

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
1	OS1.1	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Policies	I seek an amendment to the provision	The objectives and policies of PC47 intend to provide for activities that meet Māori cultural, social, and economic development needs. The policy framework supports small-scale business activities and broader economic opportunities, while also seeking to ensure activities are appropriate to the zone and that potential conflicts between activities are avoided. Incompatible land uses should be avoided. As additional MPZ sites may be rezoned in the future (including more urban environments), the current provisions may not appropriately manage amenity or interface effects. The restriction on industrial activities applies only to MPZ Urban areas. The District Plan generally limits industrial activities in rural zones to rural industry. Enabling rural industry only within MPZ Rural areas would better align with surrounding land uses.	Industrial Activities in MPZ Urban and Rural are Non-Complying Activities - Policies are included to consider at least the noxious nature (noise, odour, traffic) of such activities within MPZ and adjoining properties
1	OS1.2	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks rules to address the noxious effects (noise, odour, traffic) of activities within MPZ and adjoining properties. It supports activities that meet Māori cultural, social, and economic needs but notes inconsistencies in the activity status for Industrial Activities in MPZ Urban zones. Current rules do not adequately consider effects on surrounding urban or residential areas.	Rules are included to consider at least the noxious nature (noise, odour, traffic) of such activities within MPZ and adjoining properties
1	OS1.3	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter seeks inclusion of assessment criteria addressing noise, odour, and traffic effects of activities in Māori Purpose Zones (MPZ). They highlight inconsistencies between the stated prohibition of industrial activities in MPZ Urban and the allowance of small-scale business under PC47 as restricted discretionary activities. The submitter requests clearer activity status for industrial activities to reflect potential effects on adjoining urban or residential areas. They also suggest restricting industrial activities in MPZ Rural to rural industries consistent with surrounding land uses. Overall, the submission calls for alignment between objectives, policies, and activity statuses in managing industrial uses within MPZ zones.	Assessment criteria are included regarding the noxious nature (noise, odour, traffic) of such activities.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
1	OS1.4	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter seeks the addition of a new rule permitting Rural Industry in the MPZ-Rural zone, arguing it aligns with objectives supporting Māori cultural, social, and economic development. They highlight that existing policies allow for small-scale business activities and aim to avoid conflicts within the zone. The submitter notes inconsistencies in industrial activity rules between MPZ-Urban and MPZ-Rural zones and suggests restricting industrial activities to Rural Industry in MPZ-Rural. They contend this approach better reflects the zone's purpose and surrounding land uses.	Addition of a new rule being MPZ-R1(3) Rural Industry permitted in MPZ-Rural
1	OS1.5	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.6 Noise, NOISE-R9	I seek an amendment to the provision	The noise levels proposed for MPZ are similar to the General Residential zone however the noise limit proposed between 7pm and 10pm in MPZ is 45dBA where as the noise limit in General Residential in the same time period is 40dBA. All other time periods the noises levels are the same. On This basis, MPZ activities will be able to be 12.5% louder in this period than adjoining General Residential properties. There is no assessment in S32 report on the need for this increased noise limit. Without amendment it will create a noise burden unnecessary on adjoining properties in the General Residential Zone.	Noise levels between 7pm and 10pm be the same as General Residential ie 40dBA. Wording of Rule Noise-R9 be updated with reference to GRZ etc
1	OS1.6	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	Amend assessment criteria (f) to require geotechnical assessments for proposed residential land uses triggering MPZ S1, rather than S6. The current criteria exclude urban MPZ sites from geotechnical scrutiny despite potential hazards like flooding, erosion, and liquefaction. There are risks from higher building coverage and lack of minimum permeable area requirements.	The following alteration - Assessment criteria (f) The results of any geotechnical assessments associated with any proposed residential land uses – where an application triggers MPZ <u>S1</u> S6 .
1	OS1.7	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	District Wide Matters - Subdivision > SUB-R12	I seek an amendment to the provision	In light of NPS-NH, subdivision in MPZ (SUB-R12) and landuses (MPZ-R2) should include an assessment criteria regarding natural hazards and safety of people in relation to those hazards at the time of subdivision to understand any additional risks to people resulting from the subdivision.	The addition of an assessment criteria relating to hazards and human safety

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
1	OS1.8	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants	PO Box 165 Taupo 3351, catrionae@cheal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	In light of NPS-NH, subdivision in MPZ (SUB-R12) and landuses (MPZ-R2) should include an assessment criteria regarding natural hazards and safety of people in relation to those hazards at the time of subdivision to understand any additional risks to people resulting from the subdivision.	The addition of an assessment criteria relating to hazards and human safety
2	OS2.1	John and Beverly Campbell	168 Te Rangitautahanga Road Turangi 3334 Tūrangi 3334, bevnjohn92@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter seeks recognition of the flood zone on the land, restricting the proposed outcomes of the MPZ. They reference the 2002 Tongariro River flood, which inundated the entire land block despite the presence of a concealed stopbank. They emphasize the floodwaters exceeded the stopbank and caused ponding between the stopbank and the access road. The proposed land uses are unrealistic given the flood risk.	That the flood zone on the land be recognised and that it restricts the proposed outcomes of the MPZ.
2	OS2.2	John and Beverly Campbell	168 Te Rangitautahanga Road Turangi 3334 Tūrangi 3334, bevnjohn92@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter seeks resolution of land tenure issues acknowledging the Crown's duties in the 1999 Ancillary Treaty of Waitangi Claim related to MPS1. These lands, outside the main Turangi Township claim, were part of an unresolved ancillary claim involving four Māori families. The claim has been referred to local councils and has remained unresolved for 27 years. The submitter is concerned the proposed plan change may complicate this longstanding issue. They also note recent reserve plans may overlook historic claims, risking further disputes.	That the land tenure issues be resolved recognising the Crown's duties in the Ancillary Claim.
2	OS2.3	John and Beverly Campbell	168 Te Rangitautahanga Road Turangi 3334 Tūrangi 3334, bevnjohn92@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter requests that Public Works Act 1928 requirements regarding certain non-Māori land blocks be resolved before any zone change is considered. They highlight the Act's offer-back procedure when land taken is surplus to its original purpose. The submitter notes Department of Conservation staff seemed unaware of land ownership and reluctant to follow the Act.	That the Public Works Acts 1928 requirements pertaining to some of these land blocks that are not Māori lands be settled before any zone change be considered.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
2	OS2.4	John and Beverly Campbell	168 Te Rangitautahang a Road Turangi 3334 Tūrangi 3334, bevnjohn92@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter opposes zoning that limits full usage rights for Māori and others, specifically objecting to the ad-hoc use of the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) by Taupo District Council. The proposal is inconsistent with the district's general planning objectives and could set a precedent for selective zoning that may render similar lands non-rateable. The submitter believes existing zoning already allows the intended uses, making the plan change unnecessary. Overall, they view the plan change as a planning construct rather than a justified necessity.	That land not be zoned limiting rights of full usage by Māori and others and that the use of MPZ in such an ad-hoc approach by Taupo District Council desist.
3	OS3.1	Hemopereki Simon	5 Rata Street Wairakei Taupō 3332, hemopereki@gmail.com	MPZ General	I support the provision	The submitter strongly supports the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) in the Taupo District Plan, highlighting its importance in recognising Māori cultural and traditional relationships. They view the MPZ as a necessary shift towards enabling land use aligned with Māori aspirations, consistent with kaupapa Māori and tikanga-based approaches. The emphasis on papakainga housing, marae development, kaumatua housing, and small-scale community initiatives is particularly supported. These activities are not merely land use activities; they are seen as vital expressions of identity and intergenerational responsibility. The submitter notes that past planning restrictions have hindered Māori land development and cultural wellbeing.	Retain Plan Change 47 MPZ.
3	OS3.2	Hemopereki Simon	5 Rata Street Wairakei Taupō 3332, hemopereki@gmail.com	MPZ General	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter requests renaming the zone to "Mana Whenua Purposes Zone" to better reflect its purpose. They view the MPZ as a modest but significant step toward recognizing mana motuhake in local government planning. While it does not address deeper constitutional issues, it demonstrates a willingness to engage meaningfully with Māori authority and land relationships.	Zone name be changed to "Mana Whenua Purposes Zone."
3	OS3.3	Hemopereki Simon	5 Rata Street Wairakei Taupō 3332, hemopereki@gmail.com	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter requests increased rural setbacks under standard 5, citing concerns that the current setbacks may constrain effective use of Māori land.	Increase the rural setbacks under standard 5.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
4	OS4.1	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA supports permitting activities in the Māori Purpose Zone subject to specified standards but emphasizes the need to address road safety and human health. They seek site access to state highways to comply with TRAN R4 and R5 to ensure safe and efficient use without increasing risks. Their concerns focus on managing vehicle use and ensuring safe site entrances.	Amend as follows: Permitted Subject to: a).... d) <u>Where the site fronts a state highway compliance with Section 7.3 TRAN R4 and R5 and 12.6 NOISE R8</u> e) Is not identified as a CON, RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ.
4	OS4.2	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.6 Noise, NOISE-R9	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA requests that the Noise Control Boundaries Overlay for Sensitive Activities be extended to include the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) alongside the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones. This aims to mitigate adverse effects such as noise and vibration from the 24/7 road network that impact health and amenity. The inclusion would allow new or altered buildings within the noise corridor to be permitted activities if they meet internal noise standards and ventilation requirements. NZTA emphasizes balancing efficient transport network use with protecting community well-being. Corrected geospatial data will be provided to update the road noise overlay accordingly.	Amend as follows: Amend NOISE-R8 to include reference to the Māori Purpose Zone - MPZ zoning in addition to the existing zoning references of 'General Rural Zone - GRUZ' and 'Rural Lifestyle Zone - RLZ'.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
4	OS4.3	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	12 General District Wide Matters	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA requests the inclusion of the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) within the Noise Control Boundary Overlay for sensitive activities, either through amendments to the existing noise chapter or specific MPZ rules. They propose new provisions requiring buildings with noise-sensitive activities in the noise corridor to meet specified indoor noise levels and ventilation standards, with compliance verified by qualified reports. This aims to mitigate adverse effects like reverse sensitivity and protect health and wellbeing from road noise impacts. NZTA emphasizes balancing efficient road network use with community safety and amenity. Corrected geospatial data will be provided to update the noise overlay accordingly.	Add a New Provision to the MPZ Chapter: <u>Noise Control Boundary Overlay – Sensitive Activities</u> <u>Within the Noise Corridor Boundary Overlay, where:</u> <u>a. a new building that contains a noise sensitive activity (as identified in Table 3);</u> <u>or</u> <u>b. an alteration to an existing building resulting in an increase in floor area of a noise sensitive activity; or</u> <u>c. a new noise sensitive activity is located in an existing building; is proposed, it shall be:</u> <u>i. Designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels not exceeding the maximum values in Table 3; and</u> <u>ii. If windows must be closed to achieve the design noise levels in i. above, the building is designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system that:</u> <u>a. For habitable rooms for a residential activity, achieves the following requirements:</u> <u>• Provides mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code; and</u> <u>• is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; and</u> <u>• provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; and provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18C and 25C; and</u> <u>• Does not generate more than 35 dB LAeq (30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser.</u> <u>b. For other spaces, is as determined by a suitably qualified and experienced person; and</u> <u>iii. A report is submitted by a suitably qualified and experienced person to the Council demonstrating compliance with i and ii above (as relevant) prior to the construction or alteration of any building containing an activity sensitive to noise.</u> <u>iv. Instead of i, ii and iii above, is within the Noise Corridor Boundary Overlay but is at least 50 metres from the carriageway of any State Highway and is designed so that a noise barrier entirely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows to the road surface.</u>

