13 February 2026

Hon Chris Bishop
Minister Responsible for RMA Reform
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

and

Committee Secretariat
Environment Committee
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

Submitted via Committee portal

Tēnā koutou katoa,

HAWKE'S BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE SUBMISSION ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT BILL AND THE PLANNING BILL

Executive summary

1. This submission is made by the Hawke's Bay Regional Planning Committee (**RPC**), a unique and statutorily recognised co-governance body arising from Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi (**Treaty**) settlements with Hawke's Bay iwi and hapū and established by the Hawke's Bay Regional Planning Committee Act 2015 (**RPC Act**).

2. The RPC was established to give effect to Treaty settlement agreements in Hawke's Bay by providing Post Settlement Governance Entities (**PSGE**s) direct involvement in natural resource decision-making. The RPC is responsible for the oversight, review, and development of the regional policy statement and regional plans for the Hawke's Bay region (**RMA documents**) under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**).

3. In this submission we emphasise the need for the Planning Bill (**PB**) and the Natural Environment Bill (**NEB**) (together, **the Bills**) to recognise the RPC as a statutory co-governance arrangement and ensure the RPC retains at least the equivalent decision-making authority under the new system as it currently has in Hawke's Bay for RMA documents.

4. Our submission focuses on three principal concerns:

   (a) **The Bills fail to ensure the new system explicitly recognises the RPC and the related Treaty settlement redress and provides equivalent powers for the RPC.** As drafted the Bills do not acknowledge the RPC or its status as a statutory co-governance body arising from multiple Treaty settlements. The new system needs to ensure the RPC retains powers equivalent to those it currently holds. The Bills need to recognise Treaty settlement redress from day one.

(b) **The Bills do not provide an equivalent role for the RPC in plan-development processes**. The RPC currently has direct oversight and decision-making responsibility for RMA documents, however the Bills make no provision for the RPC's current decision-making role in the development of regional spatial plans or natural environment plans. These plans are fundamentally equivalent to those for which the RPC currently has statutory responsibility under the RMA, but the Bills provide no guarantee the RPC will continue to exercise this responsibility. This omission departs from the stated intention that Treaty settlement redress or arrangements will operate with the same or equivalent effect as under the RMA.

(c) **The Bills undermine the Crown's Treaty obligations.** Both Bills replace the existing RMA "Māori provisions", particularly the matters provided for in Part Two of the RMA in sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8, with a single *Māori interests goal*. The Māori interests goal recognises a much narrower range of iwi and hapū rights and interests than the existing provisions in the RMA. This is a direct breach of the Treaty settlements of all iwi in the Hawke's Bay (and elsewhere) which are implicitly connected to those existing RMA provisions. Removing the existing Māori provisions, particularly the RMA Part Two provisions in sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8, will significantly reduce the RPC's ability to uphold the existing rights and interests of iwi and hapū as guaranteed under the Treaty.

Summary of recommendations

5. For the reasons outlined in this submission, the RPC recommends that:

(a) the Bills explicitly recognise the RPC and ensure it retains equivalent status and decision-making powers in the new system from day one, rather than leaving it to:

(i) renegotiation between the Crown and PSGEs under clause 9 of the PB; and

(ii) negotiation between local authorities in the region under clauses 69 and 71 of the PB;

(b) the Bills expressly ensure the RPC's co-governance role and decision-making powers apply to the oversight, development and review of the NEP and RSP for Hawke's Bay, including making necessary consequential amendments to the RPC Act itself via the Bills;

(c) the RPC Act is expressly recognised:

(i) alongside iwi participation legislation in clause 8(c)(ii) of the NEB;

(ii) in clause 8(c) of the PB; and

(iii) alongside iwi participation legislation in clause 3 of Schedule 3 of the PB;

(d) the PB:

(i) expressly provides a role for the RPC in the preparation of the RSP for the Hawke's Bay region that is equivalent to the RPC's role in the preparation of the RMA documents; or

(ii) expressly provides for the same PSGE representation on the Hawke's Bay spatial plan committee under clause 71 to uphold the intent of the RPC Act and for the committee to adopt equivalent terms of reference as currently apply to the RPC; and/or

(iii) requires the process agreement for the Hawke's Bay region under clause 69 to uphold the RPC Act and the current terms of reference;

(e) the inclusion of Treaty-related obligations in the Bills, at least equivalent to those in RMA sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8, to:

(i) ensure outcomes are at least equivalent to, or better than, those achieved under the RMA and consistent with Treaty settlement commitments, noting that the Bills present an opportunity for the Government to improve the resource management system and better reflect the rights and interests of Māori under the Treaty and not settle for the bare minimum provided under the RMA;

(ii) maintain access to established jurisprudence;

(iii) enhance accountability; and

(iv) safeguard the substantive rights and interests of Māori in environmental decision-making; and

(f) the inclusion of clear and enforceable duties for decision-makers, rather than relying on a consultation-only model.

