

Online submission

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

Submitter No.	S209
Submitter Name	Helen Carter
Submitter first name	Helen
Submitter surname	Carter
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	wanakamusic@gmail.com
Wish to be heard	No
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Policies	Oppose	<p>SASM44 Rapahoe to Nine Mile</p> <p>I own a property within the SASM44 Rapahoe to Nine Mile area. I understand the overall intentions of the TTPP document and agree with most of it. However, I do have concerns about some of the wording.</p> <p>History</p> <p>Since owning the property, I have been fascinated with the local history, of both the Maori and European settlers. However, in relation to SASM44 I would like clarification from Ngai Tahu as to why the cliff top where my house is situated is an area of Significance and what is specifically meant by the vague title of 'Ancestors Embedded in the Landscape'. I can find no historic proof to back this up and I have asked the council for clarification with no answer. As an intrepid explorer from the past, if I had to travel from Rapahoe to Barrytown I would do so along the beach at low tide, and not cut a pathway over the top of the cliff which is often steep and unforgiving. The fact that the mail coach used this pathway along the beach before the road was put in would certainly corroborate the fact that there was no direct pathway along the cliff made by the early Maoris. I can find no specific mention of the area between the road and the cliff in any Maori history document and although the Maori travelled up the coast to find Pounamu I would question their right to an area which was merely a route from one place to another. I do not believe that the cliff above the beach, where my property is situated is an area of significance to Maori. I am happy to be proved wrong if Ngai Tahu can provide evidence to the contrary. Consequently my first issue is with the fact that this has been labelled a SASM.</p> <p>Back to the TTPP document. I have concerns about this wording:</p> <p>Recognise and provide for the exercise of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga by Poutini Ngāi Tahu in decisions made in relation to identified sites and areas of significance in Schedule Three.</p> <p>Although the English definitions are not given for these words (have we learnt nothing from history!) my understanding of tino rangatiratanga is that it can mean "full exclusive and undisturbed possession" of the land as well as potentially "domination", "control", "rule", "power". Am I happy that another group of people are wanting to use this language in relation to land I own? No. This needs to be re-worded.</p> <p>I am also concerned about this wording: Poutini Ngāi Tahu are able to access, maintain and use areas and resources of cultural value within identified sites, areas and cultural landscapes</p> <p>Whereas I understand the intentions behind this statement this effectively gives Ngai Tahu the right to access my property. Putting in place vague legalities could end up causing issues in the future.</p> <p>Once again later in the document it says the following: Measures are taken to maintain or enhance the ability of Poutini Ngāi Tahu to access and use the site or area of significance for mahinga kai, karakia, monitoring, cultural activities and ahi kā roa.</p> <p>That 'access' word again AND ahi kā roa – absolute authority. And a third time here:</p> <p>Any practical mechanisms to maintain or enhance the ability of Poutini Ngāi Tahu to access and use the site or area of significance for karakia, monitoring, cultural activities and ahi kā roa</p> <p>There's a common theme; several times it has mentioned that Ngai Tahu have the right (legal right?) to access my property if they choose, for food gathering, cultural activities and have absolute authority over my land. There's probably no good reason that this would ever happen, but why then put it in a document? This needs to be changed.</p> <p>My only other concerns were about making changes to property footprint or earthworks in SASM and changes to this needing to go through Ngai Tahu, but it looked like these weren't directly applicable to SASM44. It does, however, sound like a lot of extra paperwork which could potentially be costly (will Ngai Tahu be taking a fee for this? Will this become a money gathering activity?) and it looks time consuming. Adding in Ngai Tahu to every decision in governance would seem to me to be impractical, time consuming, expensive and not really allowing for the smooth running of the local authority. Please contact me if you require anything else. Helen Carter wanakamusic@gmail.com</p>	Removal of the SASM on the area between Rapahoe and Nine Mile/Kotorepi. Request English definitions to Maori phrases and the removal of the words for 'absolute authority' and also 'access' when applied to privately owned properties

Documents included with submission

None