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
	4 OS4.4	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S6	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA supports permitted activities in the Māori Purpose Zone but seeks a limit of eight dwellings where the site fronts a state highway, aligning with a 100 vehicle movements per day threshold. This reflects NZTA's requirement for Integrated Transport Assessments for activities exceeding 100 daily vehicle movements to ensure safe and efficient state highway access. The requested limit is based on typical trip generation rates from NZTA's Planning Policy Manual. This aims to prevent adverse effects on state highway safety and efficiency.	Amend as follows: 15 per MPS; <u>or</u> <u>Where the site fronts a state highway this is limited to eight per MPS</u>
	4 OS4.5	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	7 Energy, Infrastructure and Transport > 7.3 Transport, TRAN-R5	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA supports Permitted Activities in the Māori Purpose Zone but requests vehicle movement limits based on their Integrated Transport Assessment requirements. Waka Kotahi propose maximum daily vehicle movements of 200 for MPZ Rural, 150 for MPZ Urban, and 100 where access is to a State Highway. This is to ensure appropriate site-specific access design and intersection treatment, maintaining safety and efficiency of the state highway network. The 100-vehicle limit aligns with NZTA's trip generation rates of approximately 10.7 vehicles per dwelling.	Amend as follows: 6. Vehicle movements within the MPZ a. MPZ Rural - 200 EVM's for that MPS or 24 per dwelling whichever is higher. b. MPZ Urban - 150 EVMs for that MPS or 24 per dwelling whichever is higher. <u>c. 100 EVM's where access is to a State Highway.</u>
	4 OS4.6	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwaite@nzta.govt.nz	District Wide Matters - Subdivision > SUB-R12	I seek an amendment to the provision	NZTA supports the proposed matters of discretion but emphasizes the need to consider road safety for subdivisions fronting state highways. They request that such sites be assessed under TRAN R4 to ensure safe and efficient site access. NZTA is concerned about vehicle use levels and potential impacts on road safety. They seek to ensure subdivisions do not increase safety risks for site users and highway traffic.	Amend as follows: Matters of Discretion a) Those Objectives and Policies set out in MPZ1 and MPZ2 b) The need for the land to remain as Māori land. c) The need to ensure an ongoing connection between the land and its ancestral owners. d) The ability of the land to meet Māori cultural needs. e) That the land is to be used for traditional activities. f) Where the site fronts a state highway compliance with Section 7.3 TRAN R4 Notification: Applications under SUB-R12-RDIS Activity MPZ will not be notified.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
4	OS4.7	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwait e@nzta.govt.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I support the provision	The provision is supported because it aligns with statutory objectives and resulting in an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system.	Retain as notified
4	OS4.8	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwait e@nzta.govt.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.5 Light, LIGHT-R1	I support the provision	The provision is supported as it aligns with statutory objectives and results in an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system.	Retain as notified.
4	OS4.9	Luke Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi	PO Box 973 Hamilton 3240, luke.braithwait e@nzta.govt.nz	Rules > MPZ-R2(1)	I support the provision	The provision is supported because it aligns with our statutory objectives and resulting in an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system.	Retain as notified.
5	OS5.1	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Introducti on	I seek an amendment to the provision	Paragraph 1 introduces ambiguity by using “Cultural Needs” as a wide ranging concept, but then introduces it as a separate system of needs alongside 3 other needs – social, environmental and economic. This is confusing.	Rewrite paragraph 1 to explain that cultural needs include social, environmental & economic needs.
5	OS5.2	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Policies > MPZ-P1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter opposes the use of "small scale" in the policy, arguing it restricts opportunities and self-determination. They seek the removal of this phrase to allow for greater flexibility.	Remove the words “small scale”.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
5	OS5.3	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Policies > MPZ-P2	I oppose the provision	This policy introduces “character” into the MPZ. Character however is undefined in the objectives which speak to the purpose and function of the MPZ. The purpose of the MPZ is to allow mana whenua to self-determine the character of their land, not have it determined by Council.	Remove the word “character
5	OS5.4	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Policies > MPZ-P2	I seek an amendment to the provision	This policy introduces that there is “different Māori Purpose Zones”. The Objectives and other policies refer to a singular zone, not zones. This is confusing and has no explanation.	Remove the words “different” and change “Zones” to “Zone”.
5	OS5.5	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Policies > MPZ-P3	I oppose the provision	This policy is ambiguous at best and at worst appears to limit the objective of an MPZ. “Scale” is introduced yet there is no clear objective in the zone around scale. The inference is that scale should be small and managed accordingly. “Character” again is introduced without explanation, with an inference that the MPZ sits in either a rural or urban setting with an associated character. An MPZ has its own very distinct character. The key concern with this policy is that MPZ are to be “managed” in the planning process. This makes the policy ambiguous.	Remove or completely re-write this policy
5	OS5.6	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Rules > MPZ- R1(2)	I oppose the provision	Overly restrictive and conflicts with objectives and policies of the MPZ. A lease should be able to be granted to a non-owner/resident business activity which in turn employs or benefits financially owners/residents.	Remove MPZ-R1(2)

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
5	OS5.7	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Rules > MPZ- R2(1)	I oppose the provision	Overly restrictive and conflicts with objectives and policies of the MPZ. Industrial activity is a wide catchall. This excludes repairs, distribution, storage, packaging , and making. Māori culture is deeply embedded in making goods and the skills of making. The inference is that industrial activity is noisy, smelly and high waste producing.	Remove MPZ-R2(1)
5	OS5.8	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Rules > MPZ- R2(1)	I oppose the provision	Given the opposition to MPZ R1 (2) Business activity and to many of the standards S1 to S9 as being overly restrictive , and that the mix of uses is determined by the landowners, the logic of Council taking discretion on amenity is objectionable.	Remove matter of discretion (d)
5	OS5.9	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Rules > MPZ- R2(1)	I oppose the provision	Given the objection to MPZ R1 (2) Business activity and to many of the standards S1 to S9 as being overly restrictive , and objection MPZ P4 Infrastructure , the logic of Council taking discretion on infrastructure and general function of surroundings is far to wide and unrestricted.	Remove matter of discretion (e)
5	OS5.10	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S6	I oppose the provision	Given the coverage rule S1 of 15% there is no need to limit number of dwellings. The submitter requests removal of the coverage rule S1 of 15%, arguing that it is unnecessary to limit the number of dwellings.	Remove MPZ-R3 S6
5	OS5.11	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co. nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S7	I oppose the provision	Given the 15% rural coverage and 60% urban coverage and our objections to policies above there is no need for such a restrictive rule standard.	Remove MPZ-R3 S7

