



## TE RŪNANGANUI O TE ĀTI AWA

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

Via email to [district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz).

### **Further Submission on publicly notified Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan**

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

1. This is a further submission from Te Rūnanganui o te Āti Awa ki te Upoko o te Ika a Māui (**Te Rūnanganui**) on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. The email address for service is [Leilua.Ailaomai@atiawa.com](mailto:Leilua.Ailaomai@atiawa.com).
3. This is a further submission in support of or opposition to a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.
4. Te Rūnanganui considers that, under Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act, we may make a further submission because:  
  
We are submitting as persons who have an interest in the Proposed Plan that is greater than the interest of the general public, which is as Mana Whenua / Tangata Whenua and kaitiaki.
5. Table 1 below sets the submissions we support or oppose with comment on particular parts of those submissions, and the relevant reasons.
6. We wish to be heard in support of our further submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
8. Any position that Te Rūnanganui takes on the following submissions extends to any and all similar submissions that are not noted in Table 1 below but are included in the Summary of Decisions Requested.

Table 1: Te Rūnanganui o Te Āti Awa decisions requested on Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan

Submitter name and number	Submission point	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief sought
Wellington Regional Council (452)	20	NESD-02	Support	Agree that restoration of the water bodies is an appropriate objective.	Allow
	21	NESD-03	Support	Agree that restoration is an appropriate objective here.	Allow
	141	CE-P3	Support	It is important that we as Tangata Whenua are able to uphold customary harvesting practices.	Allow
Connexa, Chorus, FortySouth and Spark (311)	39	INF-P13	Support	Agree the provision is clear.	Allow
	76	INF-S19	Support	Reasonable amendment.	Allow
Wellington Tenth's Trust and Palmerston North Māori Reserves Trust (446)	1	SASM	Support	We support the points made by the Trusts including the suggestion to make it clearer within the introductory text that the rules aim to protect cultural heritage rather than alter ownership rights.	Allow
	21a-21b <sup>1</sup>	SUB-P15	Oppose	This policy is intended to provide for subdivision of land whilst avoiding or reducing the impact on the SASM values. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that this will impact on housing supply.	Disallow
Troy Tarrent (286) Roger Faircough and Dr. Anna Raadt (299) Neil Carr (310) John Francis Burrell (312) Rupert Sutherland, Helen Sutherland and Sarah Gilbert (318) Philip Morris (338) Sam Barnett (339) Derek Locke (358) Warren Bolger (360) Sarita Von Afehl (378) Andrew Swan (379)	21c	SUB-P15	Oppose	This policy is not intended to diminish private property rights but to recognise Mana Whenua long-standing connections to these sites and areas, as such it is important that it applies to all sites/areas that are noted as being significant.	Disallow
	21d	SUB-P15	Oppose	We oppose deletion of this clause. Subdivision, particularly of large parcels of land can	Disallow

<sup>1</sup> There are a number of form submissions that make the same point as those noted as 21a, 21b, 21c, 21d, and 21e, 1a, and 1b. Whilst the numbers may differ slightly across submissions, the points a-e (and a-b) are essentially the same. For ease of reading, submitters and their submission numbers are listed in the table, but the submission point number variations are not.



TE RŪNANGANUI O TE ĀTI AWA

Submitter name and number	Submission point	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief sought
Susan Brown (395) John Griffin (396) Rachel Laurent (409) Mark Blackham (450) Warren Owen (490)				materially impact access to sites/areas, and it is of high importance that access to sites and areas of significance to Māori are maintained or enhanced. Furthermore, we do not accept the assertion that clause 4 is forcing anything; where access is already available it is asking that <i>practical</i> mechanisms are incorporated. Whilst we oppose the deletion of this clause, in line with the submission made by the Wellington Tenants Trust and Palmerston North Reserves Trust, are open to considering further wording in the explanatory text for this chapter (and for the SASM chapter).	
	21e	SUB-R6	Oppose	We oppose this rule for a similar reason to that noted in our response to point 21d around deletion of SUB-P15, clause 4.	Disallow
	1a	Category 1 SASMs	Oppose	The category 1 sites have been classified as such because they are of the utmost significance to us.	Disallow
	1b	Category 2 and 3 SASMs	Oppose	This does submission does not recognise the significance of these sites and areas. Category 3 explanation itself makes it clear that these are important sites or areas to acknowledge, but that subdivision, land use, and development is generally appropriate.	Disallow
	Various	MAPS – SASMs	Oppose	We continue to support the inclusion of the SASMs as noted on the maps but seek that the introductory comments in the SASMs chapter are clarified to further explain the intent of the chapter.	Disallow



TE RŪNANGANUI O TE ĀTI AWA

Submitter name and number	Submission point	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief sought
Michael William Norman Lee (418)	8	SUB-P15	Oppose	We reject the assertions of this submission, particularly that the assertions that the areas identified are vague and arbitrary.	Disallow
My Land Group	22-23	SUB-P15	Oppose	We oppose this point and support retaining the policy as drafted as it is appropriate that subdivision of land containing a SASM meets the requirements set out in this provision.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (424)	90	CE-R1	Support	It is important that we as Tangata Whenua are able to uphold customary harvesting practices.	Allow
Policy Planning team of the Hutt City Council (440)	35b	CE-R1	Oppose	We seek retention of the existing provision provided upfront as a first rule in this chapter, as recognition of the importance of customary harvesting practices.	Disallow
Jodie Govind (328)	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Kelly Hinaki (337)	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Matthew Love-Parata	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Hikoiko Kaumatua Roopu	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Vicki Hollywell (492)	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Richard Te One (503)	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Roger Hollywell (507)	2	Schedule 6	Support	We agree with the points made.	Allow
Eti Gifedder (22)	1-2	Waiorau-Lowry Bay (category 2)	Oppose	We disagree entirely with the points made in this submission particularly we reject the notion that the associations are ambiguous and far-reaching.	Disallow