Waimakariri District Council
215 High Street
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440, New Zealand
Phone 0800 965 468

12 February 2026

Environment Committee Secretariat
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

en.legislation@parliament.govt.nz

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL SUBMISSION ON THE PLANNING BILL

1. Introduction

1.2. The Waimakariri District Council (the Council) thanks the Environment Select Committee for the opportunity to provide a submission on the Planning Bill (the Bill).

1.3. We support what the Bill aims to achieve, however we consider the breadth and pace of the reforms are significant and present their own challenges for effective implementation. For councils to deliver on these expectations, we require clearer guidance, coordinated processes and realistic timeframes.

2. The Waimakariri District

2.1 The Waimakariri District spans a diverse range of environments, from the provincial towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus, and Oxford to the remote high country of Lees Valley. The district is home to approximately 74,000 residents, with around 80% living in the eastern part of the district and about 60% concentrated in the four main towns. Waimakariri also has one of the highest proportions of lifestyle blocks in New Zealand, with around 6,500 lifestyle blocks in the district. Sustained growth since the 2010–11 Canterbury earthquakes, alongside projections indicating a population of 100,000 by 2050, continues to shape the district's development pressures and planning priorities.

2.2 Following the earthquakes, the Council worked closely with national agencies, iwi partners, and local communities to rapidly restore critical infrastructure and essential services. Strong emergency response capabilities in flood mitigation and vegetation fire management remain a key focus. Despite ongoing growth and recovery pressures, the Council has maintained prudent financial management, with average rates increases of 4.8% over the past decade and an AA (Stable Outlook) credit rating from Fitch. The proposed average rate increase for 2026/27 is 4.91%, with a general average increase of 2.7% for most ratepayers. The Council's recovery leadership, infrastructure investment, and community-focused planning—particularly through the District Plan Review—have been widely recognised by central government and the Office of the Auditor-General.

3. Local Government Reform programme including Resource Management reform

3.1 Although delivered individually, the recent flurry of reforms produces a forward work programme matrix that councils must progress cohesively to avoid unintended consequences for the sector and the communities they serve.

3.2 We emphasise the importance of fully understanding the implementation requirements, sector interdependencies and the practical implications of the proposed legislative changes. We encourage active collaboration between central and local government staff to build a shared, practical understanding of how the reforms will be delivered and to support effective, coordinated implementation across the sector.

3.3 For example, we note the timing and significant workload associated with the Regional Spatial Plan signalled in the Planning Bill. The Spatial Plan is expected to commence this year and will therefore be developed in advance of any new regional reorganisation legislation. This Bill requires councils to have a view on regional reorganisation ahead of the implementation of this programme. This out-of-order sequencing creates additional pressure on councils, and a risk of misalignment in outcomes. It also introduces the real possibility of significant rework of spatial planning documents. This underscores the importance of aligning reform timeframes.

3.4 The Council is concerned that no dedicated funding has been identified to support this substantial area of reform, or any recognition of the costs that will be incurred through the transitional period in which rates capping legislation will also potentially apply.

3.5 The proposed changes represent a significant undertaking for the local government sector, and adequate resourcing will be essential to manage the interim period and achieve sustainable, long-term outcomes. While the Council supports the intent to improve efficiency, we also recognise that delivering the best reorganisation plan will incur short-term costs - costs that our ratepayers are unlikely to support without corresponding central government investment.

4. General Comments – Implementation and RMA Reforms

4.1 The partially operative Waimakariri District Plan 2025 is a modern plan developed over many years and refined to reflect changes in national direction (including MDRS) and to align with the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan, which we helped develop. We are proud of both documents and consider them successful contemporary planning tools. Their development represented a significant cost to our ratepayers, and we do not want that investment undermined by new legislation.

4.2 To support transition into the new system, we consider it will be important for national direction to be detailed, stable, and responsive to different regional contexts. As stated, we have recent experience with a contemporary District Plan and are well placed to assist government in the development of National Standards and would welcome the opportunity to do so.

4.3 We believe it would be beneficial for the National Standards to not only address zone consistency issues, but also how overlays and infrastructure should be managed. In our experience Crown organisations (e.g. Transpower, NZTA, Kiwirail, Kainga Ora) repeatedly argue the same points across the country, at considerable cost and time. This is not efficient and often results in different outcomes in different districts.

4.4 A strong and clear definition of ‘well-functioning urban environment’ and ‘out of sequence’ development is needed within the National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Without this, development infrastructure will not be affordable or sustainable. Uncontrolled urban sprawl is a costly development model and hinders affordable development. We are

well placed to assist the government in developing these definitions and would again welcome the opportunity.

4.5 Understanding how the various parts of the new system interact will help avoid confusion and ensure consistent implementation across the region, and the country.

4.6 We consider that success of the planning reforms is dependent on how related systems, such as housing and infrastructure, operate alongside them. Strong coordination across government departments and bipartisan agreement on the desired outcomes and implementation, is essential to ensure the reforms deliver practical, on-the-ground results.

4.7 The reforms will require significant investment in people, capability, and time. It will be important for central government to recognise these demands and share the costs of meeting new requirements with those charged with implementing them.

4.8 We note the timing of these reforms is unlikely to align with climate change adaption planning. We view this as a critical component of spatial planning and recommend that the government consider it carefully when setting the timing for regional spatial planning processes.

5. Increasing costs for Local Government

4.9 We note this Bill would impose additional costs on territorial authorities at a time when central government is seeking to improve efficiencies for New Zealand ratepayers (and is currently consulting on proposals to apply a 'rates cap').

4.10 These costs have a direct and unbudgeted financial burden on councils, which is then passed on to ratepayers. To have our costs increased by central government, while being required to reduce costs, will likely result in a reduction of services for residents – which they haven't voted for.

4.11 We would encourage the select committee (where enabled by the legislation), and later government, consider how these costs will be managed in the context of wider reform packages, including rates capping.

4.12 We would also encourage stronger linkages between outcomes, for example impacts on Civil Defence functions. Our submission on the Emergency Management Bill highlights some of these direct linkages.

6. Timing of legislative change

6.1 While we appreciate that the timing of RM reform is intentionally designed to precede potential outcomes from the SLG proposals, we note that regions such as Canterbury are likely to face practical challenges in meeting the proposed timeframes, particularly in relation to spatial planning.

