

APPENDIX 5
INTERIM CULTURAL VALUES REPORT



Te Kaahui o Rauru

**Interim Cultural Values
Report:
Otamatea Structure
Plan Change
17 October 2017**

Executive Summary

This interim cultural values report is written primarily from a Tamareheroto hapuu perspective, with additional commentary from Te Kaahui o Rauru (TKOR), the iwi governance entity for Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi. Through genealogy and geographic location, Tamareheroto acknowledges descent from both Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi and Whanganui iwi.

Whanganui District Council (WDC) has sought to understand cultural perspectives of the area identified as “Otamatea West” as part of a proposed plan change, structure plan and re-zoning to enable residential development, collectively known as Plan Change 46.

The hapuu has identified Otamatea West as ancestral land. The cultural values associated with this area are described and together seek to underpin and address:

- the need to preserve and protect ancestral heritage;
- the wellbeing of the land and its people; and
- the desire and right of tangata whenua to reconnect with ancestral lands wrongfully taken as part of the 1848 confiscation.

This report also references the discovery of an urupaa (burial site) containing human bones at a nearby site, Rapanui Road, in 2008-09.

The hapuu and TKOR seek recognition of the cultural significance of this area. TKOR requests consideration of a new name for the area and reference to its Puutaiao (environmental) Management Plan regarding protection of heritage and values in this process.

TKOR also holds concerns about the lack of requiring archaeological surveys or cultural impact assessments prior to recent construction activity in the area, and supports a proposed application for an archaeological site layer over the whole area.

While the hapuu and TKOR understand that WDC believes a change in zoning will trigger stronger protections if accompanied by the Otamatea Structure Plan, they do not support a residential zone status. It is unclear how the change in zoning, which will encourage residential development, will achieve greater protection; in addition, it is not the only way to achieve greater protection and consideration of heritage values.

TKOR also seeks Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi and Tamareheroto to be identified as affected parties in relation to activities in this area.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Hapuu Assessment	6
1. Background	6
2. Iwi/Hapuu Association to the Area	6
2.1. Iwi taketake: Ngaa Aruhe	6
2.2. Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi: Te Kaahui o Rauru	7
<i>Figure 1: (2003). Area of Interest of Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi. In Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi Deed of Settlement (2003).</i>	8
2.3. Lower Whanganui Iwi: Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho	9
2.4. Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust	9
2.5. Hapuu in Lower River Reaches of the Whanganui River	9
2.6. Tamareheroto	9
2.7. Whaanau/Hapuu in the Castlecliff Area	9
3. Otamatea: The Name	10
4. Cultural Values	10
4.1. “Mai uta ki tai, mai te rangi ki te whenua, ko ngaa mea katoa he tapu”	11
4.2. Mouri	11
4.3. Hauoratanga	11
4.4. Whakapapa	11
4.5. Mana Whenua	11
4.6. Taonga	11
4.7. Kaitiakitanga	12
4.8. Waahi Tapu	12
4.9. Waahi Tuupuna	12
4.10. Wairuatanga	12
5. Issues	12
5.1. Increased Likelihood of Heritage Loss	13
5.2. The 1848 Land	13
5.3. Desire of Iwi to Re-connect with Ancestral Lands	13

6.	Conclusion.....	13
7.	Recommendations	14
	Te Kaahui o Rauru	15
1.	Commentary	15
2.	Additional Recommendations	17

Introduction

In May 2017, Whanganui District Council (WDC) contacted Te Kaahui o Rauru (TKOR), the iwi governance entity for Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi, to initiate engagement surrounding Plan Change 46, a plan change, structure plan and re-zoning of the area the Council has labeled “Otamatea West”. The plan change aims to enable residential development in the area.

WDC communicated a desire to understand the cultural perspectives and story of settlement of tangata whenua for this area prior to publicly notifying the proposed plan change. The main impetus for this engagement was the presence of archaeological sites, specifically middens and food pits, in the area, indicating a history of tangata whenua association.

