

Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Oral Submission

Hearing Stream 3

Tuesday 7 December, 1:30pm

*Ko tōku waka kā u ki te whenua
Ka rere tāwhangawhanga te au o
Ko Whitireia me Rangituhi te maunga
Ko Parirua te awa
Ko Raukawa te moana
Ko Te Mana a Kupe te motu
Ko Tainui tōku waka
Ko Ngāti Toa Rangatira tōku iwi
Ko Takapūwāhia me Hongoeka ōku marae
Ko Te Rauparaha tōku tangata
Ko Anahera ahau
He kaimahi au mō Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira*

Kia ora,

My name is Anahera Nin and I whakapapa to Ngāti Toa and I am a Senior RM Advisor for TROTR. Today, I am speaking on behalf of TROTR on the Proposed District Plan (PDP).

I will be addressing points we made in our Submission and Further Submission on the Proposed District Plan on Strategic Directions, Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.

Strategic Directions

This may be the District Plan and may cater for spatial planning and rules and objectives but is this not for an overall purpose? To ensure the health and vibrance of the iwi and community that live in Porirua City? Isn't the purpose of planning our city so we can lead better, healthier lives?

TROTR 264.95 - Amend HCH-02 as follows: "The character and identity of Porirua is reflected through its mana whenua and community throughout the City".

The purpose of our submission point to amend Historic and Cultural Heritage Objective 2 is to reflect in the District Plan our goal for a healthy, vibrant and culturally rich iwi and community.

Historic Heritage

We seek to ensure that when discussing Historic Heritage this clearly and appropriately reflects Māori Historic Heritage. The chapter does not appropriately reflect this relationship. In fact, several of our sites we wished to add to Schedule 4 have been opposed by PCC on the basis that, "they're already addressed in SASM". There are several of our important places that are significant in many historical events to many groups of people, such as Ngāti Toa Domain.

Historic Heritage in Porirua started long before 1840 and even before our heke-mai-i-raro. We have to ensure that the Historic Heritage chapter and the Sites and Areas of Significance chapter are not divided up into “Non-Māori Historic Sites” and “Māori Historic Sites”. Therefore we support adding the sites we requested to Schedule 4 and we indeed support the notion that Historic Heritage should at least provide cross-reference to SASM.

Te Rūnanga must also be informed of **any** unknown archaeological site that is discovered and prior to being removed because not only does this ensure that our sense of place and identity is protected from further degradation but it also provides cultural safety for all who interact with the unknown archaeological site. There have been many incidents in the past where we were not informed of archaeological sites and our tāonga were tampered with. This is not tikanga nor is it safe for anyone interacting with our tāonga or tūpapaku unless the appropriate measures are carried out by Ngāti Toa iwi monitors and/or kaumātua.

We also support the requested addition of New Zealand Wars Memorial on the basis that statements of significance for these sites and all sites within HH and SASM are co-created with and finalised by Ngāti Toa. This site should also be cross-referenced with SASM003.

SASM

Intro

TROTR [264.80] - We wish to include an introductory paragraph that states we have additional sites to add to SCHED4 and SCHED6 as part of the upcoming/next Plan Change process. We have discussed the following introduction:

*Ngāti Toa has additional sites that they seek to be added to SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori of the District Plan. Porirua City Council will continue to work in partnership with Ngāti Toa to add further sites and areas of significance to Ngāti Toa within SCHED6. This will be undertaken through working with the iwi authority Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira in the form of the **next/upcoming** Plan Change.*

SCHEDULE 6

Schedule 6 is not complete without our additional sites therefore PCC will be releasing an incomplete schedule according to the RMA. We were planning this Chapter with PCC as far back as June 2019 to implement SoS from Me Huri Whakamuri. We have advised PCC on what sites we want to be added, when we wanted them to be added by and how we wanted them to be added. We suggested a potential phrase for them to use ‘that this will be done in the future’. They have not followed this and our additional sites may not be appropriately protected. A Plan Change will follow soon but if SASM work is not prioritised then we will lose another opportunity.

To be frank – we expected a better planning process to protect our wāhi tapu and tāonga places.

The SASM protection framework itself is quite restrictive and not nuanced. The current rule framework assumes all sites are important *to the same extent* and the repercussions of this is quite large for Ngāti Toa and the aspirations we have for our iwi. We have created and provided

a framework with different categorisations of the sites. What we like about this process is that our sites are determined *by us for us and our sites*.

Finally, our SoS are not places that anyone else should have a say on. This process should instead be a unilateral process where we should be able add sites as needed including contemporary sites, because the SASM Schedule as it relates to the PCC area is basically the Ngāti Toa Rangatira schedule. An example of this is that we have land gifted back through our Settlement on Whitireia for an ūrupa. However, it is not a wāhi tapu yet. What will happen when the District Plan becomes operative and we bury someone at Whitireia the next day? It will be a wāhi tapu but will not be acknowledged as such in the District Plan.

Treaty Partnership

In order to address the process of our SASM work with PCC, we need to address our Treaty Partnership with PCC. We are not stakeholders; we are Treaty Partners. Iwi trumps all of the submitter's points. We will acknowledge that this Partnership approach to the PDP and process for PCC is new and that the intent was there. However, as of late and especially in relation to the most important part of the District Plan that PCC needed to work with us on (SASM), we have not been engaged in the spirit of Treaty Partnership or within the Treaty Framework.

The planning system is set up where you are either the Developer or Developing the policy. Iwi sit comfortably in both, and PCC needs to understand that the rules are different for Ngāti Toa than everyone else. We've had heaps of hui, provided PCC with answers, but the execution was not followed through with.

Amendments

We'd like to include the following amendments:

- Include Placeholder written *by Ngāti Toa* that includes adding contemporary sites as needed
- Include introductory paragraph for SASM Ch (note that that best practice includes talking to Ngāti Toa/looking at IEMP)
 - Include examples (wāhi tapū)
 - Add additional SASM sites through Plan Change
 - Meet w/ Council, in particular their consenting team, so we can be sure they are interpreting the plan in the way we originally intended.