6.2 We request that, in developing the detailed provisions of the legislation, consideration is given to the distinct governance and resourcing arrangements in each region tasked with delivering the first generation of plans under the new system. This should include an assessment of how the legislation can enable efficient and effective implementation within

these regional contexts, as well as acknowledgement of components of the current system that are both recent and already meeting the desired outcomes.

7. Local democracy and local decision-making

7.1 A key concern is the potential reduction in local democracy, and the possibility that communities may lose a vehicle through which to protect features that are unique to them.

7.2 Local knowledge plays a vital role in environmental planning. We want to ensure communities can continue to influence the decisions that shape their environments. We have many experiences where local input into consent and plan change processes has led to positive outcomes for all parties.

7.3 These examples include cases where residents have been strongly opposed to development in areas where it could materially change the land use from semi-rural to urban. Another example includes having Councillors on our recent district plan review hearings process. This meant that submitters could talk directly to panel members who understood the local context and history of the area and its sense of identity. Within *appendix 1* we suggest amendments we consider will achieve the intent of RM reform and retain the benefits local input brings to system implementation, including input into national direction.

7.4 We believe that councils need room to respond quickly and tailor solutions to local challenges. Retaining this flexibility will help us protect and manage the unique qualities of our district while meeting broader national objectives.

7.5 We welcome opportunities to work with central government to test and refine how the changes will be best implemented in our local environment. We also want to ensure the new system supports our relationship with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

8. Opportunity to resolve existing system inefficiencies

8.1 Rebuilding the planning system is a rare opportunity to address long-standing systemic issues. We have put forward suggestions aimed at creating a more streamlined and user-friendly system for both councils and our communities.

8.2 We recognise that in some of our suggestions will be outside of the scope of this submission process. We provide these comments in the hope that they will be considered within the wider package of reforms occurring.

8.3 We note that our ability to comment on the impact of the bills was hampered by the absence of full understanding of both national directional and proposed legislation. We consider that these aspects of the system are as equally important to successful implementation as the bills themselves.

8.4 We encourage meaningful consultation and analysis alongside local government as the legislation and national direction is developed. We recommend that the Minister specifically consider the costs of implementing future regulations before decisions are made.

8.5 Table 1 (Appendix 1) provides some suggested improvements to the legislation that we consider will help deliver on these outcomes.

Our contact for service and questions is via our Development Planning Unit developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz.

The Council would like to speak in support of its submission.

Yours faithfully

Dan Gordon
Mayor
Waimakariri District Council

Jeff Millward
Chief Executive
Waimakariri District Council

Appendix 1

Table 1 – Waimakariri District Council position on the Planning Bill

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Theme 1 – General Matters				
Standardisation within national directions and appropriate recognition of Māori goals	Support with minor alterations	In our Going for Growth submission, we supported the intent to introduce National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga (NES-P), which would allow existing provisions that have been agreed between Councils and mana whenua to remain. However, we sought amendments to ensure that appropriate terminology was used recognising local arrangements and agreements. In support of this position, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri (our local Rūnanga) prefer the term 'kāinga nohoanga', which was the specific terminology used in the Canterbury Deed of Purchase between the Crown and Ngāi Tahu in 1848. The Deed promised access to mahinga kai and the rights for development of townships on Māori Reserves in perpetuity. This potentially goes beyond the traditional concept of Papakāinga as housing. We are concerned that the provisions of the proposed Planning Bill, in combination with the NES-P, will unreasonably constrain the ability of the Council to work with iwi and hapū by carrying over and entrenching existing planning approaches to the use of Māori land by limiting it to housing; and requiring consenting or justification processes for non-residential and mixed use activities that are onerous and costly. We note that our recently completed District Plan review provides a contemporary example of a solution that recognises that and iwi hapū no longer hold ancestral land in many developed urban areas where a large proportion of Māori now reside (this includes former pā, reserves, mahinga kai, and nohoanga sites) and that provides for acquisition and development of these specific areas. The theme of appropriate enabling terminology is important to consider where similar concepts are addressed within legislation.	Our Council has built a constructive relationship with mana whenua, based on the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Through this relationship, the Council has become aware of the barriers within the resource management system for the use and development of Māori land. This has affected the ability of iwi and hapū to realise their contemporary social, cultural and economic development aspirations. We are therefore supportive of a National Goal for Māori interests that is sufficiently broad and accommodating of the varying needs and aspirations of iwi and hapū.	Ensure that appropriate terminology is used (or can be used) when describing concepts. Amend the planning legislation and National Planning Standards to ensure appropriate terminology and provide a clear, enabling pathway for the development of Māori land, including ancestral land reacquired through conventional means. This should require national direction to integrate iwi and hapū aspirations into regional spatial planning, allow Māori Purpose Zoning beyond the current definition of Identified Māori Land, and enable housing, cultural, and economic development aligned with iwi and hapū aspirations and cultural imperatives.
Section 4 (Purpose)	Support with alterations	While the Planning Bill does provide direction on the use, development and enjoyment of land, the Bill also covers other aspects listed in the bill's explanation, such as the creating well-functioning urban and rural areas, provision of infrastructure, identification of natural character and outstanding landscapes, and significant historic heritage, and the protection of sites of significance to Māori. These other aspects are listed as the goals but don't seem to be reflected in the purpose of the Bill.	While the purpose of the Bill is normally not considered as having statutory significance, it does get used for guidance to apply the goals.	Amend the Purpose to state (or to like effect): *The purpose of this Act is to establish a framework for planning and regulating* the use, development, and enjoyment of land <u>while protecting those values that provide for peoples social, *economic and* cultural well-being</u>.
Section 11 (Goals)	Support with alterations	We note that the needs of future generations are not explicitly provided for within the goals.	Ignoring the needs of future generations will lead to environmental degradation,	Amend clause (1) as follows: (1) All persons exercising or performing functions, duties, or

