

APPENDIX 7
MINUTES OF PRE-HEARING ENGAGEMENT

MINUTES OF MEETING

File: 5-WD010.00	Sheet:	Date: 9 Nov 2017	Time: 10.00am
Subject District Plan Change 46 -Otamatea West Submissions Received			
Location Opus Whanganui		Minutes By: Victoria Edmonds (WDC)	
	Persons Present	Organisation	Copy Received
1.	John Maihi	Kaiwhakahaere, Te Rūnanga o Tūpoho	
2.	Anne-Marie Broughton	Kaiwhakahaere, Te Kaahui o Rauru	
3.	Brenda O'Shaughnessy	Principal Planner – Opus (Planning lead on behalf of WDC)	
4.	Hamish Lampp	Principal Planner - WDC	
5	Tracey Waitokia	Project Manager - Whanganui Land Settlement Negotiation Trust	
6	Marama Laurenson	Strategic Lead: Culture and Community - WDC	
7	Raukura (Naani) Waitai	Te Kaahui o Rauru	

Karakia from John Maihi

Introductions

- Everyone introduced themselves and their role in the process.

Summary of PC46 and plan change process from here.

- Brenda outlined the basic PC46 proposal, and background to the proposal and outlined the Council process going forward.
- Adhoc pressures to approve subdivision and development in Otamatea over the years.
- Concerns around how SW and WW would cope with more residential development.
- In 2011/12 Council commissioned investigations into residential development at Otamatea, where it was concluded that the cost of upgrades to the existing WW network was prohibitive based on the limited knowledge of the network available.
- Archaeological assessments were undertaken for both the eastern and western sides of Otamatea and sites recorded in the NZAA database, and steps taken in the design process to avoid areas identified to protect those sites.
- In 2015/16 Council modelled the existing SW and WW networks and in 2015 completed a desktop study to identify projected growth/demand for residential dwellings out to 2065. That information together confirmed that existing services could, with developer contributions, accommodate the projected demand of 630 new dwellings in the wider Otamatea area.
- Purpose of PC46 is to manage the location of projected growth of residential density out to 2065. Plan change also proposes to remove the Otamatea Development Overlay which limits section sizes to 1000m² within areas already zoned Residential.
- **Timing – Hearing 11 December 2017 at Council at 10am and potentially 12 Dec** also if extra time is required– Commissioners appointed. Chair will be Ms Christine Foster from Wgtn.
- An officer's recommendations report will be circulated by 23 November along with invitations to submitters to attend the Hearing.
- Submitters will each be given an opportunity to speak about points raised in their submissions,
- Hearing is open to the public.

Clarification of Submission and concerns

Te Rūnanga o Tūpoho – John Maihi spoke:

- All leaders have said no to both development and rezoning.
- Leaders have given permission for development in the past to happen near Lake Westmere, with support of protecting areas with middens and bones.
- Have already allowed buildings to be built in sacred places.
- If there are parts of the Ngaa Rauru report that can be supported – they will be.
- Concerns around protection mechanisms and them being upheld

Whanganui Iwi LNT – Tracey Waitokia spoke:

- Support for some development in areas from leaders, however no development in Otamatea is wanted.
- Have discussed some areas that need to be protected, previous conversations about building in sacred areas with Council have broken down.
- Consents have been granted without iwi consultation even though areas have been identified as sacred.
- Otamatea has major significance and needs to be protected.
- The Rapanui example is important, especially to learn from as this was a negative experience.
- The bigger picture is important rather than little pockets individually.
- The story and site cannot be separated.
- How does the weighting take place? Who decides to protect or not?
- Concerned about protection mechanisms. What protection is proposed?
- Want entire area to be protected, and any development is the exact opposite of this.

Te Kaahui o Rauru – Naani Waitai spoke and then Anne Marie Broughton:

- Rapanui experience still in mind – urupa was protected but middens were found also around the urupa but building still took place.
- Middens appear to have been deemed an area of lower importance, however everything shares the same level of importance.
- Do not support development or rezoning.
- Current unrecorded sites and their protection are of great concern.
- Consider the whole area as one site, not separate land parcels. Areas without/ beyond the Structure plan area of equal interest.
- The feeling of ‘permission to destruct’ is of concern- Archaeological Authority process.
- Have not been able to have a physical connection with the land (understand that it is in private ownership).
- No confidence in the resource consent process.
- If middens are found, development should not occur.
- Concerned about protection mechanisms.

