

## **OTAMATEA ENGAGEMENT MEETING**

**Thursday 15 February 2018 at Cooks Gardens Event Centre**

**Facilitator:** Reginal Proffit

Note taker: Leayne Huirua

### **Heritage Alert Overlay**

Present: Raukura Naani Waitai, Keryn Amon, Michael Taylor, Jill Sheehy, Mariana Waitai, Nicola Patrick, Damien Wood, Hamish Lampp, Brenda O'Shaughnessy, Tina Rupuha-Green, Pania Winterburn, John Maihi.

Apologies: Mahalia Tapa-Mosen, Anne-Marie Broughton, Marty Davis

Mihi / introductions

'How we roll' – all agreed with meeting protocols.

Clarification on 'collective iwi'. Refer to as 'Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru'

### **Discussion**

Through introductions it was clear all parties attended in good will and intent to make progress forward in good faith.

Values identified confirmed as those of the iwi and are defined in the Interim Cultural Values Report (ICVR). PC46 confirmed as framework as to how these will be managed in light of any proposed development.

Discussion had from Whanganui me Nga Rauru noted ICVR provided insight as to the values and relationship with the whenua but to be able to build framework need to understand these in light of type of development. This concern from iwi partly due to need to have certainty and security as to the means of management given this will be decided on by Council. Council have insight but do not understand these values and relationships. Therefore put forward and agreed by all parties that ICVR needed more work at broad level as to potential implications of this type of development at a high level on values.

Iwi also noted the compressed timeframe they had to develop ICVR and as such it was called an Interim as always intention it needed more work.

## **Agreed**

1. Cultural Values Report
  - a. Further work to be done on basis that values and relationship statements in ICVR provide insight only.
  - b. Practical implications of type of development at broad/high level will provide understanding needed to guide the development and application of provision framework.
  - c. Once completed, work will begin to develop / confirm incorporation of values and relationship into framework.
  
2. Cultural Impact Assessment

Use of CIA acknowledged as being appropriate tool at time of subdivision / land development and therefore still to be applied as part of DP framework when development is proposed for a defined site.
  
3. Timing - 14 weeks until the hearing is reconvened.
  - a. Six weeks for Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru CVR completion. A workplan has already been partly if not completed in draft and intention is for regular interaction with Council over this time.
  - b. Following two weeks, WDC will review and provide revised framework to Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru and all other parties.
  - c. Following four weeks, all submitters review framework and provide comment to WDC.
  - d. Following two weeks, WDC to finalise framework reflecting Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru and any other parties feedback and present to Commissioners

Canvassed opportunity to go over fundamental changes in approach Council has proposed in the latest amended *WDC Revised Hearing Report R2 version (R2)* circulated 12 February. However Iwi made it clear they were not in a position to discuss nor would they go into those in any detail. Council presented an overview/summary of the approach taken and key changes in the R2 version as a means to show extent of shift in thinking as a result of evidence shared through the hearing process.

In response to a question from Mr Amon the regulatory frame proposed under the Heritage Alert Overlay, and how it would apply, was covered as he sought greater understanding from a practical nature when undertaking development. This was useful and appreciated by all participants as providing useful insight to the management framework and all iwi representatives noted the visible shift made by Council and that this was positive.

## **Agreed**

- Indicative level agreement to timing, but details to be confirmed / agreed to.
- Provisional offer of Council commissioning CVR work.
- Change name of Heritage Alert Overlay to Culture Alert Overlay.

Tentative date of meeting (Council officers and Whanganui mi Ngaa Rauru) of Monday 19 February at 1pm to discuss CVR scope and confirmation of commissioning completion.

**Meeting closed 12.30pm**

### **Structure Plan (Appendix L) Road 3**

Present: Damian Wood, Brenda O'Shaughnessy, Shane Stanfield, Graham Lillington, Keryn Amon.

Apologies: Geoff Underwood, Hamish Lampp, Letitcia Jarrett (NZTA)

Mr Lillington advised that in the past, NZTA has given consent for new accesses to be formed along SH3. Mr Lillington noted difficulty he is having as to proposed development plans for his property. This is attributed to NZTA's restrictions and the influence the structure plan, specifically the access way shown across the Underwood property linking to his. He requests deletion of the indicative road going through the Underwood property. He also stated he speaks on behalf of Mr Underwood as well.

Council noted in developing the structure plan, it sought to implement good planning practise and as such was bound by NZTA guidelines. Council noted this was a 50 year plan and Council needs to show connectivity for development of this area. Issues around future-setting planning were explained and a range of alternative access routes were discussed but all were dismissed.

Parties were separated on fundamental differences and no resolution reached.