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
		Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei, for us, and our children. Primarily used by Ngāi Tahu, this whakataukī signifies a duty of care, ensuring the protection of resources, environment, and interests for both the current generation and those yet to come. We must consider future generations to ensure sustainable communities, resilient infrastructure, and liveable environments that endure beyond immediate needs and short-term decisions. Consideration of future generations needs to be included within the goals.	costly infrastructure failures, social inequity, reduced resilience, and communities unprepared for long-term climate, population, and economic change.	powers under this Act must seek to achieve the following goals <u>for the benefit of present and future generations</u> subject to **sections 12 and 45**:
Section 11(1)(a) (Goals)	Support with alterations	We note that the concept of 'unreasonably affect' in Section 11(1)(a) is not defined. While we note that national direction will likely define this concept in terms of practical effect, we consider that this concept as a technical assessment matter is better specifically defined in the legislation. We have suggested wording that would align with the required justification report outcomes (acknowledging that there will always be a degree of subjectivity as a high-level system goal).	Without a technical concept definition, 'unreasonably affect' is likely to change its application through subsequent national direction and implementation practice. This will create system inefficiencies as implementation changes.	Add a definition of 'unreasonably affect' to read as follows (or to like effect): *'Unreasonably affect means an outcome related to effects controlled by this legislation that are not justified in terms of the imposition on the person generating the effect'*
Section 13 (Procedural Principals)	Strongly support	We strongly support the identified principles and in particular requirements to ensure documents are easily understandable to the public. We also support these principles applying to national direction. We note that to achieve this, there also needs to be a recognition from all system participants that this may mean that public notices and other public communications need to be able to be flexible in how they are worded rather than exactly following prescribed wording (for example the Forms, Fees and Procedure Regulations 2003).	Our experience has been that there are often legal challenges that result when public notices summarise legislation or process steps to make these concepts easily understandable. This drives the opposite outcome that is intended with notices that replicate legislative directions to reduce the risk of legal challenge.	Provide significance emphasis and guidance on the applicability of this section across the system as a key tenant that enables system change.
Section 163(1)	Oppose	We note that both the Planning Bill and the Natural Environment Bill refer to Councils ability to refuse consents/permits where the natural hazard risk is 'significant', this does not align with Policy 3 of the NPS for Natural Hazards which 'very high' risk is avoided.	We note that this may result in inconsistencies between the Bills and the NPSNH may result in adverse outcomes.	Amend the NPSNH (and specifically its successor under the new bills) to align with 'significant risk' approach of the two Bills.
Interactions with the Privacy Act	Note	While not a specific section within the legislation, we would encourage the Ministry to work with the Privacy Commissioner to develop guidance on the interaction between the Privacy Act and the Planning Bill, where there are requirements for Councils to collect and publish information, for example submission contact details.	Better integration between the Planning Bill and the Privacy Act 2020.	Consider interaction between the requirements of the Planning Bill and the Privacy Act 2020.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Funding of Independent Hearings Panel	Seek Clarification	Sub-clause (2) outlines that a single authority is responsible for all costs incurred where the process is limited to a single instrument. Council is unclear whether this is a single instrument such as a land use plan, or a single instrument such as a national environmental standard, both of which have different extents of applicability.	A lack of clarity in this area will potentially create inefficiencies associated with dispute resolution processes.	Clarify the applicability of Schedule 4 Clause 8(2).
General – national e-planning portal	Note	The information provided on the bill anticipates that plans will be hosted on a national e-planning portal. As a Council, we have had a lot of experience working with ePlan text content and maps. In our view, it is important for the government to consider how the plans will be updated, the capacity of the portal for storing and loading a large amount of data, data compatibility, access, responsibilities, licencing and ownership matters in time for enactment of the bill, and the ability for the national platform to function well when being accessed simultaneously by practitioners nationwide.	We consider there are many risks if this is not carefully considered such as plans not able to be updated in a timely manner, and information overload that the portal cannot cope.	Consider achievability of Councils' ability to feed into the e-planning portal and a realistic timeframe for this.
Funding for Regional Spatial Planning	Note	We note that with a regional spatial plan needing to be notified by September 2027 that local authorities would have needed to allocate funding within annual plans that have already been prepared for consultation or are in effect (noting that this is also prior to the enactment of the bills). While this is now unavoidable, we consider it would be appropriate for consideration to be given to the timing of long-term plan updates across the 2027 – 2037 Long Term Plan period.		
Section 14(1)(c) Effects outside the scope of the Act	Oppose	We are concerned about the impact of disregarding retail distribution effects from consideration will have on the viability of town centres. It is important to be able to set limits such as gross floor area to ensure there is not an oversupply of retail floor space.	This could impact on growth and development if decision makers cannot consider retail distribution effects on the role, function and viability of town centres.	Delete Section 14(1)(c).
Section 14(1)(e)	Oppose	The impact of disregarding visual amenity effects could have perverse outcomes for achieving a quality-built environment.	Could have perverse outcomes for achieving a well-functioning built environment.	Delete Section 14(1)(e).
Section 85 (Conflicts between rules and regulations)	Support with alterations	We support the intent of this provision and note that while section 3 limits this to '*regulations made under this act*' that this clause could be extended to provide a mechanism to further reduce consents for effects that are controlled through other mechanisms. Examples include mandatory industry codes of practice. We acknowledge that this issue may be resolved within the preparation of standardised plan provisions. We note that aspects of New Zealand Standards (or appropriate international standards) may be appropriate for incorporation into standardised plan provisions.	No guarantee that the standardised plan provisions will address this issue and therefore a better approach is to address this in the legislation.	Consider extending the scope of section 85 to better resolve conflicts where effects are controlled by other mandatory and appropriate standards.
Section 281(1) (Regulations)	Oppose	With respect to the clauses in Section 281(1), Council note that this section of the legislation provides the potential to regulate the content of forms, the methods of making an application and the criteria a Registrar should follow in relation to waiving of fees. It is accepted that some of the provisions listed in s281(1) may be appropriate as amendments to legislation, however we consider that most of the provisions would be better forming part of a guidance document to avoid efficiencies that will eventuate if regulations are created that require technical process changes.	Inefficiencies that will result from evolving regulations for matters that would otherwise be technical in nature.	Consider narrowing the scope of what changes can be made by way of regulations as against what should be included in guidance documents.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Schedule 3, clause 22 – Striking out and publishing further submissions, summary of submissions (timeframe)	Note	The ability to publish a summary of submissions and further submissions no later than 20 working days after the closing date for further submissions on a proposed plan will be highly dependent on the system and the prescribed form that will be used to produce a summary. It would have to be user friendly and require no manual input (is able to either read hard-copy handwritten submissions or they are all entered directly into the online system), drafting, or editing. For example, by using AI that did not require word-for-word checking, and it produces a summary that is suitable for publishing without any data compatibility, formatting or content issues.	Schedule 3, clause 22 of the Bill will not be able to be achieved without a highly efficient electronic system.	Extend the timeframe of 20 working days in Schedule 3, clause 22(1) to a length that is achievable for the electronic system that is being used to produce a summary of submissions, or ensure the electronic system is fit-for-purpose to meet the timeframe.
Schedule 4 (Appointment of an IHP)	Support	In support of our introductory comments, Council supports the ability for Local Authority members to be appointed to a 'jointly appointed panel' - an Independent Hearings Panel.	Supports democracy.	Support Schedule 4 Clause 6.
Schedule 5 Designations	Support with alterations	We support that clause 39 clarifies when a construction plan (formerly known as an outline plan) is deemed to be confirmed, including when the timeframe referred to in clause 38 (20 working days) has lapsed and no response from the territorial authority has been received. However, we consider that it would also be appropriate to require that territorial authorities acknowledge receipt of an outline plan within a certain timeframe to ensure that the processing of an approval efficiently occurs.	Our proposed changes would help to avoid a situation where an outline plan is not progressed prior to the processing clock beginning.	Clarify what constitutes lodgement of a construction plan so it is clear when the 20 working days starts e.g., when a construction plan is lodged and a fee is paid a receipt must be issued with a consent number that relates to the construction plan, proving lodgement has occurred thereby initiating the 20 working days.
Schedule 5 Designations	Support with alterations	We consider that further clarifications are needed as to when designations in partially operative plans become operative. Currently, under the RMA, even if a designation in a partially operative district plan is beyond challenge, it is technically not operative until the plan, as a whole, becomes operative. This is because the RMA defines a designation as a provision in a district plan, and a district plan is defined as an operative plan. Some councils treat designations in a partially operative plan as operative when beyond challenge. However, that relies on legally being able to treat designations the same as rules which, under the RMA, can be regarded as operative once beyond challenge.	A legally unclear situation that can impede use of designations in partially operative plans when the designations are beyond challenge, but other parts of the plan remain subject to challenge.	Clarify that designations in partially operative plans can be regarded as operative when the designations are beyond challenge, but other parts of the plan remain subject to challenge, the same as rules in the same circumstances.
Schedules - General	Support with alterations	The schedules often refer to a 'prescribed manner' (for example: Schedule 3, clause 50). We support a consistent approach but are unclear on what the 'prescribed manner' is intended to be? Are there going to be prescribed forms within regulations (like the Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003) to direct what the 'prescribed manner' is?	Lack of clarity which will result in efficiencies of plan interpretation.	Clarify what the 'prescribed manner' is intended to refer to.
Schedule 11 – Amendments to other legislation *Part 4 - Other Acts and further legislation amended*	Support with alterations	We support the retention of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 and updating that legislation to replace reference to the Resource Management Act 1991, with reference to the Natural Environment Act 2025 and the Planning Act 2025. However, we ask that the government consider making Planning Decision final and therefore ensuring it is not able to be circumvented by the fast-track process.	More efficient, cost effective and democratic.	Amend Planning Bill to ensure decisions that are made under the Planning Bill are respected and not over-ridden by the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024.
Theme 2 – Relationships between Natural Environment Bill, Planning Bill, and other National direction				
Requirements in relation to water service entities	Note	We are unclear as to whether there will be a change to the Local Authority Water Services Act to require water service providers to have regard to a Regional Spatial Plan when preparing a Water Service Strategy. While this	Provides clarity.	Require a direct linkage between and Water Service Strategy and a Regional Spatial Plan (noting that this

