

Copyright is owned by the author of this thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. This thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**He Taonga Tuku Iho
Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu
Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Gardens**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of**

**Master of Resource and Environmental Planning at Massey
University,**

Palmerston North, New Zealand.

**Hinetākoha Hayley Millar Viriaere
2015**

Tuhinga Whakarāpopoto - Abstract

This study was guided by kaupapa Māori principles and was therefore grounded in a tangata whenua research framework 'This means it must stem from a Māori worldview, be based in Māori epistemology and incorporate Māori concepts, knowledge, skill, experiences, attitudes, processes, practices, customs, reo, values and beliefs' (Bevan-Brown, 1998, p. 231). Kaupapa Māori research must also aim to contribute to positive outcomes for Māori. Therefore this research sought to examine how planning can contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as part of New Zealand's indigenous living heritage.

The research method included interviews with participants from Te Tai Tokerau, Tāmaki Makaurau, Kirikiriroa, Whakatāne, Kawerau, Te Teko, Matata, Rotorua, Te Matau-a-Māui, Papaioea, Whanganui and Te Upoko-o-te-ika-a-Māui. Analysis of planning documents, heritage reports and academic literature also took place to gather data.

The findings revealed that within heritage management and planning there continues to be a fixation on buildings and physical heritage. As a result, tangible heritage is at the forefront of planning decisions while intangible heritage, living heritage and Māori heritage values are often overlooked. Māori garden heritage can therefore be relegated to unseen archaeological sites or viewed as static physical representations of the past. These issues hinder the re-establishment of Māori heritage gardens and their long term viability.

This thesis contributes to the body of knowledge around Māori heritage, planning and Māori food gardens in the contemporary era. It does so by examining the historical antecedents and key issues relevant to planning for Māori heritage gardens. It then reveals how local authorities and planners can assist those whānau and hapū who are seeking to retrace their ancient connections with their food cultivation heritage and thereby contribute to the restoration of Māori heritage and wellbeing.

Te Oha - Dedication

Hei maumaharatanga,
ki tōku kuia ko Te Mori Belshaw rāua ko tōku koroua ko Brian Belshaw,
ki tōku mama ru'au ko Ami Viriaere, ā, ki ōku mātua ko Tina Te Te
Belshaw rāua ko Alan Kahurangi James Millar e moe, e moe, moe mai rā.

*In loving memory, to my beloved grandparents and parents, rest on in
peace.*

“Whaowhia te kete mātauranga”

Hei whakatinana te whakataukī nei, ko te nuinga o te akoranga. Ko ēnei kupu hei
kawe te kōrero tohutohu o ōku mātua, kuia me koroua, kia whakaohoho i a mātau
mō te uara o te mātauranga o te ao Māori me te ao Pākehā, kia whakakaha tā mātau
whānau me ngā whakatupuranga mō āpōpō.

*“Fill the basket of knowledge” This proverb embodies the importance of learning and
conveys the advice of my parents and grandparents who urged and inspired in us the
value of learning and knowledge from both the Māori and Pākehā worlds to
strengthen our whānau and our future descendants.*

He Kupu Mihi – Acknowledgements

Ranginui e tū iho nei

Skyfather high in the celestial regions

Papa-tū-ā-nuku e takoto ake nei

Earth mother who nourishes life below

Rongo-marae-roa te pūtake o te kai

o ngā huanga kai o te whenua

Rongo-marae-roa

Progenitor of cultivated foods of the land

Ki ōku tīpuna katoa o Te Moana nui a Kiwa

Kua wehe atu ki Hawaiki/‘Avaiki

My ancestors of the Pacific who have

Departed to our spiritual homeland

Kei te mihi, kei te mihi ki a koutou katoa!

Tributes to you all!

He mihi maioha atu ki a koutou ngā kaikōrero o te mahi rangahau nei.

Sincere thanks to the research participants, many thanks to you all.

Ki ōku whānau me ōku hoa, ngā mihi aroha ki a koutou katoa.

Love and thanks to my family and friends.

E te rangatira, ko te toihuarewa tuarua Caroline Miller, ko tēnei te tino

whakawhetai atu nei ki a koe mō tōu tautoko nui ki tēnei tuhinga whakapae.

Thank you so much to my supervisor Associate Professor Caroline Miller; I am indebted to you for all of your support with this thesis.

Table of Contents

Tuhinga Whakarāpopoto - Abstract.....	ii
Te Oha - Dedication	iii
He Kupu Mihi – Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Abbreviations	vii
List of Figures	viii
Papakupu – Māori Glossary	ix
1. He Kupu Whakataki	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Question.....	1
1.3 Research Drivers	1
1.4 Culture and Wellbeing	3
1.5 Thesis Outline.....	8
2. Background	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Emergence of the Heritage Movement	9
2.2.1 Garden Heritage.....	12
2.3 Heritage Planning.....	14
2.4 Māori gardening.....	17
2.5 Māori gardens.....	25
2.5.1 Gardens Post-Contact	29
2.5.2 Contemporary Issues	30
2.6 Conclusion.....	31
3: Methodology - Kaupapa Māori Research	32
3.1 Introduction	32
3.2 Kaupapa Māori.....	32
3.2.1 Kaupapa Māori Research	34
3.3 Research Method.....	36
3.4 Ethical Considerations.....	37
3.5 Data Collection.....	39
3.6 Conclusion.....	41
4. Literature Review	42
4.1 Introduction	42
4.2 Scope of Review	42
4.3 Organisation of Review	44
4.4 Key Concepts and Terms.....	45
4.4.1 Heritage.....	45
4.4.2 Cultural and Natural Heritage	46
4.4.3 Tangible and Intangible Heritage	47
4.4.4 Living Heritage	49
4.4.5 Cultural Landscape	50
4.4.6 Ancestral Landscape	51
4.4.7 Māori Heritage	52
4.4.8 Historic Garden	52

4.4.9 New Zealand Historic Garden	53
4.4.10 Māori Heritage Garden	54
4.5. Heritage.....	55
4.5.1 Critical Heritage Studies.....	55
4.5.2 Cultural Heritage Management	57
4.5.3 Heritage and Values	58
4.6 Heritage and Planning.....	59
4.6.1 Participatory Planning.....	59
4.6.2 Contested Values	61
4.6.3 Values Centered Planning	63
4.6.4 Pro-Active Planning.....	65
4.6.5 Collaborative Planning	66
4.7 Māori Garden Heritage	69
4.7.1 Aotearoa Garden Heritage.....	71
4.7.2 Sustaining Gardens and Health.....	72
4.8 Summary	74
5: Discussion	77
5.1 Introduction	77
5.2 Summary of the Study	77
5.3 Existing Māori Heritage Gardens	78
5.5 Traditional Culture	84
5.5.1 Value System.....	89
5.5.2 Traditional Crops and Seeds	92
5.5.3 Te Ao Huri Huri.....	92
5.6 How Heritage is Defined	94
5.7 Health and Wellbeing.....	102
5.8 Re-establishing and Sustaining Gardens	103
5.9 Planning and Heritage.....	108
5.9.1 Improving Planning Responses	115
5.10 Conclusion.....	123
6. Kupu Whakamutunga-Conclusion	124
6. 1 Introduction	124
6.2 Summary of Findings.....	124
6.3 Limitations and Future Research	128
6.3 Conclusion.....	129
Ngā Rārangi Pukapuka- Bibliography.....	130
Appendix 1	145
Appendix 2	146
Appendix 3	147
Appendix 4	148
Appendix 5	149
Appendix 6	150

List of Abbreviations

AHD	Authorised Heritage Discourse
CHM	Critical Heritage Management
CHS	Critical Heritage Studies
CIA	Cultural Impact Assessment
HNZ	Heritage New Zealand
HNZPTA	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IMP	Iwi Management Plan
KM	Kaupapa Māori
KMR	Kaupapa Māori Research
KMT	Kaupapa Māori Theory
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
N.D	No date
N.P	No page
RMA	Resource Management Act
S	Section
TOW	Treaty of Waitangi
TPK	Te Puni Kōkiri
WHC	World Heritage Convention

List of Figures

Figure 1: Kūmara mounds and pātaka at Te Para Para garden	5
Figure 2: Ōrākei marae garden	6
Figure 3: Whare Tapa Whā model (Source: Spicer, Trilin & Walton, 1994, p. 196)	23
Figure 4: Harvesting kūmara using a kō gardening implement at Te Para Para garden	80
Figure 5: Timo gardening implement being used to soften soil during kūmara harvest at Te Para Para garden	80
Figure 6: Ōrākei marae garden	82
Figure 7: Tamariki learning about planting kai at Ōrākei marae garden	85

Papakupu – Māori Glossary

Ahi kā	Burning fires of occupation, continuous occupation - title to land through occupation by a group, The group is able, through the use of whakapapa, to trace back to primary ancestors who lived on the land
Aotearoa	Original Māori name for New Zealand
Ariki	Paramount chief, chieftain, leader, first-born in a high ranking family
Atua	God, deity
Aukati	Boundary
Aute	Paper mulberry
‘Ehua	Land (In Mangaian and Kuki Airani Māori Language)
Hauhake	Harvest
Hauora	Health, vigour
Hinengaro	Mind, thought, intellect, consciousness, awareness
Hoturoa	Chief and captain of the Tainui waka
Hue	Bottle gourd
Hui	Gathering, meeting
Ipukarea	Ancestral home, native land
Iwi	Tribe
Kai	Food
Kānga	Māori corn
Kāinga	Unfortified settlement utilised for day-to-day living
Kaitiaki	Custodian
Kaitiakitanga	The intergenerational responsibility inherited at birth to care for the environment; which is passed down from generation to generation.
Kanohi ki te Kanohi	Face to face
Kanohi kitea	A face seen is appreciated
Kao Kūmara	Dried kūmara
Karakia	To recite ritual chants, say grace, pray, recite a prayer, chant
Kaumātua	Be elderly, old, aged
Kete	Kit, Basket
Kirikiroa	Hamilton
Kuia	Grandmother, Female elder
Kō	Used for digging and used as a weapon by some iwi in ancient times
Koha	Contribution
Kōkihi	New Zealand spinach
Kōkōwai	Red ochre
Kōrero nehe	Historical accounts or ancient history
Koroua	Grandfather, elder
Kotahitanga	Unity
Kūmara	Sweet potato

Kura	School
Mahi	Work
Mahinga kai	garden, cultivation, food-gathering place
Mana	Prestige, authority, control, power, influence, spiritual power
Mana atua	Life force of the gods
Manuhiri	Visitors
Mana Whenua	Territorial rights, authority over land or territory
Māra	Plot of ground under cultivation, a garden
Marae	Village compound, serves as focal point for Māori communal events
Maramataka	Māori lunar calendar
Mātauranga	Māori knowledge, ways of knowing and associated practices
Māori	
Mauri	Spiritual life force
Mauri manaaki	Life force of the guests and visitors
Mauri tangata	Life force of tangata whenua
Moana	Ocean
Mōteatea	Lament, traditional chant
Ngā kete e toru	Three baskets of knowledge
Noa	Free from the extensions of tapu, ordinary, unrestricted
Pā	Fortified settlement, a defense stronghold during wartime
Papaioea	Palmerston North
Pātaka	Large decorative storehouses for food
Pātaka Whakairo	Carved storehouse raised upon posts
Peka	Spade varieties
Pikopiko	Ferntips
Pūha	Sow thistle
Pūrākau	Myth, ancient legend or story
Pūtea	Money
Rangatira	Chief
Rangatiratanga	Authority and control
Raupatu	Confiscation
Reo	Language
Rua kūmara	Kūmara storage pit
Taha wairua	Spiritual side
Tamariki	Children
Tanenuiarangi	A higher being in Māori cosmological thought
Tangihanga	Funeral
Taonga tuku iho	Treasures passed down from our ancestors
Tapu	Sacred, restricted, state of being set apart
Taro	A tropical plant of the arum family
Tauranga waka	Place where ancestral canoes were beached
Tāmaki-makau- rau	Auckland
Te Ao huri huri	Contemporary world
Te Reo Māori	Māori language
Te Matau-a-Māui	Central Hawkes Bay

Te Moana-ā-Toi	Bay of Plenty
Te Tai Rawhiti	East Cape
Te Tai Tokerau	Northland
Te Upoko-o-te-ika-a-Māui	Wellington
Te Wai Pounamu	The Māori name for the South Island, New Zealand and translates as the greenstone waters
Ti pore	Species of cabbage tree also known as tropical cabbage tree
Tikanga	The right way of doing things or customary practices
Tikoko	Forms of shovel
Timo	Grubber
Tīpuna	Ancestors, grandparents - eastern dialect variation of tūpuna
Tohunga	Skilled person, chosen expert, priest
Tūāhu	Sacred place for ritual practices by a tohunga, consisting of an enclosure containing a mound (ahu) and marked by the erection of rods (toko) which were used for divination and other mystic rites.
Tipuna/Tupuna	Ancestor, grandparent - western dialect variation of tipuna
Uwhi	Yam
Wāhi tapu	Sacred place, sacred site, a place subject to long-term ritual restrictions on access or use, e.g. a burial ground, a battle site or a place where tapu objects were placed
Wāhi tupuna	Ancestral site
Whakairo	Carving
Whakapapa	Genealogy
Whakataukī	A tribal saying/proverb
Whānau	Family
Whanaungatanga	Relationship, kinship, sense of family connection
WhareKauri	Chatham Islands
Wharekura	The first whare wānanga-house of learning
Whata	Elevated platform
Whenua	Land

1. He Kupu Whakataki

1.1 Introduction

This introduction provides an overview of this thesis titled: *He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu, Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens*. This chapter starts with an outline of the research question and drivers for the research, followed by, a discussion on food gardens as Māori heritage with a focus on the planning system, and on how these gardens can benefit Māori. Finally, this chapter concludes with a thesis outline.

1.2 Question

The purpose of this thesis is to examine experiences of the New Zealand planning system, in particular, how Māori heritage is viewed and treated and how this relates to reviving Māori food gardens as heritage. In attempt to further understand this link between heritage, planning, Māori food gardens, cultural and physical wellbeing this thesis will explore the question, *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?* Therefore the objectives of this research are to investigate the following:

- What has shaped heritage conceptions and what have been the implications of this?
- In what ways do Māori food gardens express living heritage and promote positive outcomes for Māori?
- How is Māori heritage recognised and dealt with in the NZ planning system? And how does this relate to planning for Māori food gardens?

1.3 Research Drivers

This research topic resonates with me as Māori gardening is a part of my Polynesian heritage. My whakapapa links me to the cultivation traditions carried out by my tīpuna from Aotearoa whose ancestral waka include Mataatua, Nukutere, Te Arawa, Tainui, Horouta and Tākitimu and to the gardening tradition of my 'enua Mangaia (Ngāti Tāne, Ngāti Ngāriki and Ngāti Mana'une) ki ngā Kūki Airani (Cook Islands). Moreover, my parents both instilled in me tikanga Māori and values associated with

kai cultivation from a young age. They were also people of the land who collected kai from the ocean and creeks, utilised resources from the bush for our home and were both avid gardeners. This made an impression on me and as a result I am very passionate about the retention of the practices and tikanga associated with Māori gardening.

In the summer of 2013 I received a scholarship to carry out research about Rangitāne cultivation and settlement history for Massey University and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, New Zealand's Indigenous Centre of Research Excellence. My research supported the multi-faceted project called *“Sustaining culture through teaching, learning and researching indigenous agri-food: learning from the past to strengthen the future”*. This project involved Rangitāne, Massey University and Palmerston North City Council (PNCC) representatives. The aim of the project was to increase the visibility of Rangitāne ki Manawatū traditions around kai in Palmerston North city. It promoted cultivation initiatives based on local tribal knowledge and customs, access to nutritious kai and seed sharing between the university and other groups.

My research provided a historical narrative of Rangitāne settlement and cultivation, with a focus on the area surrounding the historic site Karaka Grove. Karaka Grove is listed in the PNCC District Plan as a cultural heritage site and is located on Massey University farm land between Batchelar Road and the Manawatū river (PNCC; 2011). The remnant stand of 6 karaka trees is a visual marker of Rangitāne settlement and cultivation history in the area (Taylor & Sutton, 1999a). The karaka trees at Massey Karaka Grove were once part of a pā karaka or uru karaka which both describe a karaka plantation. The trees were a valued food crop and provided sustenance and shelter for many generations of iwi members of Rangitāne ki Manawatū who occupied this area pre-European settlement. In 2014 Karaka Grove and the surrounding area became a focal point for the revival of Rangitāne cultivation and traditions.

This summer research project made me aware that the concept of Māori gardens is ancient but its potential in a contemporary context to promote cultural heritage on sites historically used for settlement and cultivation, associated cultural mores and Māori wellbeing has not been explored in a planning context. This apparent gap, my interest in the area and encouragement from my supervisors drove me to explore this problem in greater depth. This thesis is the result.

1.4 Culture and Wellbeing

Māori food gardens are part of the rich cultural heritage of Aotearoa, New Zealand. The exact date of the arrival of the first Māori in New Zealand from Polynesia has been contested. However, more recent evidence has revealed that Māori migrated from central Polynesia to Aotearoa in the 13th century (Wright, 2009). Before widespread European settlement of Aotearoa, having a garden to cultivate crops was integral to Māori daily sustenance. Without the advent of modern technology and tools to produce food, gardening was essential for survival a necessity alongside hunting, fishing and collecting wild foods for survival (Colenso, 2001; Best, 1976).

For Māori, gardening is underpinned by spiritual connections to their gods. Within Te Ao Māori food is recognised as coming from atua including the creation god Papa-tū-ā-nuku recognised as the earth mother, wife of sky father Ranginui. Their son Rongomarae-roa also known by other names such as Rongo-mā-Tāne is the god of the kūmara and cultivated foods. The god Pani-Tinaku in some traditions was identified as the mother of the kūmara, as Tinaku means to germinate and thus Pani was known as the germinator (Best, 1976). Statistics New Zealand's (2013a) first survey on Māori well-being, Te Kupenga provides a general overview of Māori wellbeing with 70% of Māori wanting to be connected to Te Ao Māori and 66% agreeing that spirituality is important to them. This suggests that many Māori are likely to support initiatives such as Māori gardens that foster cultural and spiritual connections.

Gardening for Māori is an expression of a Māori worldview that is underpinned by meta-physical and holistic understandings that explain how Māori interpret their environment (Marsden & Henare, 1992). Moon (2005) gives account of gardening by tohunga Hohepa Kereopa in which he describes the philosophical motivations of

Māori for gardening. Hohepa believes that through gardening Māori are able to grow kai but also to connect with their atua Papa-tū-ā-nuku who they view as the supporter of life and provider of all needs.

Māori philosophy is the basis of the Māori value system. Values express cultural identity and govern Māori cultural activity and are therefore an important aspect of food cultivation. For instance, Māori gardens can support manaaki tangata or manaakitanga, which is a source of mana for hapū. Manaakitanga describes the value of hospitality or being able to look after and feed guests, including serving traditionally grown foods that are culturally significant to particular areas (Mead, 2003).

Tikanga governed Māori cultivation activities from planting, harvesting to storage. The planting of cultivated crops particularly the kūmara were acknowledged in many tikanga such as offering the first kūmara grown back to the gods. Spiritual rituals and ceremonies associated with the tapu restrictions were also apart of certain aspects of gardening (Mead, 2003).

Recognition of gardens as part of Māori garden heritage presents a number of challenges. Today gardens are regarded as heritage by ICOMOS and UNESCO agreements that define and safeguard heritage which signals an acceptance of the intangible nature of some heritage. However, as Munasinghe (2005) observes in heritage practice there is a tendency to prioritise tangible heritage over the intangible. Thus a Māori garden although expressing physical properties will also express intangible heritage values but this may not be obvious meaning the garden may be overlooked as having heritage values.

In New Zealand the focus of heritage in this country is on its buildings rather than its associated curtilage i.e. its gardens, relegating Māori sites to unseen archaeological status (Goldsmith, 2014). As a result there is little recognition of food gardens as heritage and there are no Māori food gardens listed on the Heritage New Zealand (HNZ) list of Class 1 and 2 heritage building or sites, thus there are none that have heritage status. Queen's Gardens in Nelson became the first gardens in New Zealand

to be registered on the HNZ list. Although the gardens were once a rich food-gathering area for Māori, today they represent a classical Victorian ornamental park. The garden's landscape architect hoped that the heritage classification would make it easier in future to protect the gardens (Neal, 2009). However, the most current HNZ list includes only six heritage gardens¹. None are food gardens and only one features Māori heritage (Rotorua). Other gardens are mentioned as part of the curtilage of cottages, historic buildings and houses. There is recognition of some wāhi tapu but there is no mention of wāhi tupuna or living heritage sites.

Ancestral garden sites are valued by Māori for their heritage significance but proving evidence of this may be challenging. Ancestral garden sites are associated with mātauranga-ā-iwi such as kōrero o nehe, pūrākau, mōteatea and whakataukī that represents a cultural repository of Māori heritage. Some gardens that have been revived on historic sites with the goal of reconnecting their people with their ancestral land and traditions includes Te Para Para gardens in Hamilton (shown in figure 1.), the revival of a kūmara site on Moutohora Island by Ngāti Awa and the Ngāti Whatua Ōrākei marae gardens (shown in figure 2.) and many others.



Figure 1: Kūmara mounds and pātaka at Te Para Para garden

¹ Gardens on New Zealand heritage list- Oamaru Public Garden (Waitaki), Domain Winter Gardens (Auckland), Mary Williams Garden (Far North), Rotorua Government Gardens historic area, Wellington Botanic Gardens, Winter Gardens, Dunedin.



Figure 2: Ōrākei marae garden

Whether the planning system can support the revival of Māori gardens on heritage sites is dependent on current planning provisions. The *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* (HNZPTA) directs the identification and classification of heritage and the *Resource Management Act 1991* (RMA) provides for the protection of the identified heritage. Under the RMA re-establishing a garden may require a resource consent incurring costs and time delays. Furthermore, food and its' cultivation is not a traditional planning area. There is a move by some council to allow edible forest gardens, community gardens and allotments on council land to improve people's access to healthy food in New Zealand (Cairns, 2014). However, the local food and garden policies and plans that exist in countries like Australia and the USA are not commonplace in New Zealand.

Gardens can promote cultural wellbeing by re-connecting Māori with traditions that have faded as Māori have adapted to city living. According to Statistics New Zealand (2013b) most Māori today live in urban areas. As a consequence of urbanisation many Māori have lost connection with cultural heritage traditions such as those associated with growing their own food gardens. The majority of Māori therefore live

away from their ancestral marae that are located in rural areas and no longer grow their own food.

Instead like most city-dwellers rely on imported and processed foods bought from the supermarket (Tanzcos, 2009). Tawhai (2013) observes that the hectic urban existence of today's young Māori may mean they are not inclined to seek out the few remaining kaumātua to receive the traditional indigenous knowledge associated with gardening. Tawhai (2013) further notes that gardening knowledge is at risk of being lost if it is not written down or transmitted orally by kaumātua.

Garden's may also help to address some of the disparities in Māori health that exist today. For example, the Ministry of Health (2013) New Zealand Health survey 2012/2013 shows that Māori adults report high rates of most health conditions. Additionally vegetable consumption was shown to be lower in Māori than non-Māori, apart from Pacific and Asian people. In 2012/2013 48% of Māori were identified as obese. These rates were higher than the national average. Physical activity levels were shown also to be lower among Māori than non-Māori adults (except Pacific and Asian adults) and had decreased significantly since 2011/12. Māori were also shown to have a lower life expectancy than non-Māori. Awareness of these issues has led to the recent revival of māra kai as a health promotion initiative including marae, home and school gardens and Māori cultivation projects at universities.

Māori gardens can contribute to reviving Māori heritage sites whilst providing additional benefits such as the promotion of cultural and spiritual traditions, health and wellbeing. Food gardens encompass Māori perspectives of health that are based on a holistic approach connecting physical health with cultural and spiritual life.

Further chapters address the failure of the planning system to adequately understand the importance of Māori heritage. Additionally, why the problem must be addressed if the planning system is to provide greater support for indigenous heritage including initiatives such as Māori heritage gardens that are living reminders of the cultivation history of tangata whenua. Through interviews and inter-disciplinary research, I

develop recommendations to help improve understandings around traditional Māori food heritage within the context of the contemporary New Zealand planning system.

1.5 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 describes the methodology used for this research discussing Kaupapa Māori research and qualitative research followed by methods used.

Chapter 3 provides a background to this research first discussing the emergence of the heritage movement in New Zealand as it relates to Māori heritage and planning. Second, the Māori heritage and planning statutory framework and institutional arrangements are outlined. Lastly the issues, concepts and values relevant to Māori gardening are explored.

Chapter 4 reviews the literature surrounding the topic. Major themes that are discussed centre on:

- Key heritage terminology and concepts relevant to this thesis.
- Heritage and planning theory as it relates to Māori heritage.
- Gardens as they relate to planning, heritage and Māori.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the interviews and discusses the key ideas raised by this research. Links are made between preceding chapters and the interview findings.

Chapter 6 concludes this thesis by addressing the central question of this study through a summary of the overall findings of this research.

2. Background

2.1 Introduction

This chapter first provides the context for this thesis. It starts by exploring the emergence of the heritage movement in New Zealand as it relates to Māori heritage and planning. Secondly, the statutory heritage management and planning framework and institutional arrangements are discussed to illuminate the extent to which these structures meet the needs of Māori. Lastly, aspects of Māori gardening are discussed including Māori knowledge, values, traditions, methods, heritage and contemporary issues.

2.2 Emergence of the Heritage Movement

The idea of preserving material traces of the past has European origins. During the Middle Ages Roman fortifications and buildings were preserved, mainly because they added prestige to medieval rulers. Davoudi (2012) observes that before nineteenth century industrialisation, an environment's meaning as a heritage landscape was founded on an aesthetic and utilitarian approach underpinned by the desire of the elite to preserve the past. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most European countries developed policies for protecting archaeological sites and landscapes; however buildings remained at the forefront of heritage preservation. The European ideas on heritage became widely accepted and were reflected in the *Venice Charter 1964* that emphasises the material aspects of heritage. In the UK, when concerns around preserving heritage first arose in the nineteenth century, heritage was associated with monuments, and then later focused on buildings (Trapzenick & McLean, 2000).

During the early settlement of New Zealand colonists demonstrated little interest in conserving cultural or indigenous heritage. The settlers preferred to leave their own indelible mark on landscape that is evident in the early English topography of the landscape (McLean, 2000). Furthermore, as Fairburn (1989) notes, the early settlers did not want to discard their British heritage and failed to develop a strong New Zealand national identity. Mead (1996) observes that Māori heritage was seen as something to remain in the past in the new colonial society, viewed in national and

international exhibitions and museums including replica Māori villages archaeological displays, artefacts, Māori meeting houses, villages and tattooed Māori heads, Māori carvings, as exhibits void of stories. Today, according to Swafield & Fairweather (2010) the landscape continues to reflect British culture.

However, an interest in historic associations including preserving old pā sites began with the early scenery preservation societies in New Zealand in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The jubilees of the 1890s celebrating fifty years of British settlement since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (TOW) sparked an interest in sustaining history and organisations such as the “Old Colonists” and the “Polynesian Society” were born. During this period Māori artefacts and structures began to be collected for display in museums. The *Māori Antiquities Act 1901* was also passed to prevent the export of Māori artefacts and the *Scenery Preservation Act 1903* was enacted to preserve lands of historical interest, including a small number of Māori cultural sites such as pā (Trapzenick & McLean, 2000). Following the war in 1918 heritage interest grew with New Zealanders turning to war commemoration such as erecting war monuments, victory halls and establishing events to create colonial heritage. However, they viewed them as memorials to the soldiers that had fallen rather than as heritage (Flagler, 2014).

The twentieth century saw a more concerted effort to recognise and preserve heritage. Interest grew in preserving and appropriating Māori artefacts and ethnography as a part of settler nationalism, colonisation and tourism to contribute to national wealth. New Zealand presented this newly independent and more multicultural identity in museums and exhibitions (McCarthy, 2011). Interest by museums and historical society’s ethnologists in preserving Māori history prompted the systematic recording in 1935 of archaeological sites (McLean, 2000). The approaching centennial of colonisation in 1940, increased community interest in heritage and local history with an increasing concern for preserving European historic buildings (McLean, 2000).

Mainstream visual culture in the post-war period featured a borrowing of Māori motifs, subjects and language which started to replace the British character of national images with a self-conscious national identity (McCarthy, 2011). The Town Planning Act's (1926) successor the 1953 *Town & Country Planning Act* (TCPA) gave local authorities a mandate of sorts for heritage protection (Neave, 1981). However, responses to the act were minimal and were only precipitated by pressure from historical societies or trust regional committees (McLean, 2000). During this period planners focused more on managing urban development, through the regulation of space in the built environment, conserving amenity and protecting rural landscapes (Miller, 2000).

The *Historic Places Act (HPA) 1954* set up the first comprehensive approach to heritage however the focus on Māori heritage protection was minimal. From the 1950s communities had raised more concerns over preserving buildings which was addressed in the *HPA 1954*. The Act included the establishment of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) (now Heritage New Zealand) to carry out core activities such as property management, identification, assessment and regulatory protection. However, according to Kahotea (2010) specific protection for cultural sites such as pā did not occur until the 1975 amendment to the *HPA 1954*. Paterson (1999) notes that Sir Tipene O'Regan, chair of the Ngai Tahu Trust Board observed that the Māori membership of the NZHPT in the 1970s and early 1980s highlighted a lack of legal protection to support the protection of Māori heritage sites.

Māori heritage eventually gained recognition within town planning however Māori had to fight to obtain recognition of their intangible connection to their heritage. For example, in 1977 the new *Town and Country Planning Act* was the first time Maori values were considered to be nationally important, with the inclusion of section 3(1)(g) which considered "the relationship of the Maori people and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land" as a matter of national importance to be recognised and provided for. However, in *Knuckey v Taranaki County Council* (6 NZTPA 609), the Planning Tribunal concluded under section 3(1)(g) that 'ancestral land' had to have been continually held by Māori people. Māori viewed this as a

narrow understanding of ancestral land and saw the provision as tokenistic (Cotton, 1989). This narrow definition remained until 1987 when, to the relief of Māori, the High Court in *Habgood v Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc* (H.C.[M655/86]) 1986; ruled that a relationship with ancestral land could exist even if the land title in legal terms had passed to the ownership of the other party (Taiepa, 1999).

