

BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

**I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA MOTUHAKE I TE
KAUNIHERA O TE HIKU O TE IKA**

UNDER

the Resource Management Act 1991
("RMA")

IN THE MATTER OF

the Proposed Far North District Plan
("PDP") – Hearing 12 – Historic and
Cultural Values, Sites of Significance
to Māori

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MAKARENA EVELYN TE PAEA DALTON ON BEHALF OF
TE AUPŌURI COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT LTD**

PLANNING

16 MAY 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Makarena Evelyn Te Paea Dalton. I am a Consultant Planner (Senior Associate) at Barker and Associates ("**B&A**"), a planning and urban design consultancy with offices across Aotearoa New Zealand. I am based in the Kerikeri office, but undertake planning work throughout the country, although primarily in Te Taitokerau Northland.
- 1.2 I whakapapa to Ngāpuhi-Nui-Tonu and Ngāti Kahu-ki-Whangaroa in the Far North, and to hapū including Te Hikutū, Ngāti Ueoneone, Ngāti Rangi, Ngātiringimatamamoe and Ngātiringimatakakaa in Hokianga, Kaikohe and Otangaroa.

Qualifications and experience

- 1.3 I have a Bachelor of Arts with double majors in Māori Studies and Political Studies and a Master of Planning Practice from the University of Auckland. I am an Intermediate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 1.4 I have 10 years' experience in planning. During this time, I have been employed in various resource management positions in local government and private companies within New Zealand. My experience includes statutory resource consent planning in the Northland and Auckland regions, including in the Far North, Whangārei and Kaipara districts. Of particular relevance, my experience includes processing, including for the Far North District Council ("**Council**"), and the preparation of resource consent applications under operative Far North District Plan ("**ODP**"). I have also been involved in preparation of plan changes, section 32 reporting and consideration of submissions for councils and private clients.

Code of Conduct

- 1.5 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this statement of evidence. Unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my sphere of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

Involvement with the PDP on behalf of Te Aupōuri

- 1.6 I have been engaged by Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd ("**Te Aupōuri**") since September 2022 to provide independent planning advice and evidence on the PDP, including:
- (a) Assisting with preparing Te Aupōuri's original and further submission on the PDP; and
 - (b) Ongoing planning advice associated with those submissions and the hearings relating to those submissions, including filing and presenting evidence to Hearing Streams 4 – Natural Environments and Hearing Stream 10 – Māori and Treaty Settlement Land.
- 1.7 I confirm that I have reviewed the Sites and Areas of Significance Section 42A report ("**s42A Report**") and officers recommended amendments.

Scope of evidence

- 1.8 My evidence addresses submission (#339) and further submission (#F409) by Te Aupōuri and addresses the following matters:
- (a) Te Aupōuri's revised relief (section 2);
 - (b) Relevant statutory context (section 3);
 - (c) Issues with the PDP approach to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (section 4);
 - (d) Assessment of Sites and areas of significance to Te Aupōuri (section 5);
 - (e) Schedule 3 of the PDP (section 6);
 - (f) Section 32AA Evaluation (section 7); and
 - (g) Conclusion (section 8).
- 1.9 In preparing this evidence I have relied on the expert cultural evidence of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad on behalf of Te Aupōuri.
- 1.10 **Attachment A** of my evidence sets Te Aupōuri's recommended amendments to Schedule 3 and Planning Maps of the PDP and are considered

