

Queenstown Lakes District Council, Plan Change 54

Tanya Stevens, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu: Summary of Evidence

Tēnā koutou,

Ko Tanya Stevens ahau. My role is Senior Policy Advisor, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Te Rūnanga).

The Hāwea/Wānaka block, also known as Sticky Forest, has its origins in the colonisation of New Zealand. Between 1844-1864 ten major land purchases were negotiated by the Crown with Ngāi Tahu. Contractual agreements made between parties were not honoured, and Ngāi Tahu was left largely landless.

Investigations, of varying rigor and effort, were undertaken by Crown agents between 1886 and 1905 which identified the landlessness issue amongst Ngāi Tahu, and also the fundamental effect that that had on the tribe. Ngāi Tahu relied not just on ownership of land itself, but the ability to access and use resources to support economic and social well-being. Ultimately, it placed Ngāi Tahu people in a state of severe poverty.

The South Island Landless Natives Act 1906 provided a means for title to allocated land blocks to be transferred to landless "natives". Nearly all blocks were transferred except four, one being the Hāwea/Wānaka block.

The four outstanding blocks were included in the Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997 and a process for the transfer of those blocks to successors of beneficial owners set out.

The Hāwea/Wānaka block was originally located at Manuhaea/"The Neck" (Orokotewhatu). That land was not available at the time of settlement, as such Sticky Forest was identified as a replacement block.

As the panel is aware Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest is landlocked. For it to be a meaningful allocation of land to the successors of beneficial owners, access is necessary. The Plan Change includes provision of access to Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest which Te Rūnanga supports.

From a planning perspective I have considered proposed Plan Change 54. Following from the evidence of Ms Ellis the outstanding matters for me to highlight are:

- Rule 15.2.3.4(xx) essentially makes subdivision in area B6 a non-complying activity if access isn't provided to Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest. As a non-complying activity I was concerned that an assessment of the activity against relevant objectives and policies of the plan was not sufficiently clear or robust. The applicant has agreed to an amendment to Policy 3.1 which I support:
- Policy 3.1 To ensure that roading is integrated with existing development, and the existing road network, ~~and with~~ including provision for legal vehicle and infrastructure servicing access to Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest (to the west).
- Te Rūnanga also sought greater clarification to Objective 3, being:
Development that is well-connected internally and to networks outside the zone including access to Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest.

In my opinion the amendment simply provides clarity to the existing drafting.

- I also support amendments to the drafting of Rule 15.2.3.4(xx) proposed by Te Arawhiti and agreed to by the applicant.

Te Rūnanga submission proposes that references to Sticky Forest within the Plan Change should instead be "Hāwea/Wānaka – Sticky Forest" to reflect the origins of the block in the South Island Landless Natives Act 1906, the Ngāi Tahu settlement, and the colloquial term for the block. The section 42A report recommends that this is rejected and instead suggests awaiting a more formal name, potentially through the Environment Court process.

I consider "Hāwea-Wānaka – Sticky Forest" an appropriate means to reference the block. In my experience place names and the way that we talk about places is important. For that reason I disagree with the section 42A report on this matter and consider that a change to how the block is referenced in this plan change is necessary. I note that the successors may seek a formal name change in the future, but I consider that amending the references used in Plan Change 54 is appropriate regardless as it better reflects the genesis of the block rather than simply the colloquial term used.

I welcome any questions.