Following discussions with WDC, and given the lack of easily accessible historical knowledge of the area, TKOR were commissioned to complete an interim cultural values report regarding the Otamatea West area.

It is primarily composed from the perspective of Tamareheroto, the local hapuu, with reference to the association of Whanganui iwi with the area. The lead author is Raukura Waitai.

TKOR generally supports Tamareheroto’s views and, where those views differ, additional commentary has been provided.

Hapuu Assessment

1. Background

The writer was approached by Te Kaahui o Rauru to assist in the writing of this report. The approach was based on the writer belonging to the local hapuu, Tamareheroto. Discussion determined that the report would be an interim cultural values report that would reflect the iwi cultural values pertaining to this area. Interim in this sense indicates that iwi reserve the right to identify additional reports that may be deemed necessary over time, prompted by this report or as other information comes to hand. Further discussions amongst leadership of Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi and Whanganui expressed a desire for a concerted approach that reflected the interest of both iwi.

This report is written primarily from a Tamareheroto perspective. Through genealogy and geographic location, Tamareheroto acknowledges descent from both Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi and Whanganui iwi. Because of this fundamental point both iwi should feel confident that the interests of both are herein represented.

2. Iwi/Hapuu Association to the Area

To understand the values associated to this area it is important to gain an understanding of the wider area.

There are a number of layers of iwi, hapuu and whaanau association to the area known to the Whanganui District Council as Otamatea West. The iwi involved are Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi and Whanganui. Both iwi acknowledge the existence of an overlap area which stretches from the mouth of the Whanganui River to the Kai Iwi stream. A relationship document called 'Te Mata o te Rua'ⁱ exists between the two iwi which acknowledges this overlap.

Today each iwi have collective entities comprised of representation from affiliated hapuu. All hapuu, without the detriment to another, are encouraged to exercise their own 'mana motuhake'. This may be translated as an acknowledged special authority based on cultural precepts to determine the self-direction of a hapuu, and so forth. In terms of Whanganui iwi this is expressed in the Whanganuitanga - Declaration of Nationhood documentⁱⁱ. In terms of Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi, it is a key underlining principle of Ngaa Raurutanga.

At the ground level are the hapuu and whaanau that comprise the two iwi mentioned. Below ground level are the Ngaa Aruhe tuupuna from which Tamareheroto and others collectively descend. The following paragraphs elaborate.

2.1. Iwi taketake: Ngaa Aruhe

The iwi taketake, original people, of this area are called Ngaa Aruhe. The name refers to the fernroot that was once the staple diet of our early ancestors. According to tribal elders these ancestors came from the land, i.e they were here before those that arrived via waka. Elders say that when Kupe came on Matahourua that it was Ngaa Aruhe who passed down the record of this eventⁱⁱⁱ.

Archaeological evidence^{iv} of intense occupation in the ‘Otamatea West’ and Rapanui areas are the remaining physical connection that we have to these ancestors. The urupaa on Rapanui Road uncovered in 2008-2009, that dates to the late 14th or early 15th century A.D. is a Ngaa Aruhe urupaa. The tuupuna were interred upright and their teeth attest to a diet of fern root.

To give further context to the era of Ngaa Aruhe we recall the following. Turi, captain of the Aotea waka is thought by academics to have arrived in the mid. 14th century A.D. Rauru, the eponymous ancestor of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi, predates Turi by four generations. Rauru’s mother was Rongoueroa, a descendant of Ruatipua from whence is derived the old name of the Whanganui River, i.e. Te Wainui-aa-Rua. Rauru married into the ancient people of this coast called Te Kaahui Rere, who were renowned for their ability to levitate at will, hence the name.^v

2.2. Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi: Te Kaahui o Rauru

Te Kaahui o Rauru (TKOR) is the post-settlement governance entity that represents the people of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi in certain arenas including dealings with central and local government.

Specific details regarding this entity, iwi boundaries and the Treaty settlement itself can be found online in the Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi Settlement Act 2005, i.e.:

<http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2005/0084/latest/DLM359211.html>.

