

Hearing 11: Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report and other reports for the above hearing, the Hearing Panel members have questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author(s) in writing prior to the hearing commencing.

Sec42A Report

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
8.15 (last sentence)	<p>You appear to be saying here that the RMA confers this duty to the Rūnunga. Is it not legally the case that SDC still has a duty to determine who the affected parties are, <u>after</u> iwi has seen and commented on the applications that have been sent to iwi?</p> <p>This seems to be confirmed in your next paragraph, please clarify.</p>
8.17.4	<p>You have recommended amendments to Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions, including changes to HPW10 - Consultation and MANA7 Local Authority Relationships, to outline the roles and responsibilities of Papatipu Rūnunga, SDC and resource consent applicants in the consent process.</p> <p>A hearing has already been held on Part 1 Introduction and General provisions – was this recommendation placed before that panel?</p>
8.21	<p>Are you recommending another change to Part 1 – Introduction and General chapter here to refer to an engagement process? If so, where does the scope come from to do that?</p>
9.16.2	<p>The submitters seek to remove Policy 2, and your response is that to remove it would compromise the effectiveness of the PDP.</p> <p>Can you advise in which rules the SAMS Chapter actually implements Policy 2 (is it implemented just in the assessment matters)?</p>
10.40.1	<p>The report states that the removal of rule SASM-R4 or granting the proposed amendments would undermine the effectiveness and efficiency of the PDP. Please clarify how defining 'new' or 'expanded' intensive outdoor primary production undermines the effectiveness and efficiency of the PDP.</p>
11.6.1/11.6.2	<p>Is the advice contained in the MKT report (as to consultation/engagement/advice processes) in any way binding on MKT/Council, and if not - what assurances can the submitters have that these processes will always be followed (as that report sits outside the Plan)?</p>
11.17.1/11.17.2	<p>Does your recommendation here regarding 'important infrastructure' align with advice given at the EI hearing?</p>
12.5.3	<p>Can you please clarify your advice with respect to the process for ground truthing and how this affects any decisions on submissions (i.e. should the</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	ground-truthing exercise occur first, the Panel review the results, and then it issues decisions on these submissions)?
12.26	As above, please advise on the process for ground truthing and how this is staged in relation to the issuing of decisions on submissions.
Appendix 2 – SASM-R2	The Nga Turanga Tupuna Overlay has been removed in the location column and “within a Wāhi Tapu or Wāhi Taonga overlay” has been added as text. Are both changes needed?