6. Given the importance and significance of these matters and the unique status of the RPC as Treaty settlement redress, we also request and invite the Environment Committee to provide an opportunity for the RPC, along with relevant PSGEs, iwi and hapū, to present directly to the Committee at a location in the Hawke's Bay.

Genesis and status of the RPC

7. The RPC was established via the RPC Act following a suite of Treaty settlements – including those between the Crown and Ngāti Pāhauwera and the Crown and Maungaharuru-Tangitū Hapū – and embodies the commitment of HBRC to *"improve tāngata whenua involvement in the development and review of documents prepared in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) for the Hawke's Bay Region"* (section 3(1) RPC Act).

8. The RPC's composition and operating principles reflect a deliberate and permanent partnership between HBRC and PSGEs within Hawke's Bay. Notably, the RPC Act:

(a) provides the RPC with statutory recognition and protection;

(b) binds the Crown (section 6);

(c) recognises the RPC is a joint committee of the HBRC (section 3(2)), with its central function being the oversight of RMA documents for the region (sections 4 and 9(1));

(d) provides that any draft regional policy statement or regional plan must be referred to the RPC (section 10); and

(e) requires the RPC to consist of equal numbers of tāngata whenua and Council members (section 11).

9. The RPC Act recognises tāngata whenua as being of equal standing in natural resource decision-making in the region. That position reflects careful and deliberate consideration, and the establishment of the RPC embodies the mutual understanding reached between the Crown, HBRC, and PSGEs in the Hawke's Bay region. It is therefore critical that any resource management reform preserves the role of the RPC and upholds the Treaty settlement redress that led to its genesis and operation.

10. It is important that any future resource management system does not compromise or weaken the RPC without the explicit agreement of the PSGEs who were involved in its formation. The RPC is directly connected to Treaty settlement redress and provides a core mechanism for tāngata whenua involvement in the management of the natural environment in the Hawke's Bay region.

Key concerns of the RPC

The Bills fail to recognise or explicitly provide for the RPC and the related Treaty settlement redress

11. Clauses 9 and 10 of the Bills deal specifically with Treaty settlement redress and arrangements. Those clauses provide that, to assist in the transition from the RMA, the Crown will work with any PSGE who wishes to do so to seek agreement on how their Treaty settlement redress or arrangements will operate with the same or equivalent effect "to the greatest extent possible" under the Bills. Where agreement has not yet been reached, a person exercising or performing functions under the Bills must give an effect that is the same, or equivalent, as the effect that the redress or arrangement has in relation to the RMA "to the greatest extent possible" under the Bills.

12. The two-year timeframe for the Crown to reach agreement with relevant PSGEs on how settlement redress will be upheld is problematic on several fronts:

(a) These provisions automatically expire after two years, whether agreement has been reached or not, without any direction on what happens if agreement is not reached.

(b) The initial version of Regional Spatial Plans are also likely to be completed within the two-year window the Crown has to reach agreement with iwi. This

means a significant aspect of the new planning regime may be completed before the Crown and PSGEs agree on how settlement redress will be provided for.

(c) The condition "to the greatest extent possible under this Act" effectively limits and undermines existing settlement redress if it is inconsistent with the Bills. In the context of the RPC there is no certainty how far the current scope of the RPC will be considered to be consistent with the Bills. This is even more of a concern when considered in the context of the Government's local government reform proposals.

(d) Existing settlements cannot be unilaterally changed without the agreement of the relevant PSGE.

13. The RPC supports the stated intention that Treaty settlement redress or arrangements will operate with the same or equivalent effect as under the RMA. However, the Bills themselves fail to achieve this intention because they do not explicitly recognise the existence of the RPC or the Treaty settlements that led to its establishment or provide direction on how these should be given equivalent effect.