In brief the Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi tribal estate extends from the Whanganui River mouth, Castlecliff, Kaierau (St. Johns Hill), Westmere, Brunswick, up the Whanganui watershed to the Matemateaonga range, down to the mouth of the Paatea River and back along the coast including Kai Iwi and Rapanui to the beginning point. The southernmost hapuu (sub-tribe) of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi is Tamareheroto, inclusive of Ngaati Iti and Ngaati Puukeko. Hapuu of Ngaa Rauru had fishing kaainga along what is now the port area from the mouth to approximately Cobham Bridge and other sites of significance including Te Oneheke (in vicinity of Churton’s Creek); Kaierau – the paa on the bridge of St. John’s Hill overlooking Whanganui town ; Roto Kawau and Roto Mokoia (Virginia and Westmere Lakes respectively).

AREA OF INTEREST OF
NGAA RAURU KIITAHĪ




Figure 1: (2003). Area of Interest of Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi. In Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi Deed of Settlement (2003).

2.3. Lower Whanganui Iwi: Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho

Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho (TROT) is comprised of representation of the collective hapuu of the lower reaches of the Whanganui River. Like TKOR, TROT represent the collective voice of their people across a range of social, political, environmental and economic issues. Tamareheroto, though not formally included in their constitution documents, is aligned with Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho.

2.4. Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust

The Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust (WLSNT) is the official entity mandated to represent hapuu in negotiation of historic Treaty land claims. The 'Otamatea West' site lies within their area of interest. Tamareheroto, Ngaati Kauika and other hapuu represented by Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho and Te Ruunanga o Tamaupoko are represented by the Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust.

2.5. Hapuu in Lower River Reaches of the Whanganui River

Prior to the 1848 confiscation of land which includes the 'Otamatea West' area, up river hapuu would seasonally camp in the lower reaches of the Whanganui River to trade, fish, and gather other resources. Generally the upriver hapuu would return to their respective lands. Seasonal kaainga were found on both sides of the Whanganui River right up to the mouth. Ngaa Paerangi, Ngaati Rangi, Ngaa Poutama, Ngaati Ruaka, Ngaati Tumango, Ngati Tuupoho, Patutokotoko and others had seasonal kaainga on the true left of the river as well as in the Aramoho to Paakaitore area. Today the surviving kaainga are at Puutiki and Te Ao Hou in Aramoho.

2.6. Tamareheroto

Tamareheroto and its' forefathers Ngaati Taahinganui, Ngaati Tuutemangarewa, Ngaati Kauika, Ngaati Tahau and Ngaa Aruhe were located on the true right of the river towards the river mouth. In contrast, the Tamareheroto hapuu did not retreat inland. The hapuu estate is predominantly coastal and hence they remained within its perimeters.

It is possibly because of this fact that knowledge of the Tamareheroto hapuu boundary points has survived. The hapuu boundary stretches between the mouth of the Whanganui River mouth and the Okehu stream, inland via Kaierau (St Johns Hill) to Whakaware and Puatearapa at the junction of the Ruahine, Tokomaru and Rangitatau land blocks.

As stated above Tamareheroto acknowledges descent from both Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi and Whanganui iwi rootstock.

2.7. Whaanau/Hapuu in the Castlecliff Area

In the 20th Century, an urban drift saw many groupings of hapuu related whaanau move into the Castlecliff area. Many whaanau, amongst whom are Ngaati Kauika and Ngaa Wairiki to name two, have been there for several generations. Streets became known for the interrelated whaanau/hapuu that lived there. Kaumatua Potonga Nielsen speaks of the large whaanau of Ngaati Kauika, Ngaati Maika and Ngaati Pourua

who lived on what is now Castlecliff School land.^{vi} Other upriver whaanau have also now been in the Castlecliff area for several generations.

