.3

The *nature-based solutions* suggest that there are a handful of proven and trustworthy solutions and proposals in place to responding to Climate Change. However, if looked closer, this objective targets increasing planting practices, as well as the planting extent that aims to achieve multiple outcomes as a core part of climate change adaptation. It is encouraging to see the role of increasing our forest cover and ecosystems, however the current phrasing and content of the Objective and what is actually meant, could lead to misunderstanding of offering less of a kete of larger solutions.

The consideration behind preparing forest spatial plans seem to align with the intention of increasing forest cover for climate change adaptation purposes. However, it is unclear whether

such exercise is time and resource intensive and could draw us away from the implementation path. Another question regarding spatial forest plans is that how this impacts on land ownership and land use.

Objective CC.4

This objective can be strengthened from 'recognises and provides for', especially considering Policy 29, Policy 51, Policy 52, and CC.13 being non-regulatory, specifying how these policies performed and whether the current wording would improve the status quo. Since the first generation regional and district plans, the objectives could not avoid inappropriate subdivision and development in natural hazard overlays, and in some cases, plans could not deliver the objective of reducing the risk and consequences faced from natural hazards.

Looking at Policy 52 to deliver this Objective, somewhat contradicts the strength of the Objective CC.4. Given that Policy CC.13 is also non-regulatory, the regulatory impact of CC.4 can be diluted in the consent process. 'recognises and provides for' could be redrafted to say '*Land use planning will respond with appropriate tools and practices...*'

Objective CC.5

Objective CC.5 is powerful in the sense that a Regional Policy Statement could impact the behavior strongly- however the Objective is implemented with **Policy CC.19 climate change adaptation strategies** which is a non-regulatory instrument. Can this objective be used in land use planning practices?

Objective CC.6

This objective does not recognise the lack of resources, funding, and capability of iwi and hapū to help build climate resilience. The wording is suggesting an objective that iwi and hapū would do anyway without the RPS dictating it. This brings in the question of who is the audience of the Objective. Objective CC.6 can be reworded to express the objective of 'increasing the resilience of iwi and hapū' if that is what was intended and clarify the audience of the Objective.

3.3. Energy, Infrastructure and Waste

It is surprising to see the text used in 2013 when the RPS became operative has not changed, since New Zealand in particular, and world in general are going through some major events, that will fundamentally impact our energy use, food demand, and transport.

Particularly, the third paragraph that refers to energy demand from all sectors continuing to grow, and with the most significant growth coming from transport. Seeing a raft of Objectives on Climate Change being introduced in this RPS, Section 3.3 is not well connected to these objectives.

Global oil demand is changing with the invasion of Ukraine and we are living in a world where food scarcity is a real prospect. Our choice of energy will be impacted by these developments. The introductory text does not refer to this new contextual environment and reads as if we still need to grow our requirements of energy and therefore, associated emissions.

Paragraph six that refers to our international obligations on reducing our emissions; reads as the core reason of reducing our emissions in New Zealand. We are not necessarily reducing our emissions because of our international obligations.

Paragraph eight refers to 2007 and 2008 Government's Energy strategies and is not reflecting the latest policies and documents that are associated with this section. The latest New Zealand Energy Strategy is 2011-2021 and there are plans for a new one to be released in 2024.

Section (b) and Section (c) that refers to infrastructure and waste, do not connect the dots about how infrastructure and waste has been dealt with through the RPS. The issue analysis, for instance, in these sections do not link the issues Tangata Whenua face regarding these subject-matters. For instance, the analysis of waste issues do not refer how connected this issue to infrastructure and three waters network management. These issues pop in consent applications and processes which are the inappropriate processes for them to be addressed.

(2) Regarding the infrastructure section, it seems the discussion focus is the barriers that infrastructure faces rather than its broader context.

(3) Regarding the waste section, a most up to date issue definition is needed, as the system is still requiring landfill consent applications for addressing waste management, although the RPS is aspiring to lessen the need for new landfills.

Objective 11 The quantity of waste disposed of is reduced

Objective 11 could be worded to express a stronger behavioral direction to say: *the quantity of waste disposed of is reduced to ultimately remove our reliance on landfills*. Policy 65 is non-regulatory for the extent of the Objective. To be able to remove our reliance on landfills, a policy that is regulatory will be required.

3.6. Indigenous Ecosystems

Issue 3

Iwi and landowner values- roles are not adequately recognised and provided for. These are two different matters and need to be decoupled on page 29. It would invite confusion to bring two matters in one phrase.

Objective 16B is supported specifically *recognising Mana Whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity and these values are given effect to in decision-making and the roles of mana whenua as kaitiaki are supported and resourced*. The use of Policy IE.2 and Policy IE.3 is also fundamental to achieve this objective.

Objective 29A

It is encouraging to see an objective that is aiming to increase the resilience of the land. The policies to implement this objective seems to be limited to forest cover and extent. Was there any deliberation of using District Plan and land use controls to strengthen the tools that are available to us increasing land resilience, not just a regional policy. Another consideration is the negative impacts of development on the decrease of resilience, how does the RPS address that?

Objective 31

The wording of Objective 31 can be strengthened to mean: *the demand for mineral resources is met from resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand – in an appropriate way we can reduce its footprint.*

The Objective should not encourage further mining, and the wording could somewhat contain the need of mining and its footprint. This objective should not read to encourage mining activities further.

3. Submission - POLICIES

Policy 2 Reducing adverse effects of the discharge of odour, smoke, dust, and fine particulate matter, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions – regional plans

The new addition to the policy where existing industrial and trade premise consent holders to demonstrate a reduction in GHGs at consent renewal is encouraging as well as the phasing out the coal. However, we are unsure of the policy impact on our communities especially given that the transition required is not too far (2024). Having access to a warm and dry house in most instances could mean domestic fires. It will be costly to change this overnight.

Another question this Policy also poses is how monitoring and compliance will be performed.

Policy 7 Recognising the benefits from renewable energy and regionally significant infrastructure – regional and district plans

The changes and amendments made in Policy 7 (a) and (a) (i) supporting a low or zero carbon system, Policy (i) (1), (2), and (3) are contributing to the status quo and might be doing more of the same. For instance, reducing fugitive GHGs from wastewater treatment plants and increasing the diversion of wastewater sludge, requiring efficient municipal landfill gas systems. The RPS policy intention could encourage practitioners to transition to new and innovative systems- not doing more of the same. Allowing a more efficient landfill could be seen as improvement, but the policy could re-shift focus on having no landfills.

Policy 9 Reducing the use and consumption of non-renewable transport fuels, and greenhouse gas emissions from Transport – Regional Land Transport Plan

The preparation of another plan (Regional Land Transport Plan) to give effect to Policy 9 dilutes the policy intent. It is unclear that as a higher order document, the RPS will be reconciled with a lower order document (Regional Land Transport Plan), which may not be binding, producing policies to give effect to policy 9.

The wording also ‘promotes reduction’, it is more cost-effective to reduce than promote, and why promote while we can be more directive to ‘reduce’.