14. The preamble to the RPC Act records that "legislation is required to ensure that the committee cannot be discharged except by unanimous written agreement of the appointers". The appointers are HBRC and the relevant iwi and hapū.

15. While the Bills do not purport to (and should not) discharge the RPC, the RPC is concerned that the Bills do not refer to the RPC or the RPC Act at all. Instead, the Bills contemplate a transitional period of up to two years for renegotiating Treaty-related arrangements (clause 9(3)).

16. In relation to the RPC:

(a) This transitional period is unnecessary, because there is already a clear mandate for the RPC. The Bills can and should directly recognise the RPC and its continued existence.

(b) The standard of "to the greatest extent possible" is inappropriate and does not ensure an equivalent role for the RPC. It is unclear what effect this standard may have on the future role of the RPC, or direct negotiation with PSGEs on their respective settlement redress, including any consequences arising from a failure to reach agreement within two years. Any failure to uphold the status and function of the RPC or to reach agreement with relevant PSGEs within the two-year timeframe will be a direct and egregious breach of existing settlements.

(c) The transitional period is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty and with the Treaty settlements themselves, for the reasons expanded on below in relation to regional spatial plan preparation.

17. It is important that the Government ensures Treaty settlement redress and agreed outcomes are not diluted or left in limbo either during or after the two-year transitional period provided in the Bills. The Bills need to recognise the sanctity of

Treaty settlement redress from day one and ensure it continues as it would under the existing framework. Consequential amendments will be needed (via the Bills) to the RPC Act so that the RPC's continuation is expressly confirmed in the Bills.

18. Additionally, Treaty settlement redress is intended to be durable and enduring. The Bills should therefore expressly provide that nothing in it overrides, diminishes, or otherwise affects Treaty settlement redress or related statutory protections, unless Parliament clearly and expressly states an intention to do so. Silence or general provisions should not be capable of impliedly weakening or displacing those pre-existing Treaty settlement arrangements.

19. While not directly arising from the Bills, a further relevant and complicating factor is the proposal to replace regional councillors with the new Combined Territorial Boards (**CTBs**) under the *Simplifying Local Government* proposals. CTBs are proposed to hold regional-level planning authority but are comprised solely of mayors or Crown appointees, with no guaranteed tāngata whenua representation. If this proposal proceeds it will be critical to ensure the RPC is explicitly integrated with the CTB legislation and the status and function of the RPC is preserved. Failure to do so would represent a direct departure from the intent and basis of the RPC Act and the RPC. Further work will be required, including negotiation with the relevant PSGEs, if this proposal progresses.

20. To address these issues, we recommend the Bills explicitly recognise and preserve the RPC's existence and co-governance role in the new system from day one, rather than leaving it to:

    (a) renegotiation between the Crown and PSGEs under clause 9 of the PB; and

    (b) negotiation between local authorities in the region under clauses 69 and 71 of the PB, as addressed below.

The Bills do not provide an equivalent role for the RPC in plan-development processes

21. As noted above, the RPC supports the apparent intention to ensure that Treaty settlement redress or arrangements will operate with the same or equivalent effect as under the RMA. However, the Bills do not achieve this intention because they do not provide an equivalent role for the RPC in relation to plan development processes, i.e. by explicitly acknowledging the RPC role in developing RMA documents will be replaced by an equivalent role with the RSP and NEP. This creates a real risk of exclusion from the planning framework once the Bills take effect.

22. Nothing in the Bills extends the functions of the RPC Act to the new planning framework. The RPC's functions are left contingent on future negotiations or discretionary decisions, rather than being carried forward as an integral part of the new framework. The interim requirement for decision-makers to only give effect to Treaty settlement redress and arrangements "to the greatest extent possible" (clause 10(2)), instead of directly carrying over the effect of Treaty settlements under the RMA in full, is inadequate. Such a provision does not guarantee continuity of the RPC arrangements or planning functions on the same conditions as now, particularly where the new legislative framework does not provide an exact equivalent for those functions. The Bills effectively place the burden on PSGEs to ensure existing settlement

arrangements are carried forward, without ensuring that the new system is capable of accommodating them. This may result in the PSGEs resorting to litigation to protect and enforce their rights if the Bills fail to do so.