While heritage has steadily broadened its outlook from the narrow conceptual framework of the 1970s however, the focus on architecturally or aesthetically interesting buildings dominates. The ongoing building bias means that other forms of heritage are neglected (Donahy, 2006). Leading world heritage organisations, such as UNESCO from the late twentieth century began to recognise a wider array of heritage, including garden and intangible heritage (Van Gorp & Renes, 2006). However, McClean (2011) notes that the New Zealand heritage sector is renowned most widely for identifying and researching old buildings. Furthermore, Goldsmith (2014) asserts that the focus of heritage in this country has been on its buildings and its curtilage including its gardens have been ignored.

2.2.1 Garden Heritage

A rapidly developing urban middle class during the early European settlement period meant that gardening as a leisure activity became popular. Settlers accustomed to the colourful and aesthetic gardens associated with the English countryside tried to replicate these garden styles in New Zealand. During the Victorian era a gradual merging of science and gardening gave lay people a greater interest in botany and ornamental gardening which became a fashionable interest of the new settler culture (Gabites & Lucas, 1998).

The most significant influences on gardening during this early settlement period were the the picturesque and the gardenesque approaches. The picturesque was the fashion garden of the late nineteenth century elites and was widespread in England, based on the ideal of creating gardens that look like landscape pictures. The gardenesque developed out of the picturesque movement and promoted the idea that gardens should be distinct looking to its surrounding landscape and include

artificial features such as arbours, trellis-work and exotic shrubs. Leach (1996) notes that native plants were only accommodated in any part of the garden where they would satisfy popular taste for colour in flowers or foliage, essentially being slotted into a garden style that had been created in Britain.

There is scant evidence of gardens being created for ornamental purposes among Māori. Māori gardening outside of rongoa Māori was primarily for food which is highlighted in the many references within whakataukī that connect growing, food and sustenance (Mead & Grove 2001). When the NZHPT first acquired properties in the 1960s little was known about historic gardens as the trust was focused on building restorations rather than its gardens. Due to increased interest in heritage tourism historic gardens and garden visiting became part of the trend to keep the best of what remained, then to plant what was appropriate and attractive. Recognising this, the NZHPT began to register gardens (Bradbury, 1995).

Today gardens that represent past history are recognised internationally as a form of cultural heritage. Initially, historic gardens were included as a specific group under the definition of historical monuments in the 1964 UNESCO *Venice Charter*. However, according to Fatsar (2010) it took quite a long time before a garden was considered as significant as a building. Support for statutory controls over gardens were recognised in the ICOMOS's 1981 *Florence Charter* (Art 23), adopted as an addendum to the Venice Charter. The *Florence Charter* 1981 states that responsible authorities have to adopt the appropriate legal measures for the identification, listing and protection of historic gardens (ICOMOS, n.d).

Gardens in a heritage context are referred to most commonly as historic gardens. The European *Florence Charter* and the English planning system, that has a listing system for gardens refers to historic gardens (Peddlebury, 1999). However, historic gardens are also described as heritage gardens. In this thesis I have chosen to refer to Māori gardens as “heritage” rather than “historic” gardens as the term heritage stresses the intergenerational nature of heritage which is aligned with Māori philosophies.

The authenticity of heritage gardens can be determined through various ways. Gustavsson & Peterson (2003) highlight that authenticity can be identified in heritage through the ways it presents and promotes education alongside ethics, emotions and creativity. Authenticity in a Māori garden sense may include site history either through maps, soil profile, archaeological or oral evidence. Furthermore, the extent to which the site promotes cultivation heritage through the transmission of knowledge, customs, practices, traditions, values, wellbeing and the arts such as whakairo may also be used to measure authenticity.

Dreija (2012) says that authenticity is a planning tool for the restoration of historical gardens, but exact adaptation of the terms depends on the legislation in the national or local context. Hapū and iwi alongside heritage managers will need to determine the level of tradition that must be incorporated into their garden on top of it being situated on an ancestral cultivation site that in their view makes it a tuturu (authentic) representation of what they define as their heritage.

2.3 Heritage Planning

Heritage planning is the analysis of how places have developed, changed and survived over time and involves the identification of heritage significance, developing policy, implementation and monitoring. This approach was originally developed as part of the Australian ICOMOS *Burra Charter* which has become an international guide for managing historic heritage. Heritage planning in New Zealand now aims to ensure heritage places including Māori heritage places are preserved, maintained, are accessible and protected against hazards to meet the needs of present and future generations (McClellan, 2011).

The *HNZPTA 2014* repeals the *Historic Places Act 1993*. However, the new act continues to promote the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand's historical and cultural heritage. The *HNZPTA* still provides for the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (previously the register) to identify sites of historical and cultural heritage significance i.e. historic and cultural places, historic areas, wāhi tapu, and wāhi tapu areas. As well, the act provides for two new

categories, national historic landmarks and wāhi tupuna. The act continues the Māori Heritage Council of HNZ whom registers wāhi tapu places and provides advice and support to Māori concerning heritage protection (McIndoe, 2014; McClean, 2007).

In NZ there's no standard term to describe the term heritage (McClean, 2008). The various heritage-related legislation and policies use a variety of terms to describe heritage. The *World Heritage Convention* (WHC) adopts the term 'cultural heritage'. While the *HNZPTA 2014* section 2 refers to 'historic areas and places as part of New Zealand's 'historical and cultural heritage'. The *Reserves Act 1977* uses the term 'historic features'. The Department of Conservation prefers the terms 'historic resources' or 'historic places,' as they assert this represents cultural heritage (New Zealand Government, n.d). The *RMA 1991* did not initially define heritage but defined the purposes of heritage orders was to protect places of special character and interest. Kirby (1996) aptly points out that the difficulties involved with defining heritage for practical purposes meant the *RMA*'s description of heritage was open to wide interpretation.

The 2003 amendment to the *RMA* introduced the concept of historic heritage. Historic heritage means 'those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of NZ's history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities: (i) archaeological (ii) architectural (iii) cultural (iv) historic (v) scientific (vi) technological; and includes – (i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and (ii) archaeological sites; and (iii) sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; and (iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources (RMA, 2003, s.2).

New Zealand historic heritage management is shared between central and local government bodies that include HNZ, local authorities Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH), Ministry for the Environment (MFE), iwi and hapū, and community groups. Local authorities must ensure *RMA* policy and plans provide appropriate definitions, identify heritage places, assess heritage values, historic sites, provide incentives, regulatory controls, and mapping to help protect historic heritage.

Therefore, local authorities need to work with HNZ, owners of heritage places, tangata whenua, the community, and sometime specialist expertise (Quality Planning, n.d).

In policy and plan preparation, the RMA s.74 (2)(b)(iia) requires local authorities to have regard to any relevant entry in the New Zealand Heritage List . This heritage registration schedule is the primary heritage identification tool and a means of advocacy for the protection of places (McClellan, 2007). A two stage process determines the eligibility of any place to be entered on the register. The registration process raises concerns for Māori, as the concept of ranking of places is not culturally appropriate because places of significance to one iwi are no more or less significant than others. The register consists mainly of historic buildings, whilst the number of Māori sites is significantly low (Kahotea, 2010).

Heritage management and planning is governed by the *RMA* which provides for the protection of New Zealand historic heritage and the relationship of Māori with their cultural heritage. Heritage is recognised as a matter of national importance under the *RMA* including the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Sections 6(f) and 6(e) of the *RMA* requires decision-makers to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga (New Zealand Government, 2014).

The *RMA* also provides for Māori heritage planning indirectly through a number of sections of the act. Other sections relevant to Māori heritage is s.7a that requires in achieving the purpose of the *RMA* all persons exercising functions and powers shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga and in the same vein s.8 requires that principles of the TOW including the protection of taonga under article 2 of the treaty are taken into account. Under s.61, 66 & 74 territorial authorities must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, when preparing or changing a regional policy statement or district plan where its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district (New Zealand Government, 2014).

The First Schedule of the *RMA* requires council to consult with tangata whenua on resource management issues that are significant to them. District councils play a key role in carrying out the *RMA* statutory obligations regarding Māori heritage planning. This is achieved through its district plan, which gives effect to the *RMA* in relation to Māori heritage by scheduling wāhi tapu, sites of cultural significance and archaeological sites and recording them on planning maps. Development of or in proximity to these sites is subject to the resource consent process and any rules in the district plan (New Zealand Government, 2014).

Despite this strong statutory support for Māori heritage, the extent to which these provisions are applied in practice raises concerns. Smith (2010) observes that Māori cultural and spiritual values associated with the landscape have often been overridden, with incentives for protection almost entirely lacking. Additionally, Awatere, Harmsworth, Rolleston and Pauling (2013) highlight the lack of understanding by local authorities of Māori values, perspectives and knowledge while limited iwi/hapū capacity are also significant factors to the poor uptake and incorporation of Mātauranga Māori in planning. They also note that despite an increase over the past 20 years in Māori participation and engagement in the planning process the extent to which council's support iwi participation in resource management varies throughout the country. As a result there is a lack of direct Māori input into most planning and decision-making processes.

2.4 Māori gardening

Māori cultivation is part of the rich cultural legacy of New Zealand's indigenous people that stretches back to their beginnings in Hawaiki. Māori gardening is underpinned by ancient values, concepts and knowledge. Māori values express cultural identity and regulate cultural activity. The Māori concept of value is incorporated in the inclusive holistic term taonga which describes anything highly prized (Williams, 1957). Therefore taonga can describe something of value that may be tangible or intangible, material or spiritual. Taonga includes all taonga tuku iho and refers to the cultural lore, history and corpus of knowledge that upholds Māori cultural identity (Mead, 2003).

Kaitiakitanga is a salient issue for Māori. According to Marsden & Henare (1992) the term kaitiakitanga is derived from the word “tiaki” the basic meaning of which is to guard, but the term have other closely related meanings depending on the context i.e. to preserve, conserve and to protect. A kaitiaki is a guardian, conservator and protector. The principle of kaitiakitanga ensures resources are sustained for future generations. Marsden (2003) notes that failure to carry out kaitiakitanga duties can result in loss of mana and harm to an iwi and its region. Historically there has been large scale alienation of Māori from their lands and heritage (Kawharu, 2002). This loss has contributed to a diminished role of Māori as kaitiaki. Thus many Māori are no longer able to fulfil inherited intergenerational responsibilities to protect their taonga and the people and culture they sustain (Kawharu, 2000). Māori gardens can promote kaitiakitanga by ensuring traditional cultivation sites and local knowledge is protected and passed on through the generations. Furthermore, traditional Māori gardening is based on organic methods (Kerckhoffsa & Smith, 2010).

Kaitiakitanga cannot be understood without regard to other interrelated Māori concepts. For instance, whakapapa according to Kawharu (2000) establishes the rights to exercise kaitiakitanga. Philosophies relevant to Māori heritage are based upon a Māori worldview which describes the world by means of whakapapa and networks of interactive links between people and the environment, the physical and the spiritual (Selby, 2010).

Māori believe all living things have a whakapapa and everything is interconnected, the gods, the land, all of nature, ancestors and people (Mead, 2003). Māori therefore have a holistic view of their cultural, natural and intangible heritage and see it as inextricably connected. This is because Māori see no separation between the physical and metaphysical (Folke, Berkes & Colding, 1998). Māori knowledge has been built on a holistic communal view of humanity through cultural practices (Wham, Maxted, Dyall, Teh & Kers, 2012). Māori horticultural systems are therefore based on a holistic approach that is described as “Ki uta ki tai” (Roskruge, 2007). Māori gardens reconnect Māori with their whakapapa, through spiritual links to Papa-tū-ā-nuku and

cultivation deity such as Rongo-marae-roa and to their ancestral links to cultivation sites and traditions.

Mauri is imbued in all things which if degraded negatively impacts on whānau, hapū and iwi wellbeing, therefore the protection of mauri is expressed through kaitiakitanga (Selby, 2010). Mauri is a concept which binds and relates all resources to every other element in the natural order, including people, land and the spiritual realm (Marsden, 2003). Preserving mauri is seen as integral to Māori well-being and all actions and relationships. Any activity that affects the health of a resource such as land is said to be affecting its mauri and will impact the people associated with the resource. Protecting the integrity of mauri or the health and vitality of a resource or specific area was paramount for survival. Tikanga regulated access and use of natural resources in a manner that protected the mauri of a site to ensure sufficient supply of resources for the survival of the tribe (Marsden, 2003). Re-generating heritage sites in accord with sustainable practices employed by ancestors can restore the mauri of a site and therefore have positive impacts on the land and those involved.

Rangatiratanga is the authority for kaitiakitanga to be exercised (Mutu, 2010). Whereas the mana over resources is held by manawhenua who are the people holding title to land and resources and are therefore are the kaitiaki of the resources (Mutu, 2010; Kawharu, 2002). Rangatiratanga promotes Māori control over their heritage, customary knowledge and traditions. According to Durie (1998) the concept of Tino Rangatiratanga was consolidated by Māori at the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1835. This momentum grew in the 20th century through Māori development ideology. Māori development was a central theme at the landmark Hui Taumata in 1984, a Māori Economic Development Summit stressing Māori initiatives and self-reliance to address social disparities and promote Māori advancement (Fitzgerald, 2004). Self-determination is similar to Māori Development as both are focused on the advancement of Māori through economic self-sufficiency, social equity, cultural renaissance, increased political independence and safeguarding the environment for future generations. However, Tino Rangatiratanga places greater emphasis on Māori control over resources (Durie, 1998).

Māori gardens support self-determination and Māori development. Māori specific outcome goal classes for Māori development based on the Te Ngahuru schema, measures the wellbeing of the Maori nation and includes:

- Te Manawa: A secure cultural identity promotes positive Māori participation in society.
- Te Kāhui: Collective Māori synergies encompass vibrant Māori communities, enhanced whānau capacities and Māori autonomy or Tino rangatiratanga.
- Te Kete Huawai: Māori cultural and intellectual resources, encourages the practice of Māori culture and values.
- Te Ao Turoa: The Māori estate refers to regenerating the Māori land base and thereby providing access to a clean and healthy environment and enhancing resource sustainability (Durie, 2003).

Māori heritage food gardens can fulfil these measures as they promote Māori identity, self- determination, Māori culture, values and a regenerated land base. Traditional gardening methods supports environmentally sustainable practices as they are based on kaitiakitanga that. Māori gardens in former times had minimal impact on the environment as materials were obtained locally and limited to available resources within the surrounding landscape. For example, coastal settlements would use fish waste from the sea to fertilise their māra, illustrating the interconnection between the elements in accord with a Māori holistic worldview (Māori Council Officer 4, personal communication, August 7, 2014).

The traditional Māori world-view recognises the relationship between the spiritual world and the natural environment. Food was the central driver for cultivation because it was so important to Māori survival and played an important part in spiritual rituals as a sanctifier of tapu and noa. Food brings people back into a safe state of noa restoring physical and spiritual balance. Noa frees something from tapu or restriction and negates tapu which is inseparable from Māori cultural

practices. For example a roasted kūmara is often used in reducing the level of tapu of a new meeting house. All food continues today to be restricted in a tapu environment (Mead, 2003).

Food gardens were considered tapu from the time of planting right through to harvest (Tawhai, 2013). The first act of the harvest was the ritual of lifting the tapu associated with the plantation through karakia followed by the presentation of the first fruits of harvest to the Māori god of the kūmara and cultivated foods Rongomarae-roa (Ericksen-Sohos, 2005).

A spiritual custom of the hapū Ngāti Wairere of the Tainui iwi from the Waikato was at hauhake right on dawn before sunrise, old people gathered and lit a fire by one particular mound chosen as the one that contained the mauri of the māra. At harvest time, kuia are the first to pull kūmara out and also to recite the first karakia to lift the tapu from a kūmara crop. The kuia will then place the first offering of kūmara along with other offerings on a tūahu to Hoturoa. Ngāti Wairere also plant their kūmara directly facing the east where the sun rises. These practices have been continued today at Te Para Para garden and emphasise how hapū can retain the cultivation traditions of their forbearers in modern times (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2015). Māori heritage food garden initiatives continue the ongoing practice of spiritual rituals associated with gardening such as tapu and noa considerations and karakia.

Tapu also applies to rahui that were sometimes used to assert kaitiakitanga to protect Māori cultivation resources. A rahui is a restriction or prohibition where something becomes tapu from normal use. Rahui, expresses broader rights to exercise kaitiakitanga. All types of rahui, whether for rejuvenating a depleted resource, restoring mauri or periodical harvesting, support customary resource management and are used as a tool for conservation prohibition (Kawharu, 2000). Makereti in her ethnographic account of Māori life around the 1900s, influenced by her own upbringing and tikanga of Te Arawa, described the use of rahui in relation to gardening. Makereti described the restrictions of entry to areas of cultivation

particularly of kūmara to reinforce hapū/tribal territory and aukati or risk penalty for trespassing or taking kūmara without permission (Makereti, 1986). In a contemporary context, rahui may include restrictions such as rules around vandalism or resource use. This is important because as Pirikahu (2008) notes theft and vandalism can hinder the success of Māori communal gardens.

Spiritual associations underpin the Māori value of Manaakitanga. According to Māori cosmology Tane planted three mauri in where kura including mana atua, mauri tangata and mauri manaaki which exemplifies the importance of manaakitanga to Māori (Marsden, 2003). Māori place great value upon hospitality and looking after people, an idea encompassed in the word manaakitanga. All tikanga are underpinned by the high value placed upon manaakitanga which encompasses nurturing relationships, looking after people and being very careful about how others are treated (Mead, 2003).

According to Marsden (2003) manaakitanga is derived from the power of the word mana-ā-ki and means to bestow a blessing upon, express love and hospitality towards people. Its purpose is to remind the host people to whom the house belongs, that they should be charitable and kind to host visitors who come to their marae. Manaakitanga requires that people who visit a marae or the homes of Māori are treated as special guests and are offered hospitality by the hosts. The most important attributes for the hosts are to provide an abundance of food, a place to rest, and look after visitors so that peace prevails during the gathering. Even when the available food has been consumed, the hosts must make an effort to provide food for the next group of visitors (Barlow, 1991).

For Māori upholding manaakitanga and providing generously with good quality kai is about enforcing the Māori philosophy of aroha ki te tangata² and raises the mana of the people. The whakataukī “E nui e te whaing-a-kai, e tau e Tamaiwaho”³ emphasises that the reward of good hospitality is the blessing of Tamaiwaho, the

² Love for the people.

³ The more plentiful the heap of food, the more favourable is Tamaiwaho.

source of all karakia (Mead & Grove, 2001). It is just one of the many Māori proverbs which accentuate the importance of maintaining the cultural ideals of manaakitanga. Mead (2003) says it cannot be stressed enough that manaakitanga is always important no matter what the circumstances might be. The particular food sources associated with tribal areas are a source of mana and manaaki for iwi/hapū of that area (Mead, 2003). Māori food gardens can help to uphold manaakitanga obligations through the provision of food traditional to an area.

The meaning of *oranga* includes livelihood, welfare and health. *Oranga* is encompassed in the Te Whare Tapa Whā model (shown in Figure 3.) constructed by Durie in 1982 that uses the four walls of the meeting house to represent different aspects of health in accord with a Māori worldview:

Te taha wairua – the spiritual component

Te taha hinengaro – a psychic component

Te taha tinana – a bodily component

Te taha whanau – a family component (Spicer, Trilin & Walton, 1994, p. 196).



Figure 3: Whare Tapa Whā model (Source: Spicer, Trilin & Walton, 1994, p. 196)

This holistic model of health recognises the physical, mental, spiritual, cultural and family aspects of health that cannot be considered in isolation when addressing health in wellbeing (Durie, 1985). The ICOSMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value 1995 stresses that the indigenous heritage of Māori is inseparable from identity and wellbeing. Furthermore, Kawharu (2002) notes that ancestral landscapes of iwi, hapū and whānau are inseparable from the identity and wellbeing of Māori as tangata whenua.

Community and marae gardens have also been identified as a way to improve health and wellbeing as a part of Whānau Ora initiatives to promote Hauora Māori (Huri ki te whenua, 2007). Whānau Ora evolved out of the coalition between the National and Māori parties after the 2008 general election and became a cornerstone of the coalition agreement between them after the 2011 general election. Te Puni Kōkiri describes Whānau Ora as an inclusive approach that empowers whānau as a whole rather than focusing separately on individual whānau members. The assumption is that if whānau health is protected so will the health of the hapū and iwi. These initiatives are important to address the intergenerational effects of past practices on Whānau Ora including the impacts of assimilation and cultural genocide. According to Marsden (2003) colonisation has robbed tangata whenua of their taonga resulting in loss of dignity, self-esteem and identity. Furthermore, cultural genocide produces spiritual and psychological insecurity manifested in negative social and other disorders.

Traditional foods promote the Māori concept of oranga. Wham et al. (2012) notes that traditional foods grown and eaten in the past by Māori meet healthy eating goals and also contain protective antioxidants, phytochemicals and anti-inflammatory agents. Furthermore, research by the Riddet Institute showed that traditional rīwai cultivars they tested showed significant nutritional advantages over the modern potato. These research results are true for many old vegetable varieties compared to the modern equivalents, which paradoxically produce more food yet are less nutritious (Barr, 2010). The Ngai Tahu (2013) publication, *Te Karaka*, observes that

indigenous people all around the world are returning to their traditional diet as a way of addressing the growing problems of modern diseases like diabetes, heart problems and obesity. Furthermore, *Te Karaka* mentions how along with sea and river foods, there's now a return to cultivated crops.

Māori food gardens will promote the retention of foodways. Cheung (2013) describes foodways as a kind of intangible heritage that includes traditional foods associated skills and traditions. Cheung (2013) notes that “foodways” are becoming more challenging to inherit and sustain, thus the risk of their erasure should not go unnoticed (Cheung, 2013).

Māori gardens address health in a number of ways. Māori communal gardening helps to prevent loneliness and isolation as it promotes kotahitanga and whānaungātanga. Māori gardens also promote cultural identity through linking back to culture and traditions and heritage. Gardens promote physical wellbeing through healthy nutrition and physical activity. Moreover, gardens can contribute to spiritual wellbeing through practices such as karakia and connection to the Papa-tū-ā-nuku through having contact with the whenua.

Māori gardens support cultural wellbeing as they can help to uphold Akoranga. Barlow (1991) describes akoranga as the traditional teachings of a tribe. Akoranga includes Mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori and the ethical values. Gardens provide a space where kaumātua can pass their knowledge on younger generations through oral teachings. This is important as “The oral tradition is considered by Māori as the most important historical tradition for Māori” (Royal, 1992, p. 20). According to Māori Affairs Minister Dr Pita Sharples setting up the māra kai programme in 2009 to promote community gardens on marae and Māori community projects promotes is an act of reclaiming Māori culture and knowledge transfer (Sharples, 2009).

2.5 Māori gardens

Māori brought with them from Polynesia an array of traditional foods that supported their wellbeing. Seed crops that were brought from the tropics to Aotearoa included

kūmara, ūwhi, hue, taro, ti pore and aute grown specifically for its use as a textile. However, the cooler seasonal temperate climate of Aotearoa with its distinct seasons meant that the only crop that was grown successfully on a large scale was the kūmara. In Polynesia the kūmara was not as highly regarded as the taro or breadfruit and therefore unlike in New Zealand there was an absence or ritual in its planting. Hiroa (1925) wrote that the kūmara was a vital carbohydrate source for Māori and therefore played a key role in sustaining the people and fulfilling social obligations such as Manaakitanga and as a result was highly prized.

Māori had to employ innovative techniques to grow Polynesian root crops that had to adjust to a cooler climate. “Hawaiki te whenua e tupu noa mai te kūmara I roto I te rauruhe” this Māori proverb describes how Hawaiki is the land where kūmara grows spontaneously among the fern root. This is a reference to the supposed ease of gathering food in Hawaiki. However, after arriving in Aotearoa Māori had to adapt to more difficult growing conditions. This adjustment included utilising different raw materials and modifying the environment to improve growing conditions such as the addition of gravel and sand to soil, mulching, fences, windbreaks and possibly stone rows (Leach, 1984).

Taro was grown for its starch tuber and leaves that can be eaten. However, it has higher moisture requirements than kūmara growing well on banks of streams or in swampy areas and takes longer to grow than kūmara with a growing period of 6-7 months (Best, 1976). Little is known about ūwhi except that they were soon replaced by potato in the nineteenth century as ūwhi takes several months to grow. The hue, however was cultivated for large fruits and when mature were used as containers. However, they too have a long growing season of 6 to 7 months and needs temperatures above 17C (Ericksen-Sohos, 2005). Pre-European Ti pore was only suited to favourable parts in Northland and soon disappeared from Māori gardens after the Europeans arrived. Its unlikely aute was cultivated in large numbers to make sufficient cloth as it became extinct after 1844 (Furey, 2006).

Kūmara was one of the most important of the cultivated food products before European settlement as Kūmara was the most tolerant to the widest range of conditions. However to grow a reasonable crop of tubers temperatures of 15°C were needed for five continuous months to ensure successful germination. The climate of the North Island fits these criteria. However, young kūmara plants are very susceptible to frost damage early in their growing season. Furthermore, harvested kūmara had to be kept at a temperature above 10°C, so Māori developed subterranean pits, known as rua kai or rua kūmara, an Aotearoa adaption for their storage during non-growing seasons (Burtenshaw, Tawhai, Tomlin & Tawhai, 2009).

The exact number of varieties brought to New Zealand is unknown. Colenso in 1880 named 32 from Northland and 16 from the Hawkes Bay and East Coast ranging from white skin with white flesh to purple with purple flesh. Elsdon Best (1976) identified over 100 from different districts. It was probably on account of its importance that so much custom and ceremony pertained to the planting, cultivation, and storage of Kūmara (Nelson Mail, 2003). Because of its importance, mana was also derived from having quality kūmara to present to guests (Horrocks, Shane, Barber, D'Costa & Nichol, 2003).

Wild foods were semi-cultivated in areas where it was more difficult to grow root crops. In colder locations such as Te Wai Pounamu, kūmara could not be cultivated so endemic wild food alternatives such as aruhe (fernroot) and poro poro were semi-cultivated. The rhizomes of the bracken fern Aruhe were according to eighteenth century botanist Joseph Banks the foundation of meals eaten by Māori. Tree's with edible berries or parts such as Karaka and Tī kouka were also grown. The indigenous people of Wharekauri, the Moriori, relied on karaka as one of their primary land-based food sources as they were unable to grow kūmara (Hamilton, 1903). Today remnant groves of Karaka or Tī kouka can indicate the location of former Maori settlements and therefore mark Maori heritage sites (Best, 1976; Taylor & Sutton, 1999b).

The introduction of European cultivars impacted on the cultivation of traditional Māori vegetables. Potato crops took priority over kūmara, as they are easier to grow, have greater yields and tolerate a wider range of soil types (Gould, 2007). Kūmara continued to be grown after the introduction of European crops but by the early 1800s Māori kūmara was replaced with European introduced varieties which were bigger and sweeter (Coleman, 1972). The new vegetables introduced by Europeans were absorbed into the Māori gardening system, and the traditional crops were either dropped or replaced with superior varieties (Leach, 1983).

Garden design was an expression of Māori identity. Māori gardens included embellished tribal carvings to illustrate tribal beliefs, history, customs and ancestors (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2015). Māori resided within the boundaries of their iwi domain around the various districts of the country and lived in kāinga or pā as hapū groupings. Hapū were made up of different whānau united through their common whakapapa and kinship ties. Kāinga also known as papa kāinga were characterised by communal living arrangements where large groups of people shared common amenities and activities such as gardening (Rolleston & Awatere, 2009). The strong association between land occupation and food resources was evident in the many claims heard during Māori Land Court hearings where land title could be proven through reference to food cultivation sites (Baldwin, 1905).

Favoured sites for gardening were identified by their names usually associated with specific whānau or hapū. Some gardens were located near unornamented pātaka called pātaka kokau or pātaka toto kau that were used to store preserved and dried foods such as kao kūmara (Best, 1974). According to Best (1974) pātaka whakairo at pā, often located in the centre of a kāinga, were not used to store crops. Rather they stored ornaments, garments or objects belonging to the ariki. Whata were used for food storage such as kūmara (Best, 1974). Māori placed stone statues of Rongomarae-roa in plantations that were kept at the tūāhu and were located at the head of the māra site from planting until harvest time (Best, 1976).

2.5.1 Gardens Post-Contact

The nineteenth century saw a number of significant changes to Māori gardening practices. Spiritual practices associated with gardening declined with the missionary influence who introduced European religious practices and horticultural instruction. Additionally, urbanisation, the adoption of new technologies, methods and tools, land loss and colonisation contributed to the decline in Māori cultivation knowledge and traditions (Furey, 2006). In the 1880s pastoralism became a major focus and traditional gardening crops, methods and tools were abandoned as new manufactured items became accessible and intensive land management was preferred (Roskruge, 2011).

European immigration increased the prevalence of pests, diseases and weeds brought from Europe (Bulmer, 1995). The introduced potato came to take priority over kūmara, as they were easier to grow and had greater yields (Gould, 2007). The potato is not generally considered as having arrived with the Māori in pre-European times. Māori however have oral anecdotes which indicate some varieties of potato were here prior to that time (Roskruge, 1999).

Gardening implements of the Māori included stone and wooden tools such as ko, karetu, kaheru, hoto and peka, koko, tikoko and timotimo. Post European settlement these tools were replaced by metal tools that were easier to use, access and allowed for larger cultivations (Leach, 1984). However, Māori tools had their advantages. For example, ketu used to lever kūmara from the soil do not bruise kūmara like other tools can (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2015).

Prior to WWII, ninety per cent of the Māori resided rurally and predominantly within their tribal domains (Spoonley, Pearson & MacPherson, 1996). However, for many Māori from the 1950s onward saw a decrease in the number of Māori who kept gardens at their homes with increasing urbanisation (Durie, 2003). With this shift much of the traditional knowledge surrounding the cultivation of local foods is being lost (*Cultivated foods of the Māori*, n.d). Moreover, cheaply available food from

stores in urban areas meant gardening was not a priority anymore for many Māori. As a result, today's younger generations have limited experience with growing and harvesting food (Moon, 2005; Earle; 2011).

The process of urbanisation not only continued but also intensified the threat of cultural losses that had begun with European contact and colonisation, as many Māori urban migrants were distanced and disenfranchised from the tribal origins of their parents and grandparents (Walker, 2004). Earle (2011) highlights that in rural locations gardening was a collective effort, important to supplying local marae and hui with kai. However, Māori who migrated to urban areas in the mid-twentieth century tended to lose touch with this knowledge and skills. Tanzcos (2009) notes that 30 years ago many marae were relatively self-sustaining, able to provide food for hui instead of having to go to the supermarket. However, as produce has become cheaper and less people are living in rural communities' marae gardens became less common. Roy (2011) points out that the majority of marae are located on the rural outskirts of small villages. Over time though as more jobs were to be found in the city very few lived near these rural marae and the customary transfer of knowledge from elder to grandchild was disrupted.