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
5	OS5.12	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S8	I oppose the provision	Given the 15% rural coverage and 60% urban coverage and our objections to policies above there is no need for such a restrictive rule standard.	Remove MPZ-R3 S8
5	OS5.13	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	7 Energy, Infrastructure and Transport > 7.3 Transport, TRAN-R5	I seek an amendment to the provision	Vehicle movements in the Taupo plan are measured by allotment, Māori land by its collective ownership is generally unsubdivided and so the EVM limits for non- residential activity should be per individual activity	Change rule to add “per individual activity of non-residential activity”
5	OS5.14	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.7 Signs, SIGN-R1	I seek an amendment to the provision	A maximum sign area should be per individual activity within the MPZ to reflect the mixed use nature of the zone	Change rule to add “per individual activity of non-residential activity”
5	OS5.15	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.8 Temporary Activities, TEMP-R2	I seek an amendment to the provision	The provision is overly restrictive and conflicts with objectives and policies of the MPZ. Māori cultural needs (incl social and economic needs) often involve activity of a temporary nature. The current objectives and policies for temporary activities places the non-Māori public and non-Māori neighbours’ needs before Māori. Often a temporary activity is undertaken to prove a cultural, social or economic opportunity can succeed before becoming permanent. Other Councils place a limit of visitors (500) operating hours (6.30am to 10pm) and a maximum duration of 30 days per year.	Change wording from 4 day per 6 month to 30 days per year.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
5	OS5.16	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	3 Interpretation	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter requests expanding the list of activities to make the mixed use nature of the zone clear to all.	Expand list to include: accommodation, community facilities, business, food and beverage, health facilities, network utilities, offices, retail, rural industry, and yard activities.
5	OS5.17	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	Paragraph 3 introduces the notion that MPZ is for “small scale business”. The policies and rules that follow, in turn seek to limit scale and therefore opportunity and self determination.	Remove the words 'small scale'.
5	OS5.18	John Lenihan for Rangatira E	PO Box 9672, Newmarket Auckland 1146 johnle@rcg.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The first paragraph of this policy repeats policy P3 but sets limits as to what “appropriate activities” are, in particular limits in item 3- infrastructure and by item 5 – “conflicts between activities” that are not of an environmental nature. Māori land in Taupo has had a long history where infrastructure capacity is withheld by Council. Rural Māori land and large urban blocks of Māori land is capable of sustaining its own services infrastructure. Conflicts between activity within a MPZ is for the mana whenua landowners to resolve.	Rewrite point 2 to explain that cultural needs include social, environmental & economic needs. Rewrite point 3 to remove a lack of infrastructure as a means of limiting activity in a MPZ. Remove point 5.
6	OS6.1	Shane Heremaia	Unit 1J, Monument Apartments, 245 Wakefield Street Te Aro Wellington 6011, shane_heremaia@icloud.com	Rules > MPZ-R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests linking density limits to land area or infrastructure capacity instead of a fixed maximum of about 15 dwellings per site. The current flat cap is disproportionate for large rural blocks and does not account for incremental development by returning whanau. An effects-based assessment option is also suggested where fixed limits are overly restrictive. The concern is that the existing rule assumes all development occurs simultaneously rather than gradually.	Recommendation •Link density to land area or infrastructure capacity; or •Allow effects-based assessment where fixed limits become disproportionate

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
6	OS6.2	Shane Heremaia	Unit 1J, Monument Apartments, 245 Wakefield Street Te Aro Wellington 6011, shane_heremai a@icloud.com	Rules > MPZ- R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests allowing larger buildings for activities connected to land-based production, trust-owned enterprises, or large rural landholdings. It highlights that current GFA limits apply uniformly across all MPZ sites, which may not suit large rural blocks. The submitter emphasizes the need for bigger structures to support whenua-based economic activities like tourism, processing primary produce, and agricultural support. Flexibility is necessary to accommodate these rural enterprise needs.	Allow larger buildings where activities are linked to land-based production, trust-owned enterprises, or large rural landholdings.
6	OS6.3	Shane Heremaia	Unit 1J, Monument Apartments, 245 Wakefield Street Te Aro Wellington 6011, shane_heremai a@icloud.com	Rules > MPZ- R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission highlights that development on Māori land typically occurs incrementally rather than as a single project, with stages including initial infrastructure, gradual addition of dwellings, and eventual establishment of a full papakainga with community facilities. Planning rules assuming all development happens at once fail to reflect this reality and may create unnecessary consent barriers. The submission calls for planning provisions to recognise and accommodate the staged nature of Māori land development.	Rules that assume development occurs all at once will not reflect the lived reality of Māori land development and risk creating unnecessary consent barriers at each stage.
6	OS6.4	Shane Heremaia	Unit 1J, Monument Apartments, 245 Wakefield Street Te Aro Wellington 6011, shane_heremai a@icloud.com	Policies > MPZ-P3	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter seeks rules that scale with land size and allow effects-based assessment to avoid disproportionate limits. They note that current flat limits, suitable for small urban papakainga sites, unintentionally restrict large rural landholdings. The goal is to better achieve zone objectives by enabling development without undermining productive land use.	Rules that scale with land size and allow effects-based assessment where limits become disproportionate.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.1	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	MPZ General	I support the provision	The submitter supports the establishment of a Māori Purpose Zone in principle and recognise it as an important planning mechanism for enabling Māori land use, development, and guardianship in a manner consistent with tikanga Māori and intergenerational wellbeing. However, to be effective, the Māori Purpose Zone must move beyond symbolic recognition and operate as a clear, directive planning framework. It must actively enable the exercise of mana whakahaere, kaitiakitanga, and te whanake, and provide a legally robust basis for Māori-led, intergenerational development outcomes.	Retain Plan Change 47, subject to targeted amendments set out in this submission.
7	OS7.2	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to insert a new lead Māori Purpose Zone objective requiring all related objectives, policies, rules, and assessment criteria to give effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki as the primary interpretive and decision-making framework. This approach aligns with sections 181–182 of the Ngati Tuwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018. Embedding Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki at the objective level ensures transparent and reliable statutory compliance. The framework is intended to guide interpretation and planning judgment rather than contain specific rules or methods. Implementing it as an objective-level gateway is considered the most effective and legally sound method.	Insert a new lead Māori Purpose Zone objective requiring all Māori Purpose Zone objectives, policies, rules, and assessment criteria to give effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki as the primary interpretive and decision-making framework, consistent with sections 181–182 of the Ngati Tuwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018.
7	OS7.3	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O2	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests amending MPZ-O2 to explicitly recognise and prioritise mana whakahaere and hapu and Māori landowner-led development frameworks in decision-making. It highlights that the current wording balances effects but does not establish a clear priority for Māori-led frameworks when conflicts occur. The intent is to ensure these frameworks are primary considerations in land use, development form, scale, and sequencing.	Amend MPZ-O2 to explicitly recognise and provide for the exercise of mana whakahaere and to require that hapu and Māori landowner-led development frameworks are primary considerations in interpreting and applying MPZ provisions, including in determining land use, development form, scale, and sequencing.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.4	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O3	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that MPZ-O3 explicitly prioritise the exercise of mana whakahaere and ensure hapu and Māori landowner-led development frameworks are primary in interpreting and applying zone provisions. The current wording fails to make these principles operative and risks defaulting to conventional effects-based assessment rather than tikanga-based decision-making. Clear objective-level direction is needed to give authority-based priorities primacy and guide development in Māori land contexts. Without this, the Māori Purpose Zone's intent and statutory obligations could be undermined.	Amend MPZ-O3 to explicitly recognise and provide for the exercise of mana whakahaere and to require that hapu and Māori landowner-led development frameworks are primary considerations in interpreting and applying MPZ provisions, including in determining land use, development form, scale, and sequencing.
7	OS7.5	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O4	I seek an amendment to the provision	Te whanake is a core principle underpinning Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki and Ngati Tuwharetoa's vision for the Taupo Catchment. Without explicit reference, MPZ-O4 is the principal objective intended to enable sustainable Māori land development within the Māori Purpose Zone but as drafted it is not sufficiently directive to secure the intended MPZ outcomes. Without stronger objective-level direction, decision-makers may default to general rural or residential norms rather than recognising staged, evolving, intergenerational Māori development models. The amendment sought is therefore necessary to ensure MPZ-O4 clearly and affirmatively enables te whanake, with effects managed in a way that supports—rather than undermines—the Zone's purpose.	Amend MPZ-O4 to explicitly enable te whanake, including viable, appropriately scaled, and intergenerational Māori land development, and to recognise economic development as a legitimate and anticipated outcome of the Māori Purpose Zone.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.6	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies	I seek an amendment to the provision	Effects assessment within the Māori Purpose Zone must be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the Zone's enabling objectives, rather than through the application of generic, reductionist technical metrics. Where effects are assessed without reference to kaupapa Māori values and holistic outcomes, there is a real risk that conventional amenity-based norms will override the intended purpose of the Zone. Objectives sit at the top of the planning hierarchy and determine how downstream provisions, including effects assessment criteria, are to be interpreted and applied. In the absence of clear objective-level direction, effects assessment may default to non-tikanga frameworks that prioritise narrow environmental or amenity effects over interconnected cultural, social, economic, and intergenerational outcomes.	Amend MPZ policies and assessment criteria to: (a) require effects assessment within the Māori Purpose Zone to be undertaken holistically and consistently with MPZ objectives and kaupapa Māori values; and (b) require infrastructure planning and servicing provisions to operate as an enabler of Māori land development, including through staged, adaptive, or alternative servicing approaches, rather than as a fixed constraint on anticipated development.
7	OS7.7	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objectives	I seek an amendment to the provision	Procedural mechanisms within the Māori Purpose Zone—including infrastructure thresholds, servicing assumptions, and default reliance on public notification—continue to operate as material barriers to Māori land development. These mechanisms are not neutral administrative tools; they shape how enabling objectives are interpreted and applied, and therefore have a direct and significant influence on development outcomes. To ensure the Māori Purpose Zone operates as an effective and directive framework, procedural provisions must be explicitly aligned with its enabling objectives. This includes requiring that notification, thresholds, and servicing mechanisms be applied in a manner that facilitates anticipated Māori land development, rather than impeding it through default or precautionary application.	Amend MPZ-O5 and MPZ-O6, and associated policies, rules, and assessment criteria, to require that procedural and structural mechanisms—including infrastructure thresholds, servicing assumptions, and notification requirements—be removed, adapted, or applied in a manner that facilitates anticipated and objective-consistent Māori land development, and that effects be assessed cumulatively and holistically rather than through default procedural barriers.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.8	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	MPZ General	I seek an amendment to the provision	An interpretation clause is required to ensure the Māori Purpose Zone gives effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki, as required by sections 181–182 of the Ngati Tuwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018. Without it, Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki risks being treated as contextual only and outweighed by generic planning considerations. Such a clause will provide certainty and ensures the Zone operates as intended Interpretation clauses are an orthodox and well-established tool within the Taupo District Plan. The proposal does not create new policy or displace statutory considerations; it should clarify how existing provisions are to be read and applied, with particular regard to mana whakahaere and holistic, intergenerational outcomes.	Insert a Māori Purpose Zone interpretation clause requiring that the MPZ provisions be read and applied as a whole, and interpreted to give effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki, with particular regard to mana whakahaere and holistic, intergenerational outcomes
7	OS7.9	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies	I seek an amendment to the provision	A new lead policy (MPZ-P1A) is proposed to enable Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki to be the primary framework for interpreting all provisions within the Māori Purpose Zone. This aims to ensure decisions are guided by tikanga Māori rather than district-wide or non-tikanga frameworks. The policy seeks to remove barriers to the development of Māori land caused by inconsistent interpretive approaches. It will provide clarity and consistency for decision-makers applying objectives, policies, rules, and standards in the zone.	Insert a new lead Policy (MPZ-P1A)
7	OS7.10	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that MPZO1 be amended to explicitly prioritise hapu and Māori landowner values, aspirations, and development frameworks as primary considerations. It argues that current recognition of Māori relationships with whenua lacks provision for mana whakahaere and authority in decision-making. Without explicit prioritisation, Māori land development may be unfairly assessed under standard rural or residential criteria that do not reflect cultural values.	Amend MPZO1 to explicitly prioritise hapu and Māori landowner values, aspirations, and development frameworks as primary considerations

