

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Kia ora koutou

Ko Stella August tōku ingoa and I am here today on behalf of the Kairakau Lands Trust.

Thank you for having me here today. I would like to acknowledge the Commissioners for your dedication to Te Taiao and mihi to Mayor Alex and her team at the CHBDC for the work they do.

We have just had two days of wānanga for Hearing Stream 4 – Tangata Whenua Matters that I found very valuable and am grateful to be a part of. I really appreciated the chance to sit down together and share feelings, thoughts and experiences to increase our knowledge and understanding of the various matters and move forward. So thank you for that opportunity.

Today I will discuss the following submission points. I noted from the first hearing how useful examples were, so I have endeavoured to illustrate my points with examples today.

### Subdivision

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Plan Chapter</b>	<b>Provision</b>
S84.015	Subdivision	Subdivision

### Earthworks

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Provision</b>
S84.014	General District-Wide matters	Earthworks

## 2.0 SUBDIVISION

2.1 Just for clarity, when I talk about subdivision, I am referring to creating separate parcels of land for, for example; lifestyle blocks, house sections, farm parks, commercial operations, and housing developments.

When I talk about development, I am talking about improving conditions and in a broad sense; eg. in farming this could refer to activities to increase production eg. ploughing paddocks, but it could also mean improving services such as roading.

And when I talk about changing land use, I mean a change from its current use to a different use and we all know this is happening rapidly.

2.2 The SASM Schedule in the PDP has very few cultural sites listed and therefore, in its current state has little value. As a result of this, the PDP should take an extremely cautious approach in relation to cultural and historic sites.

2.3 The current provisions and processes are not adequate at protecting our cultural sites and landscapes. We submitted that the PDP should require:

2.3.1 The New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme (ArchSite) should be checked in all instances where a subdivision, development and a change of land use is occurring. This will ensure that recorded archaeological sites are identified.

2.3.2 A Cultural Impact Assessment should take place when a subdivision or development or change of land use occurs within 100m of a recorded archaeological site.  
Eg. Afforestation with SPAR.  
Some sites were recorded but it was expected that there were many unrecorded sites (over 50 new sites identified – many containing more than one feature).  
Through this process we were able to agree on a result that benefited both parties (eg. skyline, buffers, earthworks).  
Eg. Homestead subdivision.  
Through this process we were able to agree on a result that benefited both parties.  
This ensures both recorded and unrecorded sites are identified through process, (no need to involve an archaeologist).

2.3.3 A Cultural Impact Assessment (CIAs) should take place when a subdivision, development or change of land use occurs in an area of known Māori occupation or a cultural landscape.  
Eg. Housing development at Pouterere. No recorded sites in area to be developed, only nine recorded sites in ArchSite in wider Pouterere area, but as this was an area that was occupied by Māori up to and after European settlement, we expect there are many unrecorded sites. An Archaeological Assessment and a CIA are being done in this instance because of the Māori history of settlement and occupation in this area.  
The result of a CIA and the sharing of information is to come up with solutions that suit all parties to minimise the effect of the development.  
Eg. Water upgrade at Kairakau Beach.

- 2.3.4 There is increasing housing development in the rural environment. Proposed house sites should be checked by an archaeologist when they are within 100m of a recorded archaeological site or within a known cultural landscape.  
Eg. House by garden rows.  
It should become common practice for people planning to build a house to undertake an Archaeological Assessment as they would a Geotech Report. An archaeological authority from HNZ may be required if there is the possibility there may be archaeology. This process does not necessarily prevent a house from being built. An authority means if there is any archaeology, it is recorded, and the potential scientific information is not lost or ignored.  
Eg. Pre-turf house sites and driveways.
- 2.4 An Accidental Discovery Protocol should be used in instances where there is a low chance of archaeology.
- 2.5 A thorough archaeological survey of the entire district would provide some certainty about the location of archaeological sites for future planning and development.
- 2.6 A cultural overlay (or polygon), as part of a GIS layer (that could incorporate NZAA ArchSite information), could be used to identify sites where exact locations of SASMs did not want to be disclosed for various reasons. It would advise who to talk to and their contact information.
- 2.7 We do not support any subdivision, development or change of land use to waahi tapu, those sites or areas that are spiritual, revered and sacred to tangata whenua such as urupā, pā, tūāhu and battle sites (to name a few).

### 3.0 EARTHWORKS

3.1 Our submission was concerned that there were no specific objectives or policies relating to ensuring that cultural sites were protected by earthworks in the Earthworks component of the Plan.

3.1.1 The Section 42 report advises this issue is addressed by other parts of the PDP such as the SASM chapter. We submit that cultural and historic sites should be mentioned, and those other relevant sections of the PDP should be referred to here so that this Earthworks section is not read in isolation of those other parts of the PDP.

3.2 We also asked that Council employ earthworks contractors who have had sufficient training or a certain level of competency regarding recognising sites of significance to Māori.

3.2.1 The Section 42 report stated this was a matter of operational policy for Council, and not something that can be achieved through the provisions of the Plan. We accept this position but would like to stress this is one way Council (albeit operationally) can start to change the colonial mindset.  
Eg. terraces cut through for farm tracks and water tables. Some damage is unnecessary and completely avoidable.

Thank you for your time, and I am happy to take questions.