

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of hearings on the Proposed One Plan – Te Ao Maori

Submission from:

Horticulture New Zealand

To:

Horizons Regional Council

Date:

13 August 2008

1. Introduction

1.1 Councillors and Commissioners - thank you for the opportunity to table this evidence as Horticulture New Zealand is unable to attend the hearing on this topic.

2. Submissions addressed in the Officers Report on Te Ao Maori

Horticulture New Zealand has submissions or further submissions addressed in the Te Ao Maori Officers Report as listed in the table below.

Submission F/S	No	Decision Sought:	OR Pg	OR Recommendation
HNZ	FS 531/34	Oppose G Stephens (369/17) re mauri	23	Accept
HNZ	357/46	Amend Objective 4-1 to 'recognise and manage'	45	Accept in part
HNZ	FS 531/35	Oppose in part Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Bd (377/12) re iwi management plans in 4.3	47	Accept
HNZ	FS 531/37	Support Horowhenua DC (280/23) re consultation processes	51	Reject
HNZ	FS 531/36	Oppose in part Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Bd (377/13) re consultation	55	Accept
HNZ	357/47	Consultation for consents	64	Reject
HNZ	357/48	Use of term mauri	73	Accept

2.1 Horticulture New Zealand opposed a submission by G Stephens because it sought to extend the scope of the use of the term 'mauri'. Horticulture New Zealand has raised concerns about the use of the term in its submission and seeks to have it limited, not extended as sought by the submitter and others.

The Officer Report rejects the submission to extend the scope of Mauri to ridgelines and this is supported by Horticulture New Zealand.

2.2 Objective 4-1

Objective 4-1 as notified sought to protect the mauri of natural and physical resources. Horticulture New Zealand sought that it be amended to be to 'recognise and manage' the

resources to be consistent with Sec 6 of the RMA. The Officer Report is recommending that the objective be to 'recognise and provide for' to be consistent with the RMA. Horticulture New Zealand supports that recommendation.

Horticulture New Zealand opposed in part a submission by Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board which sought to add additional objectives, including that iwi management plans be given regard in resource consent processes, not just plan processes. The Officer Report considers that the matters sought to be added are already provided for in the RMA or in the Plan. Horticulture New Zealand concurs with that position in relationship to iwi management plans. The requirements of the Act do not need to be included as specific objectives in the Plan. Nor should the objective seek to put in place a framework that is more stringent than the Act.

Therefore the recommendation to not include other matters in Objective 4-1 is supported.

2.3 Consultation

Horticulture New Zealand supported a submission by Horowhenua District Council regarding the roles and responsibilities for consultation with tangata whenua in the RMA consent processes. The Officer Report suggests that Policy 4-1 g) only applies to the Regional Council and are recommending a change to that effect so that the involvement in consent processes is a Regional Council matter.

However the involvement is dependent on other documents and agreements which are not part of the Plan. It needs to be clear that such agreements cannot commit parties other than the Regional Council.

Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board also sought changes relating to consultation which Horticulture New Zealand opposed. The Officer Report is recommending that an additional point be added to Policy 4-1 to 'advise and encourage' resource consent applicants to consult directly with hapu and iwi. While this may be considered by Council to be 'good practice' the reality is that it is often a difficult process and hence why the responsibility in the Act lies with Council to undertake such consultation. To this extent Horticulture New Zealand does not support the recommended change by adding Policy 4-1 h).

Horticulture New Zealand sought that Policy 4-2 b) i) be amended to reflect Council's role in consultation with tangata whenua. This submission is rejected in the Officer Report. The policy seeks to 'encourage' consent applicants to consult with iwi but Horticulture New Zealand sought a wording that reflected Council's role. If there is a desire to retain the policy of encouraging consent applicants to consult there should be another policy added to clearly articulate Council's role.

Decision Sought: Reject Recommendation to reject Submission 357/47 and amend Policy 4-2 b) i) to read: *Council will undertake consultation with iwi to develop minimisation protocols where a resource consent application may impact on a site.*

2.4 Policy 4-3

Horticulture New Zealand sought that Policy 4-3 be amended to 'Recognise and provide for the mauri of waterbodies' rather than 'protect'. The Officer Report recommends that the submission be accepted for similar reasons as set out in 2.2 above. Horticulture New Zealand supports that recommendation.

Thank you for the opportunity to table this evidence in support of the Horticulture New Zealand's submissions and further submissions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Keenan', with a long diagonal stroke extending downwards and to the right.

