

Inclusionary Housing Variation: Submitter # 205 – Lorraine Rouse

Kia ora koutou, my name is Lorraine Rouse.

1. I am attending today to speak on behalf of myself and Theo Bunker. Together, we lodged a submission in respect of the notified Inclusionary Housing Variation to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan.
2. I am a descendant of one of the 50 people to whom the Crown committed land in the late 1800s at 'The Neck', between lakes Hāwea and Wānaka. The Crown introduced legislation to enable transfer of that land. This was passed by Parliament in 1906 as the South Island Landless Natives Act, or 'SILNA'.
3. However, my tūpuna did not get the land at 'The Neck' as promised.
4. In 1997, the Crown committed the Hāwea/Wānaka – Sticky Forest land to myself and the other descendants of the people who did not get the promised land at The Neck.
5. As Monique King has said in her evidence for Te Arawhiti, the process to effect transfer of the Sticky Forest land to us is yet to be completed, but is in train.
6. I am also the appellant in an Environment Court appeal relating to the rezoning, which is currently rural, of the Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest whenua/land under the proposed Queenstown District Plan. That appeal seeks the residential rezoning of approximately 17.6 hectares of that whenua/land. The Hāwea/Wānaka -Sticky Forest block is approximately 50 hectares in total.
7. While we don't have ownership of this land yet, I'm concerned that the interests of the people who are the intended owners are taken into consideration and heard. I'm concerned that in the absence of the intended owners having possession of what is rightfully ours, other parties will make assumptions about what is in our interests, or not take them into consideration at all.
8. The land, Hāwea/Wānaka - Sticky Forest, is to be transferred to the intended owners under the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 as part of redress for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, committed against our tūpuna, and in particular the failure of the Crown to act in good faith, and fulfil its promises of providing land to enable our tūpuna

“to live economically productive lives.”¹ Those are the words of the Waitangi Tribunal in 2005 when it looked into the intentions of the Crown behind the land allocations to our tūpuna.

9. The provision of road access to Hāwea/Wānaka – Sticky Forest through Plan Change 54 has provided a resolution for legal access to what was what was landlocked, and Theo and I are grateful to Northlake for their efforts in this regard.
10. Whilst I support the provision for more affordable housing, I agree with Te Arawhiti that it is not appropriate to require an affordable housing contribution as part of that or any future development of the Site, given its the unique whakapapa, in particular, its specific role as Treaty redress land and SILNA intentions of providing us land to live economically productive lives.
11. As a successor of Hawea Wanaka-Sticky Forest there have been a number of barriers to date: 120 years of waiting, roading access, rezoning 17.6ha of the 50ha, ONL restrictions, and now inclusionary housing. Hawea Wanaka-Sticky Forest is to provide economic benefit to the successors.
12. Additional restrictions, and especially one of this nature which requires land or financial contributions from the successors of this land, will reduce the original intention of this redress land. For these reasons, I request that any residential development of the Site is exempted from the Variation.
13. I am happy to answer any questions you have.

Lorraine Rouse

¹Quote from the Waitangi Tribunal decision 2005 ‘The Waimumu Trust (SILNA) Report’, page 89.