Descendants of these whaanau, still in residence, speak of their elders regularly travelling by foot to gather kai in both directions up and down the coast. This would include the hills above Castlecliff, along Rapanui and beyond. Whaanau speak of the relationship with the land to be ongoing, albeit to a lesser extent due to circumstances beyond their control. Whaanau treat their homes as homesteads and marae where tangihanga and other important events take place. Despite iwi/hapuu affiliations, these whaanau – who are numerous, regard one another first and foremost as whananunga (family relations). Elders say that this was the status quo before and despite the need for iwi entities to exert authority.^{vii}

3. Otamatea: The Name

The name Otamatea relates to the visit of Tamatea Pookaiwhenua to the Whanganui River. Tamatea Pookaiwhenua, from which descend the Ngaati Kahungunu of the Wairoa to Wairarapa coast, was reputed for his travels. A number of names were placed on the landscape up the Whanganui River, including in the unabbreviated name for Puutiki marae - Te Puutiki Wharanui aa Tamatea Pookaiwhenua.

In this case however, with no disrespect intended, 'Otamatea' is not a name on the landscape spoken of by our elders. There is clearly a link of sorts between the statue of Tainui at Roto Kawau, the nearby street name Turere and the name of Tamatea. Tuurere and Tainui were secret lovers who dwelt at Puutikituna on the Taangaraakau River. The intense grief of Tainui following the murder of Tuurere by her own people is said by one source to be the mythical origin of Roto Kawau – Virginia Lake. We know of course that the origins of Roto Kawau are significantly older. The only connection to Tamatea in this narrative is in the name of the Tangaarakau River, said to stem from the action of Tamatea cutting trees to fix his canoe.

The traditional names on the landscape are Kaierau, Rotokawau, Toronui, Roto Mokoia and Rapanui. The area known as Otamatea West is located within these names. It is not clear as to the process that the WDC undertook when they placed that name on the land. The prefix 'O' generally implies ownership, i.e. in this case of the name Otamatea – inferring ownership of the land by Tamatea, which is clearly incorrect.

Note, TKOR has since received some advice from WDC about the naming, discussed in the TKOR section at the end of this report.

4. Cultural Values

In regards to 'significant' decisions in relation to land or a body of water, WDC is required under the Local Government Act 2002 to take into account the relationship of Maaori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, water, sites, waahi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga. Further requirements in terms of participation in decision making; recognition of Maaori culture and world view; and heritage protection is outlined in the Resource Management Act 1991 and its' amendments.

Otamatea West is ancestral land. The cultural values associated to this area revolve around:

- the need to preserve and protect ancestral heritage;

- the wellbeing of the land and its people; and
- the desire and right of tangata whenua to reconnect with ancestral lands wrongfully taken as part of the 1848 confiscation.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of the cultural values/concepts associated with Otamatea West:

4.1. “Mai uta ki tai, mai te rangi ki te whenua, ko ngaa mea katoa he tapu”^{viii}.

(From inland to the coast, from the sky to the land, everything within is sacred.)

This statement acknowledges the sanctity within which the tribal estate, and indeed the world, is viewed. It compels respectful interaction with the environment and people of the land, past and present.

4.2. Mouri

Mouri may be translated as life-force. We believe that all things animate and inanimate have a mouri. The mouri is susceptible to human intervention, such as inappropriate land use. Mouri acknowledges that the life-force of the land and the people are interdependent. A symbiotic relationship exists which recognizes the impact that occurs on people when the life-force of their ancestral lands is not cared for.

4.3. Hauoratanga

Hauoratanga refers to holistic wellbeing. Hauoratanga acknowledges that the physical, spiritual, cultural, historic, intrinsic and extrinsic well-being of the land and the people are interdependent. As with mouri a symbiotic relationship exists which recognizes the impact that occurs on people when the wellbeing of their ancestral lands is not upheld.

4.4. Whakapapa

This value recognizes the genealogy (whakapapa) linking people of today to the original inhabitants of a specific place. Whakapapa acknowledges certain rights and obligations including mana whenua and kaitiakitanga.