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
		is less of an issue where there is a direct linkage between the water service entity and a local authority, we consider that it would be appropriate for a direct linkage to be provided to ensure that infrastructure and zoning decisions support one another.		relief would likely be out of scope on the Planning Bill).
Theme 3 – Classification of Activities and Permitted Activity rules				
Section 31 (Principles for classifying activities)	Support with alterations	While Council agrees with the removal of the controlled activities for simplicity, the removal of the non-complying activity classification could result in less certainty on the intention of a plan regarding activities anticipated in zones. Our understanding is that a discretionary activity status indicates that the activity needs consideration and the matters to consider cannot be isolated to a specific list, are lengthy/wide-ranging, or not able to be identified but that effects could potentially be addressed. A non-complying activity status indicates that the activity itself is not anticipated in a zone but does not necessarily mean decline for 'out-of-the-box' activities where effects are minor or the activity is not contrary to the plans' objectives and policies. Prohibited activity status is a complete barrier as resource consent cannot even be applied for.	This could mean that activities that are not anticipated are included as a prohibited activity even if there are scenarios that are different than the typical activity of a type.	Retain the non-complying activity status.
Theme 4 – National Instruments, National Policy direction and National Standards				
Section 40 (Relationship between national and plan rules)	Support with Alterations	Section 40 provides helpful guidance to reconcile national and plan rules, however this section could be further enhanced by providing guidance where for example a rule in a national rule addresses multiple matters (i.e. is equivalent to a 'catch all' rule in the 'old' system). An example of this could be a national rule controlling stockpiling, with a local rule controlling the volume of moved material. Would this rule be considered more or less restrictive to a general earthwork activity?	Council can foresee issues arising whether there is a disagreement between the matters that a national and proposed plan rule control where there are different/ other effects covered.	Clarify that section 40 applies to the effects that the national rule covers or, in addition, provide clarity within national direction on specifically what effects are proposed to be managed under that rule.
Section 49 (Withdrawal of proposed National Instrument	Support with Alterations	Section 49 allows the Minster to withdraw all or part of a national instrument prior to approval. Our Council has had recent experience of plan making in which this occurred, which had significant time and cost implications associated with reconfiguring hearings and reporting. To limit this occurring in the future system, Council suggest that an additional clause is added requiring the Minister to specifically consider the time and cost implications that withdrawing a national instrument would create (where a process is already underway to implement that instrument).	There is the potential for significant cost and time implications on plan making.	Insert new clause 49 (or to like effect): '(3) *When considering withdrawal of a National Instrument the Minister must undertake an evaluation of the cost impact of the withdrawal and the need for further regulation to enable authorities to amend a process to decide upon a document that intends to give effect to that instrument'*

