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I love the clean brown tussock,
And the hills where the cool winds blow,
It is my prayer,
I may still be there,
When the Lord calls “way’rele’go”
-----P.R. Woodhouse
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The South Island High Country is a distinctive New Zealand landscape, but one which could be set to change significantly over the next fifty years. Tenure review, once completed, is expected to see around sixty per cent of the area, predominantly at higher altitude, retired from grazing and returned to Crown management. At the same time, remaining areas are likely to be freeholded to runholders, who will be given considerably greater freedom to develop their land as they see fit. Such changes will bring areas of significant nature conservation and outdoor recreational value into the conservation estate, but what about historic heritage? Many of these sites are at lower altitudes, while most of the High Country river basins offer outstanding scenic vistas.

Tenure review in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge is underway, but less advanced than in most High Country areas. With the resultant benefit of hindsight, the conservation and recreation interests are keen to see the Department of Conservation (DOC) protect as much of the area as possible. DOC and these interest groups also wish to see the Ashburton and Timaru District Councils (ADC and TDC) control modification of the landscape generally, through strict land use controls in their District Plans. This strong protectionist mentality has concerned runholders, who believe DOC and its supporters are being quite unrealistic in their demands. Efforts to protect the area’s historic heritage are also lagging behind those for natural heritage. With most sites of historic significance on areas likely to be freeholded, if not already so, it is important that the opportunity to preserve them is not lost.

Initiatives to protect historic sites and structures must also consider the wider landscape. The High Country is typically seen as an outstanding natural and scenic landscape, but it is also very much a cultural landscape. Sharp contrasts in natural features, such as mountain ranges and river valleys characterise the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, but the landscape is also one dominated by tussock grasslands resulting from Maori burning, and numerous farming improvements typical of High Country stations.

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge is a cultural landscape with an interesting history, which includes the association of Samuel Butler with the area. It is also,
however, an area in which a number of stakeholders are competing for its resources in pursuit of their goals. If historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection are to be successfully achieved, it is important that their advocates seek to get alongside and achieve the co-operation of other interests, who might otherwise be opposed to such initiatives. Integrated environmental management (IEM), a comprehensive but integrative approach to the environment, and one which seeks to involve a range of diverse stakeholders in the pursuit of common goals from the outset, is offered as a means to this end. Initiatives to better protect the area’s historic heritage and its wider cultural landscape should be considered alongside a broad range of resource management concerns, Proponents of specific interests are then likely to be more understanding, and hence supportive, of each other’s intentions.

Application of an IEM approach should ideally be co-ordinated by a neutral type of agency with a broad resource management focus, such as the ADC in respect of the Ashburton Gorge and TDC in respect of the Upper Rangitata. The TDC has recently adopted an IEM-type approach in the form of a working party to progress the identification of outstanding landscapes and significant natural areas in the District. The ADC, meanwhile, is seeking to work with runholders to address concerns over areas of significant nature conservation value as identified in its District Plan. Both initiatives could be easily broadened to include an historic heritage dimension. Environment Canterbury (ECAN) should be encouraged to assume the role of co-ordinator, should this be necessary to achieve a consistent approach on both sides of the Rangitata River.

DOC, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and others with an interest in historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection should be encouraged to develop a range of possible initiatives in pursuit of their goals. This should include better identification of the area’s historic heritage. Opportunities should also be taken to involve local interest groups, such as the Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group. Others seeking to work with runholders at the grassroots level, such the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust, should also be encouraged to become involved. Intentions should, however, be discussed with stakeholders as part of the IEM process. Such an arrangement should help to reduce conflicts between and build a greater sense of common purpose between a range of interest groups concerned to see this scenically attractive and historically important part of New Zealand managed more effectively.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The South Island High Country (SIHC) is an iconic, yet dynamic, landscape. For decades its scenery and way of life have inspired the artist, photographer, writer, tourist, adventurer and many others. Frequent commercial use of such imagery, and the common promotion of lifestyles offered and recreational opportunities available, have given it a significant profile in New Zealand culture. At the same time, however, it is a part of New Zealand faced with inevitable change, as moves towards a more sustainably managed society call into question the appropriateness of the High Country’s use for low-input, extensive pastoral farming.

