



Theresa Burkhardt

Submission# 580

@ FADC
- gaut
2022

Remember submissions close at 5pm, Friday 21 October 2022

Proposed District Plan submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

Form 5: Submission on Proposed Far North District Plan

TO: Far North District Council

This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for the Far North District.

1. Submitter details:

Full Name:	HAAMI PIRIPI ONZM		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)	N/A - ON OWN BEHALF		
Contact person (if different):	N/A		
Full Postal Address:	PO BOX 54025, MANA, PORIRUA		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 0274419426	Home: (04)2338953	Work: N/A
Email (please print):	hpiripi@gmail.com		

2. (Please select one of the two options below)

- I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
- I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete point 3 below

3. I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
- (A) Adversely affects the environment; and
 - (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition
- I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
- (A) Adversely affects the environment; and
 - (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition

Note: if you are a person who could gain advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are:

(please provide details including the reference number of the specific provision you are submitting on)

PLEASE REFER TO ATTACHED SUBMISSION



Confirm your position: Support Support In-part Oppose
(please tick relevant box)

My submission is:
(Include details and reasons for your position)

REFER TO SUBMISSION ATTACHED

I seek the following decision from the Council:
(Give precise details. If seeking amendments, how would you like to see the provision amended?)

AS ABOVE

I wish to be heard in support of my submission
 I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission
(Please tick relevant box)

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
 Yes No

Do you wish to present your submission via Microsoft Teams?
 Yes No

Signature of submitter:
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date: 12/7/23

(A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

Important information:

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions (5pm 21 October 2022)
2. Please note that submissions, including your name and contact details are treated as public documents and will be made available on council's website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan Review.
3. Submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

To : Far North District Council

Attention: llani.harding@fndc.govt.nz

From: Haami Piripi ONZM

Chief of Ahipara

Cc Northland Regional Council – Chair Tui Shortland

E te Kaunihera tenā koe, e ngā kaiwhakahaere matua e ngā apiha, e ngā hāpu ō; tēnei te mihi ki a koutou katoa i runga i te mana o mātou tūpuna ki te whenua. No rātou te hononga e tātai nei ki te whei ao, ki te ao, ki te ao mārama. Anei hoki o rātou reo, hei poutokomanawa mo te iwi, anā he purapura whetu i tēnei wā o Matariki.

This submission builds upon the existing provenance and evidence of cultural and historical information relating to the importance of “rākau” to the wellbeing of our people. And the context for that issue is the historical wanton destruction of forested land by colonial settlers and the institutions they have established. Having been alienated from the corridors of power within these local government bodies there has been generations of neglect of information fonts of kaitiakitanga and a culminating disrespect for our culture and our people. The notion of significant trees is one of these areas with the emphasis falling more on historical than cultural. Consequently, processes over the years have fallen into disuse and in places even forgotten by some of the communities involved. But that should in no way detract from an institutional obligation with local government to sustain its importance on behalf of the community.

End the case of Morangai this I believe is exactly what has occurred, and the ineptitude of the system has enabled the resulting scenario to disempower and disingenuously dispossess my people of our land and mana at Morangai.

And this has continued into contemporary arrangements when the Environment Court surreptitiously removed the protective status from the tree and essentially made the tree available for modification by the promoters and residents of the housing development.

According to our records neither were we consulted, and it was not until the tree why was damaged that we became aware that the tree which is of significant to all of us in Ahipara had been damaged.

He Rakau Whakemarumarū

This submission affirms the prevailing view of the Māori community at Ahipara about the significance of the Pohutukawa tree located at Morangai (an ancient site of Māori occupation) which has been a site approved by Council for housing development causing local controversy.

The Pohutukawa tree itself has a rich provenance within our history and the area has long been a convergence point for travellers (by sea and by land) and an ideal location for convening hui and other gatherings including more recently Land Court sittings facilitating the fitting and pākehā acquisition of māori land.

The cultural and historical significance is already well understood by the council right from the start when our elders first enabled pākehā settlers to utilise and occupy the area.

Considerable evidence was produced by the Ministry of Cultural Heritage around that cultural significance and specific reports identifying aspects off the site that had cultural importance for its ongoing management.

This included the determination there are at least two burial sites within the development, a stream significant enough to be mentioned in the settler account and a Pohutukawa tree which stood on the site of an earlier marae and subsequently all that was relocated to its present site at Korou Kore.

It is a tree that was planted by our tupuna as was the Pohutukawa tree at Te Awapatiki at Te Kohanga (Shipwreck). The provenance for this was considered by council and led to a decision that was supported by tangata whenua at that time. However, a subsequent appeal to the Environment Court by the developer revised the prior arrangement to create one further section for selling and by halving the area set aside as a historical reserve removing and negating the face "of the development and in doing so the protection that had been put in place by agreement for the tree that we are discussing.

It is yet to be determined how compliant the council has been in this action but there are a number of issues for us that indicate a hidden agenda and unusual practices that included not consulting with local or wider iwi representative and a hearing convened by the Chief Judge of the Environmental Court that our people were unaware of.

I believe there is a cause for concern if the record reveals any collusion by agencies in that process and that must include both councils and their committees.

However, that action is for another day. My submission is that the establishment of that housing development upon our ancestral land has detrimentally impacted on the integrity of the parties concerned who have through the stroke of a pen upon the desire of an individual it seems removed and discarded the cloak of protection we had agreed for our tree. Moreover, the finally approved planning consent actually endangered the tree further, denoting its significance and almost promoting it as being dispensable to potential purchasers of adjacent land. On that basis I expect that as a matter of good government the cultural significance of the tree must be reinstated as a first step toward an adequate resolution of this problem which has not at any point been created by us.

I make this submission as a descendant of two of the five original rangatira who sold the first 5 acres to James Berghan and also as a cultural representative of the hapu and iwi of Ahipara.