23. The RPC's role directly provides a decision-making role for the RPC in relation to the development and review of regional plans and regional policy statements under the RMA. Under the Bills, the logical equivalent documents are Natural Environment Plans (**NEP**s) and Regional Spatial Plans (**RSP**s). These documents are intended to set the long-term direction for environmental and spatial management in the Hawke's Bay region. We are concerned that if the RPC is not provided the ability to exercise its functions and powers at the earliest stage of their preparation, initial strategic decisions will be particularly difficult to undo, even through subsequent plan reviews.

Natural Environment Plans

24. Section 92 of the NEB introduces NEPs as part of the resource management system. The purpose of an NEP is to enable and regulate the use, protection, and enhancement of natural resources within a region and assist regional councils in carrying out their functions and responsibilities under the NEB. It is the responsibility of the regional council to prepare an NEP, and there is specific provision for the regional council to prepare its plan in accordance with 'iwi participation legislation' – which includes a Treaty settlement Act but does not include the RPC Act in the definitions within the Bills.

25. While the RPC supports the recognition of iwi participation legislation, the NEB fails to adequately recognise or provide for the RPC Act and the RPC's functions in developing an NEP. The role of the RPC is readily transferable to this context.

26. We also note that the hierarchy of instruments in clause 12 of the NEB significantly constrains the ability of NEPs to develop bespoke responses to local issues. Because NEPs must give effect to national policy direction, national standards, and regional spatial plans, the scope for discretionary decision-making will be limited. This has implications for both the RPC and PSGEs in addressing region-specific matters.

Regional Spatial Plans

27. Section 67 of the PB introduces RSPs as part of the planning regime. The purpose of an RSP is to:

(a) set the strategic direction for development and public investment priorities in a region for a time frame of not less than 30 years;

(b) enable integration at the strategic level of decision-making under the PB and the NEB;

(c) implement national instruments made under the PB and the NEB in a way that provides for use and development within environmental limits;

(d) support a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure funding and investment by central government, local authorities, and other infrastructure providers; and

(e) promote integration of development planning with infrastructure planning and investment.

28. The matters that drive RSPs are the same issues that the RPC is currently required to navigate in its role overseeing the preparation and review of the regional policy statement for Hawke's Bay. For example, both regional policy statements and RSPs:

(a) set strategic direction for the whole of a region;

(b) address regionally significant infrastructure and its integration with development;

(c) provide direction on urban form, growth management and land use integration;

(d) seek to manage risks from natural hazards; and

(e) address the protection of areas of high natural character, outstanding natural features, landscapes, and significant historic heritage from inappropriate development.

29. Given the clear similarities and overlap between regional policy statements and RSPs, it is logical for the RPC to have a role in the preparation of RSPs. This outcome would give effect to clause 10 of the PB, which requires Treaty settlement redress or arrangements to be given the same or equivalent effect as under the RMA, to the greatest extent possible. In light of the two-year timeframe set by clause 9(3), and the requirement that RSPs be developed and notified within 15 months of the Royal assent, conferring that function to the RPC is an appropriate and logical means of achieving the outcome sought by clause 10.

30. Under the PB, RSPs are to be prepared by spatial plan committees, which are to be established by the local authorities in each region (clause 71).

31. Clause 69 requires the local authorities to reach a process agreement including "*how each local authority will ensure that its obligations or agreements under iwi participation legislation or agreements under that legislation, existing joint management agreements, or existing or initiated Mana Whakahono ā Rohe are upheld during the process*". However, it is unclear whether "agreements under that legislation" captures the RPC Act and, if so, how the RPC's current role would be reflected in the development of an RSP.

32. We do not support leaving it to the local authorities to agree upon how tāngata whenua will participate in the preparation of RSPs. Doing so would undermine the purpose and effect of the RPC Act and the role of the RPC.

33. In our view, the RPC's role in decision-making is directly relevant to RSPs and should be provided for in the process for preparing RSPs under the PB.