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.11	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks a new lead policy establishing Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki as the primary interpretive framework for all objectives, policies, rules, and standards within the Māori Purpose Zone. This aims to ensure decision-makers apply a tikanga-based lens rather than defaulting to district-wide frameworks. The policy is intended to remove historical barriers to the development of Māori land by embedding tikanga in the planning framework.	Prepare and insert a new lead Policy (MPZ-P1A) requiring Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki to be recognised and provided for as the primary interpretive and decision-making framework.
7	OS7.12	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P3	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter seeks to remove references to managing “scale” in MPZ-P3, arguing it implicitly caps Māori development and enforces a small-scale expectation that conflicts with cultural and economic aspirations. They propose assessing development scale case-by-case based on tikanga, intergenerational, cultural, environmental, and economic outcomes, aligned with Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki. This approach aims to prevent “scale” from acting as a proxy control limiting Māori development and to support te whanake as an evolving, outcomes-focused concept.	Amend MPZ-P3 by replacing/rewriting it to remove its capacity to be used as a de facto small-scale cap.
7	OS7.13	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that infrastructure capacity constraints should not be used to restrict or permanently limit Māori land development within the Māori Purpose Zone. It emphasizes that infrastructure planning and investment must proactively support anticipated Māori development outcomes. The intent is to ensure infrastructure acts as an enabler rather than a barrier to growth on Māori land.	Amend MPZ-P4 by replacing/rewriting it to remove its capacity to be used as a veto and instead rewrite it to be a policy to enable and encourage tikanga-based, intergenerational, cultural, environmental, and economic outcomes.
7	OS7.14	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Policies	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks a new interpretive clarification policy to ensure that where there is conflict between Māori Purpose Zone provisions and district-wide rules, greater weight is given to the Māori Purpose Zone's objectives and policies. This aims to prevent generic rural or amenity controls from overriding the intent of the Māori Purpose Zone and undermining mana whakahaere.	New Interpretive Clarification Policy

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
7	OS7.15	George Asher - Chairman for Ngati Kurauia Taiao Committee, Tokaanu Marae	Tokaanu Marae 45 Rangimoana Avenue, RD 2, Turangi 3382 geoera@xtra.co.nz	Other Plan Matters	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to prioritise mana whakahaere and hapu-led decision-making within the Māori Purpose Zone (MPZ) framework. It advocates for enabling sustainable, viable Māori development that supports intergenerational outcomes and allows for holistic, mixed, and evolving land use rather than rigid models. The submission requests recognition of papakainga as an anticipated activity aligned with tikanga-based land use. It also calls for reducing unnecessary public notification to avoid procedural barriers inconsistent with the MPZ's purpose. Lastly, it emphasizes making compliance with section 181 of the Ngati Tuwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018 clear and unambiguous in the Plan.	•Explicitly prioritise mana whakahaere and hapu-led decision-making within the MPZ framework. •Enable te whanake, including sustainable, viable, and appropriately scaled Māori development that supports intergenerational outcomes. •Provide for holistic (torowhanui), mixed, and evolving land use, rather than single-activity or rigid development models. •Recognise papakainga as an anticipated activity within the Māori Purpose Zone, consistent with tikanga-based land use. •Reduce unnecessary reliance on public notification for activities anticipated by the MPZ, to avoid re-introducing procedural barriers inconsistent with the zone's purpose. 5.6 Ensure that compliance with section 181 of the Ngati Tuwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018 is clear, visible, and unambiguous on the face of the Plan, rather than reliant on inference or discretion.
8	OS8.1	Courtney Lambert	8 Hera Grove Tūrangi 3334, cjlambertnz@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter opposes the proposed reclassification of Kohineheke Reserve to a Māori Special Purpose zone, emphasizing the importance of retaining its conservation status to protect native flora and fauna. They express concerns that reclassification could lead to ecological degradation, set a precedent for future land use changes, and restrict public access. The submitter highlights potential environmental risks, including floodplain considerations, and notes insufficient justification for the change.	Retain MPS1 as DOC conservation land

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
8	OS8.2	Courtney Lambert	8 Hera Grove Tūrangi 3334, cjlambertnz@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter opposes reclassifying Kohineheke Reserve to a Māori Special Purpose zone, emphasizing the importance of retaining its current conservation status to protect native flora and fauna. They express concern that reclassification could lead to ecological degradation, reduced public access, and set a precedent undermining long-term protection. The submission highlights potential environmental risks, including floodplain impacts, and notes a lack of sufficient justification for the change. They urge the Council to maintain the reserve's existing classification to safeguard its ecological values and community use.	Retain MPS1 as DOC conservation land
9	OS9.1	Johnnie Mushet	8 Hera Grove Tūrangi 3334, jshmushet@gmail.com	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I oppose the provision	The submitter opposes rezoning SEC 1 & 2 SO 36174, classified Recreation Reserves, to maintain public access and reserve status under the Reserves Act 1977. There is an illegal dwelling obstructing a gazetted 1921 access road, raising safety and legal concerns. There is a need for independent environmental, biodiversity, and hydraulic hazard assessments due to flood risk and ecological sensitivity, including impacts on endangered species and downstream conservation areas. There is inadequate infrastructure servicing and non-compliance with the NPS-UD and Reserves Act requirements. The proposal will alienate public green space and violate community rights to access the reserve.	1. SEC 1 & 2 SO 36174 are removed from the proposal to maintain their status as public Recreation Reserves. 2. The illegal dwelling at 1/42 Hirangi Road is removed and the gazetted 1921 access is restored. 3. A comprehensive, independent Environmental and Biodiversity Audit and Hydraulic Hazard Assessment are conducted. 4. An Infrastructure Servicing Plan is provided that complies with the NPS-UD and the Reserves Act.
10	OS10.1	Tredegar Hall for Nukuhau Pa, Ngati Rauhoto - Ngati Te Urunga	17 Kiwi Street Taupō, 3330, tredegar@tamore.co.nz	Introducti on	I oppose the provision	Nukuhau Pa opposes the current Māori Purpose Zone objectives for not adequately recognising mana whakahaere, rangatiratanga, or hapu-led planning. A framework reflecting true partnership that supports hapu and ahu whenua-led decision-making based on cultural values is required. The submission calls for integration of existing cultural planning frameworks and prioritisation of intergenerational wellbeing. The District Plan should enable, not replace, Māori planning systems. Amendments should explicitly recognise hapu authority and enable hapu-led spatial planning.	We seek a framework that: • reflects true partnership • enables hapu and ahu whenua-led decision-making based on cultural values • recognises and integrates existing cultural planning frameworks • supports intergenerational wellbeing for our people and our taiao