2.5.2 Contemporary Issues

There has been a renewed interest in growing traditional Māori crops. Today Māori potatoes have become difficult to obtain, as cultivation had severely declined with the urbanisation of Māori and loss of land, and those that have survived are susceptible to many pests and diseases (Kerckhoffsa & Smith, 2010). A major research effort coordinated by Tāhuri Whenua Incorporated Society, a National Māori Vegetable Growers collective has helped to improve the quality, quantity and supply of Māori potatoes. Virus-free lines of several cultivars are now available through their established seed banks.

Kūmara is regarded as non-indigenous by scientists. However, the WAI 262 indigenous flora and fauna and cultural intellectual property treaty claimants stressed

that certain cultivars of kūmara were developed in New Zealand by Māori gardeners and highlighted the importance of retaining their genetic seed heritage as taonga species (Park, 2001). Kerckhoffs & Smith (2010) note that some treasured kūmara heritage varieties are making a comeback. In addition, vegetables such as kokihi, kānga and pikopiko are all identified by growers as possible growing options. This is important to note in relation to the revival of Māori gardens that they could potentially revive old Māori seed crop varieties. Jordan (2010) highlights that retention of heritage seed to help recover vegetable varieties close to extinction, will help to ensure the survival of genetic heritage.

Evidence of Māori gardening sites and methods has largely been through archaeological evidence⁴. However, in many areas these physical remains of gardens are difficult to trace even when the location of gardens is known. This is because archaeological evidence has been vulnerable to land-use change over time. Many land-use activities especially those associated with farming are not subject to the resource consent process and therefore do not require evaluation of adverse effects on archaeological sites present. Furey (2006) highlights that more consideration is needed to assess adverse effects and possible solutions.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the European roots of the New Zealand heritage field and the evolution of considerations of Māori heritage within the planning field. The heritage and planning statutory framework relevant to Māori heritage was discussed and the role of councils in protecting Māori heritage. The building bias in heritage management was highlighted and the need for improvement in the management of Māori heritage to ensure its protection into the future. Then an overview of traditional Māori gardening knowledge, traditions and practices was provided and how this can still be relevant today in relation to reviving Māori gardens as heritage. The next chapter discusses the Kaupapa Māori research methodology and qualitative research methods used for this thesis.

⁴ Such as stone structures i.e. terraces, rows, alignments, mounds and heaps, ditches and channels, borrow pits and garden soils that have had other materials such as sand, gravel or shell added .

3: Methodology - Kaupapa Māori Research

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the research techniques used in this thesis. Investigating the best research methodology was the first step in deciding which approach was appropriate for this thesis. I identified that the research carried out to support this topic, required a kaupapa Māori research (KMR) methodology and its supportive ethical framework. This approach would allow me to conduct this research using a Māori perspective given the research focus and my background. This chapter will first discuss a kaupapa Māori (KM) approach to research. Next, it will investigate KM ethics and ethical considerations. Lastly, the research methods to be used are discussed including a consideration of qualitative and quantitative methods, participant recruitment and interview methods.

3.2 Kaupapa Māori

Although it's usage in academic research only began in the 1990s, KM is actually an old term. Williams (1957) defines kaupapa as a plan, scheme or proposal and the modern use of the term Māori is native, or belonging to New Zealand. However, the past usage of the term Māori is defined as normal, usual, ordinary and was often used to distinguish objects from others. Marsden & Henare (1992) observe that kaupapa is derived from two words kau and papa in this context kau means to appear for the first time, to come into view, to disclose, papa means ground or foundations. Hence kaupapa means ground rules, first principles and general principles.

Today's interpretations of KM are based on how KM applies in a contemporary setting. Pihama (2001) says KM encapsulates Māori aspirations to recover Māori philosophies and traditions. Royal (2012) describes KM as broadly referring to a particular plan of action made by Māori and illustrates Māori aspirations, worldview and values. Therefore, in a contemporary context a KM model draws on and affirms customary knowledge and practices. Bishop (1994) and Tuhiwai-Smith (1999) highlight that the goal of KM methodologies is the creation of knowledge, which enables transformation and liberation to take place. KM therefore operationalises

self-determination and is seen as transformative practice, a decolonisation process and promotes the development of practical proactive interventions.

Kaupapa Māori theory (KMT) was born out of socio-political shifts in Māori society. Political activism started in the later part of the 20th century by groups such as Ngā Tamatoa, highlighted the obligation of the Crown to redress the dire Māori suffering as a result of the impact of land loss through Crown raupatu and assimilation policies which lead to the erosion of Mātauranga Māori including land, customs, language and cultural heritage. A transformation in society occurred in the late 1960s; a period of cultural and political revival for tangata whenua coined the Māori renaissance (Durie, 1998).

Māori began to assert their tino rangatiratanga by asserting their intellectual and cultural property rights over Māori knowledge. For example, movements developed focused on global indigenous rights recognition, Māori education and language revival policies such as Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003; Durie, 1998). Underpinning KMT is an examination of the impacts of colonisation, forces of power and disparities in society. According to Pihama (2001) KMT provides Māori with a theoretical process that addresses their struggles and issues of power as a conscious part of their analysis. KMT is about challenging injustice, revealing inequalities, and seeking transformation (Pihama, 2001). Bishop (1999) highlights that KMT has similarities to critical theory which concerns issues of resistance and emancipation and exposing the hegemonic power structures in society perpetuating societal inequalities.

In an attempt to understand KMT it must be recognised that KM is more than just Māori knowledge and beliefs, but a way of framing how we think about these ideas and practices. In the same way that Māori cultural practices are validated within Māori cultural contexts; KMT is validated and legitimated within the understandings of a Māori worldview. KM anticipates Tikanga Māori; “Tikanga Māori are distinctive Māori ways of doing things and cultural behaviours through which Kaupapa Māori are expressed and made tangible” (Royal, 2012, p.30).

3.2.1 Kaupapa Māori Research

In both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries writers have tended to misrepresent Māori histories in terms of models drawn from European culture which have engendered common myths about Māori personalities and cultural practices (Royal, 1992; Bishop 1999). Māori were often judged in non-Māori contexts and not on their own terms (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003; Durie, 2005). Furthermore, according to Te Awekotuku (1991) past research conducted within a western framework has been preoccupied with describing Māori people, sometimes as degenerate and inferior or as noble savages. In the 1960s Māori began to more widely voice their criticism of past research about Māori which cast Māori as the problem and perpetuated stereotypes (Glover, 1997; Forster 2003).

The Hunn Report in 1960 used statistical information to promote awareness about the division between European and Māori standards in all areas of life, highlighting that, measured against Pākehā, Māori were less well off. Yet this comparative focus did not provide effective outcomes for Māori because it focused on deficits rather than solutions. Furthermore, although the data in the report was based on valid statistical findings the report promoted media public impressions of Māori shaped by the overall view of Māori linked with negativity (Durie, 1992). Furthermore, this type of research was based on the assumption that Maori were a homogeneous group and drove the construction of negative labels for Māori people as a whole. Whilst Māori people, in a contemporary context share a number of similarities there are also many differences such as iwi identity (Forster, 2003).

The Māori activism in the late twentieth century created the conditions for the emergence of KMR founded on KM principles. In 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal was established to provide an avenue for tangata whenua land and cultural claims and in a research context provided a platform for recording Māori accounts of colonial history and its impact on Māori worldviews and values (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999).

As more Māori began to participate in university education an increasing number of Māori writers emerged. Furthermore, scholar Evelyn Stokes advocated successfully at

a high level national science policy forum, for the colonisation of Māori focused research priorities (Walsh-Tapiata, 1998). These initiatives lead to the emergence of KMR in the 1990s, developed as a means of supporting the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999).

Criticism by Māori has been that research, which has been mainly university based, has further ostracised Māori (Stokes, 1985). According to Jahnke & Taiapa (2003) academic terminology guaranteed that research was inaccessible to Māori, thus power remained with the researchers. Māori have frequently only participated as cultural advisors or interviewers.

Since tangata whenua have become increasingly focused on whānau, hapū and iwi development, the lack of research in supporting Māori advancement has become apparent. Past positivist approaches to research have often provided little benefit to Māori (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003). The major dichotomy between indigenous and Western science lies in its narrow focus and unwillingness to accept mythology or oral tradition which are essential aspects of Mātauranga Māori. Past research on Māori has been undertaken within a Western agenda where Māori knowledge and culture was objectified and invalidated (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999; Mahuika, 2008).

The purpose of KMR is to present valid knowledge and realities of the Māori world, whilst incorporating Māori values, philosophy and tikanga Māori. An examination of Māori narratives provides insights into components of Māori worldviews relevant to KMR methodologies, such as the need for research to be conducted for collective rather than individual benefit. For instance, in the story ngā kete e toru, the Māori god Tane journeyed to the heavens, to obtain the three baskets of knowledge for the benefit of all of his people; “Increasingly, literature appears criticising academics who engage in research in the Māori world which is of dubious relevance to Māoridom, which adopts culturally inappropriate methodology and which is more empowering of the individual researcher than it is for individuals involved in the study, or Māoridom collectively” (Irwin, 1994, p. 35).

Through KMR, Māori are able to advance the aims and processes of Māori development, which according to Durie (1998) supports self-determination and cultural, social, economic and environmental advancement. One central principle of KMR is that it positions researchers in such a way as to operationalise self-determination for research participants. This is because the cultural aspirations, understandings and practices of Māori people implement and organise the research process. KMR challenges the locus of power and control over the research issues of benefits, legitimation and accountability being located in another cultural frame of reference (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999).

KMR is research by Māori for Māori thus meeting the needs of Māori (Kennedy & Jeffries, 2008). KMR rejects the untenable colonial assumption that western models are normal and indigenous models are different (Sligo & Bathurst, 2005). Many scholars have argued that having a strong Māori identity should be a prerequisite for conducting Kaupapa Māori research, as it ensures the researcher has an in depth understanding of Māori philosophies and customary practices (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999; Pihama; 2001; Irwin; 1994). Throughout this research I have tried to quote Māori as much as possible, particularly planners and Māori historians and heritage experts who have an intrinsic understanding of a Māori worldview to help inform this research in accord with a KMR approach.

3.3 Research Method

There are some similarities between KM and qualitative research methods particularly in how they differ from quantitative methods. Qualitative methods are similar to a KMR approach as they both investigate human behaviour, descriptions, meanings, concepts, metaphors and reflect the quality of information. Additionally, they involve interactive, flexible and thematic processes. This thesis investigates, how planning can contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage through the reflections of the research interviewees.

Qualitative methods contrast with quantitative methods that count, measure and rank, translating variables, preferring to understand how a population as a whole thinks rather than focusing on small groups (Davidson & Tolich, 1999). For my research I needed to provide an insightful evaluation of planning for living indigenous heritage that may assist future plans of revival and development of traditional Māori gardens. With this aim in mind I needed to find out about the experiences and reflections of my interviewees which is why a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach was the suitable method for this research “Certain experiences cannot be meaningful expressed by numbers” (Berg, 2007, p. 3).

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Researchers must adhere to the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluation involving Human Participants which is a requirement of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC). These guidelines helped to steer how I approached my research including respect for those involved in the research, valuing participant’s knowledge, upholding cultural traditions and adherence with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (TOW) including protection, participation and partnership which is vital too when conducting KMR. Because my research required interaction with human participants in the form of interviews, I needed to obtain ethical approval from MUHEC to safeguard not only the interviewees but also myself and the university during the research process.

The research was identified as low risk as I was not researching sensitive topics or planning to interview vulnerable people or groups (Massey University, 2014). It was determined by my supervisor and a peer reviewer that my research required a low risk application. The application was deemed low risk as informed consent would be sought, participants would have the opportunity to withdraw at any point, give oral consent instead of written and decide whether the interview would be sound recorded. They would also be given the option of having a summary of the research sent to them when it was completed and whether they wanted their identity and role being attached to the comments in the thesis.

KMR ethics uphold Māori philosophies. For example, Māori values and attitudes towards knowledge are found in the cosmological narrative about ngā kete e toru. This narrative describes Tanenuiarangi and the pursuit of knowledge and teaches that the process of research is just as important as the information generated (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999). Additionally, it is expected by Māori that research should be guided by the principle of tika which is the basis of the word tikanga to ensure that all involved are collectively richer for the experience and pleased to have been a part of the research. Tika also provides a clear framework of ethics and ensures that no one is offended by the research process or results (Mead, 2003).

KMR promotes ethical conduct. Research must therefore be attuned to Māori ways of knowing and seeks to maximise the participation and the interest of Māori by carrying out ethical conduct which ensures responsibility and accountability to the participants and shared control of the research (Bishop, 1994; Glover, 1997). Additionally, the rights and interests of participants are safeguarded through respecting their right to regulate the research material, legitimate consent procedures, full consultation and a commitment to report back to the participants, which in turn creates enduring relationships (Te Awekotuku, 1991).

This research ensured a KMR ethical approach by adhering to Māori principles such as whakapapa, Te reo Māori, whānau and tikanga Māori to ensure the research, is authentic to Māori (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999). For example, I have incorporated the principle of Te Reo Māori, in my research by providing consent and information forms prior to interviewing my research participants written in both Māori⁵ and English⁶. Also one of my interviews was conducted in Te Reo Māori, as instigated by a kuia. The principal of tikanga Māori was incorporated through ensuring cultural institutions were provided for throughout the research process i.e. koha for participants, provision for karakia and other cultural protocols if requested. The principle of rangatiratanga was provided for by allowing participants full participation in decisions throughout the research process i.e. deciding when and where to meet and being

⁵ Refer to Appendix 1

⁶ Refer to Appendix 2

able to read over their interview transcripts and make changes or additions. The principle of whānau was incorporated by interviewing whānau research groups which included two different whānau interviews, including one interview held on the marae.

A KMR ethical framework upholds the empowerment of Māori throughout the research process. Therefore, I was conscious throughout the research process to ensure participants are participating because they want to, and was aware that their information was being sought for research aimed at benefiting Māori. My actions were guided by recommendations for ethical research conduct which promotes the adherence with the following Māori principles:

1. Aroha ki te tangata- Respect all people and their information
2. Kanohi kitea – Face to face contact, personal interviews, showing willingness to seek information and integrity
3. Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero – Listen and observe before speaking. Reflects respect and willingness to learn
4. Manaaki – Generosity, caring, patience, sharing
5. Kia tupato – Be cautious. Confidentiality very important
6. Kua e takahia te mana o te tangata - Do not ridicule, embarrass or hurt anyone in the process (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999)

3.5 Data Collection

The method used for this research was interviewing as it was identified as being attuned to a KMR approach. This is because interviewing supports the Māori principle of kanohi ki te kanohi. Interviewing which is also a qualitative research method allows participants to communicate, share their knowledge and information about their lived experiences, opinions and new insights (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Thus, through interviewing I had the opportunity to explore participants' beliefs and explanations relevant to the research topic. Interviewing meant I was able to provide a views and information that was not available in the documentation.

The snowballing technique was used during data collection which supported the Māori value of whānaungātanga that in a research context emphasises relationship building through a contact already known to the interview participant. According to Berg (2003), snowballing involves asking interviewees for the names of other people that could be interviewed for the same research. Because I was unknown to most of my interviewees I had to rely on networks and interviewees to introduce me to their contacts who were identified as appropriate people to interview for this thesis. According to Dewes (1975) Māori prefer someone they know and trust to organise face to face contacts with a researcher. The Māori saying he kanohi kitea expresses why this contact should be made (Irwin, 1994).

People were approached to be interviewed who were able to provide a perspective on planning issues related to Māori heritage. There were 21 research participants who contributed to this research including planners, Māori council officers, a heritage expert, a health promoter and Māori garden representatives. My approach in selecting the participants was to seek participants from varying cities with a high percentage of Māori residents. I presumed that finding commonalities across a broad range of council situations in various locations in the North Island would add interest to my findings and robustness to the analysis. I was limited in how many people I could interview because of time and resource constraints.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the appropriate form of interviewing for this research. A participant information sheet⁷ and consent forms were provided to the sixteen interview participants prior to the interview taking place. Structured interviews use a questionnaire format with closed questions and are primarily used to obtain quantitative rather than qualitative data and would therefore not be appropriate for KMR. An unstructured interview allows for spontaneity and development of questions as the interview proceeds (Whiting, 2008). This approach was not used as time constraints meant I did not have the time to identify patterns in interviewees' responses that is part of the unstructured interview techniques.

⁷ Refer to Appendix 3

Semi structured interviews allowed me to conduct in-depth interviews as they allow for open questions and detailed stories yet still use prearranged questions⁸ to keep interviews on track. Five research participants (three planners and two Māori council officers) had to either cancel interviews or preferred to fill out the semi-structured interview forms instead of participating in an interview. Therefore their responses were generally shorter.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the importance and need for KMR. The overarching aim is to explore the a topic centred on supporting positive outcomes for Māori through heritage planning mechanisms, thus a KM approach was selected as the appropriate methodology for this research. Important ethical guidelines were also considered as an integral part of the research process. Qualitative methods such as semi-structured interviews were identified as complimenting a KMR approach and supporting tikanga Māori during the research process. The next chapter will review the literature relevant to this thesis.

⁸ Refer to Appendix 4: Interview questions for planners Māori council officers and heritage experts; Appendix 5: Interview questions for Māori garden representatives; Appendix 6: Interview questions for health promoter

4. Literature Review

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the rationale for conducting research on planning for Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage. Therefore, the following review will explore the literature pertinent to my research study. The chapter is organised into four sections a) key concepts and terms b) heritage c) heritage and planning d) Māori gardens and heritage.

4.2 Scope of Review

The literature in this review does suggest that a supportive planning framework will help to restore Māori food cultivation heritage and therefore helps toward answering the central research question of this thesis, *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?*

The field of heritage gardens of the ornamental type is an established area of academic scholarship however there is a dearth of information on heritage food gardens in both the international and New Zealand literature. Therefore the corpus of related literature around aspects of gardening, pertinent to planning for Māori heritage from various fields such as heritage, Māori history, museum studies, architecture, archaeology and planning have informed this review. This related literature provides an epistemological framework to analyse the concepts and theories pertinent to planning for Māori heritage food gardens. The literature used for this research focuses on periphery issues surrounding the research topic such as Māori, cultural, intangible and indigenous heritage, planning and Māori gardens.

Due to research limitations this review focuses on Māori heritage planning at the district or city plan level. The planning literature that was relevant in relation to participation, values, and collaboration was sourced from both international and national sources. International sources included Healey (1992), Lane (2005), Friedman

(1987) and Sandercock (2004). However, the most relevant material came from the New Zealand literature. This is because this research is viewed within a Māori interpretative framework as it is underpinned by a kaupapa Māori methodology that legitimises and validates Māori philosophies. The fact that this research is situated within a Māori context and research framework does create some challenges due to the paucity of literature on Māori issues particularly Māori heritage planning issues. This includes a limited amount of research undertaken by Māori researchers.

Most information relevant to Māori heritage gardens in a planning context is primarily from the past two decades as there is virtually no literature regarding Māori planning and heritage before the 1990s and the enactment of the RMA. The literature used discusses Māori planning in a heritage context and includes indigenous planning theory, district plan and planning tools material as they relate to Māori such as Matunga (2001; 2013), Harmsworth (1997), Kapua (2007), Kennedy (2008), Kamo (2010) and Awatere et al. (2013). A common theme in this literature is the need for more proactive planning to better address Māori planning issues such as Māori heritage identification and protection.

There is dearth of information addressing Māori food gardens on historic sites or on marae as part of New Zealand heritage. Much of the older works on Māori gardens such as Best (1976) and Leach (1980) are more focused on gardening as an activity, including the techniques and practices of communal vegetable gardens.

Works by Tawhai (2013), Roskruge (2011), Hutchings et al. (2010) and Roberts et al. (2006) were particularly relevant as they refer to the value in restoring Mātauranga Māori, as relevant to gardens in a contemporary context. The New Zealand literature such as Harris (1995) and Leach (1996) associated with heritage gardens highlights the exotic and decorative nature of gardens modelled from overseas garden heritage that does not include food gardens.

Grey literature such as reports and internet sources were reviewed to provide information where there was limited scholarship available around heritage definitions

and terms, such as McClean (2007), and about sustaining communal gardens such as Pirikahu (2008). Masters theses such as Earle (2011) focusing on community gardens and Goldsmith (2014) on New Zealand heritage gardens as curtilage of buildings were useful to some extent as they both addressed gardening in a New Zealand context.

4. 3 Organisation of Review

This literature review first describes and provides a brief analysis of the key concepts and terms that are pertinent to this thesis including: a) heritage b) cultural and natural heritage c) tangible and intangible heritage d) living heritage e) cultural landscape f) ancestral landscape g) New Zealand heritage h) Māori heritage i) historic garden j) New Zealand historic garden k) Māori heritage garden.

The heritage section first discusses critical heritage studies (CHS) which are an important theoretical base for this study as it helps to explain how heritage is shaped and the implications of this historically and today for Māori heritage. The next subsection discusses cultural heritage management (CHM) as it relates to Māori. The planning and heritage section first discuss participation in relation to planning processes and what this means for Māori. The contested values and values-centered planning subsections highlight the challenges of competing values within planning and the need for further improvements to help create greater understandings around Māori heritage values.

Lastly, the pro-active planning subsection discusses ways to gain greater protection of Māori heritage that may also help to provide a more supportive framework for Māori heritage gardens in general. The Māori gardens and heritage section addresses the relevant Māori garden heritage literature available. The first subsection Mātauranga Māori, discusses those works that assert the significance of Māori gardening traditions, practice and values in a contemporary context. The next subsection provides a brief glimpse into the connection between gardens and health. The last section challenges and opportunities, emphasises the barriers to overcome in trying to sustain communal heritage and gardening projects.

4.4 Key Concepts and Terms

4.4.1 Heritage

Modern concepts of heritage are a product of European culture. According to Hernandez Martinez (2009) the origin of the term heritage can be traced to eighteenth-century France and linked to the Enlightenment, especially in architecture. At that time the word heritage was used in reference to ruins and monuments which represented moral and social values. These became national symbols because of what they represented.

The meaning of the term heritage developed over the twentieth century. The *1931 Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments* adopted the term monument to refer generally to historic buildings (Sickles-Taves, 1999). Following World War II, the term monuments was developed by world heritage agencies to include a broader range of built heritage. The *Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites 1964* adopted by ICOSMOS in 1965 extended the definition of heritage to include both buildings and sites (Turnpenny, 2004).

This is important to note, because the charter as Turnpenny (2004) describes, has provided an international conservation framework for heritage protection that has been used as a reference point for many countries including New Zealand. However, Ahmad (2006) notes that the charter does not refer to the many categories of heritage that are recognised today such as historic landscapes, intangible heritage, the environment or gardens. Hardy (2008) emphasises that heritage is something that has special significance to local communities. Silberman & Bauer (2012) argue that the *Venice Charter* marginalises non-European values and is exclusive of local communities input into heritage management. The importance of acknowledging local heritage is relevant to this thesis as iwi and hapū have their own conceptions of their heritage relevant to their geographical location and unique history.

4.4.2 Cultural and Natural Heritage

International agreements and charters by international organisations, such as UNESCO and ICOMOS have helped to establish and broaden the scope of heritage internationally and provide common definitions that continue to dominate today (Ahmed, 2006). UNESCO's present definition of heritage comes from the World Heritage Convention (WHC), established in 1972. It defines heritage as being either cultural heritage (properties) that includes monuments, groups of buildings or sites and/or natural heritage (properties) including natural features, geological and physiographical formations and natural sites or a combination of both (UNESCO, n.d). This UNESCO definition of heritage as inclusive of "culture" recognises that heritage can include all elements of life, not merely the built and material world and has helped to move the focus of heritage from a primarily artistic and architectural focus (Turnperny, 2004).

Smith (2006) highlights that, in its attempts to stress the universality of cultural heritage, the WHC has validated a Eurocentric definition of heritage that has influenced policy and practice. Smith's (2006) work is important in highlighting the evidence of this in the world heritage list that has been shown to be Eurocentric and dominated by monumentally grand and aesthetic sites and places. This work is important as it explains this as a western Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) that defines heritage as material (tangible), monumental, grand, good, aesthetic and of universal value and dominates, if not underwrites, much of UNESCOs heritage policy. Winter (2014) expands on this and highlights that heritage as a concept and set of practices has emerged in the West as part of the changes in Western modernity that have privileged European conceptualisations of heritage as material culture conservation.

However, Blake (2000) emphasises that in adding cultural recognition to the definition of heritage has provided an avenue for the expression of a group's cultural identity. The cultural heritage and the affiliated cultural items of a people foster

dignity by promoting the identity and comprehension of their own culture (Guruswamy, Roberts & Drywater, 1999). It is long acknowledged that there is a critical connection between place and identity and that many of our experiences and engagement with memory and identity are located within our broader surroundings within our environment (Cheape, Garden & McClean, 2009) According to Turnpeny (n.d., p. 300) “Heritage both reflects and reinforces identity”. Moreover, Al Harithy (2005) observes that heritage should remain connected to the cultural context to which it belongs; it should be defined as what is beyond the physical and visible, and should be recognised as an open process of production and transformation, sustained by roots in the identity of a local community. This reinforces the idea that Māori gardens are important as they help to sustain tribal identity and culture.

4.4.3 Tangible and Intangible Heritage

At the turn of the twenty first century the concept of heritage was broadened to include both tangible and intangible forms through the *UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (ICOSMOS, 2010). Smith (2006) observes that this shift was an attempt by the WHC to change narrow Eurocentric definitions and redefine the concept of heritage to acknowledge and privilege non-Western manifestations and practices of heritage. Tangible heritage includes all traces of human activities in our physical environment, including places associated with historical events, beliefs and traditions (Swensen, Jerpasen, Oddrun, & Tvelt,, 2013).

However, Swensen et al. (2013) state that in public discussions tangible cultural heritage is most often understood and referred to in the light of how the law is practised and which assets are formally listed and protected. This last point is relevant to this thesis as although the *RMA* and *NZHPTA* contain provisions for the protection of Māori spiritual values and intangible heritage, these values are often not prioritised in policy, plans or practice as a result of the general building bias in heritage management and planning.

UNESCO (n.d) defines intangible heritage as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills, instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated with what communities and groups recognise as part of their cultural heritage. It includes oral traditions and expressions, social practices, rituals, festive events and traditional craftsmanship. Intangible heritage is constantly recreated by communities and groups in their interaction with nature and their history and is transmitted from generation to generation. These ideas of heritage align with a Māori worldview that stresses intergenerational responsibility. This perspective is captured in HNZ's definition of Māori heritage as ngā taonga tuku iho nō ngā tupuna that describes tangible and intangible treasures handed down by their ancestors. Kearney (2009) supports this idea, emphasising that intangible heritage provides communities with a sense of identity and continuity.

Smith (2006) says there has been a tendency within the international classification of heritage to define 'heritage' and 'intangible heritage' as two separate things. However, Swensen et al. (2013) emphasises that all cultural heritage has a proportion of intangibility in its nature as the tangible can only be understood and interpreted through the intangible and values are thus intrinsically linked. Baldwin (2012) relays TPKs description that Māori heritage is connected through the concept of wairua, thus the relationship between tangible and intangible cultural heritage is inextricably linked and separating the process (intangible culture) from the product (tangible culture) is not possible. Baldwin (2012) observes that although New Zealand still has a strong legal and policy framework for its protection, it has not become a signatory to the UNESCO intangible heritage convention for a number of reasons, including the division between intangible and tangible and because the word safeguard implies the freezing of heritage. This reinforces for this thesis that in considering Māori heritage the tangible and intangible aspects should be considered together rather as separate aspects.

4.4.4 Living Heritage

Intangible cultural heritage is sometimes called living cultural heritage and is manifested inter alia in the following domains:

- Oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage
- Performing arts
- Social practices, rituals and festive events
- Knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe
- Traditional craftsmanship (UNESCO,n.d).

UNESCO, in 1994 launched the Living human treasures programme that was aimed to officially recognise local traditional experts and promoted the transmission of their knowledge and skills to the younger generations (Lenzrenni, 2011). This is relevant to Māori, as the role of tribal historians such as Māori elders as a repositories and teachers of Māori knowledge is highly regarded in Māori society (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999).

In general, the evolution of international policy instruments has broadened the focus of heritage administration from objects to social practices, considering non-Western practices as living and evolving (Paquette, 2011). Cheape et al. (2009) observe that heritage is more than just about places and things and the past. It's about experiencing your surroundings through memories, living it in the present and visualising it in the future. Durie (1998) says the past, present and future is seen in Māori society as being interlinked, as a series of events that are part of a greater cosmic process. The Māori Heritage Council define Māori heritage as a living spirituality, a living mana moving through generations that comes to life through relationships between people and place.

Living heritage is ephemeral and evolves, thus heritage is seen as having a new usability that is a new evolution of what has been traditionally thought of as heritage. Mitchell (2008) highlights that features of living cultural landscapes such as vegetation and built features are subject to change over time. Although there has

been increasing recognition of living heritage it has not yet been inserted into New Zealand heritage legislation. According to Gordon Collier, senior assessor of New Zealand Garden Trust, a challenge for the future will be identifying gardens for heritage status because most gardens are living and thus require a lot of work to maintain. He also says that the challenge is gaining consensus about what makes a heritage garden 'heritage' and how heritage gardens can be preserved while keeping them relevant (McClellan, 2007). Greater recognition of the living elements of heritage would result in more support for Māori food gardens as heritage.

For McClellan (2009), a living heritage approach highlights the need to recognise utility and functional values, especially those related to the original and continuous function of the place. Furthermore, living heritage includes values that are dynamic or have new uses that meet the changing needs of a community. Thus, a living heritage approach supports Māori communities in reviving their heritage so that it continues as a living rather than static part of the culture.

4.4.5 Cultural Landscape

The phrase cultural landscape was first coined to describe the physical result of human actions and interactions with the natural landscape overtime (Abbott, Ruru & Stephenson, 2010). Cultural landscapes were described at the WHC 1992 as cultural properties that:

Represent the combined works of nature and of man illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal (UNESCO, 2008).

Thus heritage defined as a cultural landscape recognises that the landscape cannot be viewed outside the human experience and senses. The concept of landscape as a scene representing artistic concepts, like the picturesque, was particularly powerful around the time of European colonisation and shaped how early settlers saw and described their surroundings (Abbott et al., 2010).

Ruru, Stephenson and Abbott (2011) emphasise how landscapes beyond their recognition as pristine scenery, mark heritage qualities that include connections between people and place, a sense of belonging, localness and links specific landscapes that represent identity. Furthermore, they emphasise that these qualities of landscape must be acknowledged and respected in law, policy and resource management practices to sustain their role in maintaining community, tribal and national identities. Therefore, recognising a sense of place in relation to a Māori heritage site such as a garden requires the recognition of all the layers of place, including history, narratives and tangible and intangible values.