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Section 61 (National Rules Identified) and General comment on rules and standards	Support with Alterations	To most effectively provide national consistency, we consider that Section 61 should direct whether national rules need to be in a land use plan or not, rather than leave this as an option. Our preference would be to require these to be in a land use plan where those rules in national instruments are compulsory to implement anyway, as this avoids members of our community that do not regularly interact with the plan having to find the rules that apply to them in two documents.	This approach is more efficient as it avoids having differ approaches to standards and rules (noting that the new system provides an ability to address why this was needed within the RMA structure).	Amend section 61 to require that national rules are included in a land use plan. Consider how to avoid the need for both standards and rules as different constructs.
Ability to address certain matters in a land use plan	N/A	We note that the proposed 'system funnel' is designed such that if a matter is not addressed in a spatial plan, that it cannot be addressed in a land use plan that sits lower in the hierarchy of documents. Given the high-level nature of the first iteration of spatial plans, we consider that it will be important to allow a land use plan to address a matter that would not be logical to add into a spatial plan over a large geographical area. A specific example of this is specific zoning outcomes that implement the Waimakariri Red Zone Regeneration Plan, that would otherwise not be required in a regional spatial plan (or may differ from similar responses within Christchurch City).	There is a risk that a spatial plan that covers a large geographical area cannot deal with matters that are detailed and specific to one district.	Provide an ability for a local authority to include specific matters that are local to a district, and that would otherwise not be at a scale appropriate to include in a regional plan.
Theme 5 – Regulatory relief				
Section 92 Schedule 3 Part 4	Support with alterations	Many Councils may be unlikely to include protections for significant special environments due to potential cost implications of regulatory relief, especially if in a rate capped environment and instead encourage voluntary protections. Especially if there is uncertainty as to how compensation should be worked out. At the very least, a framework for how compensation for such protections is to be worked out should be included in the prescribed provisions. This would provide certainty to councils and public as to how this is to be done. Councils can then work out the cost implications of potential protections before deciding whether to include such protections in a land use plan. We consider that the *Pūnaha hauropi me te rerenga rauropi taketake - Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter* within the partially operative Waimakariri District Plan offers a contemporary example of how such a compensation framework can operate. The inclusion of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) was voluntary, and there are bonus allotment rights associated with SNAs that are included in the District Plan.	The absence of a prescribed framework for calculating compensation for protection means the potential cost implications are unclear and could lead to councils simply not including protections in land use plans, resulting in significant special environments not being protected for present and future generations. Also, a lack of framework for this will give rise to potential inconsistencies and potential inequities between regions (e.g., a SNA landowner restricted by a nationally standardised indigenous vegetation clearance rule in one region receiving more compensation / regulatory relief compared to one in another region).	A framework for how compensation for such protections is to be worked out should be included in the prescribed provisions. We would welcome the opportunity to assist government in developing the framework and consider that we are well placed to do so given our recent experience and contemporary district plan.
Theme 6 – Consenting, monitoring and enforcement				

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Clause 18 (Schedule 7 - Certificate of Approval)	Support with Alterations	We note that Clause 18 (which looks to replace existing section 22c4 of the RMA 1991) does not specify that all conditions of consent need to be complied with (including where a bond is issued or a consent notice).	This may lead to uncertainty where not all conditions of consent are covered in the survey approval.	Amend subclause 18(2) Schedule 7 to clarify that all conditions of consent need to be met to issue a certificate of approval.
s107 (Types of consent)	Support with minor alterations	s107 as drafted reads as an interpretation section and largely creates a circular loop with the definition of a *land use consent* in section 3. Consideration should be given to the need for this section and whether the impacts can be resolved through clearer definitions.	Unclear and inefficient implementation outcomes.	Delete s107 or combine within the s3 Interpretation section
Section 116(1)	Oppose	This provision is the same as existing Section 91(1). The problem with current implementation is that it only allows councils to "not proceed with notification or a hearing". If a non-notified application which needs additional consents, it can't be suspended. This section should be amended so that councils can "not proceed with processing an application", until the applicant applies for any additional consents, which can then be processed at the same time.	Potential cost implications for applicants	Amend Section 91(1) to provide the ability for processing to cease, prior to other approvals being lodged, where applications are non-notified.
Section 117	Support with minor alterations	We note the clear consent timeframes provided within the legislation but also note that there are no 'clock stops' for consenting authority (or at least nothing to suggest that this will be available within later regulation).	No ability to stop for further information requests potentially mean that consent authorities would have to decline a consent if information is not received within the 45-day timeframe.	Provide a 'clock stop' for further information requests.
Section 128 and 131	Oppose	We have not identified that consideration has been given to how the effects of an activity may have wider impacts upon the environment and those peoples or groups that are affected by the impacts either directly or indirectly. An example are Community Boards who represent local community interests and are often the conduit on local and regional government matters, including resource consents. The definition of 'qualifying resident' also in our view overly narrows who can comment on environmental effects of a proposal. There may be bodies with national functions (eg, Heritage NZ, Fish & Game, DoC) that may be prevented from commenting in situations where potential environmental effects extend beyond the boundaries of an application site. It would also exclude persons that have lived in an area for a significant amount of time (and thus may have otherwise provided very useful contextual evidence) but may have located elsewhere for unavoidable reasons but would otherwise still wish to retain a future relationship to the district.	Wider impacts on communities and the physical, cultural and ecological environment will not be considered.	Amend provision to provide for community boards, bodies and other submitters that can demonstrate an interest greater than the general public, as potentially affected persons.
s174 (Minor correction of planning consents)	Support with minor alterations	We support the intent of this provision and suggest that this provision could also be extended to provide for amendments that make the administration or implementation of the consent more efficient.	This would enable Councils and applicants to amend consent applications to more efficiently provide for implementation (noting that good practice would be for a consent authority to discuss changes with an applicant prior to amending a consent).	Extend s174 to provide for amendments that make implementation of a consent more efficient