Policy EIW.1: Prioritising affordable high quality active mode and car share infrastructure and public transport services – Regional Land Transport Plan

The intent of the policy is supported – however we are conscious a variety of infrastructure is needed to be present to align, to make this happen. *Without needing to own a private vehicle* is a significant statement, where for affordable high quality active mode and car share infrastructure, and public transport services may not be available for our communities. We need to ensure that the policy intention is not disadvantaging our communities. This might be reworded to say: *Regional Land Transport Plan should provide detail frameworks how this can be implemented with iwi partners and ensure a detailed co-design is worked with Tangata Whenua.*

Policy 10 Promoting travel demand management – District Plans and the Regional Land Transport Plan

Detailed travel demand management plans would help us make aligned decisions while land use is being planned. The production of a travel demand management plan will be time and resource intensive. It is unclear, undertaking such exercise, just to ‘promote’ the reduction of using non-renewables and GHG emissions justifies the time and resource required to complete these plans.

It is unclear whether they are secondary decision-making documents; should they be prepared to produce evidence for our reductions, or because they offer opportunity to change the way land is used, should they be directive rather than promotional and optional.

Policy 11 can be more directive in allowing District Plans to use more directive words for energy efficient designs for all new development.

Policy 12 Management of surface water bodies

This policy does not make clear whose objectives that we are setting our vision for. Tangata Whenua objectives are not the same with the communities’, the Crown’s, or the Councils’. There are not clauses that mention Mana Whenua identifies Freshwater Management Units (FMUs), environmental flows, environmental outcomes, and limits co-designing with the Council.

All sub-clauses could be re-phrased to say ‘*co-designed with Mana Whenua*’. FMUs need to align with Sites of Significance to iwi and Māori, and this has not been mentioned or referred to in this Policy.

Policy FW.1 Urban development effects on Freshwater – District Plans

The wording of the clause (b) takes away from the strength this Policy is anchored on. This could be rewritten to make the policy intent firmer for District and City Councils to say: '*...shall use Water Sensitive Urban Design in the design and construction of urban development*'.

The clause (c) is using the word 'minimise' which does not have teeth when it comes to rules in the district plans, and their implementation. This clause caveats the land contours and extent practicable; it is unclear what triggers (rules) District Plans would have, this to be implemented. Most of the land is on challenging contours in Wellington and on hills that need to be cut out for feasible development to occur. Any mitigation that might be possible for flatter regions such as, Waikato or Auckland, may not be realisable, possible, or feasible in Greater Wellington.

The policy should acknowledge and change the wording to say, *if it is going to increase the earthworks to the point that impacts are more than minor, it is not appropriate to continue with the land use proposal unless there is some ground-breaking mitigation in place.*

In summary, the policy contradicts itself because minimising earthworks in Wellington may not be able to be an option in some instances due to topography and soil conditions.

The drafting intent of Policy FW.1 (f) is optimistic to reflect achieving multiple gains for stormwater management. In our built / urban environments, we observe the multiple issues of our stormwater network which won't be able to achieve the intent of this Policy.

The policy should ensure there are stormwater-basics and bottom lines are achieved- not compromised then the policy intent could move onto amenity, recreational, cultural, ecological, climate, vegetation retention. The policy should focus on absolute musts of stormwater management and land development and acknowledge in the absence of standards and bottom lines, delivering other aspects may be a luxury. The policy needs to ensure the stormwater system provides safe and clever solutions to our communities then the rest, multiple positive outcomes, will come.

The policy also needs to acknowledge the need of additional infrastructure to be able to give effect to this Policy.

Policy FW.2: Financial contributions for urban development – district plans

Developers are required to make financial contributions to subdivision and development as a condition of their consent, ensuring that there is treatment for stormwater. It is commonly mentioned that these contributions have not been enough in the past and can only deliver less than ideal systems when it comes to stormwater systems.

We are aware that Councils are geared up for reviewing their Financial Contribution policies as to identify what constitutes a 'fair contribution'. This policy could be reworded; instead of 'how a fair share of the cost is determined, and the nature of the contribution' it could focus on a realistic calculation of proposed development's greater connection with the current and existing infrastructure as well as the burden that it will lay on this infrastructure. It is

unproductive for development contributions to just focus on the site-based stormwater systems instead of looking at the whole system and its connections.

We have seen yet again many examples in Porirua, a development does not just have impacts where it is located but need to be considered within its overall downstream and upstream environments in the whole catchment and the infrastructure associated with it. We currently do not have well established systems to cope with existing loads regarding stormwater and wastewater overflows, let alone the needs of new subdivisions and development.

Policy 14: Managing contamination in stormwater from development – regional plans

It is worthwhile to consider whether this policy could also be included in District Plans, not just the Regional Plans. The word ‘manage’ is not ideal as it refers to a world that we may never reduce the contamination. It is not appropriate that, with this wording we are required to accept some form of contamination to constantly occur. It is ideal that the policy intent reflects the contamination from stormwater will be phased off because we have rules and provisions in place that we stopped the contamination to reach to our rivers, ocean, and wetlands. New and existing subdivision and development (their regulation mostly covered by District Plan clauses) should not allow parū water reaching to our precious freshwater environments, in which some of them are severely contaminated already.

Quite similarly ***Policy 15 Managing the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance – district and regional plans*** can be considered in the same regard above.

By using the word ‘managing’ we are accepting and acknowledging the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance instead of avoiding these activities to achieve the target attribute states for water bodies and freshwater ecosystems.

Policy 17 Take and use of water for the health needs of people – regional plans

This policy contradicts Te Ao Māori view that humans do not sit at the centre of Taiao and take and use of water is just for health needs of the people. The policy detail that says ‘providing for the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems’ in a way covers this view but also contradictorily says the ‘health needs of people ahead of any take and use for other purposes while providing for...’

Policy 18 Protecting ecological health of water bodies – regional plans

The policy seems to be strengthened by using the word ‘avoid’ in the Policy 18 (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i) maintaining the fish passages. It is unclear, though, if the policy intention is being levelled down with the word use of ‘promoting’ in the clause (a), (b), (c), and (d).

It is unclear whether the hierarchy of these clauses are considered; where ‘avoidance’ should be emphasized more than the ‘promotion’ side of the Policy 18 whether should the ‘avoiding’ clauses be coming first before the less directive clauses. The wording ‘promote’ could be rewritten into ‘ensure’ or ‘give effect to’ and rendered to a more impactful and directive policy wording instead of promoting. This will balance the priorities targeted within this policy; ‘avoid’ and ‘ensure’ reflects better of the intention of the Policy 18.

This Policy could apply to regional plans and the district plans.

Policy 23 Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values – district and regional plans

Policy 24 Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values – district and regional plans

Policy 23 and Policy 24 identifying and protecting Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) are a critical part of the RPS. It is concerning these values to be identified by June 2024. Policy 23 and 24 have been in effect for a long time and is not ideal some Councils have not given effect to these Policies and / or gave effect partially, either to include just Public SNAs and leaving out the private land areas.