4.4.6 Ancestral Landscape

Kawharu (2002) states that Māori landscapes can be viewed by heritage managers as a type of associative cultural landscape. Ancestral landscapes emphasise the primacy of ancestors as original custodians and their values associated with a site that guide present and future generations. Sites represent links to whakapapa, heritage and identity including gods, mythological heroes, political associations, traditions, ancestors and descendants (Kawharu, 2002).

The ancestral landscape is an important heritage concept as it helps to interpret and understand links between people and place and associated kin-based traditional knowledge and values. Tangible and intangible values associated with ancestral sites help to describe relationships between people with their environment; thus ancestral landscapes are reference points of a cultural value system (Kawharu, n.d.). Māori gardens on sites historically used for cultivation were often part of a wider cultural precinct such as a kāinga or pā. Therefore, Māori gardens are often linked to the tribal narratives associated with ancestral landscapes.

4.4.7 Māori Heritage

Māori heritage comprises a wide range of different places and items from the physical and tangible to the natural environment and the intangible including:

Physical/tangible heritage places described as those land-based places created, formed or shaped by earlier inhabitants. These can be archaeological sites or Māori built heritage places such as marae buildings, including their contents and structures. Natural heritage places may be natural features associated with traditional activities or a tribal landmark where no human activity is evident. Intangible heritage places are those places that have intangible characteristics where no visible feature or evidence is present but where a significant event or traditional activity took place (Heritage New Zealand, n.d, n.p).

Heritage New Zealand (n.d) also notes that all or any of the above cultural heritage places may also be considered to be wāhi tapu, traditional sites, wāhi taonga, or others depending on the iwi, hapū or whānau concerned.

4.4.8 Historic Garden

The *Florence Charter* was registered by ICOMOS in 1982 as an addendum to the *Venice Charter* and defines a historic garden in article 1:

As an architectural and horticultural composition of interest to the public from the historical or artistic point of view. As such, it is to be considered as a monument.

Article 2 adds to this definition stating:

The historic garden is an architectural composition whose constituents are primarily vegetal and therefore living, which means that they are perishable and renewable. Thus its appearance reflects the perpetual balance between the cycle of the seasons, the growth and decay of nature and the desire of the artist and craftsman to keep it permanently unchanged.

Therefore, the ICOMOS *Florence Charter* acknowledges the ephemeral and living nature of gardens in that they are effected by climate conditions, decay and pests and are therefore in a constant state of flux. Ahmad (2006) notes that this definition

recognises that heritage is subject to decay and by classifying gardens as living monuments means they require special rules for protection.

The *Florence Charter 1982*'s articles are important to this thesis. Although the charter is not legally enforceable and has a stronger emphasis on decorative rather than food gardens it does provide some important considerations regarding heritage gardens for decision-makers. For instance, the charter recognises gardens as an essential part of cultural heritage and has the only widely internationally recognised set of garden conservation principles. Furthermore, Article 5 refers to gardens as a testimony to a culture, Article 6 to garden as a landscape, while Article 23 states gardens require adequate protection in land use planning and Article 8 acknowledges the intangible values of gardens (ICOSMOS, n.d).

4.4.9 New Zealand Historic Garden

In HNZ's publication "Sustainable management of historic heritage, Discussion Paper 3: Heritage Landscape Values", a garden is defined as an area of ground designed or laid out primarily to be used for pleasure, where the growing of plants is, or was an important element and states that:

Heritage gardens will have historical, cultural or artistic values, are generally designed green and open spaces that include parks, special trees, may include large natural areas and represent ideals and the quest for aesthetic beauty and harmony (McClean, 2007, p.19).

Although the cultural values of heritage gardens are identified above there is an emphasis on pleasure, beauty and the tangible qualities of gardens with no mention of food production. Susan Clunie who worked as a gardens advisor for NZHPT emphasises the aesthetic role of gardens and says this makes them one of the more accessible forms of tangible heritage (McClean, 2007).

4.4.10 Māori Heritage Garden

Within heritage planning gardens are often relegated to archaeological sites that are hidden, which further increases the focus on built heritage. The archaeological aspects of garden heritage are noted by HNZ (n.d) who describe a variety of archaeological sites under the *HNZPTA* that include remains of cultivation areas and gardens. However, in planning legislation such as the *RMA* or *HNZPTA* there is no definition of Māori gardens. Gardens can be described as an example of a wāhi tupuna or as an ancestral site where cultivation by Māori occurred that is now recognised by the *HNZPTA* 2014 s.6 that contains a new 'wāhi tupuna' classification recognising the ancestral significance of places (New Zealand Government, 2014).

Different hapū and iwi may have their own definition of a food garden that represents their heritage. However, as there is no current working definition of a Māori heritage food garden that is tuturu (authentic, original) to Māori in any legislation or literature I have provided a definition that is formulated from my reading in the area and that incorporates my understanding from oral sources.

A Māra Kai Tuturu is a food garden that represents cultivation heritage of the tangata whenua of Aotearoa. It is a communal and functional heritage garden located on a site that was traditionally used for food cultivation such as a pā, kāinga or marae, representing a part of a wider ancestral landscape. The garden represents both tangible and intangible heritage elements that may include the transmission from elders or tribal experts of traditional knowledge to hapū or iwi members, customs, values, practices and techniques. The garden may include the restoration of traditional materials, resources, carvings, art forms, toponyms, crops and indigenous seed lines unique to a hapū and or iwi and rohe. The garden is a taonga, promoting the wellbeing of whānau and is an exemplar of the living indigenous garden heritage of New Zealand.

4.5. Heritage

4.5.1 Critical Heritage Studies

CHS presents as an important theory base for this study. Baird (2009) explains that CHS, is a cross-disciplinary framework that examines the political and social effects of heritage practices and seek to understand how knowledge is produced and underpinned by power. Further, CHS scrutinises how scholars and stakeholders engage with ideas around heritage. In an indigenous context, a CHS approach questions common assumptions about indigenous heritage. CHS addresses the appropriation and reinterpretation of heritage focusing on how indigenous peoples are engaged in renegotiating heritage. This is important because as Paquette (2011) points out, heritage assessments and decisions today continue to uphold the dominant worldview of, an assumed power basis of colonial hegemony.

Smith's (2006) observation is also important as she describes the issue as being a part of an "authorised heritage discourse" (AHD) that was developed in Western Europe. Waterton & Watson (2013) say AHD, as a theory of heritage, is distinctive as it explains heritage as a social and cultural phenomenon and reveals the hegemonic discourse that underpins heritage legislation and practices. The AHD not only defines heritage as material, aesthetically pleasing, monumental and nationally significant but also privileges the heritage of elite classes. Thus, heritage definitions are shaped to represent the ideals of those in power.

Kirby (1996) observes that heritage is a political and social construct that is defined according to the ideological base of those in power. Furthermore as Hall (2005, p.6) notes "The heritage inevitably reflects the governing assumptions of its time and context. It is always inflected by the power and authority of those who have colonised the past, whose versions of history matter".

Those in power define heritage by selecting what aspects of heritage they wish to promote. Graham and Howard (2008) adopt a constructionist perspective in their work on heritage and identity that refers to the ways in which selected forms of heritage become cultural, political and economic resources. Although they do not

focus on indigenous heritage, their observation that meaning gives value, either cultural or financial to heritage explains why certain aspects of the past have been selected as heritage and others such as Māori heritage have been disregarded.

Colonial governments who decided what should be protected as heritage prioritised the heritage and heritage values of the coloniser over those of indigenous people. Although Littler (2008) does not address Māori heritage her observations regarding heritage as interwoven with processes of racialisation mirrors New Zealand's early colonial period. In New Zealand heritage has largely been associated with buildings of aesthetic and architectural value which reflects ideas promoted by early New Zealand society's urban elite (Trapzenick & McLean, 2000). Similarly, Littler (2008) observes that the groups who got to define heritage were mainly the upper or upper middle-classes who represented the new settler colonists.

Matunga (2001) argues that colonialism has disenfranchised Māori from the New Zealand urban landscape by superimposing foreign models to assert their power. Examples of this include colonial icons, architecture, monuments, toponyms, botanic gardens and biota. Consequently, indigenous identity, place names and histories were lost during the colonial experience. Moreover, Kamo (2010) highlights that the interpretation, structure and design of most settlements in New Zealand largely reflect the history and traditions of Anglo-European settlement in New Zealand.

However, today with greater international recognition of their heritage indigenous peoples can participate more in the identification and protection of their heritage. Although Paquette (2011) focuses on museum policy his statements regarding indigenous heritage are relevant as they encourage greater participation by indigenous peoples in defining their heritage. He says that the more recent UNESCO conventions reveal an ethical approach to relations among groups involved in heritage preservation and speak to a greater awareness of the need for dialogue in heritage promotion and preservation.

The later conventions are also evidence of the expansion of the focus of preservation activities from just artefacts to cultural practices, with increasing attention on participation and collaboration (Paquette, 2011). Work by Winter (2014) suggests that we need to re-think how we view heritage and construct its theoretical frames. Thus, CHS as a theoretical framework, is relevant to this thesis as gaining recognition that gardens are part of Māori heritage and are therefore important to New Zealand's heritage, will require unpacking commonly held assumptions about what constitutes Māori heritage.

4.5.2 Cultural Heritage Management

CHM challenges heritage management approaches that privilege Western expert knowledge over indigenous expertise. Smith, Messenger & Soderland (2009) say that CHM can be defined as a technical process in which experts assess the meaning and value of heritage places and develop policies. However, Smith et al. (2009) highlight the need to examine the nature of expertise in CHM and suggest that it is important for heritage practitioners to set transparent political agendas to guide the way in which expertise and authority is implemented in CHM. Baird (2013) says that some expert practices ignore indigenous systems of knowledge and determine authenticity by their own standards.

Waterton (2005) says a reshuffling of power requires experts and the community to find a way to co-exist in a negotiated partnership increasing debate regarding the frameworks within which heritage managers operate. The *HPA* and *RMA* provide a platform to support greater input by pūkenga or local tribal experts in heritage management. Yet the extent to which local authorities apply these provisions varies throughout the country (Awatere et al., 2013).

Critical studies of CHM approaches are important to help identify how indigenous heritage management issues can be addressed. Waterton's (2005) work is important as it highlights the recent emphasis on the political and ethical responsibilities of CHM in post-colonial nations that has prompted attempts to reconsider the

theoretical frameworks that support and inform the management process. This means challenging dominant forms of knowledge, heritage definitions and values. Contesting this authority, threatens the power of the expert and the dominance of scientific knowledge. This challenge to mainstream heritage management practice is pertinent to this study as it highlights the need to change perspectives and approaches to better reflect and support Māori heritage values. Furthermore, Māori traditions and approaches to environmental management are far more compatible with ideas of sustainability than European norms (Furuseth & Cockling, 1995).

Awatere et al. (2013) say that despite progress over the last two decades poor understandings of Mātauranga Māori by local authorities and limited iwi and hapū capacity mean there has been inadequate uptake of these values in planning and a lack of direct Māori input into planning and decision-making processes. They say that most of the first and second generation resource management plans developed by iwi trust boards and rūnanga have been appendages to planning documents, poorly understood and used. This indicates that councils lack appropriate Mātauranga Māori approaches that can be incorporated into planning.

4.5.3 Heritage and Values

Smith et al. (2009) states that values are central to CHM, and a consideration of values and a value based approach is an essential part of decision-making on what and how to conserve heritage. Munasinghe (2005) observes that heritage is not the past but a representation or a reinterpretation of a past. Smith (2006, p.11) observes that, “Heritage is ultimately a cultural practice involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings”

Waterton (2005) suggests that management processes needs to respond to communities attempting to decide for themselves what constitutes value, and thus what warrants protecting as part of heritage. Furthermore, Smith-Akagawa (2009) highlight that it is imperative that the values and practices of communities, together with traditional management systems, are fully understood, respected, encouraged

and accommodated in management plans and policy documents if heritage resources are to be sustained in the future.

Logan (2009) highlights that UNESCO now promotes the view that heritage protection does not depend alone on top-down interventions by governments, but must involve local communities and be inclusive of their heritage values and perspectives. However, Kearney (2009) suggests that the extent to which intangible heritage of indigenous peoples is represented and how much they are able to participate in decision-making regarding the protection of their heritage will depend on the kinds of processes and bodies that government parties establish to address the issue. This section has highlighted that heritage management and planning practices must be improved if they are to ensure indigenous peoples heritage values are expressed and provided for.

4.6 Heritage and Planning

4.6.1 Participatory Planning

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, planners began to look for new models of planning. Theorist John Friedmann called them socially transformed planning approaches that embrace theoretical pluralism thus recognising diverse interests and values. Healey (1992) and later Lane's (2005) work highlight that by the late 1960s criticisms of previous models of planning, including no scope for public participation and a lack of consultation had begun to create a new paradigm for planning.

As opposed to a singular model, a range of new planning approaches such as transactive and advocacy planning were proposed that promoted mutual learning, public participation, negotiation, consensus building and addressing inequalities within the planning process. Increasing literature emerged from this time in response to the failures of early approaches that had represented the dominant scientific-rational planning paradigm. Planning scholars began to acknowledge that scientific-rational planning processes have alienated minorities and that planning needed new models to ensure indigenous peoples can have a voice in planning. Schon (1983)

emphasised the harmful effects of centralist planning included neglect of minorities, women and special interest groups.

More participatory and inclusive planning approaches have helped to increase Māori input into plans however these approaches can be limited. Lane & Corbett (2005) point out that conceptualising indigenous peoples as stakeholders in planning processes fails to appreciate their unique status as original owners of a country that was taken from them by the modern, colonial state and assumes inclusion is the key aspiration of indigenous peoples. Although Hostovsky & MacClaren (2010) discuss participation in environmental impact assessments with particular reference to the situation in Vietnam they make an insightful observation about Arnsteins participation ladder application. They say the ladder is limited as it does not account for culture sensitive participatory processes, which they say comes from knowing the local culture.

Local authorities are statutorily bound to consult Māori in regards to decisions regarding their heritage, however the extent of or manner in which this is fulfilled is variable. Perkins (2010) notes that many councils direct community-based heritage projects to fulfil their own prescribed ideals for community engagement. This results in tokenistic and unsustainable projects which cause distrust by community members and prevent support for future initiatives. Furthermore, Kapua (2009) notes that in terms of addressing tangata whenua issues an easier path taken by some local authorities has been to focus almost exclusively on consultation. Clause 3(a) of the First Schedule of the *RMA* requires local authorities to consult with Māori on resource management issues. However, because this clause is open to wide interpretation and its implementation is at the discretion of the decision maker, many view the clause as a token gesture (Kapua, 2009).

There is a need for greater Māori representation on local councils to ensure Māori have a greater role in representing their interests and communicating their concerns and needs regarding the protection of their heritage. According to Jojola (2008) and Sandercock (2004) effective engagement and input by indigenous peoples into

planning processes is hindered by the lack of indigenous planners. Lane & Corbett (2005) highlight the lack of indigenous representation on the relevant planning boards and decision-making forums. Awatere, et al. (2013) highlight that, although Māori and local authorities have made huge strides in developing and fostering positive working relationships particularly since the passing of the RMA in 1991, there still remains limited representation of Māori perspectives and knowledge in land use policy and planning, generally reflecting the dominant mainstream planning and policy. They also emphasise the very low number of Māori councillors and Māori staff employed in local authorities.

4.6.2 Contested Values

Indigenous people are challenged to have their values recognised and provided for in a planning system that is underpinned by competing interests. Friedmann (2008) highlights that planning in the 21st century has changed considerably because of the increased recognition of the plurality of values within society and the importance of facilitating public participation through consensus building measures. However, not all planning theorists see consensus-building as fundamental. For example, Flyvbjerg writes, “suppressing conflict is suppressing freedom, because the privilege to engage in conflict is part of freedom” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 209). Thus, he is sceptical about the non-politicized processes of building consensus. Pratt (1991, p.) described a contact zone as a place where cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power. Similarly, Barry & Porter’s (2006) view planning as a site of transgression and resistance for indigenous peoples

A significant challenge in planning is to communicate the wider value of protecting cultural resources to sceptical audiences, in particular to government funding bodies and developers Smith et al. (2009, p.93) notes that “Arguments about the wider economic, social and environment benefits of heritage are far more likely to carry weight than debates about significance Smith (2006) highlights that heritage is a cultural process of meaning making and of negotiating the meanings and values given to identity, memory and sense of place. She also affirms the importance of

understanding the discursive element of heritage, the way ideas about heritage are constructed to facilitate the identification of the conceptual barriers that may exist in recognising excluded forms of heritage.

Māori heritage values are often disregarded in local government planning. Most Māori heritage occurs on land that is threatened by land-use activity such as inappropriate designation of areas, discharge of contaminants, soil extraction and earth works. Moreover, subdivision can lead to modifications in land-use and increased development which may damage the setting or curtilage of a site. Land development projects are often prioritised by council for their economic benefits thus Māori heritage must contest with the allocation of competing uses (McClellan & Greig, 2007). Although the Māori Heritage Council makes specific recommendations to territorial authorities about wāhi tapu, final decisions about land-use rest with local authorities (Durie, 2005).

Indigenous values conflict with a planning system that is underpinned by neo liberal philosophies. In the late 1970s the New Right movement emerged that was underpinned by neoliberal ideas that promote planning within a capitalist market economy (Fainstein, 2011). Neoliberalism promoted the free market which later led to strategies of privatisation and deregulation (Healey, 1997). These changes resulted in a market led system of urban development (Glass, 1973). Grundy & Gleeson (1996) explain that the RMA's underpinnings of economic new right ideology, often overlooks sustainable development. It focuses on biophysical sustainability and economic efficiency overlooking socio-economic and cultural considerations. The market model and neo-liberalism have proved popular because they promise increases in affluence for all even if within the context of growing inequality. Thus, there may be challenges in gaining recognition of the value of Māori garden heritage particularly if the values compromise economic development.

Harmsworth (1997), from a Māori perspective, highlights that there are increasing concerns related to the modification and destruction of ancestral sites due to increasing development that diminish layers of Māori values and history. This gives

further weight to the need to reconnect Māori with their ancestral sites and associated values. Harmsworth (1997) signalled that with greater land intensification, urban and semi-urban development, the issue of protection of cultural heritage sites was likely to become more contentious. ICOMOS (2000) observes that more proactive cultural heritage management planning at the district council and national level is needed to establish protection zones with rules that effectively protect heritage sites and associated values and knowledge. Furthermore, Harmsworth (1997) suggests that Māori values information needs to be integrated into planning at all levels.

4.6.3 Values Centered Planning

McClellan (2009) notes that development challenges to heritage and identification processes gave rise to values-centered preservation providing a theoretical heritage framework that promotes the holistic understanding of sites, accounting for diverse values and engagement with diverse stakeholders. On this basis values-centered planning provides for the wide range of heritage beyond buildings and monuments, including Māori heritage values. McClellan (2009) add that all values associated with a site should be accounted for and these values need to inform decision-making. McClellan (2009) also notes that there is a bias in New Zealand toward aesthetic values and that Māori heritage values tend to be relegated to spiritual heritage places such as wāhi tapu, ignoring the diversity of heritage sites significant to Māori, including gardens.

Concerns over Māori heritage protection continue as many local authorities still provide inadequate protection measures for ancestral sites compared with buildings. Although McClellan (2013) does not refer to Māori gardens he does highlight that in most areas of New Zealand there has been little progress to recognise Māori heritage in regional and district plan heritage schedules and that this issue remains a critical deficiency in many district plans. McClellan (2013) asserts that all local authorities need to review rules relating to historic sites and Māori heritage as these places deserve and require the same level of regulatory provision as other scheduled historic

buildings. Further, objectives and policies need to be improved, to be more explicit in relation to the various types of Māori heritage.

Political and cultural values are also strongly bound up in how landscape is perceived and are revealed in the law and in policy. Kennedy (2008) noted that although RMA plans include strong, high-level recognition of Māori values they often but fail to effectively implement these as viable and usable methods for local authorities and iwi or hapū (Kennedy, 2008). The PUCM research team developed and applied a method for evaluating the quality of regional policy statements and district plans (Ericksen, Berke, Crawford & Dixon, 2003). The research found low scores for how well plans addressed tangata whenua planning issues. The findings also highlighted the poor mandate design of plans that had impeded progress in recognition of Maori vāluēs in plans. Furthermore, the failure by central government to clarify relationships between the Crown, Māori and local government, has considerably weakened local government implementation of provisions in the RMA in respect of Maori interests (Ericksen, et al., 2003). Jeffries et al. (2008) in their analysis of 28 district plans revealed that the strong RMA mandate had not been reflected well in plans. They generally paraphrased the Māori provisions of the RMA or had weak provisions which failed to address local circumstances for Māori.

A values-centered planning framework provides for the range of heritage that extends beyond monuments and historic buildings. Further, it promotes the identification and protection of values and cultural significance that express the meaning of a place in a participatory and open process of communication (McClellan, 2007). Stephenson (2005) emphasises that values may be difficult for planners to understand, particularly where a different cultural world-view is expressed. According to Harmsworth (2004) the importance of considering Māori knowledge and values in planning has been historically neglected and continues to be neglected in planning. Therefore local councils will need to take a more pro-active approach in ensuring Māori heritage values such as those connected with Māori gardens are better understood and protected.

4.6.4 Pro-Active Planning

Matunga (2013) provides a conceptual framework for indigenous planning that promotes transformation through taking action to enhance the lives of indigenous people through political, social, economic and environmental change. Ultimately the test is whether the action or activity leads to an enhanced state of wellbeing and more equitable planning for the indigenous community concerned. For planning to be indigenous it will employ indigenous analyses, frameworks, values and processes. In relation to self-determination, a critical outcome of indigenous planning is cultural protection and enhancement. Adapting traditional models of planning to modern contexts is an expression of self-determination.

Indigenous planning uses indigenous knowledge to make decisions reflecting that community and legitimated by them. Maintaining or re-establishing the physical and spiritual links between Māori and their ancestral places and resources including accumulated knowledge about a place is at the core of indigeneity and therefore indigenous planning. Ultimately, planning is about the future but it must be fully informed by the past and critically how the past has been constructed in the present (Matunga, 2013). Matunga's (2013) theoretical framework for indigenous planning underpins the re-establishment of Māori gardens, as it promotes challenging narrow definitions of heritage, promotes re-connections to ancestral heritage, place, traditions, and knowledge, enhancing wellbeing and expressing self-determination.

Galloway and Mahayni (1977) and Millette (2011) say an integrated planning framework will help improve outcomes from planning processes for indigenous peoples. Millette (2011) adds that it is possible to merge traditional and western planning approaches including the disciplines and tools involved within planning process. Similarly Matunga (2013) explains that a dual planning framework will focus on knowledge collaboration rather than competition in regard to indigenous knowledge, western science and technology. Further, Rolleston (2006) affirms that a contemporary Māori world-view encompasses modern and traditional values and concepts such as western science and mātauranga Maori. Kamo (2010) affirms that the development of a comprehensive consultative framework informed by

mātauranga Maori can help in facilitating discussion and understanding of the values that guide Māori decision making processes. This can ensure engagement occurs to identify and adequately mitigate the risk of damage to important cultural heritage sites.

There are different ways planners can play a role in supporting greater input by Māori in planning processes regarding their heritage. Matunga (2013) says planners need to develop ethical fortitude. Porter (2006) expands on this regarding her experience in planning research with Aborigine. She reports that western planners are trained to value more abstract and theoretical approaches that have obscured the ability to understand what mattered to indigenous peoples. She also says she had to learn to meaningfully listen and engage so she can find out what matters most to indigenous communities. She also had to free herself of ingrained western habits regarding time and efficiency, adopt an attitude of genuine humility and accept that western planners do not have all of the answers and that they may be part of the problem.

Kamo (2010) says that planners should engage with Maori to ensure their cultural heritage aspirations are taken into account and suggests that it's important to bear in mind that arriving with plans that have already been prepared and reviewed already will upset Māori. Thus, early engagement with hapū and iwi is essential.

4.6.5 Collaborative Planning

Collaborative planning has been identified as a way to transform oppressive planning structures. Friedman (1987) introduced the idea of “transformative theory” that asserts the potential of planning practice to be a process of identifying and implementing strategies such as social and mutual learning, to transform the structures of oppression. These ideas were important for indigenous peoples as in practice transformative planning would mean planners and previously marginalised groups that had been passive recipient of planning processes, would now engage with planners. Both parties would make decisions and plans together and learn from each other through.

Collaborative management to realistically restore and protect Māori heritage will require an arrangement tailored to local conditions and a supportive statutory and institutional framework. Cundill and Rodela (2012) say co-management can engender power sharing, social learning, trust, commitment, reframing norms, contribution of local indigenous knowledge and ecological outcomes. The parties create their own rights, rules, actions, conflict resolution processes and local solutions to address problems (Fenemor, Neilan, Allen and Russell, 2011; Prokopy, 2008). However, Tipa & Welch (2006) note that the success of collaborative arrangement is dependent on various preconditions. Tipa and Nelson (2008) argue that co-management is context and site dependent thus requires specific tailor-made design. For example, Māori tribal knowledge and customs are diverse and their lived urban realities and varying tribal interactions which must be accounted for (Hara & Nielson, 2002; Taiepa, Lyver, Horsley, Davis & Bragg, 1997).

Memon, Duncan & Spicer (2012) and Jenkins (2011) argue that collaborative success requires accurate scientific knowledge, ensuring all stakeholder views are heard, clear rules, future monitoring of resource user's actions, promotion of collective interests and cultural sensitivity to tikanga Māori. Murray (2011) expands on this and says that the success of these arrangements depends on the potential benefits that participants see for themselves, especially as they will encounter significant resourcing costs such as time, money and volunteer fatigue. Paquette (2011) stresses that a collaborative arrangement involving Māori means respecting Māori values and reflecting them in governance and administrative processes.

Paquette (2011) believes that current practices in heritage management and planning in New Zealand, such as collaborative arrangements are part of the post-colonial challenge to traditional forms of administration and governance. The recent trend toward collaborative management in New Zealand and internationally has been a response to the failure of top down governance institutions to prevent resource decline including Māori heritage. Maori are now entering into the post Treaty

settlement era, and are increasingly asserting their rangatiratanga and responsibilities as kaitiaki in the design and management of the environment within their tribal areas. Many iwi have entered into co-management agreements with local authorities to manage resources. Bennett (2011) notes that settlements have provided for a range of collaborative structures which go much further in achieving Māori aspirations for a greater voice in environmental management. An example of a co-management arrangement is the Taonga Tuku Iho Accord 2009 between the Ministry of for Arts, Culture and Heritage and Waikato-Tainui. The accord sets out processes for the Crown to interact with Waikato-Tainui in matters relating to the management of taonga tuku iho under agreements related to the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 which is part of a wider Waikato River co-governance framework⁹ “The co-management agreement extends the conventional notions of what heritage practices are to protect, since the rich site of the Waikato River is known by Māori people as a spiritual ancestor” (Paquette, 2011, p.136).

Councils can uphold their commitment to TOW principles that includes partnership in planning and protection of taonga, in a number of ways. McClean (2009) advocates that to build trust and establish certainty regarding heritage identification and protection, discussion and agreement should be enabled through hui or preparation of a MOU. A MOU should clearly outline the process of identification as it applies to Māori heritage and the expectations of the parties involved. Furthermore, Matunga (2013) and McClean (2009) promote the use of heritage planning tools such as cultural impact assessments (CIA) and tribal management plans.

Sandercock (2013) says no amount of inclusive or democratic planning practice will shift the effects of post-colonial structures and relations of power on indigenous peoples without recognition of their rights. Thus in asserting the need for recognition

⁹ Stakeholders include 5 Crown-appointed members and 5 from each river iwi including Waikato-Tainui, Ngāti Tuwharetoa, Raukawa, Te Arawa and Ngāti Maniapoto (Local Government, 2011). Guardians of the River included the five iwi along the river and relevant territory authorities as required to enter into a Joint Management Agreement.

and protection of their heritage i.e. traditional food gardens, iwi rights under the TOW need to be recognised and provided for in heritage planning.

4.7 Māori Garden Heritage

Māori garden literature is largely descriptive, discussing crops, material culture, methods and archaeological history and information. Ethnologist Elsdon Best (1976) provides one of the first comprehensive works on Māori agriculture. However, it primarily focuses on the material aspects of gardening with some mention of the associated spiritual practices of some tribes. Leach (1980) provides an anthropological account of the garden methods employed by early Māori for vegetable gardening however the intangible heritage factors such as the knowledge, customs and values associated with gardening that are relevant to this thesis are lacking. Furey's (2006) does not refer to the intangible elements of Māori gardening however her archaeological work is of some relevance through providing information about traditional Māori crops and highlights that information on Māori gardening practices are largely based on archaeological evidence and notes the the lack of oral or anecdotal evidence to provide knowledge about Māori gardens.

Tawhai's (2013) work on the maramataka and the understanding of the days and nights according to Te Whānau-ā-Āpanui tribal knowledge is based on accounts from tribal elders who received this knowledge orally and through practical demonstration. Tawhais (2013) work reinforces that Māori knowledge, retained by the local people, can be restored for the benefit of present and future generations. It is important, as Roskrige (2014) highlights, that the collective mātauranga held by kuia and kaumātua is an invaluable resource. Specialist horticultural knowledge has been marginalised through colonisation and is now only retained by a few experts across tribal regions. Roskrige (2011) observes that there is much more knowledge still held within communities, especially related to the application of kaitiakitanga in the modern world.

Roskruge's (2011) research, including interviews with Māori communities, provided the first academic ethnopedological perspective regarding Māori knowledge. The research included an exploration of the application of traditional Māori horticultural practices in New Zealand that are based on a holistic approach known as "ki uta ki tai" (the source to the oceans). The findings highlight that traditional Māori practices contribute to a cultural management tool known as kaitiakitanga. This tool supports a whole of landscape approach. Māori cultural practices within this approach are informed by the body of local traditional knowledge associated with horticultural knowledge such as soil taxonomy, crop management and land-use activities that can inform modern horticultural systems. Similarly, Roberts, Weko & Clarke (2006) observe the value in reviving cultivation knowledge in particular the maramataka that they say has the potential to complement modern horticultural practices.

Roskruge's (2011) findings also highlight that the future of traditional Māori horticulture will depend to some extent on the quality of the knowledge base which supports it, the expertise retained to support implementation and the ability to educate those around the value of traditional knowledge and practice. The findings of Roskruge (2011) and Roberts et al. (2006) were relevant to this study as they promote the continued relevance of indigenous horticultural knowledge today.