2. TE AUPŌURI REVISED RELIEF

- 2.1 Te Aupōuri's original relief sought flexibility to amend Schedule 3: Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori ("**Schedule 3**") of the PDP to incorporate sites and places that were of significance to them. The Reporting Officer has addressed Te Aupōuri's submission at Key Issue 7 and considers that Te Aupōuri's relief cannot be accepted as adding new sites to a schedule requires a full plan change which does not provide for the flexibility sought¹. While this sentiment is acknowledged, it begs the question that 'if not now, then when?' as the current process is a full plan change.
- 2.2 Te Aupōuri undertook a detailed review of the PDP's Schedule 3 and planning maps and found that many of the sites they hold a deep and enduring connection to are, in fact, already scheduled. In this regard, they support the ongoing protection of these historic heritage resources. However, Te Aupōuri have revised their relief as follows:
- (a) Amend the PDP recognise and provide for their historic, cultural and spiritual relationship the sites and areas of significance to them within their rohe / area of interest as shown in **Figure 1** below, by:
 - (i) Amending Schedule 3 to recognise Te Aupōuri as a 'Requesting Party' for sites and areas that are of significance to them;
 - (ii) Consequential amendments to Schedule 3 to correct descriptions/names of sites and features; and
 - (iii) Consequential amendments to the planning maps to accurately identify features and resources.

¹ At paragraph 241 of the s42A Report.



Figure 1: Te Aupōuri Rohe / Area of Interest (Refer to Attachment A of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad's Evidence).

3. RELEVANT STATUTORY CONTEXT

Resource Management Act

- 3.1 In achieving the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA"), s6(f) requires that historic heritage resources which includes Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development,

while ensuring the relationship of Māori, their culture and traditions with these sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga is provided for in accordance with section 6(e). In protecting and managing these sites and areas of significance to Māori, regard must be given to the role of kaitiakitanga.

3.2 There are several threads to achieving the sustainable management of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori under the RMA and in its simplest form this can be distilled down to two simple criteria that must be established to identify, protect and then manage these resources as follows:

- (a) A traditional, spiritual, historical, or cultural connection to an important place, area or site must be established; and
- (b) In establishing (a), those connections or relationships to an important place, area or site must be by the relevant tangata whenua grouping (whānau, hapū or iwi), that hold authority over an area.

3.3 The criteria above are interconnected and go hand in hand, to both protect and provide for the ongoing management of these resources to ensure Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use or development.

Regional Policy Statement for Northland

3.4 Policy 4.5.3 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland 2016 ("**RPS**") sets out the criteria to identify and assess historic heritage resources which includes the following:

"(i) Tangata whenua: the resource place or feature is important to tangata whenua for traditional, spiritual, cultural or historic reasons"

3.5 Method 4.5.4(3) does not set a timeframe, however, does direct regional and district councils to do assess and identify these resources 'as soon as practicable' and considers that this should be done in collaboration with tangata whenua, the Department of Conservation ("**the Department**") and Heritage Zealand Pouhere Taonga ("**HNZ**") in consultation with affected landowners.

3.6 The RPS became operative in part on 9 May 2016 and fully operative in 2018 (GMO's). Almost 10 years have passed since these provisions became operative, and there has not been any comprehensive review of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.

3.7 While it is acknowledged that the PDP does propose five new Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, this review is discreet, with four of the five sites nominated by HNZ. The Tangata Whenua Section 32 Report indicates that Council intends to initiate a 'comprehensive review' of these resources as a separate plan change, subject to funding being allocated by the Long Term Plan ("**LTP**")². However, there are no provisions within the PDP to require this outcome.

² Refer to section 8.3.3 of the Tangata Whenua s32 Report.

- 3.8 On this basis, it is my opinion that the PDP falls well short of giving effect to RPS Policy 4.5.3 and Method 4.5.4(3) as it relates to identification and protection of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.

4. ISSUES WITH PDP APPROACH SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI

- 4.1 The PDP proposes a 'stop gap' approach for the protection and management of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori by rolling over the existing ODP schedule and planning maps, proposes a cultural landscape over Te Oneroa-A-Tōhē, incorporates four new sites put forward by HNZ with strengthened objectives, policies and rules.