The SIHC totals around six million hectares, but it is the approximately 3.4 million hectares, principally occupied by 341 pastoral leases, to which the term “South Island High Country” is commonly applied. The terms “pastoral leasehold lands”, “run country”, “tussock grasslands” and “rangelands” have been somewhat interchangeably used to define what is an area between approximately 500 and 2,000 metres in altitude, located immediately to the east of the South Island’s Southern Alps, and used primarily for extensive pastoral farming. The Southern Alps themselves are part of the “High Country” in a strictly geographical sense, but their common separate definition as the “Main Divide” recognises that those areas are primarily managed by the Department of Conservation (DOC) as part of New Zealand’s protected area network (SIHC Review Working Party, 1994, p. 17).

Management agencies’ calls for the retirement of class VIII and badly eroding class VII lands have found popular support amongst the conservation and recreation lobbies, keen to see the conservation estate added to in the interests of better ecological representativeness and greater diversity of visitor opportunities. Tenure review, a process implemented following the environmental reorganisation of the late 1980s, seeks to transfer such areas to DOC management, while providing runholders with the opportunity to freehold the remaining more productive areas at lower altitudes. What supporters of the process popularly refer to as New Zealand’s “last great land
rationalisation” should add around one million hectares to the conservation estate (Floate and Dennis, 2001, p. 24). The process will be elaborated on in greater detail in Section 5.1.

Tenure review is further advanced in certain areas of the High Country than others. In areas such as the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, where the process has been more recent, the opportunity exists to “take stock” in terms of desired outcomes and stakeholder concerns. Time and space prevent meaningful analysis of the enormous complexities of tenure review per se. What follows will, however, seek to investigate two somewhat related concerns arising from its implementation. Firstly, it is a process which inherently separates protective and productive land uses, and can thus exacerbate conflict between competing interest groups. The concept of integrated environmental management (IEM) is offered as a means by which stakeholder groups can reconcile their differences and attain mutually positive outcomes. Secondly, resource protection interests involved in tenure review have thus far strongly emphasised nature conservation and outdoor recreational values. Has sufficient attention been given to historic heritage, or are such features, including the High Country landscape as many have known it, in danger of being lost forever?

Any attempt to define High Country heritage, particularly in an historic context, inevitably raises the issue of High Country lifestyle. Although it will be difficult within the confines of this report to do justice to what is a potentially huge and contested area, some attempt will be made to investigate initiatives by runholders to better adapt to demands imposed by a sustainable management regime. Initiatives, such as landcare groups, and the concept of social capital generally, will be briefly touched on.

What follows is, therefore, essentially a case study of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, centred primarily on the issue of historic heritage conservation and its challenges. It is hoped, however, that findings and recommendations will have relevance to other issues and areas, certainly within the High Country.
1.2 Research Aims

This project aims to investigate the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s historic heritage values, the challenges to their conservation, and the means by which such challenges can be addressed and conservation progressed.

1.3 Research Objectives

These include the following:

- To briefly investigate the area’s history, and so ascertain what historic heritage is there and how effectively this is being conserved;

- To discuss the potentially diverse aspirations of the various interest groups (including government agencies, regional and local authorities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Iwi, runholders and other commercial interests) with respect to the area’s future;

- To consider the influences of certain initiatives, whether institutional (such as tenure review), economic (such as possible heritage tourism) and social (such as landcare groups), in terms of consequent encouragement of and challenges to the area’s historic heritage, landscape and High Country lifestyle values; and

- To determine the extent to which an (IEM) approach offers a means to better enhance historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area, and how this can be effected.

IEM as a concept is more fully discussed in Section 1.6.3.
1.4 Principal Research Questions

These include the following:

- What constitutes “heritage” in terms of the area and to what extent is there any consensus on this?

- How significant are such values in the context of other interests affecting and opportunities within the area?

- What are the principal motives of and competing interests between different stakeholders which hinder effective historic heritage conservation?

- Has and/or does tenure review potentially facilitate or alienate historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area?

- What are the principal threats to the area’s historic heritage posed by present management practices and agency approaches?

- How can stakeholders concerned be encouraged to work together for better historic heritage conservation in the area? and

- What means presently and potentially exist to better effect historic heritage conservation?

The above questions would suggest there needs to be better co-operation amongst stakeholders, if historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area are to be facilitated.

