

Appendix 2: CONSULTATION, FEEDBACK AND RESPONSES  
Site Specific Management Plan 002 [Sectors 330-340-350]  
MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway  
M2PP-121-D-PLNM-002

17 DECEMBER 2014 - REV C - CERTIFIED ISSUE



The following tables set out the responses to comments raised by reviewers and those parties consulted in regard to the preliminary SSMP. The project responses are either reflected in the certification issue to which this Appendix pertains, or have been directed to other processes for action, or have been considered but for the reasons noted not agreed to. The parties consulted are those identified by the consent conditions and for Raumati are:

- Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai;
- Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC).
- Greater Wellington Regional Council (GW)
- Kāpiti Cycling Incorporated and the Implementation Group of the Kāpiti Coast District Council Advisory on Cycleways, Walkways and Bridleways in respect of the CWB and any cycle or pedestrian connections.
- Raumati South Resident's Association
- Relevant Landscape focus areas (Leinster Avenue & Conifer Court )

**COMMENTS ON DRAFT ISSUE SSMP2: RAUMATI**

**KCDC REVIEWERS COMMENTS** [JW=Julia Williams- Landscape Architect; DP = Deyana Popova-Urban Designer

Draft issue for comment 26.9.14, follow up feedback meeting 03.10.14, Draft comments received 9/10/14

Page	Reviewers Comments	Management Plan Author's response
	Note that the Noise wall for Wind Rain house still to be designed.	Noise walls are not required, however earth bunding is being designed to enhance the curtilage of the house.
	No underbridge lighting shown yet	Now shown in Appendix 2
	Leinster Ave pedestrian bridge still to be designed.	Correct, this will be a separate design process.
	<p>Require clarification on the following relating to the future ownership and management of leftover land inside the current designation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land within designation surrounded by retained &amp; valued vegetation areas where weeds have not been treated.</li> <li>• Question planting &amp; maintenance of areas west of Expressway (within designation) left between patches of retained vegetation eg just north of noise bund. These look as if they will have to be included within the final designation. What is ideal for these areas? Will weeds be killed off? How will it be maintained? Should the Council have some input? Concerns are reinforced by consultation comments from Conifer Court residents</li> </ul>	<p>The Kapiti Coast District Council will be contacted about land that is not needed for the operation of the Expressway. Owners of land next to the expressway may also be contacted if proposed changes trigger Council planning processes.</p> <p>The Alliance are still designing the expressway. When the design is complete (early 2015) the Transport Agency will know how much land is needed for roading operations and how much is left-over. Laws in New Zealand (Public Works Act 1981) set out how the Transport Agency must deal with land not required for the project.</p> <p>Before land can come to the market to be sold to an adjoining owner or the general public it must be firstly be offered to a number of parties such as but not limited to Council, former owner and Iwi. If none of the parties pick the property up, only then can it be sold on the open market. If an adjoining property owner is interested in purchasing the property they need to make an offer through the open market sale process. On average, the entire disposal process takes approximately two to four years.</p>

			Until mid 2016, the M2PP Alliance is responsible for all land within the project site. After this time the Transport Agency takes over responsibility. The Transport Agency will sometimes agree to temporary occupation of land where this is formalised through a licence to occupy. The Alliance are keeping a register of neighbours that are interested in left-over land parcels.
--	--	--	---