4.5. Mana Whenua

Mana whenua (mana – authority/whenua – land) is the term given to the people who have the right born from genealogical descent to make decisions within a certain space/place/context. Both Whanganui and Ngaa Rauru Kaitahi healthily contest rights to mana whenua on behalf of the people who actually whakapapa to the land and the tuupuna buried within.

4.6. Taonga

The land, resources and associated history, intrinsic and extrinsic are considered taonga. They are treasured and fall under the protection of Article 2 of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

4.7. Kaitiakitanga

Hapu and iwi have an inherited right and responsibility to actively protect and enhance the resources, including heritage, of the tribal estate for current and future generations. This includes the protection of waahi tapu and waahi tupuna, known and unknown.

Archaeological evidence confirms what tangata whenua already know, i.e. that this area was once populated by our ancestors. Past knowledge alerts us that where there are signs of settlement, there too will be places of ritual and interment.

4.8. Waahi Tapu

Waahi tapu are sacred places (waahi – places; tapu – sacred) which require respect. Examples of waahi tapu include places of ceremonial ritual, interment, cremation, birth places, altars, battle grounds or places where blood was split. Signs of settlement are a red flag that waahi tapu are likely to be located in the vicinity. We believe that waahi tapu are in this vicinity and the best people to look after them are tangata whenua.

4.9. Waahi Tuupuna

Waahi tuupuna are ancestral places (waahi – places; tuupuna – ancestral). They were, and where possible are still, used for certain purposes. Examples of waahi tuupuna are settlement, temporary, seasonal and permanent; cultivation sites; hunting sites, healing sites and so forth. There is a spiritual connection between the ancestral imprints on the land and their descendants.

We know that Otamatea is a waahi tuupuna. As previously stated archaeological evidence confirms what tangata whenua already know, i.e that this area was once populated by our ancestors.

There is a preference amongst tangata whenua that waahi tupuna should be reserved for the use of the descendants of the original people, this includes the respectful and appropriate re-creation of papakaainga.

4.10. Wairuatanga

Wairuatanga speaks of the spiritual values that connect tangata whenua with their ancestors and ancestral lands.

5. Issues

Within the short time-frame given for the completion of this report, a number of issues have been identified. There may be others.

1. Increased likelihood of heritage loss
2. 1848 Land Confiscation
3. Desire of iwi to re-connect with ancestral lands.

5.1. Increased Likelihood of Heritage Loss

The existing archaeological record contains evidence of ancestral occupation dating to at least the 14th century A.D. The sites of significance to tangata whenua include not only the archaeological sites but also the areas that connect them, and any other sites laying undiscovered.

Despite the suggestion from WDC staff that re-zoning the area from a Rural to Residential classification would provide for more opportunities for intervention, after consideration the hapuu fear that this in fact would not be the case. Residential development would lead to the destruction of the remnants of ancestral settlement and the connectivity between these remnants. The individual sites do not exist in isolation.

Hapuu have a number of barriers in our ability to connect with this ancestral land, none more obvious than the fact that it is in private ownership. If multiple dwellings are permitted this would distance our people even further from our ancestral heritage, the disconnect would be magnified.

Based on the 183 Rapanui Road housing development, tangata whenua are not confident that archaeological sites are afforded the appropriate level of protection that they deserve. Archaeological sites discovered on lots 7 and 8 were discovered and not afforded protection.

The preference is that the zoning on this area DOES NOT become residential.

5.2. The 1848 Land

The Otamatea West area is located within the 1848 land confiscation area. The 1848 land confiscation is currently a key focus of the Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust in their deliberations with the Office of Treaty Settlements. The confiscation led to the alienation of tangata whenua from ancestral lands, severing the ability of tangata whenua to continue customary practices including occupation of the Otamatea West area.

5.3. Desire of Iwi to Re-connect with Ancestral Lands

Tangata whenua are keen to reconnect in a meaningful manner with ancestral lands.