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
10	OS10.2	Tredegar Hall for Nukuhau Pa, Ngati Rauhoto - Ngati Te Urunga	17 Kiwi Street Taupō, 3330, tredegar@tamore.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O1	I oppose the provision	Nukuhau Pa opposes the current Māori Purpose Zone objectives. They fail to adequately recognise mana whakahaere, rangatiratanga, and hapu-led planning. The objectives impose predefined development outcomes rather than enabling hapu and marae to pursue aspirations aligned with tikanga and matauranga Māori. This approach conflicts with Mahere Taiao, Waikato Awa Cultural Impact Assessment, and Te Pae Tawhiti vision. Amendments are required to explicitly recognise hapu authority, support hapu-led spatial planning, and prioritise cultural, environmental, and intergenerational wellbeing.	Make fundamental changes to the MPZ that: •reflects true partnership •• enables hapu and ahu whenua-led decision-making based on cultural values •• recognises and integrates existing cultural planning frameworks •• supports intergenerational wellbeing for our people and our taiao
10	OS10.3	Tredegar Hall for Nukuhau Pa, Ngati Rauhoto - Ngati Te Urunga	17 Kiwi Street Taupō, 3330, tredegar@tamore.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S1	I oppose the provision	Nukuhau Pa requests amendments to the Māori Purpose Zone standards to better reflect the diversity of Māori land, cultural landscapes, and hapu aspirations. The current uniform standards constrain culturally appropriate design and local responsiveness, focusing too much on compliance rather than outcomes. Development on Māori land should be guided by tikanga, matauranga Māori, and cultural landscape context instead of generic standards. Flexible, adaptable standards are required that allow alternative pathways supported by hapu and CIA processes. The priority should be on outcomes like mauri, wellbeing, and connection to whenua over prescriptive measures.	We recommend that standards are: •are flexible and adaptable •allow for alternative pathways where supported by hapu and CIA processes •prioritise outcomes (mauri, wellbeing, connection to whenua) over prescriptive measures
10	OS10.4	Tredegar Hall for Nukuhau Pa, Ngati Rauhoto - Ngati Te Urunga	17 Kiwi Street Taupō, 3330, tredegar@tamore.co.nz	3 Interpretation > Māori Purpose Sites	I oppose the provision	Nukuhau Pa opposes the current Māori Purpose Zone framework, calling for fundamental redesign. There needs to be co-design with affected hapu and marae, enabling hapu-led planning and development. The framework should also recognise existing Māori planning frameworks such as CIA, Mahere Taiao, and Te Pae Tawhiti. Without these changes, the Zone may restrict rather than support Māori development.	Nukuhau Pa does not support the Māori Purpose Zone progressing in its current form. Fundamental redesign is required to ensure the framework: •is co-designed with affected hapu and marae •enables hapu-led planning and development •recognises Māori planning frameworks (CIA, Mahere Taiao, Te Pae Tawhiti) Without these changes, the Zone risks limiting Māori development rather than enabling it.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
10	OS10.5	Tredegar Hall for Nukuhau Pa, Ngati Rauhoto - Ngati Te Urunga	17 Kiwi Street Taupō, 3330, tredegar@tamore.co.nz	3 Interpretation > Māori Purpose Activities	I oppose the provision	Planning for Māori land must involve Māori themselves. Māori should be directly engaged in any decisions affecting their land. Excluding Māori from planning processes is inappropriate.	Māori land should not be planned for Māori without Māori.
11	OS11.1	Alec Duncan for Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO Box 448, Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240, alec.duncan@beca.com	Rules > MPZ-R1(1)	I oppose the provision	Fire and Emergency seeks an amendment to MPZ-R1 to explicitly require compliance with a new firefighting water supply standard, addressing the current lack of a clear connection between the TDP and the Code of Practice for Development of Land 2009. They highlight that the existing provisions do not explicitly mandate firefighting water supply, relying instead on a code that is not clearly enforceable through the plan. This gap poses a risk to Fire and Emergency operations, particularly for residential developments within the MPZ. The submitter proposes adding a new servicing standard to ensure new buildings have compliant firefighting water supply.	Amend as follows: MPZ-R1 – PER Activities (1) Any activity, building, or structure Subject to: a) Compliance MPZ-S1 to S89 unless specifically provided for in SCHED13.11 - MPZ; and
11	OS11.2	Alec Duncan for Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO Box 448, Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240, alec.duncan@beca.com	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	Fire and Emergency request adding a matter of discretion regarding the extent of non-compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This addition aims to enable TDC to assess non-compliance issues consistently with other related provisions.	Add a new matter of discretion as follows: <u>x. The extent of non-compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>
11	OS11.3	Alec Duncan for Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO Box 448, Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240, alec.duncan@beca.com	Standards	I seek an amendment to the provision	Fire and Emergency requests a new standard requiring all new buildings in the Māori Purpose Zone to have a firefighting water supply compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This aims to ensure adequate fire safety provisions are in place for new developments.	Introduce a new standard as follows: <u>MPZ-S9 - Servicing</u> <u>i. All new buildings must be provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u> Or to similar effect and any other consequential amendments required to give effect to the relief sought.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
11	OS11.4	Alec Duncan for Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO Box 448, Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240, alec.duncan@beca.com	7 Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	I seek an amendment to the provision	Fire and Emergency requests adding minimum driveway and accessway standards for the Māori Purpose Zone to Table 1, specifying a 4m minimum carriageway width and 16% maximum gradient. The current omission creates a gap in the planning framework, as the MPZ is not covered by existing standards due to its classification. This absence risks inadequate emergency access, potentially compromising Fire and Emergency operations and occupant safety. The amendment aims to ensure clear and consistent access requirements for the MPZ.	Amend Table 1 - Minimum Standards for Driveways and Accessways to include: Māori Purpose Zone Min. Formed Carriageway (m) – 4 Maximum Gradient (%) – 16 Or to similar effect and any other consequential amendments required to give effect to the relief sought.
12	OS12.1	Rebecca Davies for New Zealand Defence Force	C/- Tonkin + Taylor PO Box 9544 Hamilton 3204 , REBECCA.DAVIES@nzdf.mil.nz	12 General District Wide Matters > 12.8 Temporary Activities, TEMP-R2	I support the provision	NZDF supports the proposed amendment to TEMP-R2 to include the Māori Purpose Zone as proposed in Section 12.8 of Proposed Plan Change 47 and wishes to see this amendment retained as notified.	Retain as notified
13	OS13.1	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae 87 Richmond Street Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, we suggest it is used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua	The purpose of the Māori Purpose Zone is to enable a range of activities on Māori Land that specifically meet Māori cultural needs on land owned by tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> and to assist Māori communities to provide for their unique social, cultural, environmental and economic needs within the Taupo District.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.2	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The original text inadvertently, and inappropriately, confined the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands to the Māori Purpose Zone, when this is required to be recognised across the entire Plan.	This zone <u>is one way that the Plan</u> recognises and provides for the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.
13	OS13.3	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, we suggest it is used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua	The zone enables tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki and mana whenua and to undertake activities that reflect Māori customs and values. Pa/marae provide an important community focal point for social gatherings and cultural activities. .
13	OS13.4	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The statute is called the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.	MPZ are Māori land within the meaning of Section 129 (1) (a, b or c) of Te Ture Whenua Māori Land Act 1993.
13	OS13.5	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O2	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, we suggest it is used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua	Activities that specifically meet Māori cultural needs can take place within the Māori Purpose Zone in a manner that maintains and promotes the spiritual, cultural, social, economic and environmental interests and associations of tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> with their ancestral lands.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.6	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O3	I seek an amendment to the provision	Amend to include “rights and” in the objective, to properly reflect the duality of Māori interests.	Tangata whenua can exercise <u>their rights</u> and responsibilities as mana whenua in the Māori Purpose Zone to: 1. exercise their rights of kaitiakitanga...
13	OS13.7	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Objective s > MPZ-O4	I seek an amendment to the provision	Amend to clearly emphasise use as well as development.	Māori <u>Purpose Activities</u> and the comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development <u>and use</u> of ancestral land is enabled in the Māori Purpose Zone...
13	OS13.8	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that the Māori Purpose Zone explicitly provide for a broad range of activities that support Māori cultural needs, including hauora, social services, and educational facilities.	Provide for activities within the Māori Purpose Zone that meet Māori cultural needs, including but not limited to: 1. Māori purpose activities; 2. Māori cultural activities; 3. residential activities; 4. general small scale business activities; 5. business service activities; 6. <u>hauora, social services and</u> educational facilities; ...