It is crucial that councils that are tentatively holding space for these policies implement Policy 23 and 24 since District Plans to map, identify the SNAs, and undertake public consultation, and finally performing plan change to give effect to SNAs protection in the form of provisions are long processes that jeopardise the protection of SNAs.

An important development that involves the implementation of Policy 23 and 24, is the Ministry for the Environment released the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). This means there will be further policy implications to Regional Plan and District Plans. Since the exposure draft is accepting public submissions, it will be sometime for policies to take effect then to be implemented in Regional and District Plans.

The intention of Policy 23 and 24 becomes more important where all Councils are about to give effect to National Policy Statement-Urban Development (NPS-UD) prioritising housing and development needs. It is critical that SNAs are provided protection in this uncertain environment where the Councils still to give effect to NPS-IB but will give effect to NPS-UD before National Policy Statement – Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and NPS-IB start to take effect providing protection for our freshwater and indigenous ecosystems. Note that these NPSs are not synchronised, it is imperative Policy 23 and 24 ensures the Plan is given effect as soon as practicable.

Policy IE.1 Protecting Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values: Limits and outcomes for biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation – district and regional plans

The clause (a) of this Policy, that the offsetting should not be applied if the species or ecosystems are threatened, or the ecosystem is uncommon is supported. It is unclear how the clause (b) come to the number 'at least 10%'. How do we identify the benefits of and understand the results of 10%? How do we make sure that the biodiversity compensation is adequate or enough to protect what we want to protect?

Given that most of the species and ecosystems in Greater Wellington, in part, are limited, in danger or threatened, we are unsure the biodiversity value loss and gain can be in balance.

Policy IE.2: Giving effect to Mana Whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity

This policy is a pleasant improvement from the current framework that the RPS provides for. Clauses (a), (b), and (c) allows Mana Whenua to exercise their rights, and these clauses can be strengthened.

District and regional plans can only provide a Mātauranga framework when iwi desires to share this framework as it applies to indigenous biodiversity. This clause to say: partner with iwi to apply a mātauranga Māori framework for the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity' would be better.

Clause (b) should not say actively involve as Tangata Whenua holds the kaitiakitanga status; they will plan, decide, and monitor how indigenous biodiversity is tracking. Kaitiaki Monitoring Framework should be included here and be binding for District and Regional Plans. These Plans should spell out how the monitoring will be applied.

Clause (c) is not clear whether the (c) is allowing Mana Whenua to access and use indigenous biodiversity. This could be reworded to say Mana Whenua has access and use rights, and District and Regional Plans should acknowledge these rights and set up processes to ensure that their access and use are not limited and restricted in any way.

Policy 29 Avoiding inappropriate subdivision and development in areas at risk from natural hazards – district and regional plans

It is positive to see a stronger wording of Policy 29 and the intent of the policy is supported as the new wording provides. It is unclear of the Policy that specifies 'manage subdivision, use and development where the risks are low and tolerable'. The management of low and tolerable risks suggests that we might deal with cumulative effects if development is allowed in such areas. It could also mean for those who interpret the Plans where these areas are not necessarily discouraged and that we have confidence the cumulative and unknown impacts can be managed.

It is unclear in this policy what tools and management options we would have that would help managing the subdivision, use and development in those areas.

Policy 31 Identifying and promoting intensification – district plans

This policy does not mention the role of intensification and greenfield development interaction, and this may not recognise the land development trends and nuances that every city in the Greater Wellington region is going through. In Porirua, Porirua PDP Future Urban Zone (FUZ) suggested large areas of greenfield development including central government fast track greenfield development projects such as, the Plimmerton Farms. This means Porirua will gear up for quite a number of housing projects, supplied with greenfield development as well as giving effect to Government's NPS-UD requirements of intensification and densification.

This policy is not clear where the intensification is expected to be covered by brownfield development and whether greenfield development is considered as part of intensification. This will have repercussions for the environment.

It is unclear that Policy UD.1 Enabling intensification – district plans is kept separately as the policy intention could have been included in Policy 31.

Policy CC.2 Travel demand management plans – district plans

The policy intent of asking territorial authorities to prepare travel demand management plans is unclear. What does preparing travel demand management plans look like and whether this distracts the local authorities to execute zero carbon policies? Because producing such plans will take time, resources and requires robust evidence.

It is unclear also whether producing these plans will bear any additional costs to communities and whether this can be done in a more efficient way through a resource consent application. It is unclear, the word ‘minimising’ in the policy refers to District Plan minimising the reliance on private vehicles, or developers are required to prepare travel management plans so that they can provide a plan on how their development promotes and enables a zero carbon travel framework.

Policy CC.3 Environmental integration in urban development -district plans

The policy intention is supported however, the policy wording ‘ensure’ is not strong enough directing district plans to integrate environment in urban development. This policy could give stronger direction to District Councils that the policy is implemented in rules and standards.

Policy CC.6 Increasing Forest Cover – regional plans, Policy CC.7 Identifying nature-based solutions to climate change – district and regional plans, and Policy CC.8 Protecting, restoring, and enhancing ecosystems that provide nature-based solutions to climate change – district and regional plans

It is unclear whether the ‘nature-based solutions’ is just about identifying potential planting and forest areas in the region. A point that has been made in the earlier parts of this commentary, it is not clear that the term nature-based referring to, and the draft is misleading to sound like we would embrace and implement a whole raft of solutions. If the intention is about forest cover, the Policy should be upfront about this.

The second point regarding Policy CC.6, CC.7 and CC.8, are the components that are related to District Plans. For Policy CC.7 and CC.8, it is unclear how a regional council can direct a district plan to identify potential forest cover and ecosystems to be protected as this is a regional council mandate under the RMA hierarchy.

It is encouraging to see policy intention of having more ecosystems in place to manage the impacts of climate change but is unclear how this Policy could realistically be achieved through District Plans. Asking District Plans to identify areas of ecosystems to be then planted and somehow ringfenced, other than the implementation of Section 6 related vegetation, is above their mandate.

Historic Heritage Policy 21 and Policy 22:

We are unsure whether Policy 21 and 22 make a distinguished note between the historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) identification and mapping and protection. They should be separated - or the policy 21 and 22 to be worded to ensure that distinguishing features are identified and comes across in the paragraph.

Policy IM.1: Integrated management – ki uta ki tai

The policy ensures the involvement of mana whenua in resource management and decision making. It incorporates a more holistic view of the environment and its interconnectedness. There might need to be further clarification that making decisions based on mātauranga Māori need to be informed by mātauranga Māori knowledge holders. In terms of sharing data and information across all relevant agencies it should be specified that mātauranga Māori data sovereignty will be upheld, and Māori decide when their knowledge is shared.

4. Submission - MATTERS OF CONSIDERATION

Matters of consideration are important as when resource consents are evaluated, particular policies will need to be given regard to.

Policy 39 Recognising the benefits from renewable energy and regionally significant infrastructure – consideration

Most regionally significant infrastructure is located where iwi and Tangata Whenua has sites of significance or cultural redress in their Treaty Settlement Claims Act.