34. If the RPC and the RPC Act are not provided for under clause 69, the sole express provision relating to iwi in the spatial planning process is clause 70 of the PB, which provides:

> ***70 Consultation with iwi***
> *(1) A spatial plan committee must consult—*
> *(a) iwi authorities in the region in preparing the draft regional spatial plan; and*
> *(b) any customary marine title groups in the region on aspects of the draft regional spatial plan that relate to the coastal marine area.*

35. Consultation does not recognise the role of the RPC or the PSGEs that are identified in the RPC Act. Further, although clause 70 provides iwi authorities the ability to express views via consultation with the spatial plan committee, it does not provide any decision-making powers or representation. This falls short of the arrangement provided for under the RPC Act, and would downgrade tāngata whenua involvement from shared governance under the RPC Act to consultation – which is a far weaker standard than the current shared governance arrangement. This would be a breach of the Treaty settlements that gave rise to the RPC and inconsistent with the purpose of the RPC Act itself.

36. In addition, and as noted earlier, the Bills contemplate a transitional period of up to two years for renegotiating Treaty-related arrangements (clause 9(3)). This includes the RPC Act and the Treaty settlements that led to its establishment. However, because key spatial planning processes will commence and progress during that same period, without explicit recognition of the RPC from the outset, there is a risk that planning decisions will be made, and strategic directions set, before agreement is reached as to the RPC's ongoing role. Once embedded, those decisions may be particularly difficult to revisit in a manner that meaningfully restores the RPC's position, or if they are revisited will result in a substantial waste of time and resources.

37. To address these issues, we recommend:

(a) the Bills expressly ensure the RPC's co-governance role applies to the preparation of the NEP and RSP for Hawke's Bay, including making necessary consequential amendments to the RPC Act itself via the Bills;

(b) the RPC Act is expressly recognised:

(i) alongside iwi participation legislation in clause 8(c)(ii) of the NEB;

(ii) in clause 8(c) of the PB; and

(iii) alongside iwi participation legislation in clause 3 of Schedule 3 of the PB;

(c) the PB:

(i) expressly provides a role for the RPC in the preparation of the RSP for the Hawke's Bay region that is equivalent to the RPC's role in the preparation of the regional policy statement under the RMA; or

(ii) expressly provides for the same PSGE representation[1] on the Hawke's Bay spatial plan committee under clause 71 to uphold the intent of the RPC Act and equivalent terms of reference as currently apply to the RPC, noting that the terms of reference reflect the agreed principles for the co-governance arrangement, are central to the RPC's operation and can only be amended with the agreement of HBRC and the PSGEs; and/or

(iii) requires the process agreement for the Hawke's Bay region under clause 69 to uphold the RPC Act and the current terms of reference.

Dilution of Treaty-related obligations

38. The Bills significantly dilute Treaty-related obligations to Māori and any obligations to consider Māori rights, interests and relationships. They substantially undermine the existing recognition of the relationship between iwi/hapū and te taiao under the RMA with potentially far-reaching implications for the ability of iwi and hapū to uphold their status, rights and obligations as kaitiaki of all our taiao, not just in those places where councils or the Crown acknowledge Māori have sites of significance. As a result, even if the RPC is given a role under the Bills, its ability to make effective resource-management decisions in line with Treaty responsibilities is undermined.

39. The Bills do this by removing the requirement to actively consider Treaty principles and the embedded Māori values and participation at multiple levels of decision-making, particularly as set out in sections 6, 7, and 8 of the RMA. Together these RMA sections reflect the fundamental importance of environmental decision-making to iwi and hapū:

(a) Part 2 of the RMA includes provisions requiring decision-makers to:

(i) recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture, and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and taonga under section 6(e);

(ii) recognise and provide for the protection of protected customary rights under section 6(g); and

(iii) have particular regard to kaitiakitanga under section 7(a).

(b) Section 8 of the RMA also requires decision-makers to "take into account" the principles of the Treaty in achieving the RMA's purpose. Important principles relevant to environmental decision-making include partnership, protection and redress.

[1] (a) 1 member appointed by the trustees of the Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust;
(b) 1 member appointed by the trustees of the Ngāti Pāhauwera Development Trust;
(c) 1 member appointed by the trustees of Tūhoe Te Uru Taumatua;
(d) 1 member appointed by the trustees of the Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa;
(e) 1 member appointed by Mana Ahuriri Incorporated;
(f) 1 member appointed by the trustees of Te Kōpere o te iwi o Hineuru Trust;
(g) 1 member appointed by Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa;
(h) 2 members appointed by the trustees of the Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust; and
(i) 1 member appointed by the appointer for Ngāti Ruapani ki Waikaremoana.