1.5 Research Methodology

This research has been conducted within the broad parameters of environmental policy, integrated environmental management and historic heritage. A case study approach has
been taken, in order to provide sufficient focus compatible with the constraints of research time and report space. The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area has been selected for reasons of relative accessibility from the research base and its relevance to the exercise. Particularly through the association of Samuel Butler with Mesopotamia Station, the area has a unique and interesting history. It is also a part of the High Country where progress with tenure review has been slower than elsewhere, such as Central Otago. This has enabled stakeholders approached to consider their aspirations relative to both real opportunities within the area and the benefit of hindsight offered by developments elsewhere. It will also be seen from Sections 1.6.3 and 1.8 that what is a catchment-based study is consonant with many IEM approaches.

Both the nature of the topic and the response of participants have shaped the research approach. In the initial stages, it was envisaged that the research would be somewhat positivist in nature, with a strong emphasis on standard questionnaires and the seeking of one-on-one interviews, particularly with runholders (Neuman, 2000, p. 85). Simultaneous with this, however, was the intention to consult numerous management agencies and interest groups. This, it was realised, would necessitate some tailoring of approach relative to the audience from the outset. Management agencies were quick to point out that time constraints would require brief and specific questions relative to their areas of interest and involvement, with lengthy, generic questionnaires unlikely to be answered. A similar approach was adopted with respect to NGOs and other agencies and personnel. It was recognised that many such organisations have limited, if any, paid staff capacity. Such initiatives meant that the research ultimately took on more of a phenomenological approach. This necessitated a move away from quantifiable data to more qualitative understanding of perspectives relative to experiences and aspirations (Kitchin and Tate, 2000, pp. 10, 22).

It ultimately became far easier to attain dialogue with management agencies and interest groups than runholders. As will become apparent in Sections 4 and 5, runholders in the area are concerned about the potential implications of tenure review, to the extent that they are very reluctant to participate in research impinging on property values, be these of an objective or subjective nature. Ultimately, only two of the initial sixteen runholders approached agreed to respond. One did so by mail while another agreed to an “in person” interview. Such feedback was complemented to an extent by that
received from both another within the area (when offering a South Island High Country Committee of Federated Farmers perspective), and another immediately outside the area (who discussed the Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group). Both also provided some interesting historical insights. The above-mentioned sensitivity meant the approach had to be somewhat less structured than intended, but the intention remained one of ascertaining perspectives on High Country historic heritage, in terms of both personal values, and desired conservation initiatives and outcomes. Management agencies and interest groups spoken to offered considerable insight into why runholders in the area typically feel, and react, in the way they do.

Over 35 different organisations were initially approached. Subsequent referrals to other agencies and/or personnel meant that approximately 65 different persons were specifically approached in some way. Thirty one agencies were represented in the 59 individual persons who responded in some way. The most informative feedback was provided by 35 persons, who between them represented 21 different agencies. These included three government departments, three local authorities, three NGOs (including two with statutory responsibilities), three research institutions, six local interest groups and organisations, and three station managers. In terms of the final figures, nature conservation, historic heritage, recreational, farming and tourism interests were all represented to some degree. In this way, most of the area’s principal stakeholder groups are represented in the research findings. The approach was typically one of addressing points relative to an agency’s responsibilities or organisation’s concerns, offering sufficient scope for further points of interest to be raised if desired. In this way, the opportunity to include issues of concern, potentially overlooked by the researcher, was provided for.

A significant amount of detail provided by stakeholders is drawn on in support of comments throughout this report. In order that such information can be appropriately acknowledged, details of responding agencies and personnel are provided in Appendix 1. The intention is that when such acknowledgement is required, this will be done by italicised reference (eg. Smith, 2002). In this way, such citings will be readily distinguishable from those made in relation to sources listed in the References section. The latter will be referenced in the standard format (eg. Brown, 2000). The intention of this approach is to avoid excessive use of pers comm. in referencing.
Significant primary and secondary information exists on the area’s history. Section 2 discusses the literature itself in greater depth. Of significance here is the fact that secondary, rather than primary, sources were principally drawn upon. Insufficient time existed to thoroughly peruse primary material. The contents of many primary sources were ascertained as part of stakeholder discussions. A number of stakeholder comments included discussions of primary and secondary sources they were familiar with. The study is not, however, one of rewriting history. I realised from the outset that time and space constraints would preclude this. Rather, the research focus has been one of maximising the opportunity for stakeholders to offer their perspectives, in terms of the area’s historic heritage values and how these can be best conserved.