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.9	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The proposed changes support a clearer reading of the policy. Without it there is no clarification about what “potentially compatible activities” are, which risks confusion and an inadvertent subjective assessment of activities, plainly intended to apply under the MPZ, for their “potential compatibility”.	Manage activities that are potentially compatible with the purpose, function and predominant character of the Māori Purpose Zone and ensure it is appropriate for such activities to establish in the Māori Purpose Zone having regard to whether: 11. the purpose of the activity assists tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to achieve MPZ-O1 - MPZ-O4;Potentially compatible activities include: <u>1. industrial activities; 2. primary production (excluding agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities); 3. rural industry; 4. rural transport activities; 5. commercial service activities; 6. supermarkets; 7. large format retail activities; 8. integrated retail activities; and 9. entertainment and hospitality activities.</u>
13	OS13.10	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P6	I oppose the provision	No other zones have this elevated expectation on the recognition and provision for proposed activities. The policy inadvertently places expectation on enhancement of natural environment including freshwater, creating disproportionate burden on mana whenua whose land is subject to MPZ compared to other zones.	Recognise and provide for those activities in Māori Purpose Zones which will result in an enhancement of the natural environment including freshwater quality.
13	OS13.11	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d).	d) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.12	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	Delete permitted activity standard (a). Whether a business activity is run by a resident of the site is or otherwise has no impact on the effects associated with the activity. However, retention of this rule would preclude business activities from being conducted at Waitetoko Marae even if they otherwise complied with permitted activity standards (b) – (e). There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d).	a) Is required to be owned or run by a resident of the site. b) No Industrial Activities in MPZ Urban... ...e) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>
13	OS13.13	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses is not a matter a resource management plan should concern itself with. If mana whenua within a Māori Purpose Zone want to provide for modern cultural uses that reflect their values, whether any residual ‘traditional uses’ are sufficiently retained is not an appropriate assessment criteria for the district council. It interferes with our rangatiratanga. For Waitetoko Marae, decisions will always centre on what is best for the Marae, acknowledging its cultural significance and enduring reservation status. Amend matter of discretion (d). Whether the MPZ is, or becomes, a mixed-use site will depend on the activities proposed. Some sites will be solely papakainga, for example.	Matters of Discretion a) MPZ - Objectives and MPZ - Policies b) Those standards or rules which the proposal does not comply with. c) Any effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses. d) Any effects on the amenity of the zone and, <u>where relevant</u> , its ability to function effectively as mixed-use site

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.14	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The maximum combined coverage on the MPS should be increased from 15% to 40%, or 15% of the area not covered by marae buildings where present. The current 15% limit lacks clear justification and may unduly restrict activities intended to be more permissive. The proposed 40% figure is informed by considerations of enabling density and setbacks. We propose this figure, acknowledging our reading of some of the other figures in the standard (such as for business activities) are proposed to be 15% of the total maximum area of the MPS, the result of which would be to narrow the activities on a single MPS rather than provide for a mixed use zone as intended. Any consequential amendments necessary to support clarity to the Plan are also sought.	15% 40% of the total area of that MPS Or where a marae is present on a MPS 15% of that part of the MPS not covered by Marae buildings.
13	OS13.15	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to add exceptions to building height for specific structures to provide clarity and allow for customary and functional structures without compromising the overall height restriction.	No building or structure shall exceed a height of 12m Exception: <u>pouwhenua, antennas, aerials, satellite dishes (less than 1m in diameter), chimneys, flues, open balustrades and architectural features (e.g. finials, spires, parapets) provided these do not exceed the height limit by more than 3m measured vertically.</u>
13	OS13.16	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	15m unnecessarily constrains the use of land within the MPS. Other MPZ Zones, such as the New Plymouth District Plan, proposed only a 5m setback. Additional exceptions should also be added.	15m 5m from the MPS boundary. Exception: Waharoa Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.
13	OS13.17	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S6	I oppose the provision	Maximum combined coverage and minimum setback requirements will necessarily constrain the number of dwellings. There is no need for this number, which may unduly limit what is achievable on an MPS when the intention of the zoning is to be more permissive	Delete S6.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.18	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S7	I seek an amendment to the provision	Noting comments in submissions that relate to MPZ- S1 – Maximum Combined Coverage, and record that there is a lack of clarity about how S7 is intended to interact with S1.	Consequential amendments may be necessary to this provision to provide a higher percentage to this activity as is appropriate for a mixed use zone
13	OS13.19	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S8	I seek an amendment to the provision	Noting comments in submissions that relate to MPZ- S1 – Maximum Combined Coverage above, and record that there is a lack of clarity about how S8 is intended to interact with S1.	We note out comments in relation to S1 (Maximum Combined Coverage) above, and record that there is a lack of clarity about how S8 is intended to interact with S1.
13	OS13.20	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I support the provision	Support on the basis is comparable to the GRZ building height.	Retain provision
13	OS13.21	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to add exceptions for eaves up to 600mm and shared walls along boundaries to the urban MPZ rules. The change would facilitate common urban building practices while maintaining planning controls.	Exception: <u>Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.</u>

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
13	OS13.22	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	Other Plan Matters	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that all activities comply with the relevant identified matters to maintain consistency. It seeks consequential amendments to ensure the integrity, intent, and effect of the MPZ Zone are upheld throughout the Plan.	Any consequential amendments necessary to ensure the integrity, intent and effect of the MPZ Zone is not undermined by the applicable matters in the balance of the Plan.
13	OS13.23	Jade Wikaira for Waitetoko Marae	87 Richmond Street, Petone Lower Hutt 5012, jade@wikairaconsulting.co.nz	MPZ General	I support the provision	Waitetoko Marae supports retaining Plan Change 47 MPZ with amendments, recognizing its alignment with RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8. They agree the Māori Purpose Zone appropriately provides for Māori culture and traditions. The submission notes that the Operative District Plan has failed to enable development of multiply owned Māori land or adequately recognize the s 6(e) relationship. The Section 32 Evaluation Report supports the adoption of the Māori Purpose Zone to address these issues.	Retain Plan Change 47 MPZ subject to the amendments outlined within our submission.
14	OS14.1	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, it is suggested to be used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua.	The purpose of the Māori Purpose Zone is to enable a range of activities on Māori Land that specifically meet Māori cultural needs on land owned by tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> and to assist Māori communities to provide for their unique social, cultural, environmental and economic needs within the Taupo District.
14	OS14.2	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The original text inadvertently, and inappropriately, confined the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands to the Māori Purpose Zone, when this is required to be recognised across the entire Plan.	This zone <u>is one way that the Plan</u> recognises and provides for the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.3	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, it is suggested to be used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua.	The zone enables tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki and mana whenua and to undertake activities that reflect Māori customs and values. Pa/marae provide an important community focal point for social gatherings and cultural activities. .
14	OS14.4	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The statute is called the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.	MPZ are Māori land within the meaning of Section 129 (1) (a, b or c) of Te Ture Whenua Māori Land Act 1993.
14	OS14.5	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O2	I seek an amendment to the provision	The original text inadvertently, and inappropriately, confined the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands to the Māori Purpose Zone, when this is required to be recognised across the entire Plan.	Activities that specifically meet Māori cultural needs can take place within the Māori Purpose Zone in a manner that maintains and promotes the spiritual, cultural, social, economic and environmental interests and associations of tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> with their ancestral lands.
14	OS14.6	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O3	I seek an amendment to the provision	Amend to include “rights and” in the objective, to properly reflect the duality of Māori interests.	Tangata whenua can exercise their <u>rights and</u> responsibilities as mana whenua in the Māori Purpose Zone to: 1. exercise their rights of kaitiakitanga...
14	OS14.7	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that the Māori Purpose Zone provisions be amended to clearly emphasise both the use and development of ancestral land.	Māori <u>Purpose Activities</u> and the comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development <u>and use</u> of ancestral land is enabled in the Māori Purpose Zone...

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.8	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that the Māori Purpose Zone explicitly provide for a broad range of activities that support Māori cultural needs, including hauora, social services, and educational facilities.	Provide for activities within the Māori Purpose Zone that meet Māori cultural needs, including but not limited to: 1. Māori purpose activities; 2. Māori cultural activities; 3. residential activities; 4. general small scale business activities; 5. business service activities; 6. <u>hauora, social services and</u> educational facilities; ...
14	OS14.9	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The proposed changes support a clearer reading of the policy. Without it there is no clarification about what “potentially compatible activities” are, which risks confusion and an inadvertent subjective assessment of activities, plainly intended to apply under the MPZ, for their “potential compatibility”.	Manage activities that are potentially compatible with the purpose, function and predominant character of the Māori Purpose Zone and ensure it is appropriate for such activities to establish in the Māori Purpose Zone having regard to whether: 11. the purpose of the activity assists tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to achieve MPZ-O1 - MPZ-O4;Potentially compatible activities include: <u>1. industrial activities; 2. primary production (excluding agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities); 3. rural industry; 4. rural transport activities; 5. commercial service activities; 6. supermarkets; 7. large format retail activities; 8. integrated retail activities; and 9. entertainment and hospitality activities.</u>
14	OS14.10	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P6	I oppose the provision	No other zones have this elevated expectation on the recognition and provision for proposed activities. The policy inadvertently places expectation on enhancement of natural environment including freshwater, creating disproportionate burden on mana whenua whose land is subject to MPZ compared to other zones.	Recognise and provide for those activities in Māori Purpose Zones which will result in an enhancement of the natural environment including freshwater quality.
14	OS14.11	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d).	d) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.12	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	Delete permitted activity standard (a). Whether a business activity is run by a resident of the site is or otherwise has no impact on the effects associated with the activity. However, retention of this rule would preclude business activities from being conducted at Waitetoko Marae even if they otherwise complied with permitted activity standards (b) – (e). There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d).	a) Is required to be owned or run by a resident of the site. b) No Industrial Activities in MPZ Urban... ...e) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>
14	OS14.13	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Rules > MPZ-R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses is not a matter a resource management plan should concern itself with. If mana whenua within a Māori Purpose Zone want to provide for modern cultural uses that reflect their values, whether any residual ‘traditional uses’ are sufficiently retained is not an appropriate assessment criteria for the district council. It interferes with our rangatiratanga. For Waitetoko Marae, decisions will always centre on what is best for the Marae, acknowledging its cultural significance and enduring reservation status. Amend matter of discretion (d). Whether the MPZ is, or becomes, a mixed-use site will depend on the activities proposed. Some sites will be solely papakainga, for example.	Matters of Discretion a) MPZ - Objectives and MPZ - Policies b) Those standards or rules which the proposal does not comply with. c) Any effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses. d) Any effects on the amenity of the zone and, <u>where relevant</u> , its ability to function effectively as mixed-use site