- 4.2 In taking this approach, the PDP relies on the Transitional District Plan, a 'relic' of more than 20 years old which has not been updated at all. Te Aupōuri's cultural experts, Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad have raised concerns with this approach noting that the PDP fails to appropriately recognise and provide for the relationship of Te Aupōuri to their sites, places and areas that are significant to them, incorrectly lists entities that do not exist or lists other parties as 'Requesting Partys' that are not considered to align with 'whakapapa and whenua connections'. Specifically, Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad consider that:

*"Schedule 3 of the PDP, as it is currently written, is completely inaccurate and misleading. It fails to correctly recognise Te Aupōuri within the sites and areas in which Te Aupōuri holds sole or shared authority."*³

- 4.3 As set out at paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3 above, the sustainable management of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori requires that a traditional, spiritual, historical, or cultural connection to a place, site or area must be established, and that this has been done by the relevant tangata whenua who hold authority over an area. In my opinion, this is fundamental for the following reasons:

- (a) This must be done in order to accurately identify these resources to ensure there ongoing protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
- (b) The relevant tangata whenua (whānau, hapū and/or iwi), as mana whenua and kaitiaki, are the appropriate experts to assess the potential adverse effects of subdivision, use and development in relation to these resources and the relevant cultural values.

- 4.4 The planning maps and schedule sets out 'what' and 'where' these sites are, and identifies 'who' may be considered adversely affected based on the cultural values and relationship of a specified group.

- 4.5 Therefore, it is critical that that any schedules are accurate, up to date and correct to adequately protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. Taking into account the findings of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad, the PDP is deficient and cannot appropriately protect these significant

³ Refer to paragraphs 2.1 – 2.4 of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad's cultural evidence.

cultural heritage resources from inappropriate subdivision, use and development because it is inaccurate and does not identify the relevant tangata whenua groups that have a spiritual, historical, cultural or traditional connection to a place, area or site where they hold authority.

5. ASSESSMENT OF SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO TE AUPŌURI

5.1 Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad have prepared cultural evidence on behalf of Te Aupōuri. As detailed in their evidence, Te Aupōuri Iwi is one of five Muriwhenua iwi that are Mana Whenua in the Far North. Te Aupōuri is a settled iwi having signed their Deed of Settlement in 2012, settling their historical grievances.

5.2 Te Aupōuri's rohe (area of interest) is described at paragraph 4.3 of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad's evidence and is depicted in **Figure 1** above. Te Kao is Te Aupōuri's turangawaewae, with their deepest and enduring whakapapa connections. Te Aupōuri have reviewed the proposed Planning Maps and Schedule 3 of the PDP and have undertaken an assessment of the 'significance' of those sites, places and areas where in accordance with Policy 4.5.3 of the RPS taking account of the following criteria:

- (a) Are within their rohe where they hold sole or shared authority as mana whenua; and
- (b) Have established a historic, traditional, spiritual or cultural connection to those places, areas or sites.

5.3 Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad have assessed each scheduled site at **Attachment B** of their evidence in accordance with the following criteria (**emphasis** added):

“(a) **Historic** associations such as:

- (i) *pūrakau or stories associated with a place;*
- (ii) *historic patterns of occupation, such as pā sites;*
- (iii) *places where important historic or significant events occurred;*

(b) **Traditional** associations, which include but are not limited to the following:

- (i) *Mahinga kai and mahinga mataitai;*
- (ii) *Location and use of specific resources;*
- (iii) *Traditional travel routes / waka landing areas;*
- (iv) *Implementation of traditional mātauranga Māori;*

(c) **Cultural** associations:

- (i) *Wāhi tapu, wāhi tupuna, wāhi taonga*
- (ii) *Places where Te Aupōuri area kaitiaki;*

(d) **Spiritual** associations:

(i) *Pūrakau / kōrero tuku iho associated with a place, specific to Te Aupōuri.*⁴

5.4 In my opinion, the assessment undertaken by Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad establishes Te Aupōuri's connection and importance to each site in accordance with Policy 4.5.3 of the RPS by:

- (a) Outlining the connection and importance of each site, place or area based on the above criteria;
- (b) Establishing that the site is within their rohe in which they are mana whenua, either solely or jointly; and
- (c) It is within their rohe over which they are mana whenua as confirmed within their Treaty Settlement.