1.6 Research Concepts

1.6.1 Historic Heritage Conservation

Heritage conservation, and particularly historic heritage conservation, is a potentially challenging issue, because the concept of “heritage” is so subjective. It is almost impossible to define, because “heritage” means different things to different people, and is not the same thing as “history”. History is putatively objective facts about a past that is “dead” or “foreign”. Heritage is that which one chooses to inherit and/or bequeath in terms of reconstituting in the present that from the past which is important to them in their own subjective way (Aplin, 2002, pp. 13-14; Lowenthal, 1985, p. 412; 1998, pp. 31, 105-126). Such a definition would suggest the term “heritage” is principally applied to aspects of historic interest, although it is also common to talk of “heritage” as embracing the natural and the historic. In fact the World Heritage Convention calls for both natural and what it terms “cultural” heritage to be recognised (Aplin, 2002, pp. 154-178). In New Zealand, the tendency has been to speak of “historic heritage”, “cultural heritage” and “historic place” inclusively as “our heritage”, in terms of those things we personally or collectively “inherit” (Trapenznik and McLean, 2000, pp. 14-15). The Conservation Act 1987 refers to natural and historic resources. The term
“heritage order”, as used in the Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), is defined as:

...a provision made in a district plan to give effect to a requirement made by a heritage protection authority...(Section 187, Resource Management Act 1991),

but neither Act defines the term “heritage” per se. Given the obvious confusion possible from insufficient definition, the term “historic heritage conservation” will be used, emphasising that this study is primarily concerned with historic, as opposed to natural, heritage.

In recent times it has become common in academic circles to speak of the “heritage crusade” and the “cult of heritage” (Lowenthal, 1998). As such terminology suggests, it is becoming fashionable to “care about our past” and preserve certain tangible and intangible aspects of it. In a sense, everything of even the most immediate past is now potentially “heritage”. The existence and extent of such values is an entirely subjective matter. To be sure, such a movement had its genesis in the so-called “Old World” of especially Europe, but “New World” countries such as New Zealand have seen similar growth of interest in recent decades. For many years, New Zealand was seen as almost “too young” to have a (certainly Pakeha) history, while many immigrants had sought to escape the imposing castles, cathedrals and chivalry of England. Establishment of the New Zealand Historic Place Trust (NZHPT) in 1954 and the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) in 1955 recognised a growing interest in historic heritage, itself initially stimulated by the 1940 Centennial. Both international and national developments, including establishment of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in 1965 and raised profiles of historic heritage in the Conservation Act 1987 and RMA have given further prominence to historic heritage conservation as an issue (McLean, 2000, pp. 30-44).

If it has not already done so, the heritage crusade is likely to reach the High Country. There is long standing acceptance that remains from early gold mining in Central Otago are worth preserving (Evans, 1993; Hamel, 2001). What about the High Country’s pastoral farming history? A growing interest in such historic heritage is emerging, but unless potential economic spin-offs are perceived, such interest tends to be external to
the High Country community. The High Country community itself is already struggling to come to terms with changes resulting from environmental and economic dynamics, such as tenure review and the need to generate revenue from sources other than wool production. Historic heritage conservation would appear, therefore, to be emerging as yet another competing land use. Is there a means by which such potential conflicts can be reconciled and can such heritage conservation initiatives themselves be a potential source of revenue?

1.6.2 Cultural Landscape Protection

It is important that historic heritage conservation initiatives consider the wider landscape picture. Cultural landscapes are a function of the interactions between people and their natural environment. Both are dynamic forces in shaping the landscape (Plachter and Rössler, 1995, p. 15; Read, 2002). The landscape itself can be interpreted as interconnected layers of human history. People and their technologies have altered the environment over time. The present landscape is usually dominated by its present day management regime, but evidence of previous uses is typically evident in receding features relative to both the impact of that use and time which has elapsed (Jacomb, 2002; Stephenson, 2001, p. 8). A large scale open cast mine, for instance, often leaves lasting evidence of its presence well beyond its time of operation, whereas much urban development has almost totally submerged evidence of the landscape’s previous use.