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
s178 (Certificates of Compliance)	Support	We support s178 and in particular the explicit reference to how a certificate links with existing use rights.	In support of this provision, we note that this provides greater clarity where an activity with a certificate of compliance intends to continue operating after the provision framework in which the certificate of compliance was issued is reviewed.	Retain.
Section 283 (Regulations relating to a planning consent levy)	Seek Clarification	Section 283 provides for regulations to develop a planning consent levy. As drafted this levy provides for a levy on permitted activities that are 'registered'. Given that permitted activities by their nature will not need assessment, there is potentially going to be limited benefit to applying for a notice, and the potential imposition of a levy will further discourage applicants from applying. Essentially, if a permitted activity needs a level of control such that a levy is needed to manage implementation, this suggests that it should not be a permitted activity.	The resulting impact will likely mean that Councils are not informed of permitted activities which will place a larger cost burden relating to the need for more intensive environmental monitoring.	Remove the ability to make regulations imposing a planning consent levy on permitted activities.
Section 275 (Emergency Works Powers)	Support with alterations	We support the retention of Emergency powers under the RMA, however, consider that in most situations appointed Civil Defence controllers will coordinate emergency powers where an Emergency Operations Centre is in operation (whether or not an emergency is declared). To provide complete certainty, we would recommend that section 275(1) specifically includes appointed Civil Defence controllers in the list of persons authorised to make directions under this section.	Suggested change provides a more efficient legislative approach.	Provide an explicit link to the role of Regional and Local appointed Civil Defence controllers.
General Matter – Ability to apply for a consent	Support with minor alterations	Within the new bills there is an opportunity to consider limitations on external parties applying for a consent over land they do not own (excepting where there is a clear and obvious interest such as a developer applying for a consent on land that they are intending to purchase). While this is not practical issue that we experience, Council has received past feedback from our community that it is anomalous that parties are able to apply for a consent over land that they do not own.	There are unlikely to be practical implementations, however this issue would better provide for private property rights.	Consider further limitations on who can apply for consents over a piece of land to those that either own or occupy the land or can demonstrate an interest in the land greater than the general public.
Theme 7 – Combined plans				
Part 3	Support with alterations	Overall, we support the requirement for a Combined Plan which consists of the Regional Spatial Plan, the Natural Environment Plan, and a Land Use Plan for each District within the region's boundaries. However, we request that where Councils have recently completed plans, that the Minister is conducive to allowing exemptions from standardised planning provisions, and there is the ability to justify why those contemporary provisions are appropriate.	The Councils reasons for this position are to reduce costs and inefficiencies that will result from relitigating provisions that were agreed in 2025 and that have resulted from community engagement through the district plan review.	Retain.
Regional Spatial Plans				
Section 67 – Purpose of a regional spatial plan	Support	We consider the 30-year timeframe is desirable for strategic planning. We support the strategic level integration with the Natural Environment Act within the Spatial Plan which is required to ensure all Goals are achieved in both the Planning Act and the Environment Act. We also support the regional spatial plan promoting integration of development planning with infrastructure planning and investment.	N/A	Retain.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Section 67(d)	Strongly support	We strongly support a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure funding and investment by Central government, local government and other infrastructure providers. A coordinated approach is required to achieve the goals of the Act, which needs to be supported by companion legislation enabling growth to be funded by growth.	N/A	Retain.
Section 68(1) – How the regional spatial plans promote integration	Support with alterations	We support that the land use plan and the environment plan *implements* the regional spatial plan. We support that the regional land transport plan must be *consistent with* the regional spatial plan. We support that the Minister must *take into account* any relevant regional spatial plan when preparing or reviewing a Government Policy Statement on land transport. We support a long-term plan under the LGA setting out steps to implement or progress actions for which the local authority leads. Clause 2 is contradictory to clause 1 and creates uncertainty as to the planning hierarchy. This clause should be removed.	We also note that the effect of this section as drafted may result in a need to consider the jurisdiction of both statutory and non-statutory documents where relevant.	Retain section 68(1). Delete section 68(2).
Section 69 – Process agreement for preparation of regional spatial plan	Support with alterations	We support the inclusion of a delegation to local government to agree a process for the preparation of a regional spatial plan. However, we oppose this happening prior to Simplifying Local Government proposals being progressed and settled. This process will burden local government with having to undertake local government reform *de facto*. Council consider that the use of the phrase 'partner' better reflects the role that Iwi should have in the preparation of the regional spatial plan. This is not guaranteed in the drafting of clauses (1)(e) and (1)(f).	Time and cost that has not been budgeted. There is no process proposed to consult communities on representation and boundaries.	Co-ordinate central government changes to ensure greatest efficiency. Halt the requirement for a regional spatial plan until after Simplifying Local Government proposals have been progressed and settled. Amend clause (e) to ensure that Iwi are a partner in the preparation of the regional spatial plan, as below, or to like effect: *how each local authority will partner with iwi to ensure that its obligations or agreements under iwi participation legislation or agreements under that legislation, existing joint management agreements, or existing or initiated Mana Whakahono ā Rohe are upheld during the process:*
Section 70 – Consultation with Iwi	Oppose	Iwi should be a partner in the preparation of the regional spatial plan, not just be consulted.	Partnering with Iwi offers substantial benefits that extend across cultural, social, environmental, economic, and legal spheres. These partnerships, founded on the	As above