This consideration of Policy 39 should not clash implementing iwi's rights of Tino Rangatiratanga and should not be interpreted in a way that the need for infrastructure does not recognise the rights and interests associated with the proposals. If there is such prospect of this happening, going forward should be co-designed with Tangata Whenua and iwi. This link between the sites and areas of significance and regionally significant infrastructure is crucial.

Policy 40 Protecting and enhancing the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems – consideration

Policy 40 is important to consider when evaluating consents however it is challenging to identify how developers and land users will implement these considerations and how the impact of Policy 40 (a) is assessed. The Policy requires that water quality, flows and water levels and aquatic habitats of surface water bodies are 'managed in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai' it is unclear how this will be achieved. One other question related to this matter is that if an integrated view to water and a whole catchment approach is aimed at in this consideration, why this Policy only includes surface water bodies. Couldn't a development and land use activity negatively impact the groundwater?

Policy FW.3 Implementing Te Mana o Te Wai in urban development – consideration is supported; clauses of (i) and (l) can be strengthened by rewording. Instead of minimising earthworks extent and volume of works, this could mean to say performing earthworks, will need to be justified as to when they are absolutely needed. Identifying and mapping streams also need to be done as part of the stormwater and related-infrastructure investigations, that are attached to the consent application. This consideration could be strengthened to say no negative impact will occur in the identified and mapped streams.

From this a good segue way is, **the Policy 41 Controlling the effects of earthworks and vegetation disturbance – consideration** as per the comments above, ‘minimising’ can be strengthened to say controlled or avoided. We agree that this needs to be a consideration.

Policy 42- Minimising contamination in stormwater from development – consideration

‘Minimising contamination’ is not adequate wording for the intention of the Policy. It is ideal this consideration to Policy 42 is reworded to say, no contamination in stormwater.

Policy 43- Protecting ecological function of water bodies – consideration

How do we identify resource consents’ ability to demonstrate the ‘contribution to achieving environmental outcomes and target attribute states for water bodies and freshwater ecosystems’? There is need for resource consents to show the environmental progress they are demonstrating in the application and proposal. It is unclear how this would be evaluated. Even in the cases of drafting clauses in consents, may not be doing much- what is our benchmark and how do we measure and label what is an ecosystem achievement? The consideration may not provide applicants and consent processing staff enough clarity and certainty to describe what is a contribution.

Contribution as a word can be stronger; if this is a consideration it needs to match its empowering qualities and the level of higher order policy execution.

Policy 44 Managing water take and use to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai – consideration

This consideration needs to consider the needs of iwi and Māori and should be able to give flexibility to the needs of Mana Whenua.

Policy IE.3 Giving effect to mana whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity – consideration

Policy 48 Principles of Treaty of Waitangi – consideration

Policy 49 Recognising and providing for matters of significance to tangata whenua – consideration

It is confusing mana whenua roles and values are recognised in this particular policy and given consideration for a resource consent, however in other parts of the RPS we do not see them. Policy 49 has connections to Policy IE.3 and all taonga will need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework; it is confusing why the plan picks out a regime of giving effect to mana whenua values and roles particularly managing indigenous biodiversity but not other parts of the Plan.

Policy 49, in a way, explains it to extend the policy intention to fresh and coastal waters in the clause (b) and the exercise of kaitiakitanga in the clause (a) however this comes through as fragmented. The word 'recognised' can be strengthened, we suggest removing this wording and leave it with providing for.

Policy 48 Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi provides a generic explanation what the applicants need to provide and what the consideration would be from the perspective of resource consent issuer. Deed of Settlement Acts should be clause (c) and any other evidence that are provided such as, Cultural Impact Assessments and iwi environmental management plans.

Policy UD.3 Marae and papakāinga – consideration

The consideration of this policy should apply to all tangata whenua sites of significance and other land that has been given back/ returned to iwi. Some of these lands that are returned to Tangata Whenua, iwi would have a raft of different values associated to the whenua and the values will be dynamic -can change over time. Urban Development provisions need to recognise these values and that recognise they will play out differently in different sites.

Marae and Papakāinga should not be negatively impacted in the face of intensification and densification proposals, and this could be addressed when considering resource consent applications. This may need to extend to other taonga and sites and areas of significance, awa and moana and important places where iwi still practice cultural matāuranga.

Policy 51 Reducing the risks and consequences of natural hazards- consideration

It is important to support this policy as a consideration and appreciate the detail that it goes into covering all the potential issues we experience from natural hazards. It is noticeable there are water quality and overflow issues with our three-water network and flooding exacerbates these issues, and further making them more hazardous catalysed by the floods. There are not any connections created in the Policy 51. Yet this is an important consideration for Tangata Whenua.

Clause (i) includes moderate risks; it is not convincing, if the risk is moderate, the Policy should not automatically allow that subdivision, use and development. Only if the risk is low then this could justify a mitigation if the hazard occurred.

Clause (ia) is not clear; District Plans are responsible to make rules, making sure that the developments do not block the overland flood paths; do we consider the RPS should mention this, too? What policy gap this is looking into addressing or is it doubling up?

It is unclear whether the clause (j) was too conservative, taking into account 1 in a 100-year flood as we are seeing them more often in the face of worsening impacts of Climate Change and global warming.

Policy 52 Minimising adverse effects of hazard mitigation measures – consideration

Some of the new additions to the policy are encouraging, such as the long-term viability; no increase in risk to adjacent properties, and adverse effects on Te Mana o Te Wai, Te Mana o te Taiao, and that they are considered as part of the consent applications. However, the impacts of hazard mitigation measures to be minimised: these mitigations do alter the site and change the environment in ways that we cannot bring it back.

The wording of the first clause (a) 'justifiable', for instance is a subjective word and all flood hazard structures are justifiable at some point in time and that this may not be able to be evaluated from an objective perspective. Policy 52 does not elaborate how consent planner will make their assessment. Same with the cumulated effects, how these are assessed are important and may be made on some judgement and value points.

The word 'minimise' still leaves policy door open for those who are inclined to think bringing hard engineering structures to the scene is the ultimate answer.

Policy 55 Establishing and maintaining well-functioning urban environments – consideration

In clause 7, suggest delete the word 'recognise' and just keep the provide for to strengthen the intention.

Policy UD.4 Responsive Planning – consideration

The responsive planning section does not refer to three waters and stormwater. This has been mentioned generally in the clause (d) referring that required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposals. This does not say anything about whether it can be provided at all effectively or efficiently.

Policy 56 Managing development in rural areas – consideration

Mana Whenua and iwi have land in rural areas that was returned through the Deed of Settlement Acts. Policy 56 consideration needs to include the execution of Tino Rangatiratanga on this land and to be able to allow the land aspirations of iwi and Māori is accounted for.

Policy 58 Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure – consideration

The part of the Policy 58 that says 'ensure all new urban development including form, layout, location, and timing is sequenced in a way that...' seems to belong to the 'responsive planning' section of the RPS. Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure is not just about transport as specified in clause (b).