COMMENTS RELATING TO SSMP2; MEETING with Adam Forbes 7.11.2014					
GWRC REVIEWERS COMMENTS IN RELATION TO SSEMP MATTERS [Adam Forbes]					
Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/commenter	GWRC Reviewer's comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
	B. Streams and Riparian Works. Note.	Flood offset storage area	Does the 'additional 500 lineal metres' referred to here, relate to riparian revegetation treatment length? Please clarify in text.		<p>The stream is primarily provided as stated, "Approximately 500 lineal metres of intermittent stream channel will be created to assist with water movement and provide (in-stream) habitat". In essence, the wetland will fluctuate seasonally but the deeper stream channels will provide persistent in-stream habitat through the year.</p> <p>In addition the stream channels will weave through dense wetland vegetation, this vegetation providing a diversity of riparian habitat from open pools, permanently wet wetlands, and ephemeral wetlands. However, there will not be raised areas with terrestrial vegetation within this Offset Storage area.</p> <p>Note that the length in the draft SSMP was based on an early design and is likely to be less than 500m. The final length will be detailed in the lodged SSMP and included in the mitigation tables.</p>
	C. Wetlands. Note.	Mitigation shortfalls	Would like to discuss how current mitigation shortfalls can be accommodated within other ecological mitigation areas, in particular the Kakariki/Smithfield area.		As discussed in previous correspondence (dated Wed 8-Oct-2014) this table does not yet include SSMP 2, 8, 10, or 11 which will contribute in the order of 80 to 90% of all mitigation.
	I. Wetland Creation and Restoration	GWRC briefings	Approximate timeframe for final design briefing?		Because of the significant changes that have occurred to the layout in this sector our detailed design is running behind programme. If we can provide information prior to lodgement we will endeavour to do so. But there is a chance we will have to discuss once lodged.
	J. Stream Creation and Restoration	Fish access for climbing species	What will fish access for climbing species (ref. bullet 8) entail?		This relates to ensuring connectivity between the formed channels within these constructed wetland systems to the drain 7 channel.
	J. Stream Creation and Restoration	GWRC briefings	Approximate timeframe for final design briefing?		This may not be until the week of lodgement.

	O. Ground Preparation	Approval of soil mix	Who will approve the soil mix, at which stage, based on which criteria/advice/evidence?		Details for topsoil (salvaged and/or manufactured) are in the landscape specification and must be signed off by the project landscape architect.
	W. Landscape and Ecological Success Monitoring	Target SEV scores	Re. last paragraph – if mitigation success <i>shall</i> meet the forecast SEV score, then the second statement regarding ‘at least exceed the current SEV condition...’ is redundant and should be deleted.		Yes we are trying to meet the EMP target. However, If we cannot achieve the EMP ratio at all sites within the SSMP for whatever reason, the mitigation must at least achieve the current SEV score so that we return at least as good a system as currently exists (no net loss). Any shortfall would then be considered in the context of the wider mitigation requirements for the SSMP and project, just as any surplus would. In effect we are trying to ensure there is some flexibility in how the targets are achieved that allow for unforeseen outcomes.
	X. Adaptive Management – Post Construction	Report	Please clarify whether this report will be submitted to any external party (i.e., council(s)) for consultation or approval?		The EMP requires that any time an adaptive management process is triggered the remedial action required will be determined in consultation with the relevant council
	M – V.	Reference to Appendix 4.	For all of these sections should reference to Appendix 4 actually be to Appendix 5 instead?		Thanks for picking this up.
	Appendix 1 – Poplar Ave to Raumati Road Vegetation to be Retained – Sheet 6	Terrestrial valued vegetation to be retained	It appears the roughly hour-glass shaped area of terrestrial valued vegetation to be retained is located within the construction footprint. Please clarify this vegetation’s location with regard to the construction footprint and its status regarding retention.		This is a small patch of kanuka that may be able to be retained by tweaking the shared path.  This is consistent with condition G.41 d) requiring detailed design to seek to minimise effects as far as practicable.  The anticipated loss of this small group of trees is included in the overall mitigation package.
	Appendix 1 – Poplar Ave to Raumati Rd Planting Plan Sheet 4	Ecological mitigation planting on engineered batter slope	Does the comment here mean ecological mitigation planting (to mitigate loss of Raumati Kanuka) on batter slope? Or is this area not part of the terrestrial revegetation mitigation treatment?  If being counted as terrestrial ecology mitigation, was this ecological mitigation always intended to occur on engineered soils?		The use of kanuka in this general area is to mitigate loss of the Raumati Kanuka and extend the local vegetation character. The focus of mitigation planting is around Raumati Road (sheet 6) but the vegetation type is extended further south to integrate this with the other vegetation; so it is a landscape response that is tied into the mitigation requirement.  Yes; this terrestrial mitigation was always intended.  No; the batter slopes will not be formed of engineered soils, but of consolidated sands. There is no practical reason that kanuka would not survive and thrive on these batter slopes any differently than they would on a consolidated dune face.
	Appendix 4 – Ecological Mitigation Table	Ecological mitigation provision vs. requirements	Re. indigenous terrestrial habitat requirements, where (and on which substrates) will the additional 1.18 ha of terrestrial mitigation be located?		See earlier response (dated Wed 8-Oct-2014) regarding completeness of the mitigation table.