Hutchings, Tipene, Carney, Green, Skelton and Baker (2012) findings are relevant to this study as they showed that in some situations seeds belong to specific Māori tribal groups and should only be grown in their tribal boundaries. Their findings also revealed that many participants referred to the need to protect the vibration and mauri of indigenous seed. The research also stressed the importance of passing down traditional names connected to the land as a way of maintaining the whakapapa of their mahinga kai as people identify land with a name and the associated kōrero. Furthermore, the research highlighted that in restoring the names and attending stories means the land lives again. The findings were relevant to this study as they express important Māori cultural perspectives relevant to Māori food gardens.

4.7.1 Aotearoa Garden Heritage

Goldsmith's (2014) research using archival, interview and survey instruments, investigates how and why New Zealand has overlooked much of its heritage particularly curtilage gardens and the consequences of this. The findings revealed a privileging of building heritage and that no building should be considered in isolation and that its curtilage, especially its garden, can contribute meaningfully to the interpretation of a heritage place. Additionally, the need to increase recognition of curtilage gardens as more than just ornamental gardens and more as designed landscapes that connect people, views, activities and spaces, the past, present and future. This evidence supports the idea that ideas around heritage gardens extend beyond the ornamental and that food gardens at marae can be considered as a vital heritage element of the site.

New Zealand heritage gardens are largely decorative and are modelled from overseas traditions. HNZ describes gardens as a category of designed landscapes, a place designed and created intentionally by people. It uses the Heritage Victoria, Australia guidelines to identify the significant heritage values of designed landscapes (McClellan, 2007). The guidelines emphasise artistic and aesthetic values and do not refer to food or indigenous gardens. Leach (1996) questions the appropriateness of these guidelines which rely on analysis of garden styles from overseas and says that it should be adapted for the New Zealand situation. Harris (1995) advocates, instead, a consideration of New Zealand's garden tradition of Oceanic and European sources in order to provide a framework for New Zealand garden history in its widest social context. As noted throughout this thesis Māori garden traditions are based primarily on vegetable production thus this would be an appropriate style of garden to feature as an indigenous heritage garden type unique to New Zealand.

4.7.2 Sustaining Gardens and Health

Earle's research (2011) based on interviews with community garden coordinators and stakeholders in the Auckland and Wellington region investigated health benefits of gardening, how community garden groups operated and how agencies can best support and sustain a community gardening initiative. The findings showed revivals in Māori gardening such as Te Para Para garden in Hamilton. The research suggests that community gardening can assist in improving health outcomes. For example, community gardens can address health inequalities through establishing links with healthy food production and activity and improve mental and spiritual wellbeing. Furthermore, a few interviewees talked about how traditional tikanga associated with gardening were being adapted to current community gardening contexts. This research, although more focused on community gardens rather than Māori gardens, reinforces the connection between gardens and mental, spiritual and cultural health and wellbeing.

Earles (2011) findings highlight that the establishment and maintenance of community gardens requires hard work and that their success is not guaranteed and expectations may exceed what is possible. Additionally, that to be effective a community garden requires active involvement, time, passion, a suitable site and adequate resources. Some council require a lease agreement with the group setting up the garden which can be expensive. The process usually requires the group to be an incorporated society, to pay public liability insurance and may include a community consultation phase which takes time.

Pirikahu's (2008) key stakeholder research investigated the 'Grab a bite that's right' programme that helped to support communities to develop nutrition and physical activity programmes in key settings of significance to Māori, with a focus on gardening in the Whanganui region. The research's findings highlighted that funding periods are important, as community gardens may take up to ten years to develop and that inter-sectorial collaboration can take at least 18 months to develop.

Furthermore, communal gardens require staff to help develop the garden and community strategies such as social marketing and to organise education workshops. The findings also show that using a top down approach rather than a bottom up approach to developing a community garden requires time to be dedicated to extensive consultation before the project starts so community participation is ensured. Matunga (2013) says indigenous planning requires that it be done in the place with the people of that place. Thus, if traditional Māori gardens are to be revived then that must happen voluntarily and in accord with tikanga Māori as any imposed solution will fail.

Perkins (2010) emphasises that heritage community projects tend to have a top down or organisation led approach and issues between smaller heritage groups and larger organisations, such as a local council, can arise from a lack of, or uneven distribution of funding; poor facility or service provision and a perceived lack of support for the work of heritage groups. Furthermore, it is the larger organisation that has ultimate responsibility for the project and its success, due to the positional power the organisation holds in terms of managing or providing funding, staff and resources. Furthermore, the project manager of a community-driven engagement project has an important role to play in balancing the interests and needs of partner organisations and harnessing enthusiasm and beneficial outcomes for all stakeholders.

Earle's (2011) research is focused on community gardens, Pirikahu's (2008) on health promotion aspects and Perkins (2010) on heritage community projects rather than the indigenous aspects of gardens. However, all of these works are useful in highlighting the challenges involved in sustaining communal heritage or garden projects in the long term and are therefore relevant to establishing and maintaining Māori food gardens.

4.8 Summary

There is a paucity of academic research that has been carried out on Māori gardens in relation to heritage planning in New Zealand. Therefore this study has built upon a multi-faceted theoretical framework that encompasses literature relevant to the thesis topic such as heritage, planning and Māori garden history to attempt to address part of this gap in the literature. This literature provided enough content to provide a background study for this research.

After reviewing the literature it is evident that the topic planning for Māori food gardens covers a wide range of issues and literature, which have been assessed within a Māori world view and lens to make this thesis relevant to Māori. This approach has involved interpreting how the issues presented within the literature align with Māori philosophies.

Historically heritage has been socially and politically defined. For example, heritage has been reconstructed to represent the Eurocentric ideals of the dominant powers and players in society. These views continue to underpin current heritage legislation and practices that elevate the material aspects of heritage particularly buildings whilst excluding non-European values.

International heritage, charters and conventions have lead the way in terms of expanding definitions of heritage to recognise a range of heritage values such as cultural intangible heritage and identity. However, some of these universal definitions are limited in their applicability to local heritage and therefore are not sufficient to provide for New Zealand's indigenous heritage. For example, Māori do not see a division between tangible and intangible heritage and an ancestral landscape according to Kawharu (2008) is a more appropriate concept for Māori than a cultural landscape as it stresses the importance of whakapapa which is the foundation of Māori culture.

There has been greater recognition by the world heritage agencies such as UNESCO of living heritage that represents the intangible aspects of cultural heritage and represents a major part of indigenous heritage. A living heritage approach recognises the usability of heritage as functional and interactive that is representative of a Māori heritage food garden. However, living heritage although is yet to be recognised in New Zealand heritage legislation.

CHS theory in the context of this thesis supports the need to broaden perspectives of what Māori heritage represents, underlying worldviews and various types in the heritage domain such as Māori garden heritage. CHM theory supports exposing the underlying Eurocentric theoretical frameworks that support and inform the heritage management process and to be more open to indigenous knowledge rather than an over-reliance on Western experts. In a New Zealand context this means that local authorities should seek greater input from tribal experts to inform decision-making.

The literature emphasises that local authorities need to have effective Māori engagement and mātauranga frameworks, maximise planning tools such collaborative agreements and IMPs to ensure Māori heritage knowledge, values and worldviews related to heritage are recognised and provided for in policy and plans. Participation with hapū and iwi must recognise their tangata whenua status under the TOW and ensure participation is on their terms to ensure their contribution to decision-making.

Pro-active approaches such as indigenous, dual and values-centered planning are required to transform and activate greater support for Māori heritage. Planners will require solutions to help them understand the intricacies involved with planning for Māori food gardens as they are already challenged in dealing with Māori heritage in general including managing contested values that impact planning decisions.

International literature about heritage gardens discusses primarily ornamental gardens and therefore provides a limited view of issues pertinent to Māori heritage food gardens. Therefore, the more relevant material came from information that sheds some light on important facets of traditional gardening that may be incorporated today to revive Mātauranga Māori. Other research affirms the links between health and gardening and barriers to overcome to help in ensuring a communal gardens long term success.

It is evident from the available literature and gaps in the literature that the key issues that need to be addressed in the data collection are heritage experts and planners' knowledge of gardens as heritage, Māori heritage, the district plan's approach to Māori heritage, how proactive councils are in protecting Māori heritage and how is this heritage sustained. Also for those involved in establishing Māori gardens what is needed to establish a garden, what are the challenges and how hard is it to sustain a garden. The next chapter will address these questions by presenting the results and discussion of the research.

5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter through an analysis of the findings and literature explores the relationships between Māori, heritage, planning, Māori food gardens and wellbeing to help answer the study's central research question, *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?* First, a summary of the study is provided followed by the presentation and discussion of the findings. The purpose of the latter sections is to expand upon the concepts that were addressed in the literature in an effort to provide a further understanding of how Māori heritage is perceived and dealt with within the NZ planning system and the implications of this for reviving Māori food gardens as indigenous heritage.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate views on and the treatment of Māori heritage within the planning system to help ascertain what role planning could play in the revival of Māori food gardens as heritage. This was achieved by analysing the perceptions and treatment of Māori heritage through interviews with a heritage expert, district council planners and Māori council officers within Te Ika a Maui.

Additionally, data was collected through interviews with a health promoter and Māori garden representatives to help gain insight into the issues relevant to establishing and sustaining the gardens. Interviews were carried out in Te Tai Tokerau, Tāmaki-makau-rau, Kirikiriroa, Matata, Whakatāne, Kawerau, Te Teko, Rotorua, Te Matau-a-Māui, Papaioea, Whanganui and Te Upoko-o-te-ika-a-Māui. This was achieved through qualitative research through the lens of a KMR methodology.

A national heritage expert and eleven representatives from six district councils with proportionally high Māori populations compared with other areas in New Zealand including seven planners and four Māori council officers contributed to this research. The heritage expert and council participants were asked about their views around Māori heritage, the district plan and reviving Māori food gardens. The 9 garden representatives (including 2 whānau research groups and a health promoter) were

asked about their knowledge and views around heritage gardens and their district plan's approach to Māori heritage. Additionally, whether they thought their council was proactive in protecting Māori heritage and issues related to establishing and sustaining their gardens.

Five of the respondents answered their questions via questionnaire. For two of the participants this was their preferred option and for the other three they had to cancel their interviews due to other important commitments that arose on the interview day. The Western Bay of Plenty Council was asked for an interview but they did not feel they could offer any worthwhile information on the thesis topic. New Plymouth District Council and Gisborne District Council planners were approached for interviews or to fill out questionnaires but they did not respond.

The various Māori council workers despite their varied titles i.e. Māori policy analyst, Māori liaison officer and resource management advisor I have identified them in this chapter as Māori council officer (1-4) for clarity in presenting this chapter. Planners have also been identified as council planners (1-7). Where research participants answered by questionnaire their answers tended to be very concise, while interview answers were much longer and more complex.

This study included research questions that were answered through a qualitative study. Data was obtained from face to face semi-structured interviews as well as responses to open ended questionnaires. The qualitative questions addressed possible interactions of all three areas of heritage, planning and Māori gardens. Data was collected on the widest base possible which meant I was able to gain, within the set time limits, good coverage of data on the research topic to ensure the research is robust and substantiated.

5.3 Existing Māori Heritage Gardens

During the course of my research I managed to identify a few Māori heritage gardens in existence. However, they are not listed as mahinga kai or māra/gardens yet on the NZ list of heritage buildings and sites. They are more likely to be recognised within the wider historical/ancestral landscape i.e. historical pā or kāinga site. Ngāti Awa are

restoring and resuscitating key sites of spiritual, historical and cultural significance on Moutohora Island which includes a māra kūmara (kūmara gardens) at Te Rawhiti (Department of Conservation, n.d). Traditional gardening is being revived at Rewa village, a reconstructed Māori village in Keri Keri, involving Northtec wānanga students working with local hapū Ngāti Rehia to grow up to eight varieties of kūmara as well as taro, yams, potatoes and gourds (De Graaf, 2014). Furthermore, I was fortunate to have been able to interview key representatives from Te Para Para garden and the garden at Ōrākei marae. These gardens are both situated on sites previously used for cultivation by their tribal ancestors.

Te Parapara garden is the first traditional Māori garden in New Zealand in contemporary times and is located next to the Hamilton gardens. It is a joint project between Te Mana Toopu o Kirikiriroa and the Hamilton City Council. The Te Parapara Trust¹⁰ was formed in 2006 and helped to raise the funds for the gardens. Stage 1 of the garden was completed in 2008 (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2014).

At Te Para Para garden practices and methods of cultivating food crops and traditional material culture of the Ngāti Wairere hapū of Tainui in the Waikato region during pre-European times are demonstrated. The garden's site is situated along the banks of the Waikato River and was historically used for cultivation by tīpuna of the tangata whenua of the area (Hamilton Gardens, 2011). The garden has recovered gardening traditions including old crops, tools (shown in figure 4. & 5.), skills, materials for fences i.e rata vines, carvings, totara for pātaka roofs, kōkōwai ochre for painting whakaairo, use of green stone chisels for carving, use of ancient karakia and other tikanga unique to the area (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2014).

¹⁰ The Te Parapara Trust members: Wiremu Puke, Hare Puke, Ngāti Wairere Mavora Hamilton Chair person, John Gallagher, Margaret Evans, Hekeiterangi Broadhurst, Ngāti Wairere, Anaru Thompson Ngāti Haua, and Dave Samuels Ngāti Mahanga (deceased) (Te Para Para garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2014).



Figure 4: Harvesting kūmara using a kō gardening implement at Te Para Para garden



Figure 5: Timo gardening implement being used to soften soil during kūmara harvest at Te Para Para garden

Ōrākei garden (shown in figure 6.) is located at the Ōrākei urban marae, at Ōrākei (Bastion Point, Auckland) on the ipukarea (ancestral land) of Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei a hapū of the iwi Ngāti Whatua. The garden is situated near the whare tīpuna, papakāinga housing, and Auckland harbour. The site is of cultural and historical significance to the iwi and the land where the garden is on Whenua Rangitira (land of the chiefly gods) and co-managed by the iwi and Auckland council in accordance with the 1991 Orakei Act which is the first time that a relationship like this has been built up. The garden is in its early stages and at this stage it is used as an education platform for teaching the local people and community members about growing their own kai. But over time the hope is that the garden can teach more about the cultural practices associated with the garden (Ōrākei garden representative, personal communication, August 8, 2014).

The garden is part of a wider programme called Kainga Ora of promoting kaitiakitanga values on the site that includes a nursery (adjacent to the garden), beehives, extensive native plant and tree rejuvenation and involves teaching members of the community about how to care for Papa-tū-ā-nuku. The garden utilises local materials such as seaweed for fertiliser from the sea harbour that is contingent to the site. The marae also has a zero waste policy so scraps from marae events are used for compost at the garden. As the garden develops and more kaumātua are becoming involved more of the local knowledge and tikanga around the horticultural practices of the hapū are being shared and passed down (Ōrākei garden representative, personal communication, August 9, 2014).



Figure 6: Ōrākei marae garden

5.4 Māori Gardening Decline

Many Māori gardens that were once on ancestral sites such as marae do not exist today. One reason for this is European settlement, which brought the introduction of new crops, gardening tools and methods. These changes along with colonisation and loss of land lead to the demise of Māori gardening (Leach, 1986). This cultural sea-change contributed to the marginalisation of Māori horticultural knowledge and associated practices. This was emphasised by the Te Para Para garden representative who commented that:

When European crops were introduced, Christianity was introduced and this led to the demise of the use of ancient karakia and rituals related to gardening. Also the traditional arts in many instances suffered because of new cultivation methods (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

Urbanisation had a major impact on Māori food cultivation. Earles (2011) research highlighted that rural living was associated with communal food production and that this was important for supplying crops to marae. However, many Māori who migrated to towns and cities where food was readily available from stores and supermarkets lost touch with this way of living that included the customary oral transmission by elders of their knowledge and skills to younger generations. The impact of

urbanisation on Māori gardening was exemplified by the Te Para Para garden representative who commented that:

Supermarkets have probably been the biggest game changer since the 60's when supermarkets started coming into New Zealand. Most whānau had their own gardens around our parents and grandparents homesteads so they would have gardens there and at the marae. The urban drift kind of changed everything (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

Urbanisation has meant easy access to food which is a preference for many in their busy modern lifestyles today. This point was stressed by the Matata garden representative 2:

This world is just speeding up, it's a fast lane out there and things are so expensive. We have got to sustain our living for our mokopunas and every other family in Matata. We have to do this it's very important. It's about re-connecting, reconnecting to who we are (Matata garden representative 2, 2014).

The decline of Māori food gardening has impacted many Māori who are now part of an urban way of life and are not able to connect with indigenous ways of knowing and being such as their cultural food cultivation traditions. This was emphasised by Māori Council Officer 3 who commented that:

Obviously growing kai there is an aspect of hard work and toil in that, but it's also actual science in Mātauranga Māori and in indigenous ways of seeing how the seasons are working and how to respond to different changes in the weather and how we work with different soils and all those sorts of things, and how cultivation's are managed and maximised over generations. So there is a kind of sadness about that with me that it's one of those areas that many of us in our generation and subsequently probably our kids have missed out on as well (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

Furthermore, these impacts are described by the Te Para Para garden representative who commented that:

How many of our kids actually know how to grow kūmara now? How many adults, parents in their thirties, even forties and fifties have actually had the experience of gardening, out in the garden with their parent or grandparents? So we've lost our way of keeping connected to Papa-tū-ā-nuku in many ways. It has become an intellectualised exercise of oh yeah that's how the past was, look it up in a few history books and it becomes a marked essay and that's about as good as it gets (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

5.5 Traditional Culture

The connection between kai and cultural practices also makes Māori heritage gardens an important part of urban and rural marae. The findings of the *Te Kupenga 2014* survey affirm that Māori people in the twenty first century are still both connected to and committed to Te Ao Māori especially cultural practices associated with the marae. In the past marae were often only located in rural areas and with the urban drift and whānau moving away from these areas meant gardens could no longer be maintained. However, in the more recent post-settlement climate that has seen an improved capacity and capability of many iwi in developing their people both economically and culturally there is a drive to connect people back to their marae as a part of hapū development. There is a move both to involve more urban Māori in their marae on a more regular basis and to establish multi-tribal marae in urban areas such as the John Waititi marae in west Auckland. There is also a discernible movement of Māori moving back to tribal areas particularly in Northland, where a semi-subsistence lifestyle is possible on tribal land (Housing New Zealand Corporation, 2008). Furthermore, with a drive to address social housing issues and provide more affordable housing solutions that also reconnect people to their marae has resulted in more papa kāinga and kaumātua housing being built closer to marae in rural and semi-rural areas such as tribal areas in the Western Bay of Plenty (Helliwell, 2013).

Māori food gardens express cultural heritage in a number of ways. As well as reconnecting tribal members to their ancestral land, they also represent an opportunity for the transmission of knowledge, education and the revival of ancestral traditions and values. Additionally gardens can support the use of best practice Māori cultivation techniques and cultural management tools alongside western methods and revive the growth of heritage seed lines and Māori crops.

Gardens are a space where knowledge can be passed down from older to younger generations (shown in figure 7.). For example, many of the participants referred to the knowledge aspect of heritage, and the importance of passing this knowledge on to future generations. This reinforced the importance of intangible heritage to Māori people. The garden representatives and health promoter highlighted how gardens are an opportunity for the transmission of information.



Figure 7: Tamariki learning about planting kai at Ōrākei marae garden

The Matata garden representative 1 highlighted how gardening initiatives will encourage learning including Te reo Māori and sharing of knowledge and heritage by older generations:

We will involve the kohanga reo with our māra, learn and speak Te reo Māori including use of Māori reo signs in the māra and gain knowledge from our kuia and koroua. We got a local kuia on board a couple of weeks ago who has books about the techniques and gardening in Matata. She's willing to come into the garden and start sharing her knowledge. She also gave some kamo kamo seeds that came from her husband's grandfather passed down through the generations. When she gave me the kamo kamo she told me to cut it and keep the seeds that were closest to the stalk and not the seeds away from the stalk because those other ones probably won't grow (Matata garden representative 1, 2014).

Māori food gardens provide a space where knowledge transmission can occur in a traditional manner through oral teachings. The importance of the oral historical tradition to Māori was emphasised by Royal (1992). The Te Para Para garden representative highlighted the need to pass on gardening knowledge correctly transmitting it through customary practices such as the oral traditions. He also highlights that the garden provides an opportunity for further research into a tribe's horticultural history commenting that:

The garden it is to ensure that knowledge is actually correctly transmitted and also that there is further development of research out of it as well. So there are endless opportunities I see with this garden. It depends on what avenue one takes from it (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

The Ōrākei garden representative stated that:

The mātauranga is from the kuia and kaumātua which is just what we're trying to connect with. In the beginning the garden was just a bed with some vegetables so that mātauranga wasn't shared. Now we are starting to build up enough trust with those that hold mātauranga and it's starting to come through, which is beautiful. I love those little wee moments where uncles have been sitting on those balconies for a long time just come up to us and offer us just a little bit of knowledge. We are at the point now where they can start talking about the heritage of their kūmara, the whakapapa of our kūmara that

represents the heritage of Ngāti Whatua Orakei. Building up this knowledge is a key part of our māra (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

The health promoter also referred to the passing down of knowledge through hapū and Māori community gardens saying that:

Part of the reason for these projects is to pass on some of that knowledge so that the young ones can learn it (Health promoter, 2014).

Māori food gardens are important as they provide an opportunity to teach the akoranga (traditional teachings of a tribe) about cultivating food. This is important as Roskrige (2011) emphasises specialist traditional horticultural knowledge is only held by a few tribal experts among Māori communities and through providing an avenue to foster this and teach this knowledge will help to restore its use. Furthermore, Tawhai (2013) highlighted that a tribes horticultural knowledge needs to be conserved to ensure it is not lost.

The Te Para Para and Te Teko garden representatives also emphasised the educational aspect of Māori food garden such as reviving Māori arts. For example, toi whakaairo for carving ancient gardening tools and raranga (weaving) to make kete for harvesting and storing crops. These arts can also promote the use of traditional resources such as kōkōwai dye for carving.

Māori council officer 3 also highlights the link between Māori gardens as heritage and education stating that:

So I see the value of the work and in terms of looking at māra Māori whether they be kind of the contemporary type that are about doing but are sort of about showing and explaining and teaching as well as ones that are genuinely productive of feeding the whānau or the hapū. When I visited Te Para Para garden I saw the active engagement in learning about mahinga kai. There was also tremendous value in just seeing the site built with that technology of our tupuna so the sort of raised pātaka to protect against kiore, built from the same sort of technology it was fantastic it just had that appearance of, like I've seen productions but it didn't

seem like a reproduction. It seemed like it was very real and that it would be utilised to transfer that technology into other works and other structures of the iwi within that rohe, but also if the iwi come, which I'm sure they do, and sort of look back and say gee what were our fastenings and how did we process the harakeke for that and what did we in terms of colourings, for that aspect of art and craft, that sort of aspect of it, the story telling of it (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

The Te Para Para garden representative also highlights the educational aspect of their traditional Māori food garden stating that:

At Te Para Para we run wānanga that teach about heritage such as making garden implements e.g ko ,ketu, stone tools, greenstone chisels, manu aute, making kokowai and kete kūmara (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

The Te Teko kaitiaki further highlighted the connection between Māori arts i.e. weaving craft and gardening work:

Mum wasn't a fancy maker but she always made our kete for when we use to pick, she always had our riwai ketes made. They were heaps faster and easier than using bags (Te Teko whānau representative 1, 2014).

A common thread in the interviews from both the garden representatives and the Māori council officers was the link they saw between Māori gardens and indigenous knowledge and practices. The Te Para Para and the Ōrākei garden representatives view gardens as a means of reviving the traditions and tikanga of their hapū and iwi. For example, the Te Para Para kaitiaki highlighted the need to reclaim tribal traditions by stating:

It's important to ensure that the facets of our traditions, our material culture can be revived and not lost. And that could be around making correctly implements such as the ketu, the ko, those are digging implements that are not readily understood our days, they probably haven't been used for almost two hundred years. And you know that's just all part of the journey of reclaiming, reclaiming these facets of culture of society (Te Para Para representative, 2014).

Many of the garden representatives spoke of the local tikanga that have been passed down and are associated with their gardens. The Ōrākei garden representative commented that:

As a tikanga base we start and finish with a karakia, the karakia we have is specific to this area and is a very old karakia that was handed down (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

5.5.1 Value System

Māori gardening is underpinned by Māori values and concepts. Growing kai and sustaining the land based on kaitiakitanga principles contributes to the intergenerational health and cultural wellbeing of the hapū. In this sense a whole array of interlinking Māori principles such as whakapapa, kaitiakitanga, wairuatanga, ngā taonga tuku iho, manaakitanga, whanaungatanga and kotahitanga are expressed. These values represent the intergenerational and collective values of Māori people. The link between these values in relation to communal Māori gardens was emphasised by Matata garden representative 1 who along with her whānau is trying to restore these values such as whanaungatanga and kotahitanga to benefit her people. She commented that:

An outcome we want from our community garden is for it to have a generational impact and reconnect our people together. My vision particularly is to see our kids, my mokos and cousins and other families' kids to carry the garden on. Also to get our whanau, all of us together, tātau tātau, share you know (Matata garden representative 1, 2014).

Māori council officer 3 highlighted ways in which the value of kaitiakitanga is an important aspect of māra kai:

For the locals it's a way of restoring connection to the land and putting in bio markers, cultural markers to exchange between themselves and their tūpuna, contemporary gardens are certainly one way of potentially looking at that (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

Māori council officer 4 extends on how gardens incorporate kaitiakitanga by saying:

I think things evolve, the historical and cultural knowledge that is the maramataka and things like that which our tūpuna used, but people have adapted to Pākehā ways of doing things, and I think that a lot of our whānau have lost this aspect and are not adverse to a lot of round up now and again. Which to me if you take the kaitiaki concept which is kind of spiritually based, the whenua Papa-tū-ā-nuku and all of that, some of the new methodology kind of don't line up there, not quite pono with our tikanga. Which is a shame because there is spiritual energy as well and the powers of the stars and the moon for planting (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

Spiritual values and practices underpin gardening and link people with earth mother Papa-tū-ā-nuku and other gods associated with gardening such as Rongo-marae-roa. This important aspect of gardening was highlighted by the Māori research participants. For example, the Matata garden representative 3 who is a kohanga teacher highlighted the importance of the spiritual side of gardening commenting that:

The garden is awesome because first and foremost our kaupapa at the kohanga involves all the atua so the next step would be to explain how the kūmara connects to our atua (Matata garden representative 3, 2014).

Māori council officer 3 also highlighted the spiritual aspect of gardening stating that:

Māra Kai are a powerful symbol of how atua provide sustenance for people, also the activities, celebrations and connection to the celestial calendar. Hapū and iwi will have their own version of their history and reviving historic sites such as māra (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

Māori food gardens can support are a strong element within traditional Māori society and form a part of manaakitanga which itself is part of the tikanga that bind Māori together. The hospitality that a marae offers and the roles that it fulfils is an important and active part of people's lives. This is expressed in the whakataukī "He

iwi tino whakamanuhiri tēnei ki nga tangata katoa e tae ana ki tōna marae”¹¹. People who visit a marae are treated as special guests and are offered hospitality by the hosts (Mead, 2003).

Gardens can contribute to the ability of a hapū and a marae to further uphold manaakitanga at hui by having ready access to traditional foods. The provision of food traditional to an area is an important aspect of manaakitanga and the ability to do this is described by Mead (2003) as a source of mana and manaaki for iwi/hapū. Research participants connected Māori values such as manaakitanga to māra kai. For example, Māori council officer 3 highlighted how the value of manaakitanga was as an important aspect of māra kai:

They are an expression of manaakitanga, mana through the ability of providing kai from your own area to your manuhiri. Kai is a fundamental part of who we are as Māori, whānau and hapū. It’s important to be able to provide as our tīpuna did (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

Matata garden representative 3 commented in regards to their garden,

The garden helps us to uphold manakitanga, manaaki te tangata and also manaaki te whenua (Matata garden representative, 3).

Matata garden representative 2 highlighted her whānau’s hope to restore manaakitanga to her marae through their garden commenting that:

I remember when we were kids we just lived out of buckets. You see a bucket going across the road to my nans full of fish and then you see it again coming back with some kamo kamo and then you see whānau coming back with watercress. It’s always all the whānau sharing and everyone just comes to the marae. You know all the kuia were here and everyone would bring kai for tangis and stuff. But now it’s just so hard to get whānau to feed the manuhiri, and it’s hard to get whānau to go out and gather kai and bring it back into the wharekai to be able to feed our

¹¹ These people treat all guests who visit them at their marae with great hospitality

manuhiri. I think those are the precious things that we need to revitalise and bring back into Matata (Matata garden representative 2, 2014).

5.5.2 Traditional Crops and Seeds

Māori food gardens promote the retention and growth of heritage seeds and cultigens. Jordan (2010) and Hutchings et al (2010) observe that gardens can promote the retention and longevity of heritage seed lines and vegetable genetic heritage. This has been highlighted as important to Māori through the WAI 262 claim that supports the retention of taonga species as well as traditional knowledge and heritage (Park, 2001). All of the garden representatives and Māori council officer 4 highlighted how gardens can support genetic longevity through ensuring the continuation of heritage seeds lines. For example, the Matata garden representative 1 highlights the importance of being kaitiaki in regards to maintaining the whakapapa of indigenous seed lines. She commented that:

We really want to grow heritage seeds and we want to see and be like this is exactly what our tīpuna grew, so we want to put those practices into play so we can re-connect back to our tīpuna (Matata garden representative 1, 2014).