Policy CC.9 Equity and inclusiveness – consideration

This clause should apply all policy in the RPS, not just to Climate Change parts. Inter-racial and inter-generational equity is impacting iwi and Mana Whenua differently as far as Climate Change impacts.

Policy CC.15 Reducing agricultural gross biogenic methane emissions – consideration

Does this policy cover methane emissions from landfills?

Policy IM.1 Integrated management -ki uta ki tai – consideration

How does this Policy and its consideration work in the greater context for the Regional Policy Statement?

5. Submission - METHODS TO IMPLEMENT POLICIES

General comment regarding the methods and the involvement of tangata whenua in the implementation of policies in the Regional Policy Statement: Method 32, 37 and 38.

The methods (some more than the others) outlined under the Subject 'Resource Management with Tangata Whenua' should be used and applied to other topics in the RPS. The methods, Method 32, Method 37, and Method 38 are such like and cannot see these spelled out in important topics 'Climate Change', 'Regional Form, design and function', 'Natural Hazards', 'Soils and Minerals'. Suggest adding these methods into these topics.

Method 17 Promote and assist actions on waste management

It is not clear what has changed from the previous method in terms of outcomes. The wording seems that it could be strengthened. The intention of the method is not clear in the drafting; promoting and assisting actions on waste management does not seem to be targeted at what activity they are aiming for - and it is a generic statement that may not find its audience. Could this phrase be changed to say, 'ensure waste management's impact on the environment are removed gradually within the limitations of our current waste management systems'. The methods outlined are targeted at supporting District and City councils? Ideal to clarify what authority this will apply.

Method FW.1 Joint Processing urban development consents

It is not clear what role Tangata Whenua has in this process.

Method FW.2 Freshwater Action Plans

As a method, it does not say much about the involvement of Tangata Whenua. This could be something that Tangata Whenua would want to co-design.

Method CC.5 Review regional response to reducing agricultural emissions

Under the central government direction, how can Regional Councils achieve emission reductions from agriculture? Is this method, just limited to reviewing the regional response, which means reviewing land use emissions impact? It is not clear.

Method 32 Partnering with tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners, and the community in identifying and protecting significant values

The content covered in the Method 32 is supported, however it is not clear the intention of the drafting in some places, such as, 'engaging with stakeholders, landowners and community'. This method could emphasize 'co-design of actions, policies and implementation' -it is not an exercise just regarding sites of significance to iwi and Māori.

Method 34 Prepare a regional water supply strategy, method UD.1 Future Development Strategy, and Method UD.2 Development manuals and design guides:

No mention of iwi and tangata whenua in these methods and how they impact iwi, hāpu and Māori.

Method IE3 Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring programme

This is connected throughout the plan; kaitiaki monitoring is not intended just for biodiversity; the theme needs to spread throughout all areas of taiao. It has not been consistently applied the same language provided here in this method as it needs to be coming across all the RPS. The word 'support' mana whenua can be redrafted to say, 'ensure Mana Whenua has sufficient resources to establish a mana whenua kaitiaki monitoring programme to monitor the health of the region's indigenous biodiversity.' Note that comments made above, the kaitiaki monitoring does not just apply to indigenous biodiversity and the method should speak to how this is incorporated to the GWRC monitoring frameworks.

4.1 Regulatory policies – direction to district and regional plans and the Regional Land Transport

Policy 6 recognises the significance of Porirua Harbour. This could be further discussed.

4.2 Regulatory Policies – matters to be considered

Explanations for Policy 48 (Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi) and Policy 49 (Recognising and providing for matters of significance to tangata whenua) have been removed. These are beneficial explanations which provide greater context for policies. These explanations discuss how Māori values and sites of significance should be considered. If these explanations are going to be put somewhere else there should be guidance on where to find them.

Ngā mihi nui,

Naomi Solomon
Pou Toa Matarau
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Ngāti Toa Rangatira

Freshwater Vision for Regional Policy Statement

Mihimihi

(To be completed)

Disclaimer:

This draft document is a work in progress and will be subject to review and finalisation. It is to remain in-confidence and not to be shared externally.

This statement is made up of five main sections;

Section One provides a set of principles (Ngā Mātāpono)

Section Two provides the values we uphold (Ngā Uaratanga)

Section Three provides issues from an RM issues perspective.

Section Four provides a guide to our aspirations (Moemoeā)

Section Five provides a set of Objectives to guide planning provisions for the Regional Plan.

SECTION 1 PRINCIPLES

Ngā Mātāpono

For the purposes of this Freshwater Vision for Regional Policy Statement, ngā mātāpono are fundamental 'unchanging' truths that serve as the foundations for beliefs or behavior.

Principles provide the basis to the exercise of all tikanga. These principles must be guided to be pono, which 'means true' or 'genuine' that is true in terms of the principles of Māoritanga.

The principles outlined in this Freshwater Vision are founded on long standing principles of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (Ngāti Toa) and tikanga Tainui.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Principle 1: Wairua

Taha wairua is the embodiment of Te Ao Māori. It is our connection between both the physical and spiritual realm. It is intangible and in Te Ao Māori is our guiding force as a race. Karakia (incantations) are our connection in Te Ao Māori with wairuatanga which invokes spiritual guidance and protection. Wairua is our whakapapa (genealogy) our ahurea (culture), our taiao (environment), our wai (water) and our hononga (connection) to our identity as Māori. Wairuatanga is our connection to our atua (gods), our kaihanga (our creator) and takes precedence above all else in Te Ao Māori. Māori believe Wairua exists in inanimate objects which is where we reference the term mauri (life force) where essence is located.

Tohunga atua (an expert or specialist of the spiritual realm) have the capability to instill Wairua into something. Upon death in Te Ao Māori we believe that a person's Wairua continues live on.

The terminology Wai (water) stems from Wairua. Māori introduce themselves by saying “Ko Wai Au” which is a reference to the highly significant role of water and its connection to Te Ao Māori. Wai ora carries the mauri/life force of health and well-being for all Māori.

Principle 2: Te Mana o te Wai

Mana cannot be separated from Mana Whenua and Mana Moana of Ngāti Toa. It is an embedded principle that is an essential aspect and expression of rangatiratanga and whakapapa. Te Mana o Te Wai should provide for Te Hauora o te Taiao (the health of the environment), Te Hauora o Te Wai (the health of waterbodies), and Te Hauora o te Tangata (the health of People).

In the management of Taiao, Ngāti Toa asserts its te mana o te wai and retains the right to define and adapt Te Mana o Te Wai. Further, the principles outlined in this document must guide the implementation of Te Mana o Te Wai. The principles outlined in this document must guide the implementation of Te Mana o te Wai under the National Policy Statement – Freshwater Management.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Principle 3: Whakapapa

Kia tu ai a Ngāti Toa Rangatira; He iwi Toa; He iwi Rangatira

Whakapapa is the identity and basis of Ngāti Toa. Whakapapa is the relationship between the tangata and whenua. It is the foundation to recognition and respect for Te Taiao. Whakapapa is the inherit and inseparable connection between the iwi and te Taiao. Our efforts to protect each other and our environment is not out of 'good will' or citizenship. It is an inherited commitment and obligations to care for our atua, our tūpuna, our future generations. This is the basis of kaitiakitanga and all the tikanga principles of Ngāti Toa.

