

2260100-RMASUB: 52 Rorokawau Road

Minutes of Meeting between HNZPT & FNDC
AI-generated content. Make sure to check for accuracy.

Meeting Minutes

Resource Consent: 2260100-RMASUB

Site: 52 Rotokawau Road

Subject: Cultural and Archaeological Context – Subdivision Proposal

1. Details

- **Meeting Title:** 2260100-RMASUB, 52 Rotokawau Road – HNZPT Meeting
- **Date and Time:** Last Tuesday at 11:02 am (meeting concluded approximately 12:46 pm)
- **Format:** Online meeting
- **Chair:** Nick Williamson, Team Leader – Resource Consents, Far North District Council

2. Attendees

- **Far North District Council (FNDC):**
 - Nick Williamson – Team Leader, Resource Consents
 - **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT):**
 - Stuart Bracey
 - James Robinson
 - Atareiria Heihei
 - Bill Edwards
- (Attendance reflects those who actively participated in discussion)*

3. Purpose of Meeting

The meeting was convened to discuss cultural and archaeological matters associated with the proposed subdivision at 52 Rotokawau Road, including:

- Cultural significance identified by mana whenua
- Archaeological assessment findings
- The status of any Heritage New Zealand registration, recording, or listing
- How these matters may be appropriately acknowledged within the subdivision consent process

4. Background Summary

- The subdivision proposal relates to land on which building platforms and dwellings have already been established.
- Mana whenua have identified the site as culturally significant, including reference to a pā or wāhi tapu.
- An archaeological assessment was commissioned by the applicant and concluded that there is no physical archaeological evidence present.
- Questions were raised during processing about the reconciliation of cultural knowledge and archaeological findings.

5. Key Discussion Points

5.1 Archaeological Findings

- Heritage New Zealand representatives confirmed that archaeological sites can only be formally recorded and managed through the NZPT Act 2014 where there is physical evidence (e.g. earthworks, terraces, midden).
- Based on the applicants Archaeologist's site inspection and assessment, no archaeological features were identified on the subject land.
- As a result, the site cannot currently be managed as an archaeological site under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act.

5.2 Cultural Significance

- Mana whenua representatives confirm that the site holds cultural significance, regardless of the absence of archaeological remains.
- It was noted by the applicants Archaeologist, that some culturally significant sites, including places associated with burial or other tapu activities, may not leave physical archaeological evidence.
- Heritage New Zealand acknowledged the that both archaeological evidence and cultural evidence are both relevant considerations.

5.3 Heritage New Zealand Listing and Registration

- Heritage New Zealand confirmed that:
 - No archaeological site has been recorded on this development site.
 - No Heritage New Zealand listing application has been progressed or lodged for this site.
- It was clarified that:
 - Heritage New Zealand "listing" provides statutory recognition but does not in itself provide protection.
 - Protection of culturally significant sites is most effectively achieved through district plan scheduling under the RMA.
- The possibility of confusion between "recorded", "listed", and "scheduled" sites was acknowledged.

5.4 District Plan and Scheduling Matters

- It was noted that some culturally significant sites may be protected through district plan scheduling, rather than Heritage New Zealand processes.
- FNDC undertook to check whether the site has been referenced through district plan submissions, statutory acknowledgements, or settlement processes.

- It was noted that the subdivision resource consent process does provide an opportunity to address the significance of the site to Māori by utilising tools such as
 - consent notices on titles,
 - title covenants
 - conditions of consent requiring some form of physical acknowledgment on the site of cultural significance

5.5 Subdivision Effects and Acknowledgement

- Discussion occurred regarding whether subdivision is appropriately characterised as having “no effects”, particularly in relation to cultural values.
- Participants acknowledged that subdivision can alter land ownership, management, and relationships with culturally significant places.
- There was general agreement that the subdivision consent represents an opportunity to address cultural matters at this stage, rather than deferring issues to future landowners.

5.6 Potential Approaches

- A range of potential mechanisms were discussed at a high level, including:
 - Consent notices
 - Covenants
 - Other forms of acknowledgement or recognition on titles
- Heritage New Zealand advised that it cannot require outcomes but can advocate for acknowledgement of cultural significance.
- Any measures would need to be assessed within the scope of the RMA, plan provisions, and delegated authority, and would remain matters for FNDC consideration.

6. Outcomes

- No determination was made on the subdivision application.
- No archaeological recording or Heritage New Zealand listing applies to the site at this time.
- There was shared acknowledgement that the site holds cultural significance to mana whenua, notwithstanding the absence of archaeological evidence.
- The discussion informed FNDC’s ongoing consideration of cultural effects and appropriate consent mechanisms.

7. Actions

- **FNDC:**
 - Review whether the site is referenced in district plan submissions, scheduling, or statutory acknowledgement processes.
 - Continue assessment of the subdivision application having regard to cultural values under the RMA.

8. Meeting Close

The Chair thanked all participants for their time and contributions. The meeting concluded with no further business.