6. SCHEDULE 3 OF THE PDP

Requesting Party, Names/Descriptions

6.1 Te Aupōuri's cultural evidence identifies 41 Sites and Areas of Significance that are proposed for scheduling in the PDP, where Te Aupōuri Iwi is not recognised as a 'Requesting Party' where they have a cultural, spiritual, historic or traditional connection. For the reasons I have detailed above, and based on the evidence of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad⁵, Schedule 3 of the PDP should be amended to account for Te Aupōuri's connection to these important sites in accordance with the assessment undertaken by Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad. Further, Te Aupōuri's cultural experts, Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad have recommended the removal of other entities as a 'Requesting Party' where Te Aupōuri are the sole owners of a site and where the schedules refer to 'Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū' which is not a formal entity and does not exist.

6.2 As such, it is considered that the 'Requesting Party' of those 41 identified Sites and Areas of Significance requires updating to provide for the relationship of Te Aupōuri Iwi as follows:

Place #	Location	Name/Description	Requesting Party
MS01-03	Tawakewake	Tukuamereana - urupā	Ngāti Kurī Iwi, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-04		Takahua - waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī Iwi, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-05		Tumahanga Pa <u>Tomokanga Pā</u>	Ngāti Kurī Iwi, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-07	Te Neke Blk	Te Neke - waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-08	Pakohu	Moetangi - waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-19	Takahua Blk	Takahua - waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>

⁴ At paragraph 4.9 of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad's evidence statement.

⁵ Refer to the comprehensive assessment of Te Aupōuri's Sites and Areas of Significance at Attachment B of their evidence.

MS01-20	Waipuna Blk	Waipuna - waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-21	Parengarenga	Kaatata waahi tapu & Epiha fruit tree reserve	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-22	Parengarenga	Te Pua Camping Reserve	Parengarenga B3A Trustees, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-23	Parengarenga	Parengarenga Islands (Dog Island) Historic Reserve	Te Hāpua 42 Incorp; Aupōuri Trust Board, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-24	Parengarenga	Motu Mapau Tribal Reserve	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-25	Parengarenga	Mingi - waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-26	Matapia Island	Matapia Historic Reserve	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-28	on Ngakaropu Stream, Te Kao	Tangoake Wharf "site"	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-29	Te Kao (at Te Kao Stream)	Tangoake Landing Reserve	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-30	up Waitangi Stream	Rangikairuku Pa and waahi tapu	Māori Owners, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MA01-31	Parengarenga Harbour	Paua papakainga development	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MA01-32	Parengarenga Harbour	Kokota Spit - taonga and waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-33	Far North Rd	The Big Lake - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-34	Aupōuri Peninsula	Sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-35	Aupōuri Peninsula	Sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-36	Aupōuri Peninsula	Ngatuhōte <u>Ngāti Whetū</u> - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-37	Aupōuri Peninsula	Lake Waikanae - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS01-38	Aupōuri Peninsula	Lake Kihona - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-06	Te Arai Trig	Te Arai - waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-07	adjoining Lake Wahakari	Wahakari Recreation Reserve	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-08	Te Kao	Potahi - waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-09	Te Kao	Nga Tapuwae Church	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-10	Te Kao	Tirohia Saleyard Reserve	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-11	Te Kao	Tawhiti Rahi Pa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>

MS02-12	Te Kao	Ngatumoroki Tutumaiao - waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-13	Te Kao	Waimirirangi Marae	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-14	Te Kao	Te Toko o te Arawa - waahi tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-15	The Bluff & Te Wakatehaua Island	Wakatehaua Camping Reserve	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū; The Bluff Trustees, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-16	Te Kao	Te Kao Church	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-17	Simmonds Island	Motu Puruhi & Terakautuhako Islands - taonga	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū (located on DoC Estate) <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-19	Ngataki	Waihopo Lake - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-22	Great Exhibition Bay	Lake <u>Hikitama and</u> Taeore <u>Area</u> - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū (located on DoC Estate)
MS02-24	Tangoake	Lake Morehurehu <u>and Lake Te Kahika</u> - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū, <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-25	Ngataki	<u>Te Ramanuka No. 2 Te Tomo A Tāwhana (Twin Pā)</u> - maunga tapu	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū (located on DoC Estate) <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>
MS02-26	Ngataki	Swan Lake - sacred Awa	Ngāti Kurī & Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū <u>Te Aupōuri Iwi</u>