Māori council officer 4 extends on this importance of restoring indigenous seeds as taonga tuku iho by saying:

As heritage, what I think is a good idea is where people are starting to save seed. That is quite valuable where you can get it, someone has passed down kūmara as seed and then your eating the same thing that your great great great grandfather may have eaten. Pākehā do this all the time, with their livestock, genetics that sort of stuff, for Māori the names are just all different, the names for the methodologies are different, it's still genetic selection and saving your best, then you also have the aroha that is felt for Papa-tū-ā-nuku (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

5.5.3 Te Ao Huri Huri

When restoring the past this must be done within a contemporary setting. In a Māori heritage garden context this requires that in certain instances combining the Māori indigenous science of Mātauranga Māori with western knowledge, practices and technologies to make traditional gardening viable today. Rolleston (2006) affirms that

contemporary Māori philosophy encompasses modern and traditional principles that utilise both western science and mātauranga Maori. Roskruge (2011) highlights how traditional horticultural knowledge and praxis can inform modern systems. A number of interview participants emphasised this view. For example, the Ōrākei garden representative highlighted how they brought together two knowledge forms i.e. permaculture and Mātauranga Māori stating that:

Our garden is based on both permaculture and Mātauranga Māori. There are many linkages between the two. With permaculture and māramataka there are thirteen moons so we go with the thirteen moon cycle (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

Māori council officer 4 further noted:

What is interesting - there is a bit of a crossover between the bio dynamic movement and the mahi māra, some of their ideas around planting and energising are aligned with māoritanga and how our tupuna used to approach gardening (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

The Te Para Para garden representative highlighted the benefits of combining Mātauranga Māori and western knowledge commenting that:

I think as we claim our sense of knowledge, it's great to have the best of both worlds really, you can use science to revive the mātauranga. With Te Parapara I framed it around historical interpretations however Professor Lewis Clarkson provided a good list of plants from a botanical point of view of what grew on this river terrace originally, so we were able to incorporate that into the garden. Their scientists were able to provide maps for me. However, in many instances traditional knowledge was used such as how to prepare the ochre pigments to dye the carvings and other knowledge related to growing traditional foods related to migration patterns, how to align the astronomy around which stars appeared at certain times of the year and how this directs gardening activities such as planting and harvesting (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

5.6 How Heritage is Defined

The role gardens play in projecting heritage raises the question how is heritage is defined? History tells us that the elite and dominant powers in society have shaped how heritage is defined and meant tangible definitions have dominated. World heritage agencies have also led the way in regards to defining heritage and thus influenced how heritage definitions have been shaped in the western world. For example, ICOMOS and UNESCO have been defining heritage since 1965 (Ahmad, 2006). Critical Heritage Studies (CHS) theory revealed the underlying dominance of colonial hegemony that privileged the heritage of the elite classes. This was emphasised by Smith (2006) who indicated that a great deal of today's leading world heritage policy such as UNESCO heritage policy is underpinned by a Western Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) that has largely defined heritage as material (tangible) and monumental. Winter (2014) highlighted too that heritage as a concept that emerged in the West has privileged European conceptualisations of heritage as material culture.

Colonisation has shaped how heritage has been defined and treated in New Zealand and meant that overseas models have been adopted rather than indigenous models. For example, the European building bias has been the predominant heritage paradigm within New Zealand that continues to dominate today. Although international agreements have broadened to include a wider range form of heritage such as cultural intangible or living heritage, tangible material heritage such as buildings continue to dominate in New Zealand. Literature from McClean (2011) and Donahey (2006) outlined how the heritage sector is renowned most widely for identifying and researching old buildings and that New Zealand's heritage definitions are based on an English model of heritage, largely associated with buildings with aesthetic and architectural value. The participants in this study indicated that a building bias still exists in heritage planning today. This is evident in the New Zealand heritage list of buildings and sites where buildings dominate. Furthermore, this was revealed by the heritage expert and council planner 5 who emphasised the building bias in heritage planning that has prevailed. The heritage expert commented that 'the

focus of heritage is still on buildings' (Heritage expert, 2014). Council planner 5 also emphasised the building bias in heritage planning noting:

When we were reviewing heritage in the district planning in the formal sense we had an existing district plan heritage list that was mainly around building heritage (Council planner 5, 2014).

The definition of Māori heritage has been broadened with the recent addition of wāhi tupuna or ancestral sites as a site of historical significance that can include gardens.

This was noted by the heritage expert who commented that:

There's been a real push, especially from Māori Heritage Council, to recognise the places associated with the ancestors generally and of course that opens the door for gardens. So if you have places listed under the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* as wāhi tupuna in the future such as gardening sites that would actually lead towards potential protection under the *RMA* (Heritage expert, 2014).

However, Māori council officer 4 identifies the limited impact of the act due to a reliance on archaeological evidence and an overall misunderstanding of intangible connections Māori have with ancestral sites commenting that:

The council will come back as the usually do and say where are these taonga? Because they want a map where they can see where it is. They changed the historic places act a few years ago but what they've snuck in there is that for something to be described or categorised as a wāhi tapu it has to be validated by archaeologists who are mostly pākehā so there has to be an archaeologist to go in there and do the mahi and find the evidence to say why its wāhi tapu. I do a bit of work for the central government and was trying to stir them up a bit about this but they didn't want to listen. So if you have a whare wānanga site and there's no physical evidence at all its just where you go to learn , our old people went there to learn, the energy is in the ground, they didn't build a marae there they didn't usually bury anything there, it was a site chosen, it's just some kind of deep cultural knowledge that the tohunga used to choose it to do at that site, so even though it has a deep significance to us the district plan doesn't recognise that and it's not likely to with the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* because

there's no archaeological evidence there so that's a huge gap, or omission I think by the Crown and it will end up being omitted by district councils as well (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

This privileging of tangible heritage and associated values has had implications for Māori as intangible heritage in many ways represents a significant proportion of indigenous heritage. Heritage practices continue to prioritise buildings and western ideals and highlight the need for change. This indicates the challenge that will be involved in gaining greater protection for Māori gardens as heritage. To gain greater recognition and protection of Māori heritage i.e. traditional Māori gardens, narrow definitions and assumptions about what actually constitutes Māori heritage must be addressed. This includes acknowledging the living cultural aspects of Māori heritage. Gardens are now recognised as heritage in a number of the international agreements that define and protect heritage, including the ICOMOS and UNESCO agreements. However, these agreements focus on decorative gardens rather than indigenous or food gardens. This was emphasised by council planner 5 who when asked what he knew about heritage gardens responded

Internationally gardens are very significant. More the decorative type but they are a huge part of tourism in a lot of places (Council planner 5, 2014).

This approach of viewing traditional gardens as part of heritage also means they may function as museum exhibits as a scene from the past. A living heritage approach would mean garden heritage was brought into the present in a functional and interactive way.

The heritage expert emphasised the need to recognise that heritage represents more than buildings and introduces the idea of the use ability of heritage commenting that:

Heritage is not just a place to be admired but actually it's about a place, not necessarily a building as such and, it's about the people that connect between people and that place being the most important thing. When you start talking about places and the connection of people to places and the stories that are

generated by that connect then suddenly heritage expands and then it can cater for places that are currently in use. In fact that's the whole idea to keep that connect and facilitate the connect that place and the people because as soon as you museumise or you just show them off and say okay were just going to leave it and admire it but not actually use, it then the place effectively starts to wither away. So that's been a big challenge to heritage, not only in Europe but in New Zealand (Heritage expert, 2014).

The heritage expert illustrated too the limited recognition of living heritage within legislation by commenting that:

I would have liked to have seen in the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* a greater recognition of living heritage in terms of the actual purposes and principles of the act. But I think that there is enough in the act and the *RMA* to actually recognise living heritage, the tools are there. There is a new list there that talks about national historic landmarks and in that section it talks about heritage as places associated with people, with a story and is a much more living heritage approach and I guess that this list reflects more contemporary understands of heritage. I think a legislative change would have been good, and there was the opportunity but I guess they were afraid that the current existing government would actually do away with the whole act so there was like survival mode (Heritage expert, 2014).

Western views of heritage gardens focus on their decorative and ornamental qualities however indigenous gardens are primarily based on growing food. This was emphasised by the Te Para Para garden kaitiaki who emphasised how food is central to Māori gardening heritage:

Without the gardens, we simply wouldn't survive as a culture or a society. Food is part and parcel for every civilisation. So gardens in that context of food and sustainability of the communities that they represent was often emulated through their traditions and arts and the culture, you know without food you just can't survive (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

Planners' knowledge of heritage gardens in general and or as Māori food heritage is limited, as buildings remain at the forefront of heritage planning. Gardens are considered as part of a building's setting but are often disregarded. This may mean that gardens as part of marae may also be ignored also. When referring to their knowledge of gardens as heritage the majority of the research participants had either no knowledge of this or very limited. This was emphasised by council planner 2 who commented:

Not an awful lot to be honest, yeah it's not a concept that I've ever had put before me. Especially if you're talking about gardens relative to kai (Council planner 2, 2014).

The tangible preoccupation indicated the challenge that will be involved in gaining greater protection for Māori gardens as heritage. This is because by focusing on the tangible and physical aspects of heritage, ignores the cultural and spiritual concepts that are an integral part of a Māori heritage garden. This, most importantly, requires planners, heritage experts and managers to look beyond the standard concept of heritage use in New Zealand. The implication of not getting the definition broadened means Māori heritage gardens may be overlooked and will not get protection in plans.

The heritage expert noted too that heritage gardens are recognised as part of the setting that accompanies historic buildings and therefore are largely overlooked and stated that:

Normally a garden is a part of curtilage it's basically the setting or surroundings associated with a place and so of course many historic homesteads would have had a cottage garden so it's part of the surroundings of that place. At HNZ when I was there what we were trying to do was we were looking at sites that had been lived in, in the past just as buildings, and the whole setting of the surroundings was ignored including the gardens. The reason for this was highlighted by the heritage expert who commented that the key limitations are the focus of heritage is still on buildings. I think that incentives are there to

recognise this heritage. I think it's just getting up in the system and getting that recognition within the system and influencing planning perceptions of this heritage (Heritage expert, 2014).

It is possible to look at Māori gardens purely as historical remnants that are mapped and explored in purely archaeological terms as Furey (2006) does in some detail. Furey (2006) notes that further research is needed to establish the sites of historic gardens and states that 'absence of recorded sites in a particular locality does not necessarily mean that no garden sites exist' (Furey, 2006, p. 8). The tendency within New Zealand heritage management to focus on the built environment relegates Māori sites to unseen archaeological status. When referring to their knowledge of gardens as Māori heritage many of the council planners had limited knowledge. During the interviews the main aspect discussed in relation to conceptions of Māori gardens was their association with archaeological sites. The heritage expert explained how Māori heritage was limited to archaeological sites that included physical evidence of existence and commented that:

With Māori heritage there was always recognition that archaeological sites were heritage and had to be a midden or a pit. Even a battle site probably did not qualify unless it had actual physical remaining features. However, there was always resistance from Māori about that idea and there was always a lot of conflict between archaeologists and Māori on that issue over many years. So what emerged from that especially in the late 90s especially through the work of the Waitangi Tribunal was the idea of wāhi tapu (Heritage expert, 2014).

The association between Māori gardening and archaeological sites was also emphasised by council planner 6 who commented about his knowledge of Māori gardens as heritage today was:

More sort of as archaeological sites so I guess central discoveries and things like that and being identified as archaeological sites (Council planner 6, 2014).

If Māori food gardens are going to be accepted as Māori heritage then planners, heritage experts and managers will need to broaden their understanding of Māori

heritage. This broader view was highlighted by Māori council officer 1 who describes the multifaceted aspects of Māori heritage by commenting that:

Heritage is inherently based on the value that people place on a particular object, place, activity, species, practice, technology and or architecture, the authenticity of that particular taonga and how these are managed and or protected, particularly if it is affected by change and cannot be reversed. Maori heritage are taonga tuku iho nō ngā tūpuna. It is my understanding that these taonga can be tangible or intangible, seen or unseen and encapsulates taonga that is personal, national, natural and cultural. Things such as but not limited to, sites of cultural significance, marae, papa kāinga, mahinga kai, genealogies, stories, places, names, art, waiata, poetry, natural resources, practices and histories. Heritage is inherently a fundamental part of Māori identity. As children we were taught by my grandmother, who was full blooded Maori, all things were intrinsically connected through whakapapa, they existed without divisions or boundaries and it is our responsibility as people to exercise stewardship over these resources and do all that one can to protect, maintain or restore the mauri of those resources (Māori council officer 1, 2014).

Misunderstandings about Māori gardening have occurred due to a lack of knowledge about the deeper story related to Māori gardening that encompasses indigenous knowledge and spiritual values. This is illustrated by Māori council officer 3 who highlights the link between conceptions of Māori heritage such as Māori gardens and a misguided warrior notion by commenting that:

So while I am aware of the absolute importance of māra in terms of those stories, I feel like my upbringings been kind of bereft about that, about the once were gardeners kind of thing at some pā or some story someone talks about where, I think there were some papers were done where they use that phrase. It was playing off on the focus on the warrior and the notion that gardening is primarily an expression of physical skill and labour, rather than the mātauranga that links a māra into natural cycles and indigenous ecological knowledge (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

Some planners have a limited understanding of the intangible and living aspects of heritage including Māori gardening as heritage. This was emphasised by council planner 3 who did not see why Māori gardens should be viewed as heritage stating:

My interpretation of the purpose of establishing these gardens would suggest that they would be operational rather than for posterity. Identifying them as Māori heritage and applying some level of protection would be counter-productive on this basis (Council planner 3, 2014).

However, some Pākehā planners through their exposure to Māori perspectives of heritage are able to appreciate wider understandings of heritage that are more representative of Māori heritage. This was emphasised by council planner 2 who commented that:

While I suppose I still have to look at things with Pākehā eyes I try to look at it from the other side and take the spirit of what I'm looking at into it and trying to work through decision making, and probably more importantly than decision making, how best to consult and understand before making those decisions. Furthermore, to try and understand when you're dealing with land, that there's a whole different concept of what land means, what it's for, how it's owned and trying hard to understand those concepts, then to have to, if you like create from a Pākehā based law rules around things but embracing those concepts is really important (Council planner 2, 2014).

Additionally, council planner 1 commented that:

I am a Pākehā, and I have been a planner for quite a few years, and I guess over that time and the 20 years that I have lived in the Bay of Plenty, I have really started to learn lots about Maori heritage. Where I grew up I wasn't exposed to Maori heritage, but I've since seen the strong connection that Māori people have with their heritage, and I think so many of the values that we all take for granted as residents of this district are because of that connection and because

of the relationship that Maori people have with their heritage (Council planner 1, 2014).

More explicit recognition of a Māori heritage food gardens in legislation may contribute towards greater recognition and protection provision for this type of heritage. This was emphasised by the heritage expert who highlighted that:

Māori gardens as heritage would be recognised more in plans and consenting processes if they were given more prominence in planning legislation such as the *RMA* as well as iwi management plans (IMP) (Heritage expert, 2014).

5.7 Health and Wellbeing

Reviving older traditions associated with planting, maintaining and harvesting food from gardens can contribute to the spiritual and physical health and wellbeing of Māori. From a Māori point of view health is multidimensional. This is very evident in Durie's Te Whare Tapa Whā model of Māori health that was mentioned in chapter 2.

By planting traditional gardens with a combination of traditional crops and then harvesting those for events associated with the hapū or marae moves them from a static connection with the past to an active living aspect of heritage and part of a present community and manaakitanga. If traditional gardens can fulfil both these roles then they can become a positive contributor to improving the health of all Māori.

The research participants stressed the holistic view of health that is represented in Durie's Whare Tapa Whā model by highlighting the spiritual, social, mental and physical aspects of health that their gardens address. The Ōrākei garden representative in regard to the spiritual, social and physical wellbeing aspects of their garden commenting that:

We look after each other here, we look after the whenua, we respect whatever goes in, we karakia when things go in and we karakia when we harvest. Long term I would like everyone of our gardeners to be able to access NZQA training, so I

would love for them to be here and enjoy not only connecting to the whenua, but being able to produce healthy kai for their whānau, but also have employment opportunities further on the track (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

Matata garden representative 1 highlighted the physical and social wellbeing aspects of their garden commenting that:

From the garden we want to have the kai and be healthy, and not have to struggle to go to the shops and get vegetables, you know how expensive it is (Matata garden representative 1, 2014).

5.8 Re-establishing and Sustaining Gardens

As already noted the past decade has seen a revival in communal based Māori gardens on sites, historically used by ancestors for food cultivation including gardens on marae or hapū, iwi or public land. Many of these gardens have been re-established as a part of Whānau ora programmes that are initiated as a top-down health promotion approach through health agencies to promote Hauora Māori in accord with Durie's holistic whare tapa wha model addressing mental, spiritual, social and physical wellbeing. These gardens have also been re-established through a start-up Māra kai fund from Te Puni Kōkiri and Te Waka Kai Ora¹² who recognise its cultural restoration and health benefits including reviving traditional seeds and crops such as kūmara. The gardens I visited were re-established with the aim of reviving heritage, contributing to the well-being of their hapū through providing a food resource and for the Ōrākei garden as a part of what happens on the marae. This was emphasised by the Ōrākei garden representative who commented that:

When I was talking to you about Papa-tū-ā-nuku garden, they've been going now for five years; there at the point now where they can start talking about the heritage of their kūmara, you know they know where that kūmara whakapapa's to. Our garden represents the heritage of Ngāti Whatua Ōrākei. And building it up is key for our māra. I think in terms of heritage such as pātaka that would be the real genesis of this māra being capable of having the mana to have those things here. This is such a young māra, though it's been here for a long time. When we are

¹² Māori Organics Aoteroa

ready and we deserve to have such things then that would come from our kaumātua. We are a para kore marae so it's a zero waste marae. So all of the kai that come from the wharekai our dining hall comes straight to us and we process it through composting or one of our 24 worm bins (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

Re-establishing Māori food gardens can involve in a number of challenges that must be overcome if they are to be successful. Because these gardens are attached to a variety of outcomes can mean there's a lot of expectation to produce these outcomes by funders when in reality these gardens require a lot of effort to maintain in the long run as highlighted by Pirikahu's (2008) research. Funding, resourcing and rates are all obstacles to establishing and maintaining gardens and are areas that councils could support with. The issue of water rates was raised by a few participants and was emphasised by Matata garden representative 1 who commented that:

We had no water utilities and had to get water from someone's house. We put a hose over the fence, reversed the truck and put the hose into the bucket and we would drive it back to the beds and then empty out the buckets. We got shoved to the side when we went into the council. They didn't even want to help us the district council. Everything was about money, \$1000 to put one tap on the section. Regional council stepped in they will pay to get the water tap on but they won't pay the rates. The rates are \$1800.00 a year (Matata garden representative 1, 2014).

The health promoter raised the issue of gardens needing support for rates and other expenses commenting that:

There is no communal irrigation system. We have sort of talked about gathering rain water or having some tanks, but we haven't really had any pūtea. And even if it's about getting more tools or plants or even just to pay for the rotary hoe. For myself working in public health, I think the council could play a huge support role in ensuring that these sorts of projects are well supported. It will help ease the burden, even if it's sourcing plants and subsidising plants from their own growers

because councils have their own, I don't know if its fruit and vegetables but they have their own nursery's that they purchase from so it could be those sort of deals to get things going (Health promoter, 2014).

Theft and vandalism and resourcing are issues that garden projects have to contend with as noted by Pirikahu (2008) so support with resourcing and garden security is needed. Council can provide support in this manner but to make it happen, Māori will have to push to have their garden heritage projects recognised. These issues were emphasised by the Ōrākei garden representative who commented that:

The main sorts of resources they need are security for their tools, so a lockable place and are the basics that that council can provide but there not just the basics they are the staples that any garden needs. Even with council procurement of stuff you know whether its fence posts or soil or compost or stuff like that. Or like getting things at a cheaper rate because they buy in bulk. Then I guess it's up to Māori themselves to have a group to drive it (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

For Māori gardens to be successful they will need support to effectively continue. This was highlighted by the Matata whānau who said they know of Māori gardens in the region discontinued due to maintenance issues. Communication is also an important aspect of sustaining gardens. Pirikahu (2008) emphasised community buy in and ongoing communication for the effectiveness of community type gardens. The health promoter highlighted the need to ensure good communication to garden participants to maintain involvement commenting that:

I think that communication may be a little better. Because I think people generally want to be involved, you know put in a little bit of mahi and their own kai. But if they haven't been told what is happening with the garden then they may feel like they are not welcome to plant anything (Health promoter, 2014).

The Te Para Para garden representative stressed the need for effective communication when running a traditional Māori garden as a co-management arrangement with council:

Well at the moment they're supposed to be looking after the garden but they're not doing too good of a job. After January/ February they let it go to weed, I kicked up a fuss about it in the papers while the council were gloating about being an international garden. So they were not very happy when it was brought to their attention but I had to endure embarrassing comments about how neglected Te Para Para was looking. The pātaka does need some repair, we will need to apply more ochre to it, and I want to ensure that the kaitiakitanga is retained by the local hapū and am able to have that open line of communication of things going on in the garden (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

Successful gardens require initial and ongoing support through ensuring participant buy in from the start of the project. This was emphasised by Pirikahu (2008) and the health promoter who commented that:

Prior to building a māra kai or establishing the māra kai it's quite important to have as many people on board as possible and ensuring that they have an opportunity to participate. There are a lot of people willing to help and wanting to increase their knowledge about māra kai and just wanting to be involved so I think it's important to get as many people involved helping sustain the māra (Health promoter, 2014).

Communal gardens need people in specific roles to help establish and maintain them such as projects leaders, co-ordinators and researchers to maintain gardens. Perkins (2010) stressed the importance of heritage project managers for ensuring effective partner organisation and stakeholder input. This need for good leadership of communal gardens was emphasised by the health promoter who said:

In my opinion there definitely needs to be people who are always going to be there to take the lead. I think that for a lot of us who are in the community when we see them take that lead, were all keen to chip in. It's maybe just accessing a

range of different skills. A leadership group could be one way to make sure it's sustainable. For example if you have got your whānau who like getting in there and doing the work but might not be necessarily be good at communicating, so we could have someone providing the communication to the rest of the whānau, someone being the liason between the council and the marae and the hapū, maybe like a committee. Then there are some of the others that are interested in sharing their knowledge so they could also be key as well. So having a mix of all those things I think could be a good way for it to be more successful and sustainable (Health promoter, 2014).

The Ōrākei garden representative indicated that this was important to sustain the garden and ensure positive outcomes commenting that:

We have also been lobbying for council to pay for community garden co-ordinators. There is a fantastic array of volunteers and that's all good, but they are volunteers, and in winter or when things go bad, somebody gets hapū or somebody gets sick, your volunteer base drops off and you need a sturdy person who's always there, whose always connecting to the community, whose always going to plan for the next season, two seasons ahead. If all gardens could get a paid co-ordinator position then you would find real learning and behaviour changes (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

The Te Para Para garden representative commented that:

Hire a really good researcher and a person who knows how to raise the money for the garden. There are all sorts of ways and means to do it and it's just about being able to take the first initial steps and being brave enough to do it (Te Para Para Garden representative, 2014).

General daily running of the garden is important but also strategic roles. This was emphasised by the Ōrākei garden representative who commented that:

Judy does the gardening and I handle the strategic sides of things. I have connected Kainga Ora to the IMP and get us through our strategic plan you know. So thats where it is very important to have that strategic side. So I

connect and she does the mahi and tells us what to do (Ōrākei garden representative, 2014).

5.9 Planning and Heritage

So far it has been established that there are Māori gardens in existence that are recognised by those who have re-established them as actual heritage. To ensure these gardens are recognised in New Zealand's heritage management system will require legislation, policy, plans and consents to give effect to this. However, there is a lack of support for Māori heritage as highlighted by Awatere et al. (2013). Planners, heritage managers and experts will need to broaden their understanding of Māori heritage types and values if they are to recognise more intangible forms of heritage in their plans. This was emphasised by Stephenson (2005) who highlighted that it may be difficult for planners to understand different world-views. Furthermore, Harmsworth (2004) observes that Māori knowledge and values in planning are often neglected in plans.

The overall problem this research addresses is the failure of the planning system to acknowledge and provide for the relationship Māori have with their heritage. This is caused by a lack of understanding around indigenous heritage and associated values. As a result indigenous connections and heritage values are compromised. Māori council officer 4 expanded on the inadequacies of the current heritage planning system in relation to perceptions around defining Māori heritage noting that:

In Hastings we did a wāhi tapu review and they got outside help to do it but then they got down to how tapu is it? This was to align it with the plan and can it be a permitted activity? And the effects of it and so what sort of tapu is it? Is it very tapu or just a little bit? And that's what planning is coming down to now, because were saying how can we elevate these things and there saying how can we squash them or push them aside, so that's just the nature of the beast when we are planning (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

Māori heritage understandings are often limited to that of an archaeological or wāhi tapu site. There is a privileging in NZ of aesthetic heritage values and that Māori

heritage values tend to be relegated to spiritual types of heritage places such as wāhi tapu, ignoring the diversity of heritage sites significant to Māori including gardens as McClean (2009) notes. The Te Para Para garden representative highlighted that planners cannot determine the importance of a site just based on archaeological values alone and that planners tended to be overly reliant on archaeologists in assessing Māori heritage. However, with the recent change to the *HNZPTA 2014* that recognises the new category of wāhi tupuna there is more statutory weight to recognise ancestral connections that may be not just in a sacred sense.

Although gardens may include tapu practices regarding planting or tikanga in most instances wāhi tupuna would be the more appropriate way to describe them as they involve food which is actually seen as something that neutralises tapu. Māori council officer 3 highlights that Māori heritage has been largely associated with wāhi tapu sites and he and the heritage expert say there is an opportunity to recognise a greater variety of Māori heritage beyond wāhi tapu through the new recognition of wāhi tupuna sites. The Māori council officer 3 notes that:

Wāhi tapu were used a lot in the recognition of ancestral sites, even though the phrasing is less used now. I tend to use wāhi tupuna now as there are aspects to wāhi tapu that don't perhaps cover some of the activities that our tupuna were involved in (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

There is a need for greater education about what a Māori heritage garden is and how they should be provided for through planning processes. This was emphasised by the lack of consistency in the interview participant's responses in regards to how councils may deal with a request to set up a garden. For example, Māori council officer 1 commented that:

Although Māori heritage gardens are not specifically referenced in the heritage section of the plan, the integrated development zone rule provides the flexibility to include Māra kai as part of the overall development of the block (Māori council officer 1, 2014).

Two of the council planners stated that their council would treat traditional Māori gardens as permitted activities for example council representative 7 said:

They would likely be a permitted activity – we would allow the necessary earthworks etc. provided they could demonstrate that they were the only group with an interest in the site/ had the support of all interested iwi (Council representative 7, 2014).

Two of the council planners stated that they thought māra would be part of community development. For instance council representative 7 said regarding been approached about reviving a traditional garden by a Māori group:

I would also put them in touch with our community development officer for any assistance she may be able to provide with sourcing funding for the project etc. (Council representative 7, 2014).

Council planner 1 commented:

With respect to developing or protecting heritage gardens, I would look at the overall land uses within that community, and identify where you may want to protect gardens or establish more gardens. If this goal is identified by the community then you would need to put things in place to help that happen. Whether it be zoning/rules (although you probably wouldn't need to changes these), or an overall strategy or a community plan, or use for council land. Our council are not doing that actively, we're doing I guess the bare minimum of planning (Council planner 1, 2014).

An over reliance on western heritage experts and disregard for tribal experts has seen a privileging of a western worldview and the marginalisation of local or indigenous knowledge. This was emphasised in the literature by Smith et al. (2009) and Baird (2013) in regards to critical heritage management that questions conventional heritage practice that has contributed to the alienation of indigenous heritage including the privileging of western experts and ignorance of indigenous expertise. The Te Para Para garden representative highlighted this in relation to the

inadequacies of the Hamilton City District Plan in providing for Māori heritage issues and an overreliance on non-Māori expertise commenting that:

At the moment the district plan is being challenged, I haven't worked on a plan for a couple of years, at the moment there being challenged by the Heritage New Zealand, for lack of regard for Māori heritage. What I pointed out to planners is that you cannot determine the importance of a site just based on archaeological values alone. They tended to be overly reliant on archaeologists taking the view that their authority and their knowledge are more superior to that of a tribal historian. You can't convince me that archaeologists have all the answers, I don't think so, and can any of them speak Māori? Many of them are not familiar with Māori Land Court records and they don't have that same affinity with the land (Te Para Para Garden representative, 2014).

Māori council officer 3 noted the shortcomings of first generations plans and the need for the new district plans coming through to encompass Māori perspectives and sourcing the knowledge of cultural experts, bringing together both Mātauranga Māori and western scientific perspectives commenting that:

There is a lot of expertise of course, from an iwi perspective, to not only have Mātauranga Māori but also mātauranga Pākehā, that's really been useful in the sense that's there's really useful contemporary technology. Having local experts that could bridge between te ao Māori, the worldview of the hapū and whānau and strong references to a scientific perspective would be beneficial for enabling recognition and protection through district planning processes (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

The *RMA* has provisions for Māori heritage, however the extent to which this is carried through into the district plan process varies throughout the country. Furthermore, some district plans are starting to provide for a wider iwi lens regarding Māori issues as emphasised by McClean (2009) and Jeffries (2008) however there are still many issues that need addressing in regards to inadequacies of district plan processes in providing for Māori heritage. A number of the participants highlighted

that their current or proposed plans were attempting to address the inadequacies in past district plan approaches to Māori heritage. Māori council officer 2 illustrated this by stating:

The emerging Rotorua District Plan (due end October) contains a chapter devoted to cultural and historic heritage. The intention is to be enabling and is a significant change from the operative district plan, which requires an application for resource consent for almost any activity on a marae for example and has been seen as a barrier to development of Marae and Māori land (Māori council officer 2, 2014).

Planners view Māori heritage through the lens of the district plan that is a structured view focused largely on buildings and tangible heritage in relation to rules and the resource consent process. This was emphasised by council planner 1 who identified that a key issue for Māori in relation to the district plan was a concern by Māori for the intangible relationship they have with their heritage. This was emphasised by Māori council officer 4 who commented:

There is a lack of understanding about the importance of intangible Māori heritage (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

Moreover, council planner 1 highlighted the challenge in identifying intangible Māori heritage values in district plans stating that:

I guess the district plan context is quite a sterile way of interpreting Māori heritage. The district plan is quite a structured approach to try to provide for some things that are tangible, like you might have a specific Māori heritage site that you are trying to fight for, but so much of Māori heritage is not tangible. It's quite difficult to bring that through in a district plan context. For instance, when we consulted with the community over the district plan review, the key issues that I saw that came out of that process for Māori was the protection of a relationship, which isn't tangible. Its very difficult to do that through words and the rules of the plan and council processes (Council planner 1, 2014).

Māori heritage values conflict with conventional heritage ideas that focus on physical heritage and or make divisions between intangible and tangible heritage. Māori have strong attachments to both tangible and intangible heritage that are not viewed in isolation from one another. This view contrasts with a western view that underpins a lot of heritage planning today. This was emphasised by council planner 6 who stated that there is a focus on an evidence based approach to heritage that does not have a place for intangible heritage on private property.