Principle 4: Mauriora

Enhancing mauri benefits the health and wellbeing of iwi members and the community by ensuring the spiritual and cultural needs of te Taiao and those that are associated with it are respected. Environmental restoration and improved access to te Taiao, especially for activities that reconnect whānau with the sea for mahinga kai, waka ama, tikanga and associated traditional practices.

Principle 5: Kotahi Tātou

Maintaining interactions with other iwi and relations is a critical element of exercise of kaitiakitanga. Confronting environmental challenges requires a united approach and strong coalitions. The unity of Ngāti Toa is maintained by collective action, inspiring leadership and smart thinking.

Principle 6: Rangatiratanga

Ngāti Toa exercise Rangatiratanga over te rohe moana and the rights and interests of the iwi in the sea and streams, lakes and whenua are recognised and provided for.

Principle 7: Manaakitanga

The mana of Ngāti Toa must be enhanced by ensuring the iwi can fulfill manaakitanga responsibilities by the exercise of customary gathering, harvesting and maintenance of mahinga kai. Kaimoana must be plentiful and culturally safe to provide for manuhiri at mārae.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

The exercise of rangatiratanga is expressed in manaakitanga -the tikanga and traditions of respect, generosity and care for others. Manaakitanga requires the exercise of customary harvesting and mahinga kai.

Principle 8: Mana Whenua

Ngāti Toa are mana whenua te Moana o Raukawa, Te Tau Ihu and the south-western lands of Te Upoko O Te Ika, and associated waterways. The waterways are an integral part of the whenua (land) – any map of the water will show the network of channels of our waterways in an over the whenua.

Principle 9: Mana Moana

Ngāti Toa exercise mana moana over te Moana o Raukawa and the associated harbours, islands, reefs, fishing grounds, sounds and rivers. Te Rauparaha established mana whenua in the North and South Islands in surrounding waters and waterways. Waterways cannot be separated from the sea.

Principle 10: Tohu

Ngā Tohu o Toa Rangatira are observed and understood in the management of te Moana o Raukawa and the associated harbours, rivers and whenua. Tohu are markers, signs and warning signals. Tohu are grounded in the mātauranga of Toa Rangatira. Prominent hills, reefs, rocks formed ngā tohu o te moana – landmarks which guided Ngāti Toa to important fishing grounds and significant sites. The tohu of Ngāti Toa iwi find expression in wāhi taonga – significant sites and landscapes including freshwater and coastal waters as our sites of significance.

Principle 11: Mātauranga

Te Mātauranga o Toa Rangatira is developed and applied in the management of te Moana o Raukawa and associated harbours, rivers and whenua.

Principle 12: Kaitiakitanga

Under the Resource Management Act (RMA) (1991) *kaitiakitanga* means *the exercise of guardianship by the tangata whenua of an area in accordance with Tikanga Māori in relation to natural and physical resources; includes the ethic of stewardship.*



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

This statement will not refer to the RMA definition above. Instead we will use :

Kaitiakitanga is exercised by Ngāti Toa as mana whenua to protect land, culture, traditions and all taonga.

Aspects of Kaitiakitanga include:

- Maintenance of tikanga
- Maintenance of Kawa
- Preservation of Taonga
- Representation of the people and their interests
- Preservation of and maintenance of the rohe.

Kaitiakitanga flows from mana whenua and the authority to act as guardians. Kaitiaki is an inheritance, related to whakapapa.

SECTION TWO VALUES

Ngā Uaratanga

Below are the relevant values associated with freshwater and connected coastal waters. Note that this is not a full or final list.

Value 1: Ahikā

The value of maintaining a Ngāti Toa presence and connection. Ahikā includes names and boundaries which express the identity of Ngāti Toa. Names are indicators of the complex connections of mana whenua with te Taiao.

Value 2: Āhua

Āhua is the natural character of an area, and may include exceptional natural, iconic or aesthetic features. Matters contributing to the natural form and character are biological, visual and physical characteristics valued by Ngāti Toa.

Value 3: Customary use and contact recreation

The interaction of Ngāti Toa with fresh water and coastal waters for cultural purposes includes a spiritual relationship with water expressed through Māori practices, recreation and harvest of natural materials.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Contact recreation also supports people being able to connect with the water through a range of activities, such as swimming, surfing, waka, boating, fishing, diving, underwater photography, mahinga kai in a range of different flows or levels.

Value 4: Wai Ora

Wai ora is pure healthy water. This is water in its purest form. It contains the source of life and wellbeing. It is used in rituals to purify and sanctify and has the power to give life, sustain wellbeing and counteract evil. Waiora also means health.

In the wai ora state, stream flow is steady with ripples and the stream or river bed is stony. Children and kaumātua can drink the water and eat the food that comes from streams without hesitation. Mahinga Kai are abundant and able to be sustainably harvested. Knowledge of mahinga kai is abundant and transferred to younger generations. The abundance and vitality of mahinga kai express te ha o te ora of water bodies. Hau ora (well-being) is available.

Value 5: Kaimoana

Kaimoana is the values associated with customary gathering of food and natural materials from the sea, as well as the food and resources themselves and the places where those resources are gathered.

Value 6: Mahinga Ika

Mahinga ika are fishing grounds of significance to Ngāti Toa.

Value 7: Mahinga Kai

Mahinga kai are the customary gathering of food and natural materials, the food and resources themselves and the places where those resources are gathered. Te mahi kai is the utilisation of the resources of this awa for spiritual sustenance and is its highest value.

Value 8: Ngā mahi o ngā tūpuna

Ngā mahi o ngā tūpuna are values associated with the interaction of Ngāti Toa with fresh and coastal waters in relation to exercising kaitiakitanga and other purposes. This includes cultural and spiritual relationships with freshwater and the coast (Te Moana o Raukawa) expressed through daily practices, recreation, and the harvest of natural materials.

Value 9: Ngā tohu o te moana

Landmarks, prominent hills, rocks and reefs which aided navigation and guidance to locate fishing grounds and maritime wayfinding.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Value 10: Papakāinga

Ngāti Toa settlements and villages including mārae.

Value 11: Pou whenua

Pou whenua are boundary markers. They could be significant landmarks, streams, headlines or posts.

Value 12: Taonga species

All of the environment is sacred and associated with the ancestors. However, some plant, animal and freshwater species have particular importance for spiritual or cultural purposes.

Value 13: Wāhi maumahara

Wāhi maumahara are memorial places and are often associated with a significant event or person connected to the history of Ngāti Toa. Sometimes these places consisted of a memorial stone or marker associated with an ancestor (Kōwhatu whakamaharatanga).

Wāhi maumahara includes places of learning and where local knowledge and histories are etched into the landscape. These are places that have been central to intergenerational knowledge transmission of Ngāti Toa tūpuna and could be used as such again in the future.

Value 14: Wāhi tapu

Wāhi tapu are sacred places that are revered by Ngāti Toa for their traditional, spiritual, ritual and mythological values.