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.14	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg.al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The maximum combined coverage on the MPS should be increased from 15% to 40%, or 15% of the area not covered by marae buildings where present. The current 15% limit lacks clear justification and may unduly restrict activities intended to be more permissive. The proposed 40% figure is informed by considerations of enabling density and setbacks. We propose this figure, acknowledging our reading of some of the other figures in the standard (such as for business activities) are proposed to be 15% of the total maximum area of the MPS, the result of which would be to narrow the activities on a single MPS rather than provide for a mixed use zone as intended. Any consequential amendments necessary to support clarity to the Plan are also sought.	15% 40% of the total area of that MPS Or where a marae is present on a MPS 15% of that part of the MPS not covered by Marae buildings.
14	OS14.15	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg.al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to limit building heights to 12m, with exceptions for specific structures. The reason is to provide clarity and allow for customary and functional structures without compromising the overall height restriction.	No building or structure shall exceed a height of 12m Exception: <u>pouwhenua, antennas, aerials, satellite dishes (less than 1m in diameter), chimneys, flues, open balustrades and architectural features (e.g. finials, spires, parapets) provided these do not exceed the height limit by more than 3m measured vertically.</u>
14	OS14.16	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg.al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The 15m setback unnecessarily constrains the use of land within the MPS. Other MPZ Zones, such as the New Plymouth District Plan, proposed only a 5m setback. Additional exceptions should also be added.	15m 5m from the MPS boundary. Exception: Waharoa <u>Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.</u>
14	OS14.17	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg.al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S6	I oppose the provision	Maximum combined coverage and minimum setback requirements will necessarily constrain the number of dwellings. There is no need for this number, which may unduly limit what is achievable on an MPS when the intention of the zoning is to be more permissive.	Delete S6.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.18	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S7	I seek an amendment to the provision	Clarification is required on the interaction between S7 and S1. Consequential amendments are required to increase the percentage allowance for the activity in S7, reflecting its suitability for a mixed-use zone.	Consequential amendments may be necessary to this provision to provide a higher percentage to this activity as is appropriate for a mixed use zone
14	OS14.19	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S8	I seek an amendment to the provision	Clarification is required on the interaction between S8 and S1. Consequential amendments are required to increase the percentage allowance for the activity in S7, reflecting its suitability for a mixed-use zone.	We note out comments in relation to S1 (Maximum Combined Coverage) above, and record that there is a lack of clarity about how S8 is intended to interact with S1.
14	OS14.20	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I support the provision	Support on the basis is comparable to the GRZ building height	Retain provision
14	OS14.21	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to add exceptions for eaves up to 600mm and shared walls along boundaries to the urban MPZ rules. The change would facilitate common urban building practices while maintaining planning controls.	Exception: <u>Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.</u>
14	OS14.22	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahang a Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Other Plan Matters	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that all activities comply with the relevant identified matters to maintain consistency. It seeks consequential amendments to ensure the integrity, intent, and effect of the MPZ Zone are upheld throughout the Plan.	Any consequential amendments necessary to ensure the integrity, intent and effect of the MPZ Zone is not undermined by the applicable matters in the balance of the Plan.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
14	OS14.23	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I support the provision	The Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau are negotiating with Te Arawhiti to resolve ancillary claims related to Kohineheke Reserve under the Ngati Turangitukua settlement. This ancillary redress, part of commitments from the 1990s, will transfer properties along Te Rangitautahanga and Waipapa Roads to the three whanau. They have aspirations for this land that align with the Māori Purpose Zoning, supporting their unique social, cultural, environmental, and economic needs. The whanau participated in pre-consultation on PC47 and requested inclusion of the land blocks in the plan change.	Retain MPS-1 with amendments
14	OS14.24	Maia Wikaira for Titari, Rea and Rangipoia Whanau	187 Te Rangitautahanga Road Tūrangi 3334, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	SCHED 13.11 > MPS1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The full extent of land proposed for transfer has been inadvertently omitted from the MPS-1 in PC47. Additional land blocks are identified for inclusion and the boundaries of MPZ-1 need to be amended accordingly. MPS-1 needs to be divided into three separate MPZ zones to reflect the individual allotments for three whanau, supporting their unique social, cultural, environmental, and economic needs. The submitters are open to further discussion with the Council and seek any necessary consequential amendments to clarify the Plan.	Amend boundaries of MPZ-1.
15	OS15.1	Mark Chrisp for Contact Energy Ltd	mark.chrisp@mitchelldaysh.co.nz	Section 32 Report	I support the provision	The submitter supports the creation of Māori Purpose Zones in the locations proposed by PC47, emphasizing that these zones are well separated from existing and consented renewable electricity generation activities near Development Geothermal Systems. This separation helps avoid reverse sensitivity effects by preventing incompatible land uses from being in close proximity. The submitter highlights the significance of renewable electricity generation in the Taupo District, noting its importance for addressing climate change through decarbonization. Overall, the proposal is supported for enabling Māori development aspirations while maintaining the operational integrity of renewable energy activities.	Approve PC47 in relation to the creation of Māori Purpose Zones in the locations proposed in PC47 being well away from existing and consented renewable electricity generation activities on, and in the vicinity of, Development Geothermal Systems.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
16	OS16.1	Bronson Perich	218 Tamamutu Street Taupō, 3330	MPZ General	I oppose the provision	Tuwharetoa needs to lead its own land development solutions rather than having top-down policies imposed by the council. It criticizes ineffective consultation efforts and urges a shift from token consultation to genuine partnership with hapu, marae, and Māori landowners. The proposed Māori Purpose Zones are an ill-fitting blend of Māori aspirations and local government planning, unlikely to address current relationship issues. They recommend supporting Māori landowners and hapu to create their own development plans, backed by council funding and resources. Additionally, existing governance frameworks and joint management arrangements should be fully implemented to enhance collaboration and outcomes.	Let Tuwharetoa create its own solutions to realise its land aspirations. We do not need a new policy, we need a bureaucracy that understands our needs and is ready to act.
17	OS17.1	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, it is suggested to be used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua	The purpose of the Māori Purpose Zone is to enable a range of activities on Māori Land that specifically meet Māori cultural needs on land owned by tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> and to assist Māori communities to provide for their unique social, cultural, environmental and economic needs within the Taupo District.
17	OS17.2	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The original text inadvertently, and inappropriately, confined the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands to the Māori Purpose Zone, when this is required to be recognised across the entire Plan.	This zone <u>is one way that the Plan</u> recognises and provides for the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.
17	OS17.3	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	In other parts of the Plan both tangata and mana whenua are named. As mana whenua is the more appropriate term, it is suggested to be used here in addition to, or in lieu of, tangata whenua	The zone enables tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki and mana whenua and to undertake activities that reflect Māori customs and values. Pa/marae provide an important community focal point for social gatherings and cultural activities.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.4	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Introduction	I seek an amendment to the provision	The statute is called the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.	MPZ are Māori land within the meaning of Section 129 (1) (a, b or c) of Te Ture Whenua Māori Land Act 1993.
17	OS17.5	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O2	I seek an amendment to the provision	The original text inadvertently, and inappropriately, confined the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands to the Māori Purpose Zone, when this is required to be recognised across the entire Plan.	Activities that specifically meet Māori cultural needs can take place within the Māori Purpose Zone in a manner that maintains and promotes the spiritual, cultural, social, economic and environmental interests and associations of tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> with their ancestral lands.
17	OS17.6	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O3	I seek an amendment to the provision	Amend to include “rights and” in the objective, to properly reflect the duality of Māori interests.	Tangata whenua can exercise their <u>rights and</u> responsibilities as mana whenua in the Māori Purpose Zone to: 1. exercise their rights of kaitiakitanga...
17	OS17.7	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Objectives > MPZ-O4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that the Māori Purpose Zone provisions be amended to clearly emphasise both the use and development of ancestral land. The amendment aims to reflect the full scope of activities important to Māori landowners.	Māori <u>Purpose Activities</u> and the comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development <u>and use</u> of ancestral land is enabled in the Māori Purpose Zone...