Chris Keenan
Manager – Resource Management and Environment
Ends

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of hearings on the Proposed One Plan – Te Ao Maori

Submission from:

Horticulture New Zealand

To:

Horizons Regional Council

Date:

13 August 2008

1. Introduction

1.1 Councillors and Commissioners - thank you for the opportunity to table this evidence as Horticulture New Zealand is unable to attend the hearing on this topic.

2. Submissions addressed in the Officers Report on Te Ao Maori

Horticulture New Zealand has submissions or further submissions addressed in the Te Ao Maori Officers Report as listed in the table below.

Submission F/S	No	Decision Sought:	OR Pg	OR Recommendation
HNZ	FS 531/34	Oppose G Stephens (369/17) re mauri	23	Accept
HNZ	357/46	Amend Objective 4-1 to 'recognise and manage'	45	Accept in part
HNZ	FS 531/35	Oppose in part Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Bd (377/12) re iwi management plans in 4.3	47	Accept
HNZ	FS 531/37	Support Horowhenua DC (280/23) re consultation processes	51	Reject
HNZ	FS 531/36	Oppose in part Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Bd (377/13) re consultation	55	Accept
HNZ	357/47	Consultation for consents	64	Reject
HNZ	357/48	Use of term mauri	73	Accept

2.1 Horticulture New Zealand opposed a submission by G Stephens because it sought to extend the scope of the use of the term 'mauri'. Horticulture New Zealand has raised concerns about the use of the term in its submission and seeks to have it limited, not extended as sought by the submitter and others.

The Officer Report rejects the submission to extend the scope of Mauri to ridgelines and this is supported by Horticulture New Zealand.

2.2 Objective 4-1

Objective 4-1 as notified sought to protect the mauri of natural and physical resources. Horticulture New Zealand sought that it be amended to be to 'recognise and manage' the

resources to be consistent with Sec 6 of the RMA. The Officer Report is recommending that the objective be to 'recognise and provide for' to be consistent with the RMA. Horticulture New Zealand supports that recommendation.

Horticulture New Zealand opposed in part a submission by Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board which sought to add additional objectives, including that iwi management plans be given regard in resource consent processes, not just plan processes. The Officer Report considers that the matters sought to be added are already provided for in the RMA or in the Plan. Horticulture New Zealand concurs with that position in relationship to iwi management plans. The requirements of the Act do not need to be included as specific objectives in the Plan. Nor should the objective seek to put in place a framework that is more stringent than the Act.

Therefore the recommendation to not include other matters in Objective 4-1 is supported.

2.3 Consultation

Horticulture New Zealand supported a submission by Horowhenua District Council regarding the roles and responsibilities for consultation with tangata whenua in the RMA consent processes. The Officer Report suggests that Policy 4-1 g) only applies to the Regional Council and are recommending a change to that effect so that the involvement in consent processes is a Regional Council matter.

However the involvement is dependent on other documents and agreements which are not part of the Plan. It needs to be clear that such agreements cannot commit parties other than the Regional Council.

Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board also sought changes relating to consultation which Horticulture New Zealand opposed. The Officer Report is recommending that an additional point be added to Policy 4-1 to 'advise and encourage' resource consent applicants to consult directly with hapu and iwi. While this may be considered by Council to be 'good practice' the reality is that it is often a difficult process and hence why the responsibility in the Act lies with Council to undertake such consultation. To this extent Horticulture New Zealand does not support the recommended change by adding Policy 4-1 h).

Horticulture New Zealand sought that Policy 4-2 b) i) be amended to reflect Council's role in consultation with tangata whenua. This submission is rejected in the Officer Report. The policy seeks to 'encourage' consent applicants to consult with iwi but Horticulture New Zealand sought a wording that reflected Council's role. If there is a desire to retain the policy of encouraging consent applicants to consult there should be another policy added to clearly articulate Council's role.

Decision Sought: Reject Recommendation to reject Submission 357/47 and amend Policy 4-2 b) i) to read: *Council will undertake consultation with iwi to develop minimisation protocols where a resource consent application may impact on a site.*

2.4 Policy 4-3

Horticulture New Zealand sought that Policy 4-3 be amended to 'Recognise and provide for the mauri of waterbodies' rather than 'protect'. The Officer Report recommends that the submission be accepted for similar reasons as set out in 2.2 above. Horticulture New Zealand supports that recommendation.

Thank you for the opportunity to table this evidence in support of the Horticulture New Zealand's submissions and further submissions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Keenan', with a long diagonal stroke extending downwards and to the right.

Chris Keenan
Manager – Resource Management and Environment
Ends