

Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust

Speaking notes to Hearing Stream 4, Urban Development – presented by Melanie McCormick

Tēnā koutou katoa, tēnei te mihi atu ki a koutou katoa
He uri tēnei o Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai,
Ko Kaitangata tōku hapū,
Ko Whakarongotai tōku marae,
Ko Melanie McCormick tēnei

Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Commissioners,
My name is Melanie McCormick,
I whakapapa to Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai through my mother,
My role for the Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust is the Pou Takawaenga Taiao.

Unfortunately, my colleague Claire Gibb could not be here with us today. So, I will be providing our oral submission for Hearing Stream 4, Urban Development on behalf of Ātiawa.

I apologise that you do not have my speaking notes in front of you, however I will provide these to the Hearing Administration team for later reference.

Firstly, I appreciate where our relief has been included and supported by the reporting officer's proposed amendments to provisions. Thank you.

I will now provide comment on specific provisions.

Chater 3.9 introduction:

Under the sub-heading 'Well-functioning urban environments and areas', the proposed wording currently include a sentence that states: "The NPS-UD also requires planning decisions relating to urban environments to take into account the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi."

I would like to suggest re-drafting the last sentence to read: "Planning decisions relating to urban environments must take into account the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as required by the NPS-UD". While this a relatively minor change, I think it is important. The current proposed wording by the reporting officer distances itself from that requirement.

Policy UD.2 – Enable Māori to express their culture and traditions – consideration

Generally, I support the redrafting and intent of Policy UD.2. I note here, that throughout the Plan Change the wording used to refer to s6(e) matters (of the RMA), ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga, seems to differ between provisions. By that, sometimes it is the full s6(e) matters are listed, other times it is more or less, (for example, moana, marae and urupā). I think policy statement would read better if one consistent statement was included, when referring to those matters. I acknowledge that other mana whenua in the rohe have sought these inclusions, so I welcome the inclusion of drafting that provides for our ways of understanding the natural word through kupu Maori. However, I think there is not a consistent narrative throughout.

Also, with the respect to the reporting officers, there is capitalisation of some kupu Māori, such as taonga and mātauranga. The council may wish to seek the advice of an appropriately qualified reo Māori expert to determine whether that is appropriate.

Also, I request a minor amendment to the Explanation of Policy UD.2, I request that the word 'norms' is deleted. This is consistent with the re-drafting of Policy UD.2, and throughout the chapter.

Policy UD.4 Achieving a compact regional form – district and regional plans

Ātiawa support the addition of subclause (e), thank you.

However, I think that the proposed wording does not fully recognise Te Mana o te Wai and the implications of inadequate infrastructure on that. Ensuring infrastructure development pre-empts a shortfall in capacity is important part of giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai by avoiding infrastructure failures that adversely affect te taiao.

Policy UD.5

Firstly, Ātiawa support the inclusion of subclause (c).

As Policy UD. 5 is the Regional Policy Statement's expression of well-functioning urban areas, it is important that this policy fully address all aspects of the integrated nature of the wider environment in which the urban environment forms part of. As it is drafted it seems that it prioritises providing for the housing and infrastructure aspects of urban development, and not giving very much to the natural and physical aspects that contribute to well-functioning urban areas.

Further, the proposed wording does not fully recognise Te Mana o te Wai, while I acknowledge that subclause (f) addresses quality and quantity of freshwater, it does not adequately provide for Te Mana o te Wai which is much broader than that. The objective of the NPS-FM is to "ensure that natural and physical resources are managed in a way that prioritises: (a) first, the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems". Therefore, urban development must also meet this objective.

Policy UD.5 does not address the role of mana whenua or the impact of poor urban design on our relationship with the natural world. While Ātiawa supports growth, we are also seeking to ensure that the scale of that development is planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of Mana Whakahaere in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. That is, the urban environment forms part of the broader, interconnected environment. Therefore, in developing a *well-functioning urban environment*; the wellbeing of the environment must be provided for.

Policy 55

Ātiawa support inclusion of subclause (x) *Managing effects on natural character in the coastal environment, consistent with Policy 36*.

I oppose the proposed amendment to subclause (c) of the reporting officer's rebuttal evidence which deletes reference to 'in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua' – in regard to the development of structure plans. While I acknowledge the reasoning to change the requirement for a structure plan to be prepared to a level of detail commensurate to the scale of the urban development, I think that where a structure plan is necessary (due to the scale or intensity of the proposed development) there should be a requirement to partner with mana whenua. Often, I find Ātiawa in the position where we have to be reactive and provide a response to detailed design plans,

rather than be included during the design and development phase which is much more reflective of a partnership and better provides for our values.

Policy 67

I request that subclause (f) include reference include the words 'and other urban design guidelines'. I consider that the current drafting may be limiting in regard to the range of interests in urban development for mana whenua, that go beyond papakāinga. This complements Method UD.1.

Method UD. 1

I have one minor amendment, at subclause (b) this could be redrafted to read: 'Papakāinga design guidance that are underpinned by kaupapa Māori in accordance with Policy 67(f).'

Method UD.4

Ātiawa support the approach set out in this method.

Environmentally responsive:

I now turn to the definition 'environmentally responsive'. The reporting officer has proposed a definition through the rebuttal evidence. As it is drafted I do not think the drafting adequately recognises the integrated nature of both the natural and built environment. I think the words 'responds positively' does not go far enough to provide protection or recognition of the wider environment, including ecosystem values and cultural values.

I have suggested the following definition as an alternative:

Environmentally responsive:

Recognises the integrated nature of both the physical and built environment, and provides for the cultural values, natural landscape and health and well-being of the wider environment.

Chapter 5: Monitoring the Regional Policy Statement and progress towards anticipated environmental results.

I would like to note Ātiawa's support for the inclusion of point number 7. I appreciate the wording and thought that has gone into this AER.

Finally, a general point,

I also wanted to pick up reference to an early point made by my colleague Claire Gibb in her oral submission in HS3 that is reoccurring / relevant to the urban development provisions, Claire has sought minor redrafting to the way iwi authorities are referenced in this policy statement change. I seek that those changes are adopted throughout. To be clear, the current drafting by the reporting planner is "Wellington region's iwi authorities" (see pg 5, of Appendix 1A HS4 Urban Development Proposed Amendments to Provisions, and others). Ātiawa seek that this is re-drafted to "iwi authorities of the Wellington region". We seek this change because the iwi authorities are not possessed by the Wellington region, and returns mana to the iwi authorities. It is a minor change, but actually the language is important.

Thank you for taking the time today to hear our oral submission on Hearing Stream 4, Urban Development. I welcome any questions or comments.