

CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT SEMINAR OUTLINE AND ARRANGEMENTS

1) Background

- a) During work on the first HFG State of Environment Report it was identified that most of the planning instruments within the Gulf did not contain effects based methods for managing impacts on cultural heritage. Subsequently a project for the development of guidelines for effects based heritage planning was approved by the Forum. These guidelines would outline both templates for plan content, and would propose development of tools for cultural heritage management.
- b) Capacity to address cultural heritage management varies greatly across agencies in the Gulf. ARC has full time staff, and has developed the CHI as a data base for the Auckland Region. Some Auckland Region councils have staff members dedicated to heritage management. The Waikato Region does not have an equivalent to the CHI, and most councils in the region lack dedicated staff members with specific cultural heritage responsibilities.
- c) In the Auckland Region the heritage managers from councils, along with Historic Places Trust staff, have formed an informal Liaison Group which meets regularly. Waikato Region has no similar group. When the proposed guideline project was first presented to the Auckland Liaison Group they supported it in principle, but were cautious about committing time to it. More recently they have indicated that the council staff in general do not see value for them in the project. However, the HPT staff continue to express support.

2) Effects based planning for cultural heritage resources

- a) The nature of effects based planning in this context has been discussed in detail in an earlier paper received by the Forum. Simply put, much current heritage management depends on schedules of landscapes, sites, objects etc which have planning protection. Actions arising from this type of methodologies often involve arguments as to whether a particular site should have protection or be placed on a schedule. For instance, should a 1890s house in the path of a highway development be protected or demolished? In such instances effects based planning is less relevant, as simple prescriptive methods are available.
- b) However there is another category of heritage resources – those which are unknown or unrecorded prior to potential impacts of development. At times these involve post-contact examples, such as a brick-lined well beneath an existing building. But by far the greater number of instances involve pre-European Maori sites and landscapes. While the proposed guidelines would be available to be applied to all heritage management, they will most frequently be relevant to these Maori heritage resources. These include, for example, middens below soil level uncovered during initial soil disturbance of a subdivision, and pa sites which lack formal identification or protection. While these all have status under the HPA, and HPT has a responsibility for them, it is under the RMA that appropriate management of impacts can be best developed.

- c) The ARC's CHI is a tool which can enable improved effects based management of heritage resources. The CHI has been used to an extent to construct alert layers, in terms of which a precautionary approach can be used in identified areas. It is therefore understandable to an extent that the Auckland Liaison Group members do not see the development of planning guidelines and the development of tools and methodologies as having priority for their councils.
- d) Despite this response, it is probable that development of guidelines would be valuable within the Auckland Region. While approaching the only existing relevant group to discuss the project made sense, it is those outside that group, such as those in the Waikato Region, for whom the guidelines would be of greatest benefit. It is the task of the Forum to develop integrated management across the Gulf, and the guidelines are intended as a tool to achieve that for heritage management.
- e) As with the recent HGF's HGMPA guidance document, the cultural heritage guidelines will be of value not only to the statutory agencies with responsibility for planning instrument development, but also for those hapu, iwi and community agencies and individuals who submit to plans, and respond to resource consent applications. The relative lack of interest of the Auckland Liaison Group is therefore only partially relevant to our project.

3) Where to from here?

- a) While any guidance document will have relevance across all heritage resources, it is Maori heritage resources which are more frequently impacted. Iwi and hapu resource management practitioners frequently become engaged with potential and actual impacts on these resources because:
 - i) Only tangata whenua in an area can legitimately speak for those resources
 - ii) Often the resources lack the public profile of post-contact heritage – eg a midden is often seen as a pile of shells with little tangible value, whereas a colonial cottage can be far more compelling. It is therefore often only tangata whenua who become advocates for these taonga.
 - iii) Many in the mainstream, including professional planners, consider heritage responses as the only relevant tangata whenua issues related to the RMA. While this is not and should not be the reality, it has by default meant that the status of tangata whenua engagement in heritage management has been recognised
 - iv) Tangata whenua have a comprehensive and holistic view of the environment, with an integrated perspective of the physical and spiritual aspects of heritage resources. Their approaches to heritage management will be informed by these considerations.
- b) The Forum at its last meeting adopted the HGMPA guidance document, subject to minor changes. That document includes Chapter 7 – *Relationship of tangata whenua with the Gulf*. We can therefore use this document in general, and that chapter in particular, as a reference point for the heritage management guidelines, and for the structuring of the seminar which will feed into their development.
- c) It is also necessary to provide a focus for the work. While there are broad applications possible, this project is specifically intended to provide guidelines for RMA planning instruments. The RMA definition of historic heritage therefore needs to be used as the

basis. Fortunately this definition is broad, and unlike former statutory definitions includes (by inference, if not by name) historic and cultural landscapes:

“historic heritage” –

(a) means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:

- (i) archaeological:
- (ii) architectural:
- (iii) cultural:
- (iv) historic:
- (v) scientific:
- (vi) technological; and

(b) includes –

- (i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and
- (ii) archaeological sites; and
- (iii) sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu; and
- (iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources

d) When this definition is set beside Chapter 7 issues in the HGMPA guidelines the following heritage matters derived from that Act include at least the following:

Historic associations:

- Patterns of occupation, both permanent and temporary or seasonal occupation
- The sites of conflicts and the subsequent peacemaking and rebuilding of tribes

Traditional associations:

- Resource use, including trading between groups (for instance with minerals such as matā or obsidian)
- Traditional travel and communication linkages, both on land and sea
- Use of landmarks for navigation and location of fisheries grounds

Cultural associations:

- Acknowledging the relevance of whanaungatanga when identifying interested party status

Spiritual associations pervade all environmental and social realities, including:

- The need to maintain the mauri of all living things and their environment

e) We therefore need to convene a seminar leading to the development of guidelines which will:

- i) Propose cultural heritage effects based planning guidelines, and development of management tools

- ii) Be based on the RMA historic heritage definition, and the HGMPA tangata whenua related planning implementation issues
- iii) Be promoted to and relevant for tangata whenua kaitiaki / RM groups, and historic heritage statutory planners

4) Seminar format and content

- a) The seminar as described above is to be held in early June this year
- b) There will be three presenters to the seminar, with collective skills covering the following types of areas
 - i) Maori heritage management
 - ii) RMA heritage management
 - iii) Heritage management tools and methodologies
- c) A facilitator with appropriate skills for the event will be engaged
- d) The objectives of the seminar are to disseminate information, and to collate material for guidelines
- e) The guidelines will be drafted by 30 June this year

Keir Volkerling

14 April 2009