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
			principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, foster better outcomes for all parties and the wider community. This includes access to unique knowledge and perspectives, stronger community support and social licence, enhanced outcomes, environmental stewardship, cultural respect and preservation, and economic opportunity and growth. This is unique to New Zealand and goes to the heart of our national identity.	
Spatial Plan Committees				
Section 71 – Requirement to have spatial plan committee	Support with alterations	We support the delegation to local government to agree terms of reference for the committee. We oppose this happening prior to Simplifying Local Government proposals being progressed and settled. This process will burden local government with having to undertake local government reform *de facto*.	Time and cost that has not been budgeted. There is no process proposed to consult communities on representation and boundaries.	Co-ordinate central government changes to ensure greatest efficiency. Halt the requirement for a regional spatial plan until after Simplifying Local Government proposals have been progressed and settled.
Section 73 – Role of spatial plan committee	Support	We support the role of a spatial planning committee as described in s73. However, we question the practicality of clause (e) *recommend the draft regional spatial plan to all local authorities in the region for approval to publicly notify it,* being achieved within the timeframes set. (Schedule 2, clause 21 - 40 working days).	We question if this timeframe is achievable where there are multiple authorities in a region that have different Council meeting timeframes.	Extend the timeframe to 60 working days.
Section 74 – other requirements relating to regional spatial plans	Support	We support this section and having the details relating to the matters outlined within Schedule 2.	Provides clarity. However, we note the inconsistent drafting approach to appeal rights on plan processed when compared with appeal rights on planning consents. The appeal rights on plan process in contained within Schedule 2, whereas the appeal rights on planning consents is within the body of the legislation – Part 4, sections 154 and 155. We cannot see a reason for the inconsistency, and wonder how this difference in approach will be then interpreted in the future (if not deliberate).	Retain section 74. Consider drafting appeal rights for plans and planning consents in a similar manner – i.e., both in the body of the legislation, or both in schedules.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Schedule 2, clause (2)	Support with alterations	There is a requirement in Schedule 2, clause (2) for spatial plans to be consistent with environmental limits but, under section 47 and section 51 of the Natural Environment Bill, ecosystem health limits must be set by the regional council in its natural environment plan. There is a time issue as natural environment plans implement spatial plans under section 68 of The Planning Bill and therefore will not be completed until after the spatial plans.	Spatial plans may be inconsistent with ecosystem health limits.	Amend Schedule 2, clause (2) to include a transitional provision for spatial plans to be consistent with ecosystem health limits prior to them being set-out in a natural environment plan. In the alternative, consider specific provision within the legislation that recognises the transitional nature of first-generation spatial plans and provides guidance to decision makers on the interface between the 'new' and 'old' system.
Land use plans				
75 – purpose of land use plan	Support	We support the simple and clear purpose.	Provides clarity.	Retain.
76 – Each district must have 1 land use plan	Support	We support having one land use plan per district.	Provides clarity for communities.	Retain.
77 – how land use plan is prepared or changed	Support	We support this section and having the details relating to the matters outlined within Schedule's 3 and 4.	Provides clarity.	Retain.
78 – Land use plan must include standardised plan provisions as directed by national instruments	Note	It is difficult to comment on section 78 without knowing the content of the standardised plan provisions. The standardised plan provisions will have a large impact on the success or failure of the proposed system. A significant amount of work was undertaken to inform the Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan 2025. The plan is in the National Planning Standards format and contains special purpose zones (such as the Kainga Nohoanga Zone) that we wish to retain for our community. We seek certainty that this will be possible within the new system. To aid efficiency within the new system we would submit that it is important to consider including transitional provisions for land use plans for those Districts that have recently completed District Plan Reviews e.g. carrying over provisions into land use plans without requiring justification reports.	Significant community agreement could be undermined, and the outcomes that our community have decided upon could not be realised. A lot of money has been spent on District Plan Reviews which would be lost if provisions are discontinued in the new system.	Ensure the legislation allows communities to choose their own path on matters that are important to them. Consider transitional provisions for Districts that have recently completed District Plan Reviews.
79 – bespoke plan provisions	Note	As above, it is difficult to comment on section 79 without knowing the content of the standardised plan provisions. Which national instruments do not preclude the territorial authority from including bespoke provisions? Can we retain special purpose zones that are currently within the Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan 2025?	Significant community agreement could be undermined, and the outcomes that our community have decided upon could not be realised.	Ensure the legislation allows communities to choose their own path on matters that are important to them.
80 – core obligations when preparing and deciding land use plan	Note	We support the intention of the planning hierarchy as specified in clause 2, however, as above, it is difficult to provide full comment on this section without understanding the contents of the standardised plan provisions.	Significant community agreement could be undermined, and the outcomes that our community have	Ensure the legislation allows communities to choose their own path on matters that are important to them.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
			decided upon could not be realised.	
81 – provisions in land use plan	Support	We support the proposed requirement to include objectives, policies and rules in Land Use Plans and note the discretion to include methods and designations in Land Use Plans; however as noted above we would prefer that the legislation instead specified whether methods should be included or not, in order to ensure that plans are as consistent as possible Note that comments on regulatory relief (81(1)(b)) are provided in separate submission points.	This follows good policy practice.	Clarify an absolute position on whether or not methods should be included within a plan.
86 – Methods relating to incentives	Support with alterations	We support the concept of providing for incentives however consider Section 86 lacks the appropriately level of clarity and detail required to effectively implement it.	Lack of clarity and detail on what is intended by this incentives clause.	Amend to add greater clarity and detail to ensure fair, consistent and equitable implementation of this clause.
87 – Requirements for evaluation reports	Support with minor alterations	The matters covered in s87 do not require all the core obligations listed in section 80 to be addressed within the Justification Plan. We seek a new clause that requires the justification report to address the matters in section 80. A standardised plan zone could still have cross-boundary implications (for example, the ways in which tikanga of hapu or Runanga groups are recognised) and therefore, at a minimum, the evaluation report must address the consideration of consistency with land use plans of adjacent territorial authorities.	Ensures consistency of approach. Ensures that all matters in s80 have the opportunity to be considered by the evaluation report.	Insert new clause as follows: (1A) the extent to which the land use plan needs to be consistent with— (a) any land use plan or proposed land use plan of an adjacent territorial authority: (b) the provisions of any natural environment plan or proposed natural environment plan that apply to the parts of the coastal marine area that are adjacent to the district of the territorial authority:
88 – Requirements for further evaluation reports	Support with minor alterations	We support section 88 contingent on alterations sought to section 87.	Ensures consistency of approach. Ensures that all matters in s80 have the opportunity to be considered by the further evaluation report.	Retain.
89 – Requirements for justification reports	Support with minor alterations	We support the requirements of Section 89. However, the matters covered in section 89 do not require all the core obligations listed in section 80 to be addressed within the Justification Plan. We seek a new clause that requires the justification report to address the matters in section 80. A standardised plan zone could still have cross-boundary implications and therefore, at a minimum, the evaluation report must address the consideration of consistency with land use plans of adjacent territorial authorities.	Ensures consistency of approach. Ensures that all matters in s80 have the opportunity to be considered by the justification report.	Amend section 89 to require a justification report to Insert new clause as follows: (2A) the extent to which the land use plan needs to be consistent with— (a) any land use plan or proposed land use plan of an adjacent territorial authority: (b) the provisions of any natural environment plan or proposed