6.3 In this regard, the amendments outlined above and provided as **Attachment A** of my evidence are considered to set out and reflect the amendments sought by Te Aupōuri based on the expert evidence of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad. These amendments are considered to be the most appropriate for the following reasons:

- (a) They provide for the protection of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori from inappropriate subdivision;
- (b) Provide for the relationship of Te Aupōuri to their sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga that are significant to them;
- (c) Ensure that the effects of subdivision, use and development can be appropriately assessed by the relevant tangata whenua;
- (d) Relate to properties that are owned by Te Aupōuri (or their parent Post Settlement Governance Entity, Te Rūnanga Nui o Te Aupōuri) as the sole or joint owner;

- (e) Relate to properties owned and administered by Pārengarenga Incorporation who have provided that written support of Te Aupōuri⁶;
- (f) Removal of reference to 'Te Hāpua Iwi/Hapū' as a 'Requesting Party' from those relevant scheduled Sites and Areas of Significance as they do not accurately refer to an entity, group that is identifiable.

7. SECTION 32AA EVALUATION

7.1 Section 32AA of the RMA requires further evaluation where changes to provisions are proposed since the original section 32 evaluation was undertaken. I have recommended a number of amendments to Schedule 3 of the PDP which are outlined in **Attachment A**.

7.2 By way of summary, I consider that the recommended amendments to Schedule 3 will be the most appropriate way to achieve the sustainable management purpose of the RMA in accordance with section 31(1)(a) for the following reasons:

- (a) **Sustainable management (section 5 and 6):** The recommended amendments will better protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by ensuring the provisions are accurate and up to date. This will enable better and more effective management of these resources by ensuring cultural values will be appropriately taken into account when undertaking subdivision, use and development in relation to those resources. Accordingly, the amendments provide for the relationship of Māori, and their culture and traditions to their sites, wāhi tapu and taonga and will ensure adverse effects can be adequately assessed by the relevant tangata whenua.
- (b) **Role of kaitiakitanga (section 7(a)):** Te Aupōuri as kaitiaki of their Sites and Areas of Significance are enabled to actively manage these resources, by being listed as a 'Requesting Party' where they have a historic, traditional, cultural and spiritual connection.
- (c) **Appropriate management of effects:** The recommended amendments provide an improved framework for managing adverse effects on sites and areas of significance by providing greater certainty for who should be consulted when activities are within or in proximity to scheduled sites and areas of significance within their rohe.
- (d) **Costs and benefits:** I consider that the benefits of the recommended amendments will only improve the effective management of sites and areas of significance. This is because it will provide greater certainty for plan users, does not propose new sites where parties have not had an opportunity to fairly and reasonably participate, while

⁶

At Attachment C of Mr Kapa-Kingi and Mr Conrad's evidence.

also ensuring that adverse effects of subdivision, use and development can continue to be appropriately managed.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Overall, I consider that Te Aupōuri's revised relief refines the original relief sought their submissions relating to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. It responds to the issues raised by the Reporting Officer, and requires consideration by the Hearings Panel. These primarily relate to ensuring Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by ensuring the following:

- (a) Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are appropriate identified through the identification by tangata whenua that have a spiritual, traditional, historic and cultural connection;
- (b) The relevant tangata whenua who are Mana Whenua are appropriately identified as a 'Requesting Party' to ensure adverse effects of subdivision, use and development can be assessed against the cultural values of these resources;
- (c) Plan users can effectively and efficiently implement the provisions of the PDP.

8.2 To achieve these outcomes, I consider that Schedule 3 requires amendments as outlined in **Attachment A** of this evidence statement.

Makarena Evelyn Te Paea Dalton

Date: 16 May 2025

Attachment 1 – Te Aupōuri Recommended Amendments to TSL Overlay

Attachment 2 – Comparative Analysis of the TSL Overlay in Relation to RPROZ and MPZ