Value 15: Wāhi tūpuna

Most wāhi tapu are also wāhi tūpuna. Wāhi tūpuna are significant places associated with the ancestors of Ngāti Toa. Wāhi tūpuna includes places associated with wāhi ahurea or traditional places integral to the cultural identity of Ngāti Toa.

Value 16: Wāhi whakarite

Some sites are the location of specific and restricted activities which have been undertaken by Ngāti Toa for many centuries. This is a place of ritual related especially related to mahinga kai activities that require a specific environment to function. These practices differ from day to-day activities like Ngā Mahi a ngā Tūpuna.

Value 17: Wāhi whakahaumanu and wāhi rongōā



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Wāhi whakahaumanu are places of restoration and healing. They are often associated with sources of rongoā materials and cultural harvesting.

Value 18: Karakia and rāhui as tikanga expressions of Kaitiakitanga

Tikanga expressions of kaitiakitanga include karakia and rāhui. Karakia is an expression of the relationship between atua and tangata. These prayers often sought the assistance of Tāwhitimātea, Tāwhiti or other divine entities for assistance and support. Tamihana Te Rauparaha witnessed of the use of karakia for the winds to blow from a central direction to assist in battle. These types of karakia were called 'whakawhiro'.

Value 19: Rāhui is a special time of tapu

Rāhui 'prohibits specific human activities from occurring or from continuing'.

It might be directed at a group of people or focused on a single individual. There might be a visible signal, such as a post, to let people know that a rāhui has been 'stood up'.

Rāhui continues to be exercised by Ngāti Toa over its mana moana. A recent example is the two-week rāhui issued over Te Awarua o Porirua in July 2021 following spilling of untreated sewage.

SECTION THREE ISSUES

Ngā Take

<Note that these issues are not in final form, there will be further issues added>

Issue 1: Wai Mate

Wai mate is dead water. It cannot sustain life. It is dangerous to all living things, including humans and ecosystems because it can cause illness and misfortune. Water clarity is very poor, flow is too slow. The stream or riverbed is covered in silt and mud. There is no riparian overhang. Children and kaumātua cannot drink out of or eat anything from streams. There is no mahinga kai at wai mate. The potential to harvest is zero. Serious concern for coastal impacts.

Issue 2: Reconnecting with our wai

Streams that are alienated from Ngāti Toa by way of piping and modification and various land development, need to be reconnecting with Ngāti Toa iwi. These statements need to ensure that the Māori kupu is used. Piped and unrecognised streams that are not named or have anglicised names, will be given traditional Māori names under the guidance of Mana Whenua.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

These names will be formalised and shared with the local community and Mana Whenua through education and signage.

Issue 3: Piped and modified streams

Streams that are currently piped to be daylighted as far as practicable and are able to take their natural form and path. Where streams cannot be daylighted, their ecological values are targeted in the consenting processes. Native fish should have access to move freely up and down the entire length of the catchment and this will be recognised in consenting processes and conditions.

SECTION FOUR ASPIRATIONS

Moemoeā

<This is a draft and yet to be further developed and reviewed>

Regional Policy Statement must give effect to Ngāti Toa whakapapa, rangatiratanga, mana, freshwater rights, aspirations and values so that our iwi carries out their responsibilities and obligations as kaitiaki.

Regional Policy Statement will provide for Ngāti Toa so that Ngāti Toa applies mātauranga Māori to restore wai and performs kaitiaki monitoring.

Ngāti Toa Rangatira must have access to safe wai for cultural practices such as tohi, whakarite and whakawātea. Ngāti Toa must have access to safe wai for recreational activities such as waka ama, hīkoi, cycling and fishing. These activities are integral to our wairua and ora.

Traditional resources should be protected so that Ngāti Toa are able to practice customary harvesting. Kaimoana should be plentiful and culturally safe.

Ngāti Toa aspire for the mauri, mana and ora of wai to be restored and sustained for future generations. The health and wellbeing of wai is required to be prioritised under Te Mana o te Wai obligations. Wai is a taonga which needs awhina and protection. Ngāti Toa water interests in the Greater Wellington Region rohe, has cultural, spiritual, historical and social significance for Ngāti Toa. Therefore, te wai must be restored to sustain the cultural, spiritual and cultural needs of our iwi. The health of wai affects the health of our whenua and people, as it is a source of life. Wai holds value as mahinga kai and offers kaimoana, rongoā and other resources. Restoring the wai ora will restore the ora of our whenua and our people. Wai is part of our cultural identity and should be recognised for its intrinsic values. For holistic restoration of wai ora, our systems and processes will need to respond to the interconnectedness of te taiao.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Our whakapapa needs to be recognised. Our cultural responsibilities and obligations to sustain te taiao for present and future generations need to be recognised.

Future needs of Ngāti Toa iwi will be explicitly empowered and given effect by way of objectives, policies and rules in planning documents and future generations of Ngāti Toa have development rights as to how Ngāti Toa wishes to use water and share it with public and communities. A monopoly over water allocation and abstraction will need to end. Consenting processes will reflect this.

SECTION FIVE OBJECTIVES

These objectives are provided to guide Proposed Natural Resources Plan and Regional Policy Statement.

WAI MATE

Wai mate-O1: No constructed wastewater overflows

Wai mate-O2: No discharge of treated waste water into wai

Wai mate-O3: Ngāti Toa seeks land development will need to pursue innovative solutions to waste water matters and stormwater needs of communities. Doing more of the same is not acceptable for Ngāti Toa.

FRESHWATER MOEMOEĀ

FW Moemoeā -O1: Must restore the mauri, mana and ora of wai in alignment with tikanga and kawa.

FW Moemoeā -O2: Must protect cultural identity by restoring our wai and living by cultural values and practices.

FW Moemoeā -O3: Ngāti Toa makes decisions on the restoration of wai using our mātauranga and tikanga.

FW Moemoeā -O4: Uphold manaakitanga by providing for manuhiri.

FW Moemoeā-O5: Empower our iwi to maintain our customary freshwater rights.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

FRESHWATER KAITIAKITANGA

FW Kaitiakitanga- O1: Exercise full and uninterrupted Ngāti Toa Rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga

FW Kaitiakitanga -O2: Ngāti Toa Kaitiaki Monitoring Framework to determine the environmental state of wai and has status over the other forms of monitoring.

FW Kaitiakitanga- O3: Adapt to new course of action based on Ngāti Toa Kaitiaki Monitoring Framework results and what it tell us.

FRESHWATER – COASTAL WATERS OBJECTIVE

Our wai is all embedded in a cultural landscape; in this landscape Ngāti Toa iwi is the Mana Whenua of awa such as, Te Awa Kairangi, Te Korokoro, Wainui, Whareroa, Oteranga, Takapu Stream, Waitohi Stream, Te wai whakatōkato, Wairere, Ōwhāriu Stream and our Te Awarua o Porirua.

These awa cannot be separated from different resources surrounding it.

Water quality is linked to the mauri (life essence) of our rivers, streams and coastal waters. These cannot be separated by way of land development, regional and district plan objectives, policies and rules.

