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

## Joint Management Agreement between Taupō District Council and Ngāti Tūwharetoa:

A summary of lessons for local government

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

Master of Resource and Environmental Planning

at Massey University, Manawatu,

New Zealand

Sonja Hancock 2011

## **ABSTRACT**

The first Joint Management Agreement created under s36B of the Resource Management Act 1991 was signed on 17 January 2009. The parties involved were Taupō District Council and Ngāti Tūwharetoa. The JMA provides for publicly notified resource consents and plan changes applying to multiply owned Māori land to be decided upon by a panel of decision makers chosen equally by Council and Ngāti Tūwharetoa. It is the first example of an iwi authority having an equal share of decision-making power within statutory resource management decision making in New Zealand.

This research considers the Joint Management Agreement within the context of other agreements between councils and iwi authorities in New Zealand, and government and indigenous bodies internationally. In addition, the research comments on the progression of Māori involvement in the statutory resource management framework in New Zealand, with a particular focus on the implications of recent Te Tiriti o Waitangi settlements.

Findings of the research include that Ngāti Tūwharetoa's position and ability to enter into a Joint Management Agreement is in part the result of their dominant land owner status in the Taupō District, with these land holdings being relatively unchanged by colonialist land takes. The over-arching lesson of the agreement is that each council must look at its own specific situation with iwi in its district, and look at all tools available in order to improve those relationships. S36B of the RMA 1991 was a tool that had not been used before but proved to be an efficient and effective one in this case.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors, April Bennett and Christine Cheyne, for their support and guidance throughout this project. The path to completion was not a straight one and I undoubtedly would have got lost along the way without their help.

My research participants were very generous with their time and comments. I know that they have a million things to do on any given day and I am very grateful for the time and consideration that they gave to this research.

Approval from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B was obtained in November 2009 (09/45).

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ABSTRACT	i
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background	1
Justification	3
Methodology	4
Limitations	4
Research Objectives	4
Outline of Thesis	5
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND	8
Introduction	8
Te Tiriti o Waitangi – The Treaty of Waitangi	8
The Principles of Te Tiriti	11
History of Māori Resource Management	13
Planning legislation in New Zealand	21
The Resource Management Act 1991	22
Ngāti Tūwharetoa History	29
Taupō District Council	34
Conclusion	34
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW	36
Introduction	36
What Constitutes Co or Joint Management	36
International Examples of Agreements	38
New Zealand Examples of Agreements	44
Best Practice	55
Conclusion	57
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN	58
Introduction	58
Case Study Method	58
Data Collection	62
Limitations	63
Ethical Considerations	65
Conclusion	69
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS	71
Introduction	71

Document Analys	sis	71
Document Analys	sis Summary	86
Interviews		86
Conclusion		106
CHAPTER 6: DISC	USSION	108
Introduction		108
Elements that led	d to the JMA and the use of S36b	108
The Process		109
S36b Compared t	to other Methods	111
Characteristics sp	pecific to Taupō District Council	113
Relationships		115
Reviewing the co	ntext	115
Conclusion		118
CHAPTER 7: CON	CLUSIONS	120
Introduction		120
Key Findings		120
Conclusion		122
REFERENCES		124
	Tables	
Table 1 Models of Joir	nt Management Agreements in Australia	399
Table 2 Advantages ar	nd Disadvantages of Agreements in Australia	411
	ocal Government New Zealand Case Studies Described in 2007 F	
	Figures	
Figure 1 Summary of J	Joint Management Agreement Process	79
	Appendices	
Interview Schedules		Appendix 1
Approval from Massey	y University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B	Appendix 2
Introductory Letter		Appendix 3
Information Sheet		Appendix 4
Participant Consent Fo	orm	Appendix 5