			<p>Re. Table 1A – have culvert lengths shortened since BoI design?</p> <p>Re. Tables 2 &amp; 2A – Row “Combined Total (G.42)”, Column Wetland Habitat: what is rationale for reducing 9.5 ha to 9.2 ha?</p> <p>Where will the shortfalls in stream habitat freshwater (514.8 m) and riparian (0.32 ha) mitigation be made up?</p>	
	-	Planting plans and species lists/schedules	Only very generic planting plan details are provided and species lists/schedules are not included. Inclusion of more detailed planting plans and species schedules would be preferable.	They will be provided to GWRC when available.

<p><i>COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP2: RAUMATI – draft issued for review feedback meeting 29.8.14</i></p> <p><b>KAPITI CYCLING INC.</b>[LS= Lyn Sleath]</p> <p><b>IMPLEMENTATION GROUP OF KCDC ADVISORY ON CYCLEWAYS, WALKWAYS AND BRIDLEWAYS:</b> [JN= Jan Nisbet]</p> <p><b>KCDC- CWB PLANNER</b> [SK Stuart Kilmester]</p>					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/ commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
		LS	Further to my previous comments, we are happy to accept the revised details involving lower gabions and with the pathway width maintained at 3.00 m.		No response required
		LS	Suggest that at road crossings the design should follow the model used by KCDC at the Otaihangā Road crossing near Southwards, with grab rails, audible surfacing, and markings.		There are no road crossings in SSMP 2. The Alliance considers the CWB design, where it meets local roads, adequately signals to cyclists that a crossing is imminent. NZTA and M2PP traffic safety auditors strongly oppose the use of bollards or barriers on cycleways that can cause harm to cyclists.
		SK	Ensure that the southern entrance to the CWB (near Poplar Ave) has sufficient space for signage and for groups to gather. No further comments (email 2.9.2014)		Relates to SSMP1