Council planner 1, in regards to *RMA* and district plan Māori provisions for heritage, highlights the challenge of interpreting these provisions in particular, how these are applied in the context of recognising and providing for a holistic Māori world view. Furthermore, Māori council officer 1 emphasises the challenges of providing for a holistic Māori worldview through the current planning framework commenting that:

Recording sites of cultural significance to Māori as part of a District Plan process is considered to be a foreign practice for Maori. If these sites are recorded as part of the District Plan they could automatically trigger resource consent. The majority of Māori don't fully understanding the requirements of the consenting process and the affordability of obtaining such consent. Within the *RMA* there are over 30 sections which require the Council to consider matters of significance to tangata whenua. From a Māori perspective, I don't believe that the principles of the Treaty are given sufficient pre-eminence in the principles and purposes of the legislation. Albeit these sections constituents part of the legislative framework for developing the rationale, policies, objectives and methods of a District Plan according to Western science, the challenge lies in the interpretation of such directives and how these are applied in context of recognising and providing for a holistic Māori world view (Māori council officer 1, 2014).

Council planner 1 emphasises that consultation and implementation is key when it comes to providing for Māori heritage under the current *RMA* and district plan framework commenting that:

Often we are criticised that we have all the frame work there under the district plan, and we've got the RMA frame work, but when it comes to making decisions about Māori heritage, the wrong decisions are being made and we're not actually giving effect to what we hear back in that consultation. So yeah there are the two aspects of it, the actual policy frame work and in essence thats quite straight forward. Your follow the RMA kind of context , and most district plans have a chapter on heritage, they'll have policies and rules around that, but are we actually delivering that? Are we implementing that? So the policy which sits in the district plan, and how you actually protect heritage is important, but plan implementation is equally as important, and I felt that came out even more importantly through consultation. Wwhat I mean by that is the consultation processes if we're dealing with consents, so who we're talking to, when we talk to them, and also how we talk to them. If we've got policies in the plan that talk about protecting heritage and relationships, if we're implementing those properly, what importance are we giving to the consultation that we're having with Māori?. So policy implementation is really important (Council planner 1, 2014).

Māori heritage is treated within the context of a planning system that is underpinned by a western focus on economic development at the cost of Māori heritage values. The economic development focus overriding cultural connections and values is indicated by (Trapzenick & McLean, 2000) and Davoudi (2012) who highlighted the commodification of heritage as an economic resource. McClean & Greig (2007) observe that development is often prioritised by councils over competing Māori values that are easier to ignore when they are intangible or unseen. This was noted by Māori council officer 1 who commented that:

The submission process allows for the public to contest the inclusion of such heritage sites. This was one of the drivers why a number of iwi and hapū groups opted to retain individual databases, notifying council that this information existed and that should development occur within their particular area of benefit, council would need to make developers aware that a site of significance existed on their land. In my opinion, Māori heritage items are treated the same as any other

heritage item in the plan, and irrespective of what can be perceived as protection mechanisms everything has a price. Control is placed in the hands of local government to administer, with Māori providing only a very minimal influence on determining the outcome. Best practice suggests that engagement with Māori is a priority irrespective of whether or not legislation requires it, however, past experience has indicated that developers did not necessarily embrace best practice (Māori council officer 1, 2014).

Māori council officer 4 also noted that: It's taken a long time for regional councils and district councils to adapt to the urgency of Māoritanga. It's all economic development and that's been our problem here is the conflict between environmental management and economic development (Māori council officer 4, 2014).

5.9.1 Improving Planning Responses

Planning systems require restructuring if they are to support the restoration of Māori heritage such as food gardens. Friedman (1987) emphasises how planning practice can transform structures and support mutual learning. Sandercock (2004) and Nilsen (2005) promote the restructuring of planning systems and policy to better supports indigenous rights and active participation by indigenous people in decision-making.

Collaborative arrangements that are tailor made for the local area and people can help to restore these rights and more active participation by indigenous people in decision-making regarding their heritage. Paquette (2011) and Cundill and Rodela (2012) highlight how collaborative arrangements can support power sharing and the contribution of local indigenous knowledge. Tipa and Nelson (2008) affirm that collaborative arrangements need to be tailored to the context and site.

Some Māori communities have lost the connection between kai and cultural practices which makes gardens an important way of reviving cultural traditions associated with growing kai. Reviving these types of gardens may occur on land that is identified as a site of former Māori occupation but is now owned by the council. The Te Para Para garden site which is located with the Hamilton Gardens precinct is land owned by the council is held in high regard by the local people due to its heritage significance. This area of land was once the site of the Te Para Para pā occupied by the great warrior

Hanui and his Ngāti Wairere descendants. The site was renowned as a sacred site for harvesting food crops. Today the site is co-managed by Ngāti Wairere representatives and the council, an arrangement the Te Para Para garden representative believes has contributed to cultural benefits for his people. In relation to the garden he commented:

I know into the future that the garden traditions of Ngāti Wairere are going to live on and that's the best that anyone can do when it comes to serving their own people. The fact is it's about retaining ones ahi ka and manawhenua status (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

The benefit of collaborative partnerships was further emphasised by the Te Para Para garden representative who said a collaborative arrangement between the Te Para Para Trust and the Hamilton City Council has helped to support the protection of their cultivation heritage commenting that:

Mr Bill Featherstone was general manager of Parks and Gardens at Hamilton City Council and was instrumental with me in getting the project going and his assistance from the funds end from Hamilton City Council was a huge help (Te Para Para garden representative, 2014).

The Orakei garden representative highlighted that council support would go along way in helping to build up and sustain their māra and that a co-management arrangement over the garden would be beneficial to both parties. She commented that:

And this iwi in particular has alot of resourses, as in they have the ability to go and get big contracts to deliver social outcomes. So the iwi in my mind should be paying for this kind of upskilling and connection that their whanau are reaping the benefits for. But I think that council could be coming through in different ways, like supporting in resourses and supporting with funding applications to get some more resourses. I think a co-management situation would be fantastic, for example Ngāti Whatua could pay for say me and Auckland council could pay for the garden co-ordinator, and I don't think a full time position would be needed.

Twenty hours if you're doing it right and connected to your community, like we are here, twenty hours a week, because she does not have to get in there and do all the work because there is so many whānau. Yeah you would need forty hours a week if you were the only co-ordinator there and doing everything on your own. But if you did your job properly then you should have heaps of whānau here, and we do.

Māori gardens represent Te Ao Māori. Te Ao Māori is one of four key outcomes for TPK. This outcome is described as Māori succeeding as Māori more secure, confident and expert in their own culture which is encapsulated in captured in the Māra kai programme (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2010). Thus, Māori in promoting Māori heritage they support Māori development, self-determination, Mātauranga Māori, kaitiakitanga, health and wellbeing. With such a wide-ranging scope Māori gardens fit into the outcomes of different sectors of the community and therefore will benefit from support from these different sectors such as to be successful. The health promoter also highlights the advantages of inter-sectorial collaboration in helping to sustain Māori gardens commenting that:

I think the council could play a big support role. My colleague Sarah Stevenson, as part of a food security tool kit, suggests to council that they could play a big role in not only māra kai but all sorts of different initiatives for health and wellbeing, particularly with health and nutrition in the community and part of that food security tool kit talks about having committee leaders made up of different stake holders within the community and I guess what I'm saying is that it could be a similar model by gathering a range of different stake holders that could support one another (Health promoter, 2014).

The planning system could potentially support the revival of Māori gardens on heritage sites however there are a number of issues that need addressing. Traditional Māori gardens will only be able to be revived if the current planning regulations allow for this. The *HNZPTA* directs the identification and classification of heritage and the *RMA* provides for the protection of the identified heritage resource from adverse effects that may arise from an activity. Under the *RMA* re-establishing a substantive

garden may require a resource consent incurring costs and time delays. These issues and a lack of understanding of Māori tikanga have meant that planning has at times failed to keep up with the planning needs of Māori. Further, if a Māori garden on a traditional cultivation site does exist then there may be problems in having it recognised as a heritage site.

Changes to district plans such as tailor-made district plan rules for Māori heritage could potentially help to address planning for Māori food garden issues this was emphasised by the heritage expert who commented that:

I think for instance if say an ancestral garden was listed by HNZ and became part of the *RMA* I think they would have to have a set of rules especially designed for that place. Because at the moment you have to sort of type of blanket or protection in district plans where all alterations, additions, alterations, demolition and relocation requires consent as is discretionary activity. Those types of rules would not be appropriate for ancestral sites. I mean alteration and addition? It does not make sense, and that's the problem with district plan rules in the *RMA* they are still set up for buildings basically, and for a lot of Māori heritage it doesn't work. One of those Waikato district plans has a list of heritage places in the appendix, and then the rules are actually designed for that place, so they have individual rules for that type of place, that is tailored. Most of the building rules are very similar but they have different types of sites including Māori heritage sites which they have actually got special rules that would apply. That's where district plans should be going. Planners should be thinking like this (Heritage expert, 2014).

Relationship building to improve engagement with hapū and iwi regarding their heritage and consulting with hapū and iwi more proactively in regard to development decisions that may affect their heritage values is important for planners to provide for. This was emphasised by council planner 7 who commented that:

Council's policy planner is now actively engaging with local iwi to ensure we have better knowledge of significant sites for inclusion in the District Plan. Our consents planner is working on improving relationship with Iwi to improve future

consultation opportunities for development and subdivisions that may affect both known and unknown sites of significance (Council planner 7, 2014).

It's important for councils and planners to build good faith and trust with hapū and iwi groups to support effective engagement that supports the treaty principles such as partnership, participation and protection. This will allow Māori to have robust input into plans which can engender positive results for both parties. Kamo (2010) highlighted that effective engagement on the hapū or iwi's terms, is vital to ensure cultural heritage is protected. Council planner 1 emphasised the importance of building relationships and trust with local iwi by commenting that:

Another comment I will make on Māori heritage in a district plan context would be in relationship to identifying sites. So in a European RMA context, people want to know where are they, what they are and where the the boundary, why it's important, and often that doesn't work for Māori and it doesn't work for cultural heritage sites. So you have got an inherit conflict between what your trying to do through a district plan and what Māori people want to see in that district plan, and that is quite a difficult thing to overcome. Alot of that is about trust, and one of the things I have heard repeatedly is that Māori don't always trust councils, for obvious reasons, for fear that they are a vehicle of the Crown. Because they don't trust councils they certainly don't want to hand over that precious information to councils and suddenly give ownership of that information over. That causes a bit of difficulty as Māori don't want that information in a public forum so its quite difficult to get past that. I know some councils have worked really hard to do that and they are really successful, but we haven't at our Council. So I guess there's that whole framework where you have the ability to do alot through the district plan but so much of it doesn't sit well with how Māori people operate, how they own their information and how they feel about that information (Council planner 1, 2014).

Council planner 1 also highlights the need for greater resourcing supported by the elected members to help build relationships and trust with Māori to support dual planning in heritage protection commenting that:

I think that we've worked hard to start building relationships, but to build relationships you've got to have a resource to do that, you've got to have support from council hierarchy. So one of the problems with building relationships with the iwi hapū is that those relationships have got to be long term and enduring because they rely on trust (Council planner 1, 2014).

Formal arrangements such as memorandum of understanding (MOU) agreements, IMPs and CIAs are important tools for helping to ensure the voice of tangata whenua is heard in plan-making and planning processes. This was emphasised by Kamo (2010), McClean (2010) and Matunga (2013). Council representative 2 also emphasised the need to engage more effectively to build trust with iwi stating:

We are trying to engage better, particularly with Tūwharetoa, but that's got to be done in their time to some extent because there's still a heap of distrust that comes from those earlier times. And while I can stand up and say that's not the way that I want to work with you, I have got to earn some trust I guess before we can make progress. At this stage we don't have formal written accords, or things like that but these things have been on the table and hopefully in time well get there (Council planner 2, 2014).

The Heritage expert indicated that IMPs would be the best vehicle for gaining council support in protecting Māori traditional gardens as heritage commenting that:

I think for this type of issue, you could prepare an IMP for all the Mahinga Kai including the gardens in their rohe as a group and then just outline some key objectives, policies, methods, and the methods would be the design around the particular needs of that site. So designing a plan would be the ideal type of instrument and of course councils have to recognise and provide for the iwi management planning around it so that would then feed into the system. I guess the limitations of the council in the absence of that positive planning, like the IMP before it becomes something like they don't know enough about or their not aware of, they will just fob it off because they have other priorities (Heritage expert, 2014).

Council planner 1 also said that identifying Māori heritage gardens in IMPS would be helpful but outlined the issues surrounding that and other ways forward stating:

IMPs are a good way of getting past that – the ownership of information sits with the iwi, not Council. Council has to have regard to them when developing the district plan but it's probably not something that has enough teeth to drive a change from a council. So I think the best way to get momentum is to build a relationship. Council developments are part of this for example the asset arm of council, particularly the parks and reserves side. The key is to start building that relationship and thrashing that out. And obviously you can bring the policy planners in to help with the facilitation of this and if there is any development of a community planning framework around that you can do that as well (Council planner 1, 2014).

To really enable solid policy for developing Māori gardens will require greater Māori representation on councils including councillors and planners. Lane & Corbett (2005) highlight the lack of indigenous representation in planning decision-making forums. Jojola (2008) and Sandercock (2004) emphasise the need for more indigenous planners. Awatere, et al. (2013) say limited Māori representation means marginal representation of Māori perspectives and knowledge in planning.

Council planner 1 indicated that council proactivity was influenced by a lack of Maori representation stating that:

One of the problems with our council, is that we don't have any Māori representation on council, I'm pretty sure there are no Maori representatives at all, so in a community where there is forty percent Māori that is a real issue, because you just don't have the understanding or the appreciation for the whole commitment to the relationship at the elected level. I think our council is not very pro-active. Not all elected members have an understanding or appreciation of Māori heritage, and I don't think there is any true momentum or desire to try and facilitate kaitiakitanga, and better management of Māori heritage (Council planner 1, 2014).

If food gardens had more recognition in statute then they are more likely to receive greater funding through the planning system. This was emphasised by the heritage expert who indicated that councils would be more likely to support these types of gardens if they were recognised on the New Zealand heritage list of buildings and sites commenting that:

Councils have incentive funds available that support cultural heritage and definitely once you're on the actual list basically you often qualify for that sort of funding (Heritage expert, 2014).

Re-instating Māori heritage garden sites and ensuring their sustainability requires funding however some council would consider funding this where others would not reflecting the variation of support around the North Island for supporting the protection of indigenous heritage. Awatere et al. (2013) emphasised the inconsistency throughout the country in council support for Māori input into planning processes despite progress with many councils. For example, council planner 6 spoke about the potential funding avenues there were at council for gardens stating that:

We've got some dedicated funding for planting fruit and nut trees and so that is becoming, getting a little bit more in vogue so that's good and that sort a stems out of our bio-diversity strategy as well. So I think, depending on where it is we'd take a pretty open view in how to make it happen (Council planner 1, 2014).

Council planner 5 also indicated potential funding available for gardens saying that: 'The council does have bits and pieces of grants and things that could possibly be applied for' (source). Council planner 2 highlighted how it is unlikely his council would not be able to help fund Māori gardens as heritage stating:

We have some limited opportunities to access funding from council to help with those sorts of things. What we would more see ourselves in is a facilitator role or an advocacy role, if we could assist them to access funding from another source, and that would be more our way other than providing funding directly ourselves (Council planner 2, 2014).

Council planner 4 emphasised that they would have not had the funds to support Māori gardens as heritage stating that:

We have funding limitations in light of our mana whenua funding being put on hold indefinitely (Council planner 4, 2014).

Māori council officer 3 commented that:

So I guess at this stage there's an aspect of that that could be covered under what is within our current resources, targeting Māori specific outcomes. Ultimately though specific resourcing and recognition of māra where iwi identify these as important aspirations may be the most appropriate way forward in terms of local government responses to Māori (Māori Council Officer 3, 2014).

5.10 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the five themes that have emerged from the results and analysis of planning for Māori food gardens which were Māori heritage gardens in existence, defining heritage, gardens and health, re-establishing and sustaining gardens and planning and heritage. These findings were analysed in the context of the published literature discussed in chapter two and four and the interview and questionnaire findings. The findings indicated that Māori food gardens are multi-functional in that they promote heritage, culture, values including kaitiakitanga and health. In terms of the primary research question, *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?*, the findings have shown that for Māori gardens to have a place in the planning systems legal, structural and organisation changes need to be made to enable planning to be more responsive in supporting the restoration and longevity of Māori heritage gardens. The next chapter will provide an overview of the main issues addressed in this thesis and answer the primary research question to conclude this research.

6. Kupu Whakamutunga-Conclusion

6. 1 Introduction

This chapter will first explain the main conclusions that have been drawn from this study. These conclusions have helped to answer the primary question of this research, *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?* These answers are addressed in the summary of the findings. Finally, the limitations of the research and potential areas for future research are outlined.

6.2 Summary of Findings

Five key themes emerged from the analysis of the findings. They were:

- Existing Māori heritage gardens
- How heritage is defined
- Gardens, health and wellbeing
- Re-establishing and sustaining gardens
- Planning and heritage

The gardens that were visited during the course of this study emphasised how Māori heritage gardens can provide a rich treasure of cultivation history and Mātauranga Māori. Additionally, they can help to keep the home fires burning whilst nourishing people and their spirits as they connect back to Papa-tū-ā-nuku, Rongo-marae-roa and their ancestral roots. As the kai grows so do the people, their shared memories, narratives, identity and spirits. A Māori heritage garden is more than a living monument, it restores genetic seed heritage and is a link to cultural activity that expresses indigeneity through knowledge, traditions and values indigenous to New Zealand.

International bodies, charters and models have shaped heritage conceptions. These definitions have been framed by Eurocentric ideals that embrace the grandeur of architecture and art associated with buildings and decorative gardens that portray European heritage. Over time international heritage has broadened its scope to

recognise heritage types beyond the tangible such as intangible and living heritage that embrace concepts valued by indigenous peoples. However, these types of heritage encompass more than physical properties and therefore are outside the familiar and conventional ideas around heritage that dominate heritage planning. Thus the challenge ahead is to encourage wider views that look beyond the material to the metaphysical and holistic.

Garden heritage can represent indigenous life ways in the contemporary world. Customary tools can help to inform crop growth, sustain whānau and enable hapū to provide for their manuhiri and serve nutritional traditional foods that have been grown with the blessings of their atua. This thesis has illustrated the link between indigenous gardens, heritage, planning and health. Planning to help restore and sustain Māori food gardens can help to provide for the interlinking prerequisites for Māori health – social, physical, mental and spiritual wellbeing.

Pro-active measures are required to ensure that indigenous garden heritage can be re-established and although they represent an ephemeral form of heritage, through effective support the life cycle of gardens can be constantly renewed and maintained to ensure that this taonga is sustained into the future. The research findings highlight that Māori garden heritage projects must be driven by Māori as any imposed solution will be unsustainable. Additionally, councils can assist with the planning and funding that is required to help pay for resources and project staff such as coordinators and researchers. Councils could also relieve pressure by providing rates subsidies and removing leasing agreements. Collaborative and inter-sectoral arrangements between council and hapū and other agencies such as health and educational providers require open and honest communication and long term commitment to ensure the longevity and success of a heritage communal gardening project.

The problem this research has revealed is how planning can hinder effective input by tangata whenua in heritage planning and management. These issues will need to be addressed if planning is able to effectively contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage. The interview and

questionnaire findings reinforced the literature. For instance, economic development priorities will often mean that indigenous heritage values are overlooked especially where there is a lack of tangible evidence. This focus on physical properties reflects that material heritage is the most accepted form of heritage within the planning system.

The incorporation of Māori perspectives and local tribal experts' knowledge is lacking in many council planning policies and plans and as a result there is a privileging of a western worldview and the alienation of local indigenous knowledge. This is evident in the neglect of Māori knowledge and values in in policies and plans. Despite the *RMA* framework that provides for Māori input into decision-making, uptake of these provisions is often an afterthought with tangata whenua being asked to comment on plans and policies rather than develop them from the outset. Furthermore, local plans such as district or city plans contain policies and objectives that promote Māori participation in heritage management planning. However, tension remains as to how to effectively implement plans that incorporate Māori philosophies so that plans aren't just words on paper.

District plans often have scant iwi provisions or include the recognition of Māori heritage values in introductory chapters identifying issues, but have little or no mention in the rest of the plan. These issues imply that planning systems require restructuring to be more responsive to tangata whenua needs. Greater effort is needed to identify and remove the institutional barriers that prevent empowerment of Māori in contributing to heritage management. The potential opportunities for delivering change are ultimately dependent on council planning approaches to provide for structures, policy, plans and processes which speak to Māori ambitions for both celebrating and protecting their ancestral heritage.

To better recognize the value and importance of Maori heritage gardens, there will need to be changes to both planning and heritage management. Under the *RMA* re-establishing a substantive garden may require a resource consent incurring costs and time delays, if a Māori garden on a traditional cultivation site does exist then there

may be problems in having it recognised as a heritage site. Furthermore, Māori food gardens as inclusive of living and intangible heritage and spiritual values is unfamiliar territory for many planners when dealing with heritage thus they are likely to be overlooked in planning decisions unless there is more explicit recognition of Māori heritage gardens. At the same time hapū and or iwi will need to drive this if there is to be greater recognition of these gardens in plans, policies and legislation.

Local authorities have statutory obligations to recognise and provide for the rights of tangata whenua under the TOW in protecting their taonga. Therefore the treaty principles such as participation, protection and partnership must be applied in planning practice to ensure Māori heritage perspectives, knowledge and values are recognised and provided for in planning processes. Active participation means planners need to provide opportunities for regular and on-going input into decision-making by hapū and iwi in heritage planning processes including the opportunity to participate from the formulation to the development and implementation stages of heritage policy and plan-making and by councils ensuring they are aware of consents that may impact on their heritage.

Protecting Māori interests regarding their heritage and associated values can be achieved through a values-centered planning approach that ensures a mātauranga Māori framework informs heritage management and planning praxis alongside western knowledge and approaches. This approach prompts local authorities to evaluate their processes and approaches in terms of their efficacy in acknowledging and providing explicit reference to and protection for the diversity of indigenous heritage. Furthermore, councils need to support iwi to develop heritage planning tools such as IMPS and cultural impact assessments that enable them to identify how they want their heritage values protected. Furthermore, district plans need to contain robust iwi provisions such as Māori heritage protection zones with rules to protect Māori heritage sites and associated values. These provisions must cascade throughout the plan from issues, objectives and policies through to the methods. The

interview findings highlighted how district plans can help to protect Māori heritage values through having tailor-made district or city plan rules.

Partnerships must be cultivated by local authorities and planners with hapū and iwi that are based on building trust, provide for greater Māori representation, mutual learning and shared decision-making opportunities. Joint decision-making, collaborative arrangements and MOUS that are tailor made for the local people will help to ensure tangata whenua interests in heritage management and planning are represented.

Thus, local authorities and heritage planners can fulfil their statutory obligations under the treaty through best practice and respond to the post-colonial challenge to reframe heritage around supporting indigenous rights. If planning is to contribute to reviving Māori food garden heritage it will require that local authorities and planners re-think, re-plan and re-store indigenous connections to their ancestral heritage. This will help tangata whenua to reclaim their garden heritage, so that it is living once again and their people can continue to grow and thrive into the future.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

There were only brief references in this study to the planning tools that could be better utilised by local authorities such as IMPs however; time limited the scope of this thesis. Furthermore, a limitation to the research was the shortage of space to discuss in detail cultural tools such as kaitiakitanga, the māramataka and celestial knowledge can complement western cultivation methods. Or the mātauranga, values and tikanga associated with Māori garden heritage. This is a potential area of tribal research if hapū or iwi wish to use academic research to complement traditional oral transmission of knowledge as carried out by Tawhai (2013) with one of my own iwi Te Whānau-ā-Āpanui. Again due to the scope of this research other important facets of Māori gardening such as food security and sustainability were not addressed.

An area I noted through the course of this research where there was an apparent gap and an insightful area of research, is the demise and recent revival of marae gardens.

Also investigating how these gardens are viewed on marae by heritage planners are they seen as just part of the curtilage of the marae or as unique heritage that functions as part of the marae in supporting manaaki te tangata. This research thesis is just the beginning of what I hope is a deeper investigation into this new area of study.

6.3 Conclusion

This research has illuminated how planning can contribute to the revival of Māra Kai Tuturu as part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage by analysing documents, interview and questionnaire findings. The literature and interviews suggests that changes are needed to widen the understandings around Māori heritage aspects such as Māori food gardens in the management of Māori heritage sites, to ensure their long term survival. An assessment of the effectiveness of Māori heritage management has revealed that protection of Māori heritage will predominately be dependent on how territorial authorities prioritise tangata whenua input to their plans, resource consent processes and to the level of support they commit to iwi heritage plans and other planning tools at their disposal under the *RMA* and *HPA*.

Māori heritage gardens are potentially multi-functional in that they can reconnect people to ancestral sites, promote the use of Mātauranga Māori, health and wellbeing whilst reviving garden heritage. Māori people can re-connect with their land as they learn about their gardening traditions and bring history to life. A commitment to tangata whenua planning will help to improve and complement current planning approaches. This will mean the planning system will be better able to support the revival of Māori food gardens. In effect, planning will help to sustain New Zealand's indigenous heritage, culture and people through the generations.

Ngā Rārangi Pukapuka- Bibliography

- Abbott, M., Ruru, J., & Stephenson, J. (2010). Entering Landscape. In J. Stephenson, M. Abbott & J. Ruru (Eds.), *Beyond the Scene: Landscape and Identity in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp.13-21). Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Ahmad, Y. (2006). The scope and definitions of heritage: From tangible to intangible. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(3), 292-300.
- Al-Harithy, H. (2005). Reframing World Heritage. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements*, 17(1), 7-17.
- Anthony, J. (1996). Protection for Historic Parks and Gardens. *Garden History*, 24(1), 3-7.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). Ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Awatere, S., Harmsworth, G., Rolleston, S. & Pauling, C. (2013). Kaitiakitanga o ngā ngahere pōhatu- kaitiakitanga of urban settlements. R. Walker, T. jojola & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming indigenous planning* (pp. 236-260). Quebec, Canada: McGill University Press.
- Baldwin, P.E. (1905). Early native records of the Manawatu block. In A.Hamilton (Eds.), *Transactions and proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* (pp.1-11). Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printing Office.
- Ballara, A. (1998). *The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from C.1769 to C.1945*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Barr, T. (2010). Kai Māori benefits. *Te Karaka: The Ngai Tahu Magazine* (47), 42-43.
- Bassett, K. N., Gordon, H. W., Nobes, D. C., & Jacomb, C. (2004). Gardening at the edge: Documenting the limits of tropical Polynesian kumara horticulture in southern New Zealand. *Geoarchaeology*, 19(3), 185-218.
- Bennett, A. (2011). Unchartered waters: Recent settlement of new spaces for enhancing Māori participation in fresh-water management and decision-making. In R., Selby, P. Moore & M. Mulholland (Eds.), *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki* (pp. 175-184). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (6th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

- Berke, P. R., Ericksen, N., Crawford, J., & Dixon, J. (2002). Planning and Indigenous People: Human Rights and Environmental Protection in New Zealand. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(2), 115-134.
- Best, E. (1976). *Maori Agriculture*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (1998). By Māori, for Māori, about Māori – Is that enough? A framework for addressing Māori knowledge in research, science and technology. In T. P Hauora (Ed.), *Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference* (pp. 231-245). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Te Pūtahi ā Toi, Massey University.
- Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29(1), 175-188.
- Bradbury, M. (1995). *A History of the Garden in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Viking.
- Bulmer, S. (1995). Ngā Māra Traditional Māori Gardens .In M. Bradbury (Eds.), *A History of the Garden in New Zealand* (pp.17-37). Auckland, New Zealand: Viking.
- Burtenshaw, M., Tawhai, W., Tomlin, T., & Tawhai, T. (2009). Storage practice and environmental conditions in a contemporary Rua Kūmara at Omaio, Eastern Bay of Plenty. *Archaeology in New Zealand*, 52(4), 230-239.
- Cairns, L. (2014, July 12). *City food forest is growing closer*. Retrieved from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/health/10258626/City-food-forest-is-growing-closer>
- Cheape, H., Garden, M., & McClean, F. (2009). Heritage and the Environment. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15(2-3), 104-107.
- Cheung, S. C. H. (2013). From foodways to intangible heritage: A case study of Chinese culinary resource, retail and recipe in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(4), 353-364.
- Coleman, B. P. (1972). *Kumara growing*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Colenso, W. (2001). *On the Vegetable Food of the Ancient New Zealanders before Cook's Visit* (Rev. ed). Christchurch, New Zealand: Kiwi Publishers.
- Cotton, M. (1989). *Resource Management law Reform: Town and Country Planning and the Treaty of Waitangi*. (Working Paper No. 28), Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry for the Environment.
- Cultivated foods of the Māori*. (n.d). Retrieved from <http://www.b4fn.org/case-studies/cultivated-foods-of-the-maori/>
- Cundill, G., & Rodela, R. (2012). A review of assertions about the processes and outcomes of social learning in natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 113, 7-14.
- Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (2003). Charting research design. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand* (pp. 111-120). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.

- Davoudi, S. (2012). Climate risk and security: New meanings of the environment in the English planning system. *European Planning Studies*, 20(1), 49-69.
- Dawson, B. (2010). *A history of gardening in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.
- De Graaf, P. (2014, May 13). Traditional Māori garden is a growing asset. *The Northern Advocate*, n.p.
- Department of Conservation. (n.d). *Moutohora Island*. Retrieved from <http://www.doc.govt.nz/getting-involved/run-a-project/funding/nga-whenua-rahui/matauranga-kura-taiao-fund/featured-projects/moutohora-island/>
- Dewes, K. (1975). The case for the oral arts. In King, M. (Eds), *Te Ao Hurihuri: The Māori world moves on*. Wellington, New Zealand: Hicks and Sons Ltd.
- Dolesh, R. J. (2011). Back to the Garden: Parks and Gardens Build Better Communities. *Parks & Recreation*, 46(1), 2.
- Donaghey, S. (2001). What is Aught, but as 'tis Valued? An analysis of strategies for the assessment of cultural heritage significance in New Zealand. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(4), 365-380.
- Dreija, K. (2012). Historic gardens and parks: challenges of development in the context of relevant regulations, definitions and terminology. *Science – Future of Lithuania/ Mokslas – Lietuvos Ateitis*, 4(2), 167–175. Retrieved from <http://www.mla.vgtu.lt/index.php/mla/article/download/mla.2012.30/pdf>
- Durie, M (1994). *Whaiora: Māori Health Development*. Auckland, New Zealand. Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana Te Kawanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā Kahui Pou: Launching Māori Futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Durie, M. (2005). *Ngā Tai Matatu: Tides of Māori Endurance*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M.H. (1985). A Māori perspective of health. *Social Science Medicine*, 20(5), 483–486.
- Durie, M.H. (1992). *Māori Development, Māori Health and The Health Reforms*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Durie, M.H. Māori Perspectives on Health and Illness. (1994). In J.Spicer, A.Trilin & J.Walton (Eds.), *Social Dimensions of Health and Disease-New Zealand Perspectives*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Ericksen, N., Berke, P., Crawford, J., & Dixon, J. (2003): *Plan-making for Sustainability: New Zealand Under the RMA*. Hamilton, New Zealand: International Global Change

Institute, The University of Waikato.

