

## Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

<b>Submitter No.</b>	S116
<b>Submitter Name</b>	Kathryn Bennie
<b>Submitter first name</b>	Kathryn
<b>Submitter middle name</b>	Anne
<b>Submitter surname</b>	Bennie
<b>Submitter is contact</b>	Yes
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:hollyburn@xtra.co.nz">hollyburn@xtra.co.nz</a>
<b>Wish to be heard</b>	No
<b>Joint presentation</b>	No
<b>Trade competition</b>	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
<b>Directly affected</b>	N/A
<b>Withhold contact details?</b>	No

## Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 200	Oppose	<p>Ko Aoraki tōku maunga Ko Arawata tōku awa Ko Te Wharerimu tōku tūpuna Nō Whenua Hou ahau Kei Ōkahu tōku kāinga ināianeī Ko Kathryn Bennie ahou</p> <p>Yes I am Māori but I am also a New Zealander.</p> <p>My submission is mainly with regard to our property at Jackson Bay. It is also very relevant to surrounding areas in South Westland that have been identified as sites and areas of significance to Māori.</p> <p>Because the Te Tai o Poutini plan requires significant areas to be listed I feel that Poutini Ngai Tahu would be better supported if they concentrated on Crown land and not private land. Crown land can be looked at under a wider umbrella with less complication than private property owned by New Zealanders including those of Māori descent.</p> <p>I agree that places with a physical significance like urupā, kōiwi, tuhituhi o neherā &amp; whakairo as examples could be included. I am not undervaluing the spiritual values &amp; Mauri ora of the whenua as I believe the country as a whole encompasses this special significance, not just individual sites and areas. This would respect the rights of private property owners who at present feel vulnerable with this proposal.</p> <p>To be be honest, Māori can look at the whole of NZ as being of interest to them. This does not mean it is any more significant to them than the thousands of immigrants who came to NZ and settled as Pakeha. The Italians, Polish, German &amp; Irish people who came to Jackson Bay in 1875 can also claim that the area had a significant impact on their life but they are not staking an interest claim. In many instances descendants are still on the land their ancestors settled on just like many Maori families.</p> <p>If Poutini Ngai Tahu looked through the eyes of their tūpuna at Jackson Bay they would have seen kāinga boundaries as being slopes, creeks, hill top vantage points, mahinga kai areas etc. Tūpuna would not have used colonial boundaries as their descendants have done in identifying land they claim is of significance to Māori.</p> <p>Interesting that little in the DOC estate at Jackson Bay has been noted of significance and all private property has been identified. I am not convinced that the reasoning behind in the selection of Jackson Bay sites is transparent &amp; done with the best interests of everyone, Māori included at heart.</p> <p>It appears that Poutini Ngai Tahu have missed an oven &amp; flakes site using their colonial boundaries. With this in mind, how can I not question their legitimacy when the TTPP information sheet claims that a "robust process was undertaken to identify these important sites and areas"?</p> <p>If my family property at Jackson Bay is significant to Maori I would like Poutini Ngai Tahu to provide proof that their ancestors actually lived on my property. If not, then my property and others should not be included. Legally, I doubt this would stand in court.</p> <p>Maori inhabited and settled over most of NZ. Jackson Bay, like these rest of NZ shared a part in our rich Maori history. As such, historical taonga can and does turn up in Jackson Bay, as it does in any other part of NZ.</p> <p>Archeology NZ registered locations in Jackson Bay show three sites that have proven Māori history. E37/14 is on DOC land adjacent to the Moana and Joe's creek. Weirdly, this does not appear to have been included in the sites and areas of significance to Maori. Site E37/4 is at the side of a section leased by Westland District Council and is on road reserve. The remaining site is on DOC Reserve land. My family property has no site registered against it.</p> <p>The 8 December 1880 land slip that engulfed much of Jackson bay changed the whenua significantly. It also tragically took the life of 14yr old Charles Robinson. Much of the original area was buried beneath the slip. My family property, like others around me has been built on top of that slip material. The original whenua is buried deep beneath.</p> <p>I realise that my family property, like all the others identified in Jackson Bay have no rules adjacent to their titles. If they have no rules they should not be included in the the Te Tai o Poutini plan. Obviously there is no real concern by Poutini Ngai Tahu or there would be rules. There is however a facility to add rules in the future. That tells me that once the plan becomes operational it will only be a matter of time when amendments will be made and slipped into place. There is no mention of what these rules may be in the future.</p> <p>The moana surrounding Jackson Bay has also been identified. The moana is there for all to gather kai moana. Regardless of wether it is recorded in the TTPP or not ancestral rights are not affected as no one is preventing the customary gathering of kai moana.</p> <p>With regards to the management of kai moana resources MPI do a great job in conjunction with local iwi to keep the area protected and sustainable. Fishing regulations are constantly reviewed and amended if needed. I see no reason to change this. I am concerned that restrictions will be placed by Poutini Ngai Tahu in the future that could prevent, hinder or limit every day New Zealanders from gathering kai. From the Te Tai o Poutini maps the wharf is included. Does this mean that restrictions could be imposed on its use in the future once the plan becomes operational?</p> <p>Two wrongs don't make a right. The treaty was supposed to regard everyone as one people, not a divided people. We cant reverse the damage done with the original treaty having been deliberately manipulated in favour of European gains to the detriment of Māori. To move forward as one people, as intended by the original treaty private land should not be included in any areas of significance unless it can be physically proven to be of significance. Crown land should be the only option.</p> <p>To make the plan operational as it stands, will only divide our blended nation of New Zealanders more by spear heading the racial dis harmony that is being created of late. Proposals such as this one do not help at all. This is not the way forward.</p>	<p>That the Te Tai o Poutini committee reconsider the amount of sites deemed to be of significance to Māori and in doing so remove that interest from my property</p>

Documents included with submission

None