40. The Bills do not contain equivalent provisions. The "Treaty clause" in clause 8 of the Bills is inadequate as it merely describes how the Bills purport to give effect to Treaty obligations, and the actual provisions do not adequately achieve that outcome. The Māori interests goal in clause 11 is significantly weaker than the above RMA provisions, particularly when that goal is:

    (a) one goal alongside others with no internal hierarchy;

    (b) merely something persons must "seek to achieve"; and

    (c) subject to sections 12 and 45 (PB) and sections 12 and 69 (NEB).

41. Clauses 9 and 10 are limited to Treaty settlements, rather than making the principles of the Treaty relevant. This approach is inadequate, including because the settlements themselves were not (in general) intended to effectively codify the relevance and application of the Treaty and the principles of the Treaty for resource management decision-making.

42. Removing the operative Treaty clause in section 8 of the RMA, which includes references to Treaty principles eliminates access to a developed body of jurisprudence, reduces accountability, and narrows the scope of Māori rights from partnership to participation. It is likely that achieving outcomes where Treaty settlement redress "operates with the same or equivalent effect to the greatest extent possible" across all new planning instruments will require significant litigation and judicial clarification.

43. The Bills' approach also limits the ability for tāngata whenua – as kaitiaki – to influence and assist in making informed decisions for their respective takiwā. In our view, failing to appropriately recognise obligations to Māori is an explicit disregard for perspectives that are grounded in tikanga and are of assistance to resource management decisions in New Zealand. Although clause 11 of the Bills seeks to provide for "Māori participation" in developing national instruments, spatial planning, natural environment plans, and land use plans, the Bills do not specify the level of influence or decision-making power, risking a reduction of participation to consultation rather than meaningful and effective engagement. This fails to appropriately recognise the role of iwi and hapū as both tāngata whenua and kaitiaki.

44. Practically, these provisions will also require local authorities to firmly understand the contents of any existing Treaty settlements in their takiwā and traverse all pre-existing arrangements to ensure those arrangements will operate with the same or equivalent effect to the greatest extent possible under the new regulatory framework which, in our view, comes at a cost and is a role more appropriately carried out by the Crown as the Treaty partner. Ultimately, the responsibility to reach outcomes that are consistent with the Treaty and Treaty settlements rests with the Crown and cannot be treated solely as a matter for local government.

45. Overall, the Bills reduce both the recognition of, and the weight given to Māori interests. Accordingly, even if the RPC is given an equivalent structural role under the Bills, its ability to continue to recognise the rights and interests of tāngata whenua will be significantly constrained. The issues raised in this submission are therefore connected and resolving them is of equal importance.

46. To address these issues, we recommend:

(a) the inclusion of Treaty-related obligations in the Bills, at least equivalent to those in RMA sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8, to:

(i) ensure outcomes are at least equivalent to, and preferably better than, those achieved under the RMA and consistent with the Treaty and Treaty settlement commitments, noting that the Bills present an opportunity for the Government to improve the resource management system and better provide for the Crown's Treaty obligations, including upholding existing Treaty settlements and not settle for the bare minimum;

(ii) maintain access to established jurisprudence;

(iii) enhance accountability; and

(iv) safeguard the substantive rights and interests of Māori in environmental decisions; and

(b) the inclusion of clear and enforceable duties for decision-makers, rather than relying on a consultation-only model.

Conclusion

47. The RPC urges the Select Committee to ensure that the new planning framework fully preserves the Treaty settlement commitments that underpin the RPC and its statutory role.

48. The RPC strongly urges the Crown to engage directly with the relevant PSGEs urgently to address how the Bills should be amended to ensure they are Treaty compliant and consistent with the RPC Act.

49. There is already a strong degree of cohesion between local authorities and PSGEs in the Hawke's Bay region. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the Crown to ensure an effective, principled, and enduring planning system for the Hawke's Bay region.

50. We wish to be heard in support of our submission and invite/request the Environment Committee to hold hearings in the Hawke's Bay region to allow both the RPC and relevant iwi and hapū to present directly on their submissions in the local context.

Nā māua, nā

Tania Hopmans
Co-chair
HBRC Regional Planning Committee

Hinewai Ormsby
Co-chair
HBRC Regional Planning Committee