Eriksen-Sohos, M. (1996). *Iwi: Aspects of Pre-European Māori Culture through Proverb, Image and Verse*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.

Fainstein, S. S. (2011). *New Directions in Planning Theory*. Retrieved from www.nsl.ethz.ch/displus/140/docs/newdirections.doc

Fairburn, M. (1989). *The Ideal Society and its Enemies: The Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850-1900*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Fatsar, K. (2010). Reconsidering cultural landscape definitions-are historic gardens really cultural landscapes? [Unpublished paper] In 27th ECLAs Conference in Istanbul: Cultural landscape Conference proceedings, Istanbul, Cenkler.

Fenemor, A., Neilan, D., Allen, W. & Russell, S. (2011, November). Improving Water Governance in New Zealand stakeholder views of catchment management processes and plans. *Policy Quarterly*, 7(4), 10-19.

Fitzgerald, E. (2004). Development since the 1984 Hui Taumata. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata Tangata: The Changing Ethnic Contours of New Zealand* (pp.45-58). Victoria, Australia: Dunmore Press.

Flagler, B. (2014, May 1). Peace in our time. *Heritage New Zealand*. 133(6), 32-37.

Flyvberg, B. (1998). Habermas and Foucault: Thinkers for Civil Society. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49(2), 210-233.

Folke, C., Berkes., F. & Colding, J. (1998) Ecological practices and social mechanisms for building resilience and sustainability. In F. Berkes & C. Folke (Eds.), *Linking Social and Ecological Systems* (pp. 414-436). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

Forster, M. (2003). Te Hoe Nuku Roa: A journey towards Māori centered research. *A journal of plants, people and applied research*, 1, 47 – 53. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/130>

Friedmann, J. (1987). Two centuries of planning theory: An overview. In J. Friedmann (Eds.), *Planning in the public domain* (pp. 51-85). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Furey, L. (2006). *Māori gardening an archaeological perspective*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Conservation.

Furuseth, O., & Cocklin, C. (1995). An Institutional Framework for Sustainable Resource Management: The New Zealand model. *Natural Resources Journal*, 35, 243-273.

Gabites, I., & Lucas, R. (1998). *The Native Garden - Design themes from wild New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House New Zealand.

Galloway, T. D., & Mahayni, R.G. (1999). Planning theory in retrospect: The process of paradigm change. *Journal of the American Association*, 43(1), 62-71.

- Galloway, T., & Mahayni, R. (1977). Planning theory in retrospect: The process of paradigm change. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 43(1), 62-71.
- Glass, R. (1973). The evaluation of planning. In A. Fauldi (Eds.), *A reader in planning theory: Urban and regional planning series* (pp. 55-67). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Glover, M. (1997, December). *Kaupapa Māori health research: A developing discipline*. Paper presented to Hui Whakatipu at University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Goldsmith, S. (2014). *Turning over old ground: investigating garden heritage in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Unpublished master's thesis). Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Gould, A. N. (2007). *Kūmara in New Zealand: Some issues and observations*. Wellington, New Zealand: Crown Law Office.
- Graham, B. & Howard, P. (2008). *Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Guruswamy, L., Roberts, J. C., & Drywater, C. (1999). Protecting the Cultural and Natural Heritage: Finding Common Ground. *Buffalo Environmental Law Journal*, 7(1/2).
- Gustavsson, R., Peterson, A. (2003). Authenticity in Landscape Conservation and Management — The Importance of the Local Context. *Landscape Interfaces*, 1, 319-356.
- Hall, S. (2005). Whose heritage? Un-settling The Heritage, re-imagining the post-nation. In J. Littler and R. Naidoo (Eds.), *The politics of heritage: the legacies of race* (pp.23-35). London, England: Routledge.
- Hamilton Gardens (n.d). *Te Para Para Garden* {Brochure}. New Zealand: Author.
- Hamilton, A. (1903). Moriori Carving on the trunks of karaka-trees. In J.Hector (Eds.), *Transactions and proceedings of the New Zealand Institute XXXVIII* (pp. 11-13). Wellington, New Zealand: Lyon and Blair Printing.
- Hara, M. & Nielsen, J.R. (2002). A decade of fisheries co-management in Africa: Going back to the roots? Empowering fishing communities? Or just an illusion? *Land reform and agrarian change in southern Africa* An occasional paper series, 20, 1-28.
- Hardy, M. (2008). *The Venice Charter revisited: Modernism, Conservation and Tradition in the 21st Century*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hargreaves, R.P. (1963). Changing Maori Agriculture in Pre-Waitangi New Zealand. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 72(2), 101-117.
- Harmsworth, G. (1997). Māori values for land use planning. *New Zealand Association of Resource Management Broadsheet*, 37-52.
- Harmsworth, G. (2004). *The role of Māori values in Low-impact urban design and development: A Discussion Paper*. Palmerston North, New Zealand; Landcare Research.

- Harris, J. (1995). Foreword to A History of the Garden in New Zealand. In M. Bradbury (Eds.), *A History of the Garden in New Zealand* (pp.1–3). Auckland: New Zealand: Viking.
- Healey, P. (1992). Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory. *Town Planning Review*, 63, 142-162
- Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. London, England: Macmillan Press Limited.
- Helliwell, G. (2013, April 20). New homes strengthen ties. *Bay of Plenty Times*, n.p.
- Hiroa, T.R. (1925). *The Coming of the Māori*. Nelson, New Zealand: R.W. Stiles.
- Heritage New Zealand. (n.d). *Maori Heritage Ngā Taonga Tuku Iho nō Ngā Tūpuna*. Retrieved from <http://www.heritage.org.nz/protecting-heritage/maori-heritage>
- Heritage New Zealand. (n.d). *Archaeology*. Retrieved from <http://www.heritage.org.nz/protecting-heritage/archaeology>
- Horrocks, M., Shane, P.A., Barber, I.G., D’Costa, D.M., & Nichol, S.L. (2003). Microbotanical remains reveal Polynesian agriculture and mixed cropping in early New Zealand. *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*, 131 (2004), 147– 157.
- Hostovsky, C. and Maclaren, V., McGraff, G. (2010). The Role of Public Consultation in Vietnamese Environmental Impact Assessments: Towards a Culturally Sensitive Approach. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 53 (3), 405 425.
- Housing New Zealand Corporation. (2008). Māori Housing Trends. Retrieved from <http://www.hnzc.co.nz/our-publications/maori-housing-trends/2008-maori-housing-trends-report/2008-maori-housing-trends-report.pdf>
- Huri ki te Whenua-Turning back to the land. (2007, December 13). *District Monitor*, p.12.
- Hutchings, J., Tipene, P., Carney, G., Green, A., Skelton, P., & Baker, M. (2012). Hua pakore: An indigenous food sovereignty initiative and hallmark of excellence for food and product production. *MAI Journal*, 1(2), 131-145.
- ICOSMOS. (n.d). *The Florence Charter*. Retrieved from <http://www.icomos.org/en/component/content/article/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/158-the-florence-charter>
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori research methods and processes: An Exploration. *Sites*, 28, 24-43.
- Jahnke, H., & Taiapa, J. (2003). Māori research methods. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social Science Research in New Zealand* (pp. 39-50). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Jojola, T. S. (1998). Indigenous Planning-Clans, Intertribal Confederations and the History of the all Indian Pueblo c-Council. In L. Sandercock. *Making the invisible visible a multicultural planning history* (pp.100-119). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Jojola, T. S. (2008). Indigenous Planning: An Emerging Context. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 37-47.
- Jordan, J. A. (2010). Landscapes of European Memory: Biodiversity and Collective Remembrance. *History & Memory* (2), 5.
- Joyce, D. (1987). *The English Garden Tradition*. London, England: The Paul Press Limited.
- Kahotea, D. (2010). *New Zealand Local Government Heritage Planners Forum – Māori Heritage and RMA and HPA*. Ngaruawahia, New Zealand: Waikato District Council.
- Kamo, A. (2010). Mātauranga Māori. *Planning Quarterly*. 16-18.
- Kapua, P. (2007). Review of the Role of Māori Under the Resource Management Act 1991. *Resource Management Theory and Practice*, 3, 92.
- Kawharu, M. (2000). Kaitiakitanga: A Māori anthropological perspective of the Māori socio-environmental ethic in resource management. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 110(4), 349-370.
- Kearney, A. (2009). Intangible Cultural Heritage: Global awareness and local interest. In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.), *Intangible Heritage* (pp 209-226). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Kennedy, N., & Jeffries, R. (2008). *Māori provisions in plans; Mana whenua, mauri of water, wāhi tapu. Planning under cooperative mandates* (Report No. 3), Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Kennedy, N., & Jeffries, R. (2008). *Viewing the World through a Wider Lens: Māori and Council Planning Documents* (Report No. 6), Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Kerckhoffsa, H., & Smith, W. (2010). Reaching distant rural Māori communities in New Zealand through successful research partnerships. Paper presented at the 9th European International Farming Systems Association Symposium (pp.321-329), Vienna, Austria.
- Kirby, V. (1996). Landscape, Heritage and Identity: Stories from New Zealand's West Coast. In C. M. Hall & S. McArthur (Eds.), *Heritage Management in New Zealand and Australia: The Human Dimension*, (pp. 231-244). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, M. (2005). Public Participation in Planning: an intellectual history. *Australian Geographer*, 36(3), 283-299.
- Lane, M.B. & Corbett, T. (2005). The Tyranny of Localism: Indigenous Participation in Community- Based Environmental Management. *Journal of Policy and Planning*, 7(2), 141-159.
- Leach, H. (1984). *1000 Years of Gardening in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Reed.
- Leach, H. (1996). Analysing Change in the New Zealand Home Garden—by Style or Element? *New Zealand Garden Journal*, 1(2), 12–18. Retrieved from

<http://www.rnzih.org.nz/pages/NZgardens.htm>

- Leach, H. M. (2000). European Perceptions of the Roles of Bracken Rhizomes (*Pteridium esculentum*. (Forst.f) Cockayne) in Traditional Māori Diet. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 22(2000), 31-43.
- Leach, H. M. (1983). Model Gardens and the Acceptability of New Crops to Polynesian Horticulturalists. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology*, 5, 139-149.
- Leach, H. M. (1976). *Horticulture in prehistoric New Zealand: An investigation of the function of the stone walls of Palliser Bay*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Leach, H. M. (1980). Incompatible land use patterns in Māori food production. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Newsletter*, 23, 135-147.
- Lenzerini, F. (2011). Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Living Culture of Peoples. *European Journal of International Law*, 22(1), 101-120.
- Littler, J. (2008). Heritage and Race. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *Heritage and Identity* (pp.89-101). Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Local Government New Zealand. (2011). *Local authorities and Māori case studies of local arrangements* (Report No 2.). Wellington, New Zealand: Local Government New Zealand.
- Logan, S.W. (2008). Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *Heritage and Identity* (pp.439-454). Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and antisocial . *MAI Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Makereti, P. (1986). *The old-time Maori/Makereti; with an introduction by Ngahuia Te Awekotuku*. Auckland, New Zealand: New Women's Press.
- Marsden, M. (2003). God man and universe, A Māori view. In T.A.C. Royal (Eds.) *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden* (pp 2-23). Ōtaki, New Zealand: The estates of Māori Marsden
- Marsden, M., & Henare, T. A. (1992). *Kaitiakitanga: a definitive introduction to the holistic world view of the Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry For the Environment.
- Martinez, A.H. (2008). Conservation and Restoration in Built Heritage: A Western European Perspective. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *Heritage and Identity* (pp 245-263). Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Matunga, H. (2001, March). *Māori development and urban growth or tale of two cities*. Delivered at the NZ Planning Institute Conference, Tauranga, New Zealand.
- Matunga, H. (2013). Theorizing Indigenous Planning. In R. Walker, T. Jojola & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 3-35). Quebec, Canada: McGill University Press.

- McCarthy, C. (2011). *Museums and Māori – heritage professionals, indigenous collections current practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Papa Press.
- McClellan, R. (2007). *Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage: Discussion Paper No. 3 Heritage Landscape Values*. (Report No. 31). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Historic Places Trust.
- McClellan, R. (2007). *Sustainable management of historic heritage; Assessment of effects on the historic environment*. (Report no.2) Wellington, New Zealand; New Zealand Historic Places Trust.
- McClellan, R. (2008). *Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage; Assessment of Effects on the Historic Environment* (Report No.2). Wellington, New Zealand; New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Tangata.
- McClellan, R. (2009). *Historic Heritage Research Paper Identification of Historic Heritage: Theoretical and Legislative Review*. (Report No.3). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Historic Places Trust.
- McClellan, R. (2010). Planning for Kaitiakitanga. *Planning Quarterly*, 36-38.
- McClellan, R. (2011). *Planning for Heritage Sustainability in New Zealand - A Safe Heritage Credit Scheme*. Paper presented at the Safe Buildings Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.
- McClellan, R. (2013). *National Assessment RMA Policy and Plans – Heritage Provisions*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Historic Places Trust.
- McIndoe, N. (2014). Out with the old and in with the new—the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.kensingtonswan.com/Legal-Updates-And-Events/CLANZ/Developments/Out-with-the-old-and-in-with-the-new.aspx>
- McLean, G. (2000). Where Sheep May Not Safely Graze. In A. Trapeznik (Eds.), *Common Ground? Heritage and Public Places in New Zealand* (p. 25-44). Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Mead, H.M. (1996). Māori Art Restructured, Reorganised, Re-examined and Reclaimed. (1996). *He Pūkenga Kōrero*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Mead, H.M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Mead, H.M., & Grove, N. (2001). *Ngā Pēpeha a ngā Tīpunā*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Memon, A., & Duncan, R. & Spicer, A. (2012). *The Hurunui Waiau zone implementation programme as a collaborative planning process: A preliminary review* (Report No. R12/46). Christchurch, New Zealand: Environment Canterbury.
- Miller, C. (2002). The origins of town planning in New Zealand 1900–1926: A divergent path? *Planning Perspectives*, 17(3), 209-225.

- Millette, D. M. (2011). Land Use Planning on Aboriginal Lands-Towards a New Model for Planning on Reserve Lands. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 20(2), 20-35.
- Ministry of Health. (2013). New Zealand Health Survey Annual update of key findings 2012/13. Wellington, New Zealand: MoH.
- Mitchell, N. J. (2008). Considering the Authenticity of Cultural Landscapes. *APT Bulletin*, 39, (2/3), 25-31.
- Moewaka Barnes, H. and Stanley, P. (1999). *Kia mau te mana*. In: *Community action to prevent alcohol problems*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Moon, P. (2005). *A Tohungas Natural World: Plants, Gardening and Food*. Auckland, New Zealand: David Ling Publishing Limited.
- Munasinghe, H. (2005). The Politics of the Past: Constructing a National Identity through Heritage Conservation. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(3), 251-260.
- Mutu, M. (2002). Barriers to tangata whenua participation in resource management. In M. Kawharu (Eds.), *Whenua: Managing our Resources* (pp. 75-95). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Natcher, D. C., Walker, R. C., & Jojola, T.S. (2013). *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Neal, T. (2009, May 8). Nelson gardens given heritage listing. Retrieved from: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/news/2395437/Nelson-gardens-given-heritage-listing>
- Neave, D. S. (1981). *Historic preservation and local authorities: A survey of registers, ordinances and assistance*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Internal Affairs.
- New Zealand Government. (2014). *Resource Management Act 1991*. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/DLM230265.html>
- New Zealand Government. (2014). *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2014/0026/latest/DLM4005414.html>
- Orange, C. (1990). *An illustrated history of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Paquette, J. (2011). From Decolonization to Postcolonial Management: Challenging Heritage Administration and Governance in New Zealand. *Public Organization Review*, 12(2), 127-138.
- Park, G. (2001). *Effective exclusion: An exploratory overview of Crown actions and Māori responses concerning the indigenous flora and fauna 1912-1983*. A

Report commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal for the Wai 262 claim.
Wellington, New Zealand: Waitangi Tribunal.

- Paterson, R.K. (1999). Protecting Taonga: The Cultural Heritage of the New Zealand Māori. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 8 (1), 108-132.
- Peddlebury, J. (1999). The Place of Historic Parks and Gardens in the English Planning System: Towards Statutory Controls. Source: *The Town Planning Review*, 70(4), 479-500.
- Pihama, L. (2001). *Tihei mauri ora honouring our voices: Mana wahine as a kaupapa Māori theoretical framework*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Auckland. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Pirikahu, G. (2008). *Grab A Bite That's Right-evaluation report to the Ministry of Health*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Porter, L. (2006). Planning in (Post) Colonial Settings: Challenges for Theory and Practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 7(4), 383-396.
- Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession*, 91, 33-40.
- Prokopy, L.S. (2008). Ethical concerns in researching collaborative natural resource management, society & natural resources. *An International Journal*, 21(3), 258-265.
- Quality Planning. (n.d). Historic heritage. Retrieved from <http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/index.php/planning-tools/heritage>
- Roberts, M., Weko, F., & Clarke, L. (2006). *Maramataka: The Māori Moon Calendar*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Lincoln University.
- Rolleston, S. (2006, April). *An indigenous cultural perspective to urban design*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Planning Institute and Planning Institute of Australia Congress, Gold Coast, Queensland.
- Rolleston, S., & Awatere, S. (2009). Ngā hua papa kāinga: Habitation design principles. *Mai Review*, 2, 1.
- Roskruge, N. (1999). Taewa Māori: their management, social importance and commercial viability: A research report presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Diploma in Māori Resource Development at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Roskruge, N. (2007) *Hokia ki te whenua*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Roskruge, N. (2011). Traditional Māori horticultural and ethnopedological praxis in the New Zealand landscape. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 22(2), 200-212.
- Roskruge, N. (2014). *Rauwaru The Proverbial Garden: Ngā Weri Māori Root Vegetables Their History and Tips on Their Use*. Palmerston North, Massey University: The Printery.

- Roy, E. A. (2011, August 8). Marae 'disappearing into the landscape'. *Sunday Star Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/sunday-star-times/features/5436633/Marae-disappearing-into-the-landscape>
- Royal, T. A. C. (2012). Politics and knowledge: Kaupapa Māori and Mātauranga Māori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 30-37.
- Ruru, J., Stephenson, J., & Abbott, M. (2011). *Making our place: exploring land-use tensions in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Sandercock, L. (2004). Planning and Indigenous Communities. *Planning Theory and Practice Interface*, 5(1), 95-97.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). Town Planning: Limits to Reflection in Action. In: *The Reflective Practitioner: how professionals think in action*, (pp. 204-235).
- Sharples, P. (2009). *Māra Kai project sowing seeds of potential*. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/mara-kai-project-%E2%80%98sowing-seeds-potential039>
- Sickes-Taves, L. B. (1999). *The Use of and Need for Preservation Standards in Architectural Conservation*. Fredricksburg, VA: ASTM International.
- Silberman, N.A., & Bauer, A.A. (2012). *The Oxford Companion to Archaeology*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Sligo, F., & Bathurst, R. (2005). *Communication in the New Zealand workplace; Theory and practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: Software Technology N.Z. Ltd.
- Smith, G., Messenger, P. M., & Soderland H. (2009). *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Smith, H. (2010). Mā te whakaaro, mā te kotahitanga, ka whai oranga te Taiao. In R. Selby (Eds.), *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*. Wellington, New Zealand; Huia Publishers (pp. 303-323). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. London, England: Routledge.
- Smith, L. (2010). Ethics or Social Justice? Heritage and the Politics of Recognition. *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 2, 60-68.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Indigenous peoples and research*. London, England; Zed Books.
- Smith, L., & Akagawa, N. (2009). Introduction. In: L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.), *Intangible Heritage* (pp. 1–9). London, England: Routledge.
- Smith, L., & Waterton, E. (2012). Constrained by Commonsense: The Authorized Heritage Discourse in Contemporary Debates. In R. Skeates., C. McDavid. & J. Carman (Eds.),

- The *Oxford handbook of public archaeology* (pp 153-171). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P., Pearson, D. G., & MacPherson, C. (1996). *Nga Patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa, New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013a). Te Kupenga 2013 (English) – corrected: Key facts. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/maori/TeKupenga_HOTP13.aspx
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013b). 2013 Census QuickStats about Māori Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-about-maori-english.aspx>
- Stephenson, J. (2005). The Cultural Values Model: An integrated approach to values in *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 84, 127-139.
- Stokes, E. (1992). The Treaty of Waitangi and the Waitangi Tribunal: Māori claims in New Zealand. *Applied Geography*, 12(2), 176-191.
- Sullivan, B. (2012). *Intangible Cultural Heritage in New Zealand/Aotearoa: A National Perspective*. Retrieved from <http://www.baldwins.com/intangible-cultural-heritage-in-new-zealand-aotearoa-a-national-perspective>
- Swaffield, S., & Fairweather, J. (2010). In search of Arcadia: The persistence of the rural idyll in New Zealand rural subdivisions. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 41(1), 111-127.
- Swensen, G., Jerpasen, G. B., Oddrun, S., & Tvelt, M.S. (2013). Capturing the Intangible and Tangible aspects of Heritage: Personal versus official perspectives in cultural heritage management. *Landscape Research*, 38(2), 203-221.
- Taiepa, T (1999). Collaborative Management: Enhancing Māori Participation in the Management of Natural Resources, *He Pūkenga Kōrero*, 4(2).
- Taiepa, T., Lyver, P., Horsley, P., Davis, J., & Bragg, M. (1997). Co-management of New Zealand's conservation estate by Māori and Pākehā: A review. *Environmental Conservation*, 24(3), 236–250.
- Tanczos, N. (2009, May/June). Marae gardens taking off. *Organic NZ*, 40-41.
- Tawhai, W. (2013). *Living by the Moon - Te Maramataka o Te Whānau-ā-Apanui*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Taylor, M., & Sutton, A. (1999a). *Initial inventory of Rangitāne's heritage sites in Palmerston North city*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Palmerston North City Council.
- Taylor, M., & Sutton, A. (1999b). *Rangitāne heritage sites in Palmerston North City: Archaeology*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Palmerston North City Council.
- Te Awēkotuku, N. (1991). *He tikanga whakaaro: research ethics in the Māori community*. Wellington, New Zealand: Manatu Māori.

- Tipa, G. & Welch, R. (2006). Comanagement of natural resources issues of definition from an indigenous community perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 42(3), 373-391.
- Tipa, G. & Nelson, K. (2008). Introducing cultural opportunities: A framework for incorporating cultural perspectives in contemporary resource management. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 10(4), 313-337.
- Trapeznik, A., & McLean, G. (2000). Public History, Heritage, and Place. In A. Trapeznik. (Eds.), *Common Ground? Heritage and Public Places in New Zealand* (pp. 13-23). Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Turnpenny, M. (2004). Cultural Heritage, an Ill-defined Concept? A Call for Joined-up Policy. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(3), 295-307.
- UNESCO (2004). *The State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (Report no, 12)*. Paris, France: World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (2008). *The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, France: World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (n.d). *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Retrieved from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>
- UNESCO. (n.d). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003*. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- Van Gorp, B., & Renes, H. (2007). A European zcultural identity? Heritage and shared histories in the European Union. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie. Journal of Economic & Social Geography*, 98(3), 407-415.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou; Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Walsh-Tapiata, W. (1998) Research within your own Iwi – What are some of the issues? In Te Pūmanawa Hauora (Ed.) *Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference* (pp. 249-256). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Te Pūtahi ā Toi, Massey University.
- Waterton, E. (2005). Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling rchaeological Perspectives with ommunity alues: Cultural Landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(4), 309–325.
- Wham, C., Maxted, E., Dyll., L., Teh, R.,& Kerse, N. (2012). Kōrero te kai o te Rangatira: Nutritional wellbeing of Māori at the pinnacle of life. *Nutrition & Dietetics*, 69, 213–216.
- Whiting, L. S. (2008). Semi-structured interviews: guidance for novice researchers. *Nursing Standard*, 22(23), 35-40.
- Williams, D. R., & Stewart, S. I. (1998). Sense of place: An elusive concept that is finding a

home in ecosystem management. *Journal of Forestry*, 96(5), 18–23.

Williams, H.W. (1957). *A Dictionary of the Maori Language*. Wellington, New Zealand: R.E.Owen.

Winter, T. (2014). Heritage Studies and the privileging of theory. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(5), 556-572.

Wright, M. (2009). *Old South: Life and Times in the Nineteenth-Century Mainland*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Publishing Group.

Appendix 1



He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu TE WHAKAAE Ā-TUHI MŌ TE KAIWHAKAURU

Kei a koe te tikanga kia whakaae rānei ki aku pātai, kia tangohia rānei i āu kōrero, ā, toru wiki atu i te uiuitanga. Ko te mea nui he whakaaro ōu hei whakakī i taku kete rangahau. Kei a koe hoki te tikanga hei whiriwhiri wāhi uiui, hei tohu ko wai ka noho, hei whakautu pātai kāhore rānei. Kia mōhio mai hoki koe, he kōrerorero matatapu ā tāua nei kōrero, kāore au mō te whāki atu ki te ao. Nā Te Kūnenga ki Pūrehuroa taku tono i tautoko.

TE WHAKAAE A TE KAIWHAKAURU – porowhitahia te kōrero e pai ana ki a koe

Kei te whakaae/kāore au e whakaae kia hopukia aku kōrero.

Kei te whakaae/kāore au e whakaae ā-waha kia hopukia aku kōrero, ā, i kī au tēnei i te timata o te kōrero.

Kia mutu te mahi rangahau me hōmai tētahi whakarāpopotanga māku. ĀE/KAO

HE MANATU

He mohio au ko tāku tuakiri me āhuetanga i whakamaui ki te ripoata me te pakipūmeka. E hāneanea au ko ngā tangata e panui te ripoata me ngā minenga o te pakipūmeka ka mōhio ko wai au.

Ingoa o te kaiwhakauru _____

Waitohu a te kaiwhakauru _____

Īmēra a te kaiwhakauru _____

Te rā _____

Appendix 2



He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered in a way that I understand and that satisfies me. I realise that my participation in this research is voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw the information I have given as part of the study up to three weeks after the interview. I also understand that I can decide where the interview will take place and who will be present, that I may ask questions at any time during the interview and that I can decide not to answer any question at any time.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently it has not been reviewed by one of the university's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher named above is responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than researcher(s) please contact Professional John O'Neil, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06350 5249, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Participant Consent

I agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded and used in the research. I wish/do not wish to give my oral consent to have my interview recorded and this is stated at the start of my interview.

I wish/do not wish to have a summary of the research sent to me when it is completed.

I agree/do not agree to my identity and role being attached to the comments in the article.

I agree to participate in this study under these conditions and those set out in the Information Sheet.

Name of Participant _____

Signature of Participant _____

Email of Participant (for sending information to you) _____

Date _____

**Te Kunenga
ki Pūrehuroa**

School of People, Environment & Planning
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand. T +64 6 350 4343 F +64 6 350 5737.
<http://pep.massey.ac.nz>

Appendix 3



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
TE KURA PŪKENGĀ TANGATA

He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Kia ora

My name is Hayley Millar and I am undertaking my master's research thesis focused on answering the research question *how can planning contribute to the revival of Māori food gardens as a part of New Zealand's living indigenous heritage?*. My hope is to interview people who are familiar with issues related to this topic.

Interviews will take approximately one hour and will be recorded with a digital recorder. Participants may choose not to answer any questions and do not need to provide reasons. Participants can choose to receive a transcript of interviews and final copies of any outputs from the research. Participants can elect not to be recorded.

I will not identify participants in any of the research outputs including my thesis and any academic publications unless they give their approval. Participants will also be given the opportunity to approve any quotes that are being attributed to them in my thesis and any academic publications. Recordings of the interview will be lodged with my supervisor for five years, after which they will be destroyed, unless otherwise requested by the participant. If you have any questions about the conduct of this research you can contact me or my supervisor Associate Professor Dr Caroline Miller. Our contact details are:

Hayley: 06 3433001, 021 103 9965, or Email: hayley.m.millar@gmail.com. Associate Professor Dr Caroline Miller: 0800 MASSEY (627739), DDI (06) 3569099 ext. 83631 or Email: C.L.Miller@massey.ac.nz.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently it has not been reviewed by one of the university's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher named above is responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than researcher(s) please contact Professional John O'Neil, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06350 5249, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Ngā mihi nui

Hayley Millar

Te Kunenga
ki Pūrehuroa

School of People, Environment & Planning
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand. T +64 6 350 4343 F +64 6 350 5737.
<http://pep.massey.ac.nz>

Appendix 4



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
TE KURA PŪKENGĀ TANGATA

He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PLANNERS, COUNCIL MĀORI COUNCIL OFFICERS/S AND HERITAGE EXPERT/S

1. Can you tell me about your knowledge of gardens as heritage and or Māori heritage?
2. Can you describe the District plan's approach to Māori heritage?
3. How proactive is the council in protecting and sustaining Māori heritage?
4. Can you tell me what limitations and incentives there are for councils in supporting Māori to revive māra (with traditional elements i.e. Māori crops, tikanga Māori, Māori carvings such as pataka) on wāhi tupuna sites historically used for cultivation?
5. What would you want to know about the situation if approached by a Māori group wanting to revive a historic Māori garden?

Appendix 5



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
TE KURA PŪKENGĀ TANGATA

He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR GARDEN REPRESENTATIVE/S

1. Can you tell me what you know about heritage gardens and traditional Maori gardens in particular?
2. Can you describe your district plan's approach to Māori heritage?
3. Do you believe your council is proactive in protecting Māori heritage?
4. How is that heritage sustained?
5. What went well in your efforts to establish your Māori garden and what was difficult?
6. How hard has it been to keep the garden going?

Appendix 6



He Taonga Tuku Iho Te Whakarite Kaupapa Mō Ngā Māra Kai Tuturu Living Indigenous Heritage: Planning for Māori Food Gardens

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR HEALTH PROMOTER

1. Can you tell me about the type of Māori food garden projects that you have been involved with?
2. Can you tell me about some of the various Māori gardens that have been established and some of the reasons why these gardens were set up?
3. Have any of the gardens you have been involved with been set up on ancestral land that was used in the past for food cultivation by the tīpuna of an iwi/ hapū or whānau group?
4. From your observations what have been the key factors in establishing and maintaining successful Māori food gardens?
5. Can you describe some of the benefits you have witnessed from these gardens such as health and cultural benefits?
6. What have been some of the main issues in sustaining Māori food gardens?