Along the coast, there are the connections to our ngāhere and freshwater so it is a social construct where we separate these in planning processes and rules. All our marine resources are connected to our forests and rivers and streams and creeks and everything runs off into our moana eventually. This means plan objectives need to give effect to greater connectedness and physical integratedness.

Ngāti Toa's rohe in Greater Wellington is a maritime highway and inseparableness of coastal and freshwaters are reflected in our cultural and oral history. These need to be embodied in the objectives and policies and given effect in plan rules and consenting processes.

FWCW- O1: Coastal and freshwater environments are inseparable, the policies and plans will give effect to coastal and freshwater interactions and mahinga kai.

FWCW- O2: Mahinga kai is impacted by these interactions; consent processes will give effect to how land development impacts on the integrity of coastal and freshwater and its ultimate impact on our mahinga kai.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

TE AWA O PORIRUA OBJECTIVES

Te Awarua o Porirua is a cultural landscape and a beautiful place of Te Upoko o Te Ika and Aotearoa. The landscape includes the whanga (harbour) hills, streams and the sea at Whitireia, Tawhitikurī, Toka a Papa and Te Rewarewa. Te Awarua o Porirua is the harbour as it existed naturally in 1840 before reclamations buried the foreshore and seabed.

The lands, streams and sea of the south Tītahi Bay coast is inseparable from Te Awarua o Porirua, including Te Ara Taura, Wairere and Komangarautāwhiri. Te Mana o Kupe is always present as a guardian of Te Awarua o Porirua.

Ngāti Toa are mana whenua of Te Awarua o Porirua. Ngāti Toa acquired Te Awarua o Porirua by take raupatu and by subsequent occupation and marriage in accordance with tikanga Māori. The cultural, social and spiritual life of Ngāti Toa is based on the land on which the iwi hold mana whenua. The lands remain connected thorough iwi occupation, birth and burial. Te Awarua o Porirua combines the poutiaki coastal area and the cultural landscape. This means Te Awarua o Porirua includes:

- Catchment area and tributaries.
- Sea at the entrance of the harbour
- Original harbour as it existed in 1840.
- Tītahi Bay south coast.
- Relationship with Te Mana o Kupe.

For Ngāti Toa, Te Awarua o Porirua is the entire catchment – from the sea to the inland hills. The legislative boundary of mean high water streams (MHWS) and the coastal marine environment is an artificial administrative line which is meaningless in the ‘real world’ of the awa and undermines integrated management. To state the obvious – the waters flowing into the harbour create Te Awarua o Porirua. If the tributary streams are polluted, then the mauri of Te Awarua o Porirua is compromised.

Whitireia, Te Rewarewa and Toka a Papa (the Reef) are the traditional entrance points of Te Awarua o Porirua. These landmarks include the important pou whenua and sea of Hongoeka, Motuhara, Taupō and Tawhitikurī.

The reclaimed areas are still considered to be integral parts of Te Awarua o Porirua for Ngāti Toa. Te Awarua o Porirua is defined by the extent of the harbour and catchment as existing in 1840.

The whenua, lands and coast south of Tītahi Bay have always been part of Te Awarua o Porirua. Te Ara Taura is the southern pou whenua of the Porirua reserve lands and the ancient rope



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

ladder pathway. Wairere is a significant papakāinga, stream and mahinga kai and Komangarautāwhiri is a wahi tapu and urupā. There are many other places and sites of significance along the south Tītahi Bay coast which have a shared history with Te Awarua o Porirua and Ngāti Toa.

Te Mana o Kupe (Mana Island) is an important guardian of Te Awarua o Porirua. The island is physically and culturally joined to the Porirua landscape. The 'bridge' is a geo-physical reminder of this connection. The presence of the island and the relationship with Te Awarua o Porirua, must be a constant tohu and a guide to restoration.

TAOP -O1: Ngāti Toa Rangatira exercise kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga.

TAOP- O2: Enhance recreational and customary use of Te Awarua o Porirua.

TAOP- O3: Restore and protect kaimoana, taonga species, mahinga ika and mahinga kai.

TAOP-O4: Protect Te Awarua o Porirua from the effects of climate change.

TAOP- O5: Adopt a governance framework for te Awarua o Porirua using a statutory method such as, a joint management agreement.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND FRESHWATER OBJECTIVES

Climate change has cultural impacts on our iwi, hapū, whānau and taiao. Our wai and wāhi tapu are at risk:

CCFW-O1: We protect our wai from the effects of climate change.

CCFW- O2: Uphold whakauka by committing to environmental sustainability.

CCFW- O3: Practice urutau, the ability to adapt to the impacts of climate change.

CCFW-O4: We minimise degradation and pollution of te taiao by using alternative forms of transport and practicing more sustainable ways of living including sustainable harvesting.

CCFW-O5: Our whānau are empowered to learn about how they can awhi our wai. Mātauranga is transferred across generations. Whānau are involved in restoring and monitoring wai.

CCFW- O6: Uplift the resilience of whānau to adapt to climate change.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

DRINKING WATER OBJECTIVES

DW-O1: Ngāti Toa used to drink from all of our streams in our rohe, our water has been a drinking water resource before anything else and drinking resources. All of our water resources were drinkable.

DW-O2: We expect to achieve drinking water status for all of our waters.

PARTNERSHIP OBJECTIVES

Freshwater planning mahi must give effect to the Treaty of Waitangi principles through co-governance: this means that Crown authorities and iwi work in partnership to hear our wai.

To date, Tangata Whenua did not have any decision making powers over the matters of Crown's rules and provisions, although under the Resource Management Act (RMA) 'transfer of powers' were vested to iwi.

Ngāti Toa is determined to be the change for the planning provisions, where we normalise co-design and co-manage as the main decision-making processes. Ngāti Toa is determined to follow their aspirations in the RMA Plan making.

Partnership-O1: Fulfill the principles of partnership from Treaty of Waitangi and advance customary rights.

Partnership-O2: The voices and aspirations of mana whenua, kaitiaki, uri and kamātua sit alongside the voices of Crown partners and non-Māori communities.

Partnership-O3: Empower Ngāti Toa Rangatira as leaders and co-managers.

Partnership-O4: Mana whenua are resourced to have an active role in monitoring and management using cultural practices.

Partnership-O5: The capacity and capability of our iwi is increased so that we can make informed decisions to achieve our goals.

Partnership-O6: Ngāti Toa Rangatira mātauranga is developed and applied in management as well as being protected and preserved.



TE RŪNANGA O TOA RANGATIRA

Ā UPANE KA UPANE WHITI TE RA

Partnership-O7: There is meaningful and genuine engagement with mana whenua and each iwi, hapū and marae of Ngāti Toa Rangatira to ensure that each of their specific values and aspirations are upheld.

DEFINITIONS

<To be completed>

<Disclaimer>

Note that this section will include a set of definitions.

These kupu are only for Ngāti Toa to define and name.

Since this section will be populated in the future, for the time being all kupu in this statement shall be considered as it will be defined by Ngāti Toa.

Ends