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
				natural environment plan that apply to the parts of the coastal marine area that are adjacent to the district of the territorial authority:
Section 90 – Requirements for further justification reports	Support with minor alterations	We support section 90 contingent on alterations sought to section 89.	Ensures consistency of approach. Ensures that all matters in s80 have the opportunity to be considered by the further evaluation report.	Retain.
Schedule 3 – clauses 32 to 37 Appeals on proposed plan	Support with alterations	We support the ability to appeal to the Environment Court. However, as the decision on the Regional Spatial Plan is a decision of all relevant local authorities, the Minister and Designating Authorities, these sections need to be altered to reflect that. As drafted, a submitter can only appeal to the Environment Court against a *local authority's decision*. There also needs to be clarity that the appeal is against the decision of all the decision makers so that there is equal responsibility to respond to the appeal. All parties need to contribute to the defence of the decision – i.e., the relevant local authorities, the Minister and the relevant Designating Authorities. As these clauses currently read, a party could appeal against a provision and pick just one local authority within the Region to be the respondent. This would not be appropriate or efficient when it is the decision of all local authorities in the Region, and the Minister and Designating Authorities. All those making decision should have the ability to defend their decision in Court, and this should be clearly set out in the legislation.	Amendments sought ensure accountability and shared responsibility for decision making.	Replace *'local authority's'* with *'The Minister, local authority's and Designating Authorities'* throughout Schedule 3 clauses 32 to 37.
Schedule 3 – clauses 40 – Withdrawing all or part of proposed plan	Support with alterations	We support the ability to withdraw all or parts of a plan. However, these clauses do not reflect that multiple local authorities will be working together in preparing a regional spatial plan, and likely a land use plan. The clause needs to ensure that the agreement of all relevant local authorities is reached to withdraw all or part of a proposed plan. For example, to prevent one District Council withdrawing aspects that may impact another District Council, or a Regional Council withdrawing aspects that may impact District Council's, or vice versa. As the Regional Spatial Plan will be required prior to the outcomes of the '*Streamlining local government'* proposal, this change is required to ensure a fair and democratic process.	Amendments sought ensure accountability and shared responsibility for decision making and will assist in preventing unintended consequences. Note also our comments in relation to section 49 (Minister withdrawal of instruments).	Replace 'local authority' with 'all relevant local authorities' throughout clauses 40 and 41.
Theme 8 – System Architecture, timing and interactions with other legislative change				
General Comment	Note	In line with our submission introduction, we note that to support successful implementation of the new planning system, Councils will require additional resources and budget to meet legislative timeframes. With each region progressing implementation at the same time there is also likely to be		Extend timeframes for implementation, or in the alternative consider whether costs associated with system

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
		resourcing shortfalls for critical evidential disciplines, with resulting price impacts.		implementation can be excluded from rates capping (if legislated) until 2029.
Theme 9 – Jurisdiction, roles and responsibilities				
Timeframes for legislation	Note	We note that the interface between the Planning Bill and currently proposed Streamlining Local Government (SLG) timing is such that a regional spatial committee needs to be formed prior to a Combined Territories Board (CTB) coming into existence. While this is likely an intended consequence, we further note that a regional spatial committee and a CTB may not necessarily end up being the same entity. In this scenario, there are likely to be significant jurisdictional challenges arising that have the potential to significantly delay the background work in preparing a spatial plan, such as the legal and practical ability to form a secretariat and the definition of a geographical spatial area.		Provide greater clarity on the interface between a proposed CTB (under SLG consultation) and a regional planning committee under the Planning Bill, or in the alternative align the process of drafting a spatial plan with the establishment of a CTB/ reorganisation entity.
Responsibilities of territorial authorities	Note	Section 184 (Overview of responsibilities of territorial authorities) of the Bill does not include the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise (which is s31(1)(d) of the RMA). However, section 24 (Duty to avoid unreasonable noise) does not prevent a “rule in a plan from setting controls on the emission of noise” but does not state which plans. Section 185 (1)(d) includes regulating and managing effects in accordance with subpart 1 of Part 2. Subpart 1 of Part 2 (section 11(a)) includes the goal to ensure that land use does not unreasonably affect others. This implies that noise is an effect that can be managed by ensuring that land use does not unreasonably affect others despite it not being specifically listed as a responsibility of territorial authorities.	It is uncertain whether land use plans can include controls on noise, whether it is a territorial authority responsibility to control the emission of noise, and whether this has been specifically omitted from section 184.	Amend section 184 to include the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise as a responsibility of territorial authorities if this is an effect territorial authorities must control.
Duty to avoid unreasonable noise	Support with alterations	Section 184 (Overview of responsibilities of territorial authorities) of the Bill does not include the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise (which is s31(1)(d) of the RMA). However, section 24 (Duty to avoid unreasonable noise) does not prevent a “rule in a plan from setting controls on the emission of noise” but does not state which plans. It is uncertain whether land use plans can include rules from setting controls on noise and whether it is a territorial authority responsibility. Section 185 (1)(d) includes regulating and managing effects in accordance with subpart 1 of Part 2. Subpart 1 of Part 2 (section 11(a)) includes the goal to ensure that land use does not unreasonably affect others. This implies that noise is an effect that can be managed by ensuring that land use does not unreasonably affect others despite it not being specifically listed as a responsibility of territorial authorities.	It is uncertain whether land use plans can include controls on noise.	Amend section 24(2)(a) to state which plans can set controls on the emission of noise.
Theme 10– Treaty obligations				
Section 11(1)(i)(ii)	Oppose	The Bill’s exclusion of consideration for the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, broader cultural landscapes, ancestral relationships, kaitiakitanga, tikanga principles, and customary rights narrows the consideration of matters relating to Māori and their whenua and does not align with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.	Failure to honour the Treaty could lead to litigation and undermine trust and compliance.	Broaden scope to include consideration of principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, broader cultural landscapes, ancestral relationships, kaitiakitanga, tikanga principles, and customary rights.

Section no. and short description	Council position	Issue	Implications	Suggested Change
Section 128(1)(a)	Oppose	Iwi are treated as any other affected party and there is a high ‘effects more than minor’ threshold triggering notification of consent applications, which may not align with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.	Failure to honour the Treaty could lead to litigation and undermine trust and compliance.	Lower threshold notification threshold for Iwi.