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.8	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission requests that the Māori Purpose Zone explicitly provide for a broad range of activities that support Māori cultural needs, including hauora, social services, and educational facilities. The reason for the request is to explicitly include hauora and social services within the zone's permitted activities.	Provide for activities within the Māori Purpose Zone that meet Māori cultural needs, including but not limited to: 1. Māori purpose activities; 2. Māori cultural activities; 3. residential activities; 4. general small scale business activities; 5. business service activities; 6. <u>hauora, social services and</u> educational facilities; 7....
17	OS17.9	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The proposed changes support a clearer reading of the policy. Without it there is no clarification about what “potentially compatible activities” are, which risks confusion and an inadvertent subjective assessment of activities, plainly intended to apply under the MPZ, for their “potential compatibility”.	Manage activities that are potentially compatible with the purpose, function and predominant character of the Māori Purpose Zone and ensure it is appropriate for such activities to establish in the Māori Purpose Zone having regard to whether: 11. the purpose of the activity assists tangata whenua/ <u>mana whenua</u> to achieve MPZ-O1 - MPZ-O4;Potentially compatible activities include: 1. <u>industrial activities</u> ; 2. <u>primary production (excluding agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities)</u> ; 3. <u>rural industry</u> ; 4. <u>rural transport activities</u> ; 5. <u>commercial service activities</u> ; 6. <u>supermarkets</u> ; 7. <u>large format retail activities</u> ; 8. <u>integrated retail activities</u> ; and 9. <u>entertainment and hospitality activities</u> .
17	OS17.10	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Policies > MPZ-P6	I oppose the provision	No other zones have this elevated expectation on the recognition and provision for proposed activities. The policy inadvertently places expectation on enhancement of natural environment including freshwater, creating disproportionate burden on mana whenua whose land is subject to MPZ compared to other zones.	Recognise and provide for those activities in Māori Purpose Zones which will result in an enhancement of the natural environment including freshwater quality.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.11	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Rules > MPZ- R1(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d).	d) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>
17	OS17.12	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Rules > MPZ- R1(2)	I seek an amendment to the provision	Whether a business activity is run by a resident of the site is or otherwise has no impact on the effects associated with the activity. However, retention of this rule would preclude business activities from being conducted at Waitetoko Marae even if they otherwise complied with permitted activity standards (b) – (e). There are no rules with DIS or NC activity status – suggest removing from permitted activity standard (d)	a) Is required to be owned or run by a resident of the site. b) No Industrial Activities in MPZ Urban... ...e) Is not identified as a CON, <u>or</u> RDIS, DIS or NC activity within the MPZ, <u>there being no DIS or NC MPZ activities.</u>
17	OS17.13	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Rules > MPZ- R2(1)	I seek an amendment to the provision	The effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses is not a matter a resource management plan should concern itself with. If mana whenua within a Māori Purpose Zone want to provide for modern cultural uses that reflect their values, whether any residual ‘traditional uses’ are sufficiently retained is not an appropriate assessment criteria for the district council. It interferes with our rangatiratanga. For Waitetoko Marae, decisions will always centre on what is best for the Marae, acknowledging its cultural significance and enduring reservation status. Amend matter of discretion (d). Whether the MPZ is, or becomes, a mixed-use site will depend on the activities proposed. Some sites will be solely papakainga, for example.	Matters of Discretion a) MPZ - Objectives and MPZ - Policies b) Those standards or rules which the proposal does not comply with. c) Any effects on the ability of the site to provide for traditional uses. d) Any effects on the amenity of the zone and, <u>where relevant</u> , its ability to function effectively as mixed-use site

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.14	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S1	I seek an amendment to the provision	The maximum combined coverage on the MPS should be increased from 15% to 40%, or 15% of the area not covered by marae buildings where present. The current 15% limit lacks clear justification and may unduly restrict activities intended to be more permissive. The proposed 40% figure is informed by considerations of enabling density and setbacks. We propose this figure, acknowledging our reading of some of the other figures in the standard (such as for business activities) are proposed to be 15% of the total maximum area of the MPS, the result of which would be to narrow the activities on a single MPS rather than provide for a mixed use zone as intended.	15% 40% of the total area of that MPS Or where a marae is present on a MPS 15% of that part of the MPS not covered by Marae buildings. Any consequential amendments necessary to support clarity to the Plan are also sought.
17	OS17.15	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to limit building heights to 12m, with exceptions for specific structures. The reason is to provide clarity and allow for customary and functional structures without compromising the overall height restriction.	No building or structure shall exceed a height of 12m Exception: <u>pouwhenua, antennas, aerials, satellite dishes (less than 1m in diameter), chimneys, flues, open balustrades and architectural features (e.g. finials, spires, parapets) provided these do not exceed the height limit by more than 3m measured vertically.</u>
17	OS17.16	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The 15m setback unnecessarily constrains the use of land within the MPS. Other MPZ Zones, such as the New Plymouth District Plan, proposed only a 5m setback. Additional exceptions should also be added	15m 5m from the MPS boundary. Exception: Waharoa <u>Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.</u>
17	OS17.17	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialeg al.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S6	I oppose the provision	Maximum combined coverage and minimum setback requirements will necessarily constrain the number of dwellings. There is no need for this number, which may unduly limit what is achievable on an MPS when the intention of the zoning is to be more permissive	Delete S6.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.18	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S7	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter seeks clarification on the interaction between S7 and S1, noting a lack of clarity. They suggest consequential amendments to increase the percentage allowance for the activity in S7, reflecting its suitability for a mixed-use zone.	Consequential amendments may be necessary to this provision to provide a higher percentage to this activity as is appropriate for a mixed use zone
17	OS17.19	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S8	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submitter notes a lack of clarity regarding the interaction between S8 and S1 (Maximum Combined Coverage). They suggest consequential amendments may be needed to increase the coverage percentage for this activity. This adjustment is considered appropriate for a mixed-use zone.	Consequential amendments may be necessary to this provision to provide a higher percentage to this activity as is appropriate for a mixed use zone.
17	OS17.20	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S1	I seek an amendment to the provision	Where development is not possible on an area because of additional overlays such as flooding, inclusion of that area in the MPS would inadvertently constrain the effectiveness of the MPS. We seek an amendment to refer to the 'total area of that MPS capable of reasonable use'.	60% of the total area <u>capable of reasonable use</u> of that MPS
17	OS17.21	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S4	I support the provision	Support on the basis is comparable to the GRZ building height.	Retain provision

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
17	OS17.22	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Standards > MPZ-R3 S5	I seek an amendment to the provision	The submission seeks to add exceptions for eaves up to 600mm and shared walls along boundaries to the urban MPZ rules. The change would facilitate common urban building practices while maintaining planning controls.	Exception: <u>Eaves (up to 600mm) of any roof, balcony, gutter or downpipe Buildings that share a common wall along the boundary.</u>
17	OS17.23	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	Other Plan Matters	I seek an amendment to the provision	Support on the basis is comparable to the GRZ building height.	All activities shall comply with the relevant matters where applicable as identified below
17	OS17.24	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	SCHED 13.11 > MPS3	I support the provision	The submitter owns properties included in PC47's MPS-3 Māori Purpose Zone at State Highway 1, Turangi. They support retaining MPS-3 with proposed amendments. They reference the Section 32 report which acknowledges that the Operative District Plan has not effectively enabled development of multiply owned Māori land or recognized the relationship under s 6(e). The submission highlights the importance of Māori Purpose Zones to address these issues.	Retain MPS-3 subject to amendments outlined in this submission.
17	OS17.25	Maia Wikaira on behalf of Wikaira Whanau	301 State Highway 1 Tauranga Taupō Tūrangi 3382, maia@whaialegal.co.nz	SCHED 13.11 > MPS4	I support the provision	The submitter owns MPS-4. They support retaining MPS-3 with proposed amendments. They support the intent of the Māori Purpose Zone, to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands, a matter of national importance under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The Māori Purpose Zone also accords with sections 7(a) and 8 of the RMA.	Retain MPZ-4 subject to amendments in this submission.

No.	Point No.	Submitter	Service Address	Provision	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
18	OS18.1	Wiari Rauhina for Te Kotahitanga o Ngati Tuwharetoa	PO Box 315 Turangi 3353, patai@tknt.Māori.nz	MPZ General	I seek an amendment to the provision	TKNT supports the intent of Plan Change 47 to better recognise Māori land and enable development aligned with Māori aspirations, but calls for stronger integration of Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki to enable hapu-led kaitiakitanga and true partnership. They highlight that the plan retains a conventional planning framework, positioning Māori values as considerations rather than foundational elements and does not adequately provide for hapu led planning and decision-making. This approach risks. Māori Purpose Zones becoming mere overlays within a Western system rather than expressions of tikanga-based planning frameworks led by hapu. Key concerns include lack of structural alignment with Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki, insufficient hapu-led decision-making pathways, consultation-based engagement models, limited integration of matauranga Māori, and unclear implementation mechanisms. They recommend embedding Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki as the guiding framework, enabling hapu-led planning, shifting to partnership-based engagement, integrating matauranga Māori, and aligning council actions with iwi frameworks and implementation plans. Further refinement is required to PC47 to ensure it: • genuinely gives effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki • enables hapū-led kaitiakitanga in practice • and reflects a true partnership approach	Te Kotahitanga o Ngati Tuwharetoa supports the direction of Plan Change 47 but considers that further refinement is required to ensure it: • genuinely gives effect to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki • enables hapu-led kaitiakitanga in practice • and reflects a true partnership approach This is not a matter of refinement alone. It is a matter of ensuring that the planning framework: • moves beyond accommodation of Māori values • and instead enables a system where those values actively shape outcomes