Though recognising the limited power of WDC to assist tangata whenua in re-connecting with ancestral lands privately owned, this would be an opportunity for WDC to show leadership in ensuring the nature of developments is not of detriment to hapuu desire to protect and reconnect to this waahi tuupuna and potential waahi tapu. This is an opportunity to improve relationships and help rectify the significant wrongs perpetuated via the 1848 confiscation.

6. Conclusion

The Otamatea West area has been identified by tangata whenua to be an area of significance once populated by our early ancestors Ngaa Aruhe. Archaeological evidence, held within the confines of WDC, from the immediate and surrounding area confirms this knowledge.

The cultural values associated to this area speak of the importance placed by tangata whenua on the interconnectedness of the people with their ancestral lands. The area is a waahi tuupuna and as a direct consequence quite likely also to contain waahi tapu.

Tangata whenua believe that the re-zoning of the area from Rural to Residential would perpetuate cultural disconnect and lead to further destruction of ancestral sites and heritage. Tangata whenua have aspirations to reconnect with the ancestral lands which was taken from them as a part of the 1848 land confiscation.

7. Recommendations

As a result of this report, we request the following:

1. WDC recognise the cultural values outlined in this report;
2. WDC recognise the significance of the Otamatea West area to tangata whenua;
3. WDC continues to communicate in a transparent manner with all tangata whenua with expressed interest in the Otamatea West area;
4. WDC, with tangata whenua, proactively pursue avenues to protect the cultural/heritage values inherent in the Otamatea West area; and
5. WDC retains the present Rural zoning classification over the area known as Otamatea.

Te Kaahui o Rauru

Te Kaahui o Rauru generally agree and support the recommendations made by Tamareheroto and add the following additional commentary and recommendations.

1. Commentary

We note that the Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi Puutaiao Management Plan has not been included in the WDC Otamatea West Structure Plan report. We require that this be taken into consideration, specifically the sections as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi Puutaiao Management Plan policies re Otamatea proposal

3.4.1 RELATIONSHIPS	
Objective 1.1	To establish, grow and maintain relationships which maximise the ability of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi to exercise kaitiakitanga over resources within our rohe.
Policy 1.1	To work collaboratively with other Iwi and/or tangata whenua organisations, local and central government agencies, environmental organisations, stakeholders, professionals, technical experts and the public.
3.4.2 PAPATUUAANUKU	
Objective 2.1	To ensure that the realm of Papatuuaanuku is managed appropriately in accordance with Ngaa Raurutanga
Policy 2.2	TKOR will work to protect and enhance Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi relationships, culture and traditions with our ancestral lands.
3.4.5 TAONGA TUKU IHO	
Objective 5.1	To ensure that Ngaa Taonga Tuku Iho are managed appropriately in accordance with Ngaa Raurutanga.
Policy 5.1	To protect our Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi heritage as an integral part of our cultural identity and continued prosperity.
Policy 5.3	Protect our waahi tapu / waahi tuupuna from inappropriate subdivision, modification and development that would cause adverse effects on the qualities and features which contribute to the cultural, spiritual and historical values of these sites
Policy 5.4	To protect our heritage by participating in the development of local and central government agencies policy, legislative, planning, review and monitoring processes
Policy 5.5	To advocate for the return of artifacts and other taonga belonging to Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi.
3.5.4 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	“...economic development should not occur at the expense of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi cultural and environmental values. Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi does not support unsustainable exploitation of natural and physical resources. A notable feature of our rohe is the reliance on the region’s natural resources for our social and economic wellbeing. We

	encourage investors to bring business into our rohe. Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi wants economic development in our rohe to be sustainable so that the needs of present generations are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”
--	--

Name discussion

A search of WDC archives discovered a 1983 publication by the Waitotara County Centennial Committee entitled *Bush, People and Pasture*. Chapter 70 Otamatea County Town (pg 134) notes that the settlement was named Otamatea in 1958 via a special resolution of the Waitotara County Council. There were three names proposed: Mannington, Virginia or Otamatea. Otamatea was apparently suggested by the settlers who lived there and won a split vote.

TKOR supports the assertion by Tamareheroto that Otamatea is not an appropriate name and recommends WDC seek advice from the hapuu about a more suitable name.