What outcomes would each party like to achieve through their submission

- Following discussion of outcome achieved by abandoning the plan change, it was acknowledged that retaining the status quo Rural Lifestyle zone over the Otamatea West area, would not on its own achieve protection of identified cultural values, would not achieve reconnection of iwi with the land, would not protect the wellbeing of the land and its people and would not necessarily protect the archaeological items either recorded or unrecorded.
- A key reason that Council initiated a structure plan process in this area, is that there has for some years now been demand for residential development. The most recent example being the extension of Tirimoana Place for residential development even though this land was and still is zoned for Rural Lifestyle development only. This pressure for residential development will continue regardless of the zoning.

Te Rūnanga o Tūpoho

- Protection
 - Better mechanisms need to be developed and upheld
- Reconnection
- Wellbeing of the land and people.
- Areas that haven't been identified need to be.
-

John Maihi and Marama Laureson left the meeting at roughly 10.50am. Anne Marie Broughton left the meeting at around 11.30am prior to the discussion of brainstorming of possible options.

Brainstorming of options followed on how to achieve the outcomes sought in the cultural values report:

- 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.

Whanganui Iwi LNT

- Protection
 - What are the mechanisms? – They need to be identified, developed if need be and upheld. It shouldn't simply be left to the consenting process.
- Reconnection
 - Like the idea of having a heritage zone – an area set aside from development.
 - Having public access would mean that physical reconnection with the land could occur.
- Wellbeing
 - Want a value base to be built.

Te Kaahui o Rauru

- Protection
 - Better mechanisms need to be developed and upheld.
- Reconnection
 - Like the idea of having a heritage zone that would specifically protect known sites.
 - Having public access would mean that physical reconnection with the land could occur.
- Wellbeing

Other Opportunities - Options canvassed:

- Recognise the lack of real protection provided by Heritage NZ Archaeological Authority process.
- Options such as setting aside the arch sites as a zone or overlay in the District Plan– where no land disturbance permitted. Could be incorporated into the public areas or left in private ownership. Options then for more stringent controls over land disturbance.
- Public spaces – walkways and landscape and stormwater areas will be created – so this provides opportunity for the public – including tangata whenua to access the land and thus some form of reconnection with the land could be established.
- Public access as an option - only addresses the recorded sites.
- Options to tell the stories and raise awareness of the significant cultural values and history of this area could also be developed.
- Options around naming conventions for the area and for roads or public spaces could be explored – separate process to RMA but still Council.
- Is it possible to required core samples taken prior to subdivision
 - Can this legally be done –
 - Can this be imposed as a condition of consent?
- The biggest issue is time, and what can be done within this limited timeframe
 - Can we worked on up until hearing
- Would no development achieve the desired outcomes of protection?
 - Do not want a winner and loser

- Feel like there is a breakdown in communication and that iwi have to always repeat themselves at different meetings, feeling that Council staff are not communicating with each other
- All sites are of the same cultural value
- Overarching picture is important
- The commissioner needs to adhere to legislation and natural justice
 - Element of good faith
- Agreement that the area is of high cultural value
- Otamatea is the first structure plan in the Whanganui District Plan
- Mechanisms to protect infrastructure of cultural values
 - How does the council do this?
 -
- Michael Taylor has suggested joining Iwi on the site to identify areas
 - Core samples could be taken at this time
- Want to be involved in the 'lightbulb' moment
 - If not – there is imbalance right from the beginning
- Iwi would like to know (in terms of protection mechanisms)
 - What are the council obligated to do (statutory requirements)
 - Tell them why – not why not
 - What can be done? – What can Iwi add?
 - Mechanisms were generally identified to revolve around requirements for and Archaeological Authority from Heritage NZ, site inspection by archaeologist and iwi representatives during earthworks or exploration. It was acknowledged that these mechanisms alone do not ensure protection of sites. The options discussed above around defining areas set aside for protection and raising awareness are equally if not more important to achieve 'protection' of sites.

Item	Action	By Whom	By When
1.	<p>Check if core sampling by archaeologist prior to subdivision is legally allowed</p> <p>Response: Michael Taylor confirmed that can only take core samples if the site is not thought to be specifically an archaeological item.</p>	Brenda	ASAP
2	<p>Resend link for PC46 (Shaping Whanganui) to everyone</p> <p>Link below:</p> <p>http://www.whanganui.govt.nz/our-district/district-plan-text/phase-6/Pages/default.aspx#link7</p>		
3	<p>Current mechanisms need to be evaluated and new mechanisms need to be developed together</p>	Everyone	No specific timeframe suggested