**Meeting closed 3.45pm**

**Otamatea Cultural Values Report Presentation to Whanganui District Council  
12 April 2018, 10.30am**

**Attendees:** Brenda O’Shaughnessy, Hamish Lampp, Marama Laurenson (WDC), Beryl Miller, Jill Sheehy, Mahalia Tapa-Mosen, Naani Waitai, Tracey Waitokia, Ken Mair, John Maihi, Tina Rupuha-Green, Nicola Patrick (Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi)

Karakia by John

Mihi by Ken

Welcome by Marama

Opening comments by Ken highlighting the importance of Otamatea. He noted the urupa discovery at Rapanui Road and the possibility of similar discoveries at Otamatea. The significance of any discoveries of koiwi or other taonga was critical. Bones would not be shifted.

Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi continue to oppose the plan change. Ken noted the value and risk around different levels of reports at different stages in plan changes and development proposals. It was important to ensure developers did not misunderstand the needs for appropriate assessment at a future stage. This also required the developer to assess the full picture rather than their small part in a wider landscape. Tracey highlighted that the cultural impacts begin from the earliest stages.

Mahalia spoke to the Heritage Alert Overlay and that the section highlighted the limitations with this tool. Brenda checked that this was analysis of the original overlay, which Mahalia confirmed for completeness.

The cultural values framework set the framework. The discussion would highlight the values.

Te Kotahitangi was more than unity as a people; it was with the land and waters. We are seeking this value to permeate, and move away from “people control” wording/concepts. Watch for “manage resources” language as a negative reinforcement – use “with” and “relationship”, and be specific with “land” rather than “resources”.

Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tupuna – this place is not just a collective of sites and has a relationship with the wider landscape. However there is also a hierarchy within the sites with koiwi being highest level. Cultural monitoring on site was expected, funded by developers.

Mana Whenua – recognises the alienation and loss of land, and the plan change has the potential to facilitate permanence to the alienation. The 20% set aside in association with the Council development contribution. Some of this would be vested with Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiihahi and some with Council. It could take into account some of the water management necessary. It was not seen as an exclusive area; however, the value of

sustaining the environment (Te Kotahitanga) was fundamental. Ken noted it may mean the title is with the iwi, not unlike the Whanganui River.

Marama and Brenda asked questions to this level.

Naani spoke to her day site visit. She spoke about getting a true connection to the place and being able to stay there created opportunity for connection. The geography of the place showed some sense to the land. It was different to visiting a park for a couple of hours.

Ken spoke to the opportunity this presented as a template and model. The key was an opportunity to reaffirm connection. It would require further discussion with the developer and Council.

Brenda clarified that the development contribution would kick in with a specific subdivision development proposal. Tracey noted the intention to uphold the intent at the highest level so it would be clear with developers at the next levels.

John highlighted the process undertaken with the Whanganui River claims and the creation of the Paakaitore Trust that involved the Crown, Council and iwi, with the long-term intention for the iwi to hold the land in time.

Mana Wai – a number of considerations are listed with a focus on management and avoiding contamination.

Ken noted the avoiding the use of customary rights but the terminology Tupuna rights as a wider concept.

Te Reo – the naming of streets and other locations was highlighted as being with Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi.

Whanau Ora – How this development could contribute to the betterment of our people, e.g. a discussion regarding a first right of refusal with developers was highlighted as being outside the Council.

Rau Hoskings design principles for sustainability – Marama highlighted that he had previously given advice to the Council and this was being retrieved.

Hamish asked about the density – what was high or low? Ken noted it was really about the sustainability and impacts on the land rather than a number.

Kaitiakitanga – this included the sustainability of the development overall, including eco-sourced vegetation and other elements.

Atua-tanga – this value was described to help guide developers in not working against the environment.

John highlighted calls for blessings in that area, including across Great North Road, and that the values had wider reach than the Otamatea area alone. Tracey said that the presence wasn't always physical.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi – this section puts emphasis on the relationships and the RMA. With regard to the RMA, it highlights Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi support for “restricted discretionary” with suggestions on what matters to consider.

Brenda noted that the requirement for a CIA for every small proposal could be sized for appropriate scale where a straightforward sign-off was agreeable. She said it would be fit-for-purpose. Naani noted that sometimes what was minor to the Council may not be minor to Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi.

Brenda said she saw Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi as making that decision. She said the start point would be with Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi, but wanted to offer multiple pathways, e.g. a CIA. She said there were times when a CIA may not be necessary, e.g. within an area that Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi was responsible for.

Marama suggested communications protocols to help build trust.

Ken spoke to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and that the relationship was based on Tupuna values; moving from MOU models to higher level values that have legal effect. We want to ensure our relationship is given the appropriate substance.

Marama said there were many statutory obligations to drive the Council behaviour. She was seeking ways to help influence improvement and welcomed Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi input.

Ken said he was happy for further discussions to follow as useful with Whanganui me Ngaa Rauru Kiiitahi.

John closed with karakia.

Closed 11.35am