**LANDSCAPE FOCUS AREA- DC 57A A) Conifer Court & Leinster Ave**

COMMENTS ON DRAFT DESIGN DETAIL TABLED AT DROP IN SESSION 1.9.2014

FOLLOW UP ON-SITE MEETING WITH RESIDENTS AT THE END OF LEINSTER AVE 3.9.2014

DRAFT SSMP ISSUED TO IMMEDIATE OWNERS OF NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES FOR COMMENT 27.11.2014

Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/ commenter	GWRC Reviewer's comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
DC 57A A) iv)		Eric & Betty Cornick 12 Conifer Court	Requested an additional 6-800mm high noise bund to provide more separation between house and Expressway. (Currently perceive that finished road level will be similar to upper floor level of house.)		To further reduce the visual impact of the expressway, up to 1m of fill to be placed on the ridge line opposing 12 Conifer Court that extends towards the expressway. The current earthworks have been designed to meet the noise mitigation requirements agreed at the Board of Inquiry (BoI) by noise experts. No changes required for noise mitigation.
	G.42C v) A & EMP 4.2	Eric & Betty Cornick 12 Conifer Court	Concern about 'climbing asparagus' weed in bush to be retained adjacent to their south boundary on NZTA land. Offered to keep it under control if Alliance did initial clearance.		AEE conditions & EMP methodology require identification and monitoring of existing weeds to determine any spread of weeds into newly disturbed areas and levels of control required. There is no requirement to remove existing weeds on NZTA land beyond the construction zone.
	G.42C v) A & EMP 4.2	Eric & Betty Cornick 12 Conifer Court	Request that recently cleared gorse/blackberry is sprayed to control weed growth at western boundary.		There is no requirement to control weeds or to plant areas beyond the immediate construction zone or what was shown on the plans discussed at the BoI. NZTA owned land surplus to the Expressway requirement may be sold once the Expressway is built.
		Eric & Betty Cornick 12 Conifer Court	Safety concern about fencing wire being cut and flung across adjacent properties by mulcher clearing vegetation. Requested area be checked for fence remains prior to commencing work to avoid recurrence.		Issue referred to H & S team for further action to avoid recurrence.
		Eric & Betty Cornick 12 Conifer Court  7.11.2014	Regarding the bund that is being created west of our property. We would like to see a covenant put on this area preventing any future earthworks that might take place on the sale of the land that is surplus to requirements by NZTA, compromising the effect of said bund. Preferably we would like first option on the sale/disposal of this land following the offer back to the previous owners if that is necessary.		NZTA have provided comments related to surplus land in response to KCDC questions (please refer to these in the tables above)

			<p>Also it would be in our best interests to extend the 2.0m high noise wall further to the south as there will be a slight incline towards the bridge over Raumati Road in that area.</p> <p>We are also pleased to see GWRC are going to monitor any noxious weeds that are likely to spread into the newly planted areas. This has virtually addressed our concerns previously noted – G.42C v) A and EMP 4.2.</p>		<p>The design (location length, height) meets the noise mitigation standards required in the project consent conditions. The noise wall will be built as it has been designed.</p>
	G.42C v) A & EMP 4.2	Michelle & Chris Mc Donald 10 Conifer Court	<p>Concern that existing vegetation is being removed right up to boundary with no allowance for replanting in this area. Requested mass planting near boundary that is dense and high (3-5m).</p>		<p>There is no requirement to control weeds or to plant areas beyond the immediate construction zone or what was shown on the plans discussed at the BoI. NZTA owned land surplus to the Expressway requirement may be sold once the Expressway is built.</p> <p>The existing macrocarpa hedge along this property boundary provides visual screening from the expressway, and in time the enrichment planting will add to this.</p>
		Michelle & Chris Mc Donald 10 Conifer Court	<p>Concern about dangerous situation with wire fence being flung beyond boundary by mulcher doing veg clearance.</p>		<p>Issue referred to H &amp; S team for further action to avoid recurrence.</p>
	G.42C v) A & EMP 4.2	David & Velma Knight 8 Conifer Court	<p>Request planting on adjacent land now that area has been cleared. Request for tree planting and control of blackberry regrowth.</p>		<p>Vegetation within the designation adjacent to this boundary is being retained ( refer vegetation retention plan sheet 8706)</p> <p>There is no requirement to control weeds or to plant areas beyond the immediate construction zone or what was shown on the plans discussed at the BoI. NZTA owned land surplus to the Expressway requirement may be sold once the Expressway is built.</p>
		Caren Ashford 107 Leinster Ave	<p>Would like to see cul-de-sac at end of Leinster Ave for turning vehicles before the Leinster Ave extension. Does not want extension to be a full road that extends off end of Leinster.</p> <p>Requests for traffic calming measures (speed bump) at start of Leinster Road extension to deter boy racers</p> <p>Request vegetation selection at end of Leinster to be attractive to native birds.</p>		<p>A turning area has been provided at the end of Leinster Ave rather than a cul-de-sac. This is the preference of KCDC who consider rounded cul-de-sacs encourage 'boy racer' behaviour.</p> <p>Traffic calming intervention was not considered necessary by KCDC. Leinster Ave extension is considered a narrow road which self manages traffic to drive slowly. Speed bumps or narrowing of the entrance into the road extension was also considered unnecessary, and KCDC note that these measures create more traffic noise with vehicles breaking and accelerating.</p>