Zoning

WDC has proposed to re-zone the Otamatea area from “Rural Lifestyle” to “Residential” under the District Plan. We understand that under the current zoning status earthworks can occur without consultation with iwi and hapuu. WDC has proposed to amend this by including a requirement for any development within the Otamatea Structure Plan area to obtain a cultural impact assessment in agreement with tangata whenua. While this is an improvement to the current situation, it reflects deficiencies in the District Plan for protection of cultural values. It is unclear why a cultural impact assessment is not a consideration in any area of development with tangata whenua association and how that can be addressed beyond the Otamatea Structure Plan.

TKOR supports the recommendation in the Otamatea Structure Plan report that the entire Otamatea West area is labeled as an archaeological alert area in the District Plan.

The *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* and Heritage New Zealand provide protections to archaeological sites that have tangata whenua association via the requirement for cultural impact assessments, alongside archaeological assessments, in their authority-granting process. The proposed zoning change appears to only provide additional protection for cultural values if it is accompanied by the Otamatea Structure Plan requirements. The option of rezoning without introducing additional protections is therefore strongly opposed.

While the WDC has identified that earthworks provisions will be triggered with the rezoning, it is not clear to us how this will occur in practice when reviewing the District Plan. This requires further discussion. TKOR also holds concerns regarding the lack of archaeological surveys or cultural impact assessments prior to recent construction activity in the area.

Even given the benefits that would come from the Otamatea Structure Plan, TKOR, in alignment with Tamareheroto’s views, is concerned that the re-zoning to residential will be more permissive of residential development than the current zoning classification. In addition to the implicit direction that this is a suitable area for general residential development, it is also because the change in zoning will allow a higher density of housing in the same area than the current zoning. This increased development

has the potential to accelerate further dissociation from this area. Future opportunities for descendants of this area to reconnect with the whenua may be limited to their ability to purchase land, which is limited by financial status, and/or find a way to develop Papakainga in the area.

While TKOR appreciates the opportunity to provide this report into the process, it is necessary to note that the timing involved has been extremely tight, limiting the ability to explore many of these issues in more detail. It has also limited the scope of the report itself and there is undoubtedly more information available to inform this process, including additional archaeological research. While WDC notes that should their preferred recommendation be endorsed, further attention to cultural values and heritage will be undertaken, it occurs once a commitment to develop sites has been made and not before. This is problematic for coordinated site development. It means the question of setbacks from archaeological sites, or even urupaa should they be discovered, may only be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

2. Additional Recommendations

In addition to the recommendations made by Tamareheroto, we request that WDC:

- Incorporates reference to the Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi Puutaiao Management Plan in the assessment process;
- Recognises Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi and Tamareheroto as affected parties in any developments, consents and plan changes in the Otamatea West area;
- Immediately update the archaeological site information in the District Plan, proactively identify and monitor the need for archaeological authorities, regardless of any decision from the hearing relating to Plan Change 46;
- Seeks the entire Otamatea West area to be labeled as an archaeological alert area in the District Plan and value further archaeological investigations in the area outside of development applications; and
- Offer local hapuu the opportunity to consider renaming the Otamatea West area to a more appropriate name.

ⁱ Held by Te Kaahui o Rauru and Te Ruunanga o Tuupoho.

ⁱⁱ A copy of this document was included in the ONL cultural values document written by Waitai / Hawira, 2017. WDC has a copy of this.

ⁱⁱⁱ Nielsen, Potonga, personal communication.

^{iv} Horwood, M. and Taylor, M. of Archaeology North Ltd. (2011). *Whanganui District Council Historic Place and Archaeological Site Identification Project*.

^v Broughton, A.R. The Origins of Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi.

^{vi} Nielsen, Potonga. Wai 903, #D39. Brief of Evidence, 07/09/2007.

^{vii} Nielsen, Potonga / Waitokia, Tracey. Personal communication.

^{viii} He koorero naa ngaa pahake o Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi.