

Review of Significance and Engagement Policy 2021

Submissions



Submission: Significance and Engagement Policy

Submissions close 5.00pm Monday 5 April 2021

<u>Privacy statement</u>: Please be aware when providing personal information that this submission form is part of the public consultation process. As such, this document (including contact details) will be copied and made publicly available. Personal information will be used for the administration of this consultation process and decision-making. All information will be held by the Whanganui District Council, 101 Guyton Street, and submitters have the right to access and correct personal information.

Online: You can complete this submission online at www.whanganui.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Alternatively, please return this form, or send your written submission to:

Review of Significance and Engagement Policy Whanganui District Council 101 Guyton Street Whanganui 4500

Email: policysubmissions@whanganui.govt.nz

YOUR DETAILS	please print your	details clearly

Name: Miriama Cribb
E-mail: miriamacribb@gmail.com
Postal Address: 4/121 Ingestre Street, Whanganui
Best daytime contact number: .021313615
Organisation: If you are completing this submission on behalf of an organisation please name the organisation and your role:

Oral submissions

If you wish to speak to Council in support of your written submission please tick the box below.

• Yes I would like to speak in support of my submission (*please ensure you have completed the details above, including contact phone number*)

Note: Hearings will be in May 2021. If you have indicated that you wish to speak on your submission we will contact you to arrange a time.

If you would be interested in being involved in further consultation opportunities with Council please tick the box below and ensure your contact details have been completed.



Yes I would like to be involved in future consultation and am happy for you to retain my contact details.

Significance & Engagement Sub: 001

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following proposals presented in review of the Significance and Engagement Policy.

KEY ISSUES	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Addition of Clauses 12.4 and 12.6					
That Council add clause 12.4 requiring consultation with Ngā Tāngata Tiaki on matters relating to the Whanganui River or the within catchment, and 12.6 requiring Council to prioritise methods of engagement that tangata whenua prefer.					
This recognises the statutory body Ngā Tāngata Tiaki and its authority and the preference tangata whenua have for face-to- face communication.					
	See attached				
Please provide reasons for your response					
Addition of Heritage Assets to Significance Criteria					
That Council add decisions that have a significant impact on heritage assets to the table of significance criteria. This would ensure that any decision that makes a significant impact on a heritage asset qualifies as a significant decision overall,					
regardless of what other criteria it meets.					
Please provide reasons for your response					

Updating the List of Strategic Assets				
That Council update the list of strategic assets. This would include adding a reference to buildings being used as animal pounds to account for the creation of the dog pound, the addition of New Zealand Commercial Pilot Academy, and the shifting of the port to a Council-Controlled Organisation.				
Please provide reasons for your response				
General Updates				
That Council update the policy structurally, including grammatical improvements, specific references to tangata whenua, and other similar changes.	/			
These updates are not substantive, but ensure that the policy remains clear and effective in its purpose.				
Please provide reasons for your response	See attached			

Significance & Engagement Sub: 001

Please use this space to provide any further comments regarding this consultation. In particular, if you disagreed with any of the proposals please let us know why and provide any alternative suggestions you may have:				
See attached				

OPTIONAL:

Have you subr	nitted to Council before? (Circle o	one)		
	Yes			
Gender:	le			
Age:	Under 18 Years	18 – 29 yea	ars 30 – 39 years	40 – 49 years
	50 – 59 years	60 years ar	nd over	
Location: (tick	one)			
	Aramoho (Lower Aramoho, Upper Aramoho		Putiki	
	Bastia Hill / Durie Hill		St Johns Hill / Otamatea	
	Blueskin- Maxwell		Springvale (Springvale West, Springvale East, Mosston)	
	Castlecliff (Castlecliff North, Castlecliff South, Mosston)		Whanganui Central (Laird Park, Whanganui Central, Whanganui	/
	Fordell-Kakatahi		Collegiate)	☑
	Gonville (Balgownie, Tawhero, Gonville South, Gonville East,		Whanganui East (Williams Doma Wembley Park, Kowhai Park)	ıın, □
	Gonville West)		Other	
	Marybank-Gordon Park			
Ethnicity : (circ	ele all that apply)			
	NZ European Maori	Asi	ian Pacific Peoples	
	Middle Eastern/Latin American,	/ /African		
	Other			

Background

- 1. My name is Miriama Cribb and I whakapapa (have ties) to Ngā Paerangi and Ngāti Hine o Te Raa (sub-tribes) on the Whanganui River. I am a rate-payer, active member within my tribal settings and a doctoral candidate at Massey University.
- 2. This application has been made on behalf of myself, with the support of my family and not on behalf of my hapū, or any trust, committee or organisation I am associated with.
- 3. I am making this submission in light of the recent failure of the Whanganui District Council (the Council) to properly engage and consult with hapū, namely the situation with the Cycleway Bridge.
- 4. While I am aware of the shortcomings of other parties that contributed to the situation, I am using this opportunity to provide some feedback generally on how might the Council do better in regard to engagement, as you put it, with tangata whenua.
- 5. It seems piecemeal and ineffective to only agree or disagree on the addition of two clauses without commenting on the policy in its entirety. Therefore, the feedback and suggestions made here go beyond the scope of the Significance and Engagement Policy Review (the policy), but have been provided nonetheless.

Key Issues

- 6. I have no particular interest or feedback for the heritage or strategic assets component of the policy review, but am in support of the recommended changes.
- 7. I am in support of the addition of clause 12.4. Not only is this a suggested addition, but now a legal requirement. It must be reminded that whilst Ngā Tangata Tiaki might have the authority to act on behalf of the Whanganui River, it does not have the authority to act on behalf of all iwi members or its registered individuals. Please do not confuse the two.
- 8. There is a practice not only within the Council but many public and private sector organisations, that engagement and consultation with *one* group or individual equates to consultation and engagement with *all*. This assumption is very wrong and needs to be rectified.
- 9. There is scope to be more definitive when defining terms and organisations in your policy. For example, the relationship agreements and activities listed in 4.8 and 4.9, should clearly stipulate for what activities or issues they will be engaged with and consulted on. These organisations have been established under very specific pieces of legislation. They are not *always* the appropriate mechanism for engagement and consultation for *all* issues pertaining to tangata whenua, nor do they always have the appropriate mandate.
- 10. Just as a local kaumātua, a chairperson of a land trust, or a representative of an organisation, does not equate to full and effective engagement and consultation with tangata whenua.
- 11. Tangata whenua have been inundated with needing infrastructure to respond to the needs of the Crown and consequently central and local government. As a result, iwi and hapū have had structures imposed on them. This includes but is not limited to Māori land trusts, whānau trusts, incorporations, post-settlement entities, large natural groupings as part of the treaty settlement process and rūnanga. Many of these structures are in fact unnatural to the way Māori organise themselves socially and politically and are often the cause of disenfranchisement.

Significance & Engagement Sub: 001

- 12. While tangata whenua continue to decolonise these impositions and look to reclaim and value our own systems and practices, the Council as stipulated in sections 4.5 and 4.6, has a responsibility to discontinue the intentions and practices that go against the very principles the policy is advocating, such as only engaging with particular groups and or individuals.
- 13.One might ask, how then does the Council execute responsible and effective engagement with tangata whenua? At the core, the engagement framework itself should be reconsidered. The level of engagement framework, which looks to inform, consult, involve, collaborate and empower is very process driven and transactional. Is it perhaps too much to ask for an engagement framework that looks to transform not just tangata whenua, but the Council as well and its relationships. A transformational engagement framework might look to respect, connect, reflect and then direct, an example being used by Aboriginal peoples in Australia.
- 14.An engagement policy that advances the needs of tangata whenua should be supported with appropriate resources including office space and funds to support tangata whenua's involvement with council matters. Tangata whenua also pay rates and are entitled to such requirements.
- 15. The Cycleway Bridge situation is a classic example of how the policy is not working and not wanting to make improvements where possible is only doing a disservice to not only tangata whenua but ratepayers and Whanganui citizens at large. Should the Council be interested in doing better, saving time, energy and resources of both its own and tangata whenua, it would consider improvements beyond the mere changes that are up for review at the moment.