

1. The following provides further information to Groundswell NZ's appeal as requested by the Environment Court decision Decision No. [2026] NZEnvC 98 issued 30 April 2026.
2. In Appendix 3 to this decision under the reasons for further particulars sought the statement is made that "It is clear the appellant (Groundswell NZ) considers the TTPP is not required to give effect to Section 6 of the RMA." This interpretation is incorrect and the following clarifies our position and the relief we are seeking.
3. Throughout New Zealand the implementation of Section 6 matters in District, and to a lesser extent regional plans, has caused a significant amount of community upheaval, and protracted planning and environment court processes. Significant Natural Areas (SNA's), landscapes, wetlands, heritage, hazards, notable trees and the more recent Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori (SASMs) have consistently featured among the most controversial and problematic.
4. Through the RMA reform process the coalition government has taken steps to address some of the failings of Section 6, predominantly through the regulatory relief proposal. However, the governments' proposal does not fix the fundamental failings of Section 6. Nor does it address the fact that a key contributing factor to these failings, is how many councils have attempted to meet their Section 6 obligations. How the TTPP has attempted to meet its Section 6 obligations is the focus of Groundswell NZ's appeal on the TTPP.
5. Groundswell NZ's appeal does not advance an argument that the TTPP is not required to give effect to Section 6 of the RMA. Our concern and the basis of this appeal is how the TTPP proposes to address Section 6 matters. This is principally through the approach in the TTPP of mapping overlays and associated rules.
6. Groundswell NZ's appeal can be further explained as follows.
7. For RMA Section 6 (a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g) the TTPP approach of mapping overlays (and associated rules) does not meet both the Section 5 purpose of the RMA and the protection/preservation obligations of Section 6. Our concerns, as outlined in our appeal, include that the TTPP turns natural and cultural values into a liability, does not achieve protection of said values and causes detrimental impacts on community wellbeing and property owners. Our relief sought seeks that the way the TTPP addresses these Section 6 matters is amended to ensure our concerns are no longer at issue and the purpose of the RMA is met. If these concerns cannot be satisfactorily addressed, our position is that all the TTPP provisions relating to these Section 6 matters are deleted from the TTPP. The reason why we request all consequential

references to section 6 is because these Section 6 matters are interconnected across objectives, policies, rules and maps. This affects part 2 District Wide Matters –

- Strategic Directions NENV (Natural Environment Te Taiao) and POU (Poutini Ngāi Tahu)
  - Historic & Cultural Values – HH (Historic Heritage), SASM, and TREE (Notable Trees)
  - Natural Environment Values – ECO (Ecosystem & Indigenous Biodiversity, NC (Natural Character and the margins of waterbodies, and NFC (Natural features and landscapes)
8. For RMA section 6 (d) and (h) our concerns predominantly relate to detrimental impacts on private property owners. These concerns relate to mapping (Natural Hazards), consultation with affected property owners and detrimental impacts on property owners. This affects Part 2 District wide matters PA (Public access) and NH (Natural Hazards). As above, if our concerns cannot be adequately addressed then we seek that these Section 6 matters be deleted from the TTPP.

Jamie McFadden

Groundswell NZ environment spokesperson

0273218747