			Is the wire fence /trees beside driveways 108,110,112 staying/being upgraded /replaced?		<p>The vegetation at the end of Leinster will be a mixture of native planting, designed with the objective of improving the local biodiversity. Refer to planting plans.</p> <p>The existing fence and vegetation will remain as is, no upgrading is planned.</p>
		Diane Benge 7/260 SH1	<p>Would like taller trees included in the Planting on both a) the noise bund itself; and b) on the western side of the proposed 'Lane' (Leinster Ave extension).</p> <p>Would like to see some already mature trees planted in these two areas (to give quick cover), along with trees that will ultimately grow to be tall and substantial, capable of reaching sufficient height (in a fairly short time-frame) to replicate the noise-abating qualities of the trees that have been removed in preparation for the road construction</p>		<p>Currently the planning of the noise bund and western side of the new Leinster Road extension is shown as massed planting which consists of a mixture of native species that would reach 3-5m heights.</p> <p>We agree that some taller tree species, as suggested could be incorporated into the planting to provide more height. This has been conveyed to the design team for inclusion during the detailed design process.</p> <p>'Already mature trees' would not be planted, instead the typical grade of plants being used throughout the project would be used. While these are small when planted they have a much better success rate than large grade trees.</p>
		Martin Sutherland 108 Leinster Road 6.11.2014	<p>There is no comment about the meeting held on site with the residents of Leinster Ave about the cul-de-sac, and planting.</p> <p>Would like the end of Leinster Ave to be a cul-de-sac, with Leinster Ave extension coming off the end</p> <p>Is the wire fence/trees beside the driveways of 108, 110, 112 Leinster Ave staying? Being replaced? Being upgraded?</p> <p>Overall plan, details look great. Thank you</p>		<p>Reference to the site meeting has been added at the top of this table. The issues raised by residents at the meeting have been covered in the individual responses in this table. Request for cul-de-sac and traffic calming measures, inquiries about the type of planting and fences)</p> <p>A turning area has been provided at the end of Leinster Ave rather than a cul-de-sac. This is the preference of KCDC who consider rounded cul-de-sacs encourage 'boy racer' behaviour.</p> <p>The existing fences and vegetation will remain as is with no further upgrading.</p>
		Rachel Palmer 101 Leinster Ave 8.11.2014	<p>In reply to recent publications sent to neighbours of this section of m2pp;</p> <p>Q.1 Turning roundabout at the end of Leinster Avenue and a turning roundabout at the end of Leinster Extension (Lane). In affect does this mean there will be two roundabouts?</p>		<p>The turning area at the end of Leinster Ave is being provided by a 'T' turning arrangement rather than a round turning head (see Sheet 8 in the Management Plan). There is a turning head at the end of the Leinster Road extension (see detail on sheet 17).</p> <p>Yes, 2.5m wide see sheet 8 detail</p>

			<p>Q.2 Will there be a footpath beside the new Leinster Extension Road?</p> <p>Q.3 How long (in distance) will the Leinster Extension be?</p> <p>Does RETAIN = Land form to be Retained?</p> <p>What is the width of Walkways, Cycleways and Bridlepaths? Is there a standard width?</p>		<p>Approximately 500m long</p> <p>(Assume this question refers to the 'vegetation retention plans') in which case 'Retain' refers to vegetation that will be retained.</p> <p>The main CWB (cycle walkway bridleway) is 3m wide along the entire length of the Expressway, some of the CWB links to local roads are 2.5m wide . Footpath widths vary depending on their location and have been approved by KCDC.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>RAUMATI SOUTH RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION</b> , meeting with Mary Campbell-Lee 26.8.14 and <i>Information drop-in session 1.9.14</i>					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/commenter</i>	<i>GWRC Reviewer's comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
			Raised questions about the area of offset mitigation planting from area OB (West of expressway near Raumati Manuka) to area OC on the eastern side of the expressway (FWS OC)		Detailed design has confirmed that there will be no wetland OB (west of the Expressway). Instead the ecological off set mitigation planned for this area will be located on Wetland OC. Greater Wellington Regional Council have agreed that this will achieve the required consent conditions.
			Wanted to know more about planting on noise bund beside Leinster extension		Information now included in SSMP

<b>COMMENTS ON SSMP2:</b> <b>TE ATIWA KI WHAKARONGATAI</b>					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS - TO BE APPLIED TO ALL SSMP'S</i>					
57 e) i	SSMP to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	M2PP Alliance	<p>A workshop was held with Te Atiawa on the 23 October 2014. The workshop had two key focus areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Te Atiawa to review and comment on the SSMPs. Provide formal comment.</li> <li>2. Identify key opportunities for input into the design of the elements within the expressway with a focus on the</li> </ol>		<p>Formal comment received for SSMPs 1-10 at the workshop held on 23 October 2014</p> <p>In addition, the Alliance design team are working with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai to develop design of some elements along the expressway and CWB</p>

	General comment to be applied to SSMP 1 – SSMP 10		CWB and interpretation signage. Agree a methodology, deliverables and program. 3. Alliance to prepare a draft design framework by the end of November 2014 and hold a second workshop with Te Atiawa		corridor. This work considers the whole Expressway route. The first stage, currently underway, will identify the particular locations of significance to Te Atiawa. If these locations occur within this SSMP area, landscape elements or features will be designed and incorporated into the CWB corridor, in consultation with Te Atiawa.
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai and Takamore Trust  General comment to be applied to all SSMPs	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Te Atiawa request that in general terms the design of the expressway meets tangata whenua values. There is to be a particular focus on water bodies, terrestrial and wetland planting, however It is important to Te Atiawa that iwi expectations are also met in regards to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design/aesthetic values of built elements</li> <li>• Ecological values</li> <li>• Landuse and the physical environment</li> <li>• Cultural and historical values</li> </ul>		
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai and Takamore Trust  General comment to be applied to all SSMP's	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Te Atiawa request input into the naming of new waterbodies created as part of the project. (such as the new wetlands to the south of the Wharemauku Stream currently referred to as flood storage area 2)		
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai and Takamore Trust  General comment to be applied to all SSMP's	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Where possible planting within the expressway is to consider Iwi values in regards but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maori customary practice, kaupapa Māori</li> <li>• Flax cultivation (pā harakeke)</li> <li>• Mahinga kai</li> <li>• Planting for medicinal use rongoā māori</li> </ul> <p>Specific areas of interest, land use, planting type will be identified in individual SSMP comments.</p>		
<b>SSMP 2 SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b>					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/ commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai  SSMP 2 specific comment 23/10/2014	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Wharemauku named after a Pa Site at the mouth of the Wharemauku Stream. Te Atiawa would like to be involved with the naming of the CWB stream bridge. The name 'Wharemauku' could be included in the design of the Wharemauku CWB Stream bridge to acknowledge the importance of the Wharemauku Stream to Te Atiawa.		

57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai  SSMP 2 specific comment 23/10/2014	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	There is a good opportunity to provide interpretive signage that identifies the numerous layers new and old within this area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecology/wetland restoration, biodiversity, species protection</li> <li>• Historical</li> <li>• Cultural</li> <li>• Iwi Values</li> <li>• Land use</li> </ul>		
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai  SSMP 2 specific comment 23/10/2014	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Te Atiawa would like to have input into the planting of the wetlands south of the Wharemauku to ensure there are groupings/ areas of planting that meet iwi expectations/values with regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flax cultivation (pā harakeke)</li> <li>• Mahinga Kai</li> <li>• Planting for medicinal use rongoā māori</li> <li>• Maori customary practice, kaupapa Māori</li> </ul>		
57 e) i	SSMPs to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai  SSMP 2 specific comment 23/10/2014	Hemi Sundgren, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai	Te Atiawa request input into the naming of the wetlands south of the Wharemauku Stream.		