Certainly at the international level, there is growing recognition that heritage sites, be they natural or cultural, cannot be considered in isolation from the wider landscape. When the World Heritage Convention (WHC) came into force in 1975, a very clear distinction was drawn between natural areas (such as national parks) and cultural sites (such as historic monuments). Nominations (by sovereign states party to the WHC) for the World Heritage List (WHL) were evaluated by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in the case of natural areas, and ICOMOS in the case of cultural sites. Little consideration was given to the fact that areas or sites may be of natural and cultural significance (Aplin, 2002, pp. 154-168). In 1993, the World Heritage Committee (WHCom) agreed that the term “cultural landscape” should be included, to cover those areas or sites worthy of World Heritage listing for natural and cultural reasons.
Tongariro National Park was the first area to be listed as such, in recognition of the Park’s Maori cultural and spiritual associations, besides natural values (Lowenthal, 1997, p. 18; Plachter and Rössler, 1995, pp. 16-17; von Droste, Plachter and Rössler, 1995b, p. 432).

The IUCN, meanwhile, adopted “protected landscapes” as category V of its protected area classification system in 1992. Such a categorisation seeks:

To maintain significant natural landscapes, which are characteristic of the harmonious interaction of people and land, while providing opportunities for public enjoyment through recreation and tourism, within the normal lifestyle and economic activity of these areas (Lucas, 1992, p. 5).

It is essentially a concept combining landscapes and protected areas, recognising that the landscape includes human activity, be this past or present, and that human influenced landscapes can have both natural and cultural heritage values. Use of the term “natural” (as opposed to cultural) in the above definition suggests the concept’s emphasis is primarily biophysical, rather than historic. Its principal intention is one of protecting the natural environment in a manner that permits existing residence and land use patterns to continue, thus offering an alternative to the more stringent naturalness criteria inherent in the IUCN’s “national park” (category II) designation (Lucas, 1992, pp. xi-xvi, 1-9). The concept has had only indirect application in New Zealand as yet, principally via district planning controls, seeking the protection of native bush remnants in lowland areas. Its possible application to the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area is discussed further in Section 5.8. A number of European countries have sought to apply the concept, but the inherent “museumising” of existing land uses and settlement patterns has met with limited success in terms of long-term sustainability (Primdahl, 2002). At the same time, such countries are increasingly questioning the so called “purist” approach to national parks, deciding to include inhabited and farmed areas in them as part of a more integrated, holistic and sustainable approach to land management generally (Wascher, 2001, pp. 131-132).

Enthusiasm or otherwise for cultural landscape protection tends to be a function of the extent or otherwise to which a country’s landscapes are perceived to be more cultural
than natural. Europe now has few, if any, areas that are not human-modified in some way. Particularly as modern agriculture encourages greater concentration of use, but on less total land area, there is concern that cultural landscapes representing centuries of cultivation could become either lost beneath the impact of highly intensified, mechanised farming, or simply abandoned to natural processes (Green and Vos, 2001, p. 147). In New Zealand, by contrast, there is a tendency to almost interchangeably use the words “natural” and “scenic” when describing the landscape, and so link its protection more with natural, rather than cultural, heritage conservation initiatives. In reality, landscapes are seldom if ever entirely natural, despite the fact that the human element may be small (Head, 2000, pp. 5-7; Turner, 2001, pp. 20-26). A good example is a small network of huts and tracks within an extensive back country area.

The South Island High Country is popularly perceived to be a natural landscape, but it is inherently cultural in the sense that it has been modified, first by Maori and then by Pakeha/European settlers. The present landscape is a function of a continuum of land uses, such as Maori hunting and gathering, and European mining and pastoral farming. The pattern of land use has been and continues to be dynamic, with local variations dependent upon both natural resource endowments and human intentions at the time. Central Otago, for instance, retains a strong cultural heritage, centred on the 1860s gold rushes. The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, by contrast, is a landscape primarily dominated by the extensive pastoral farming begun in the 1850s and continuing, albeit with technological modifications, through to the present day. High Country tenure review could potentially transform the nature of such farming and hence the landscape. The significance of such changes remains to be seen, but it is important to realise that the area is very much a dynamic cultural landscape, with a range of features that are both natural and cultural in their origin. This is illustrated in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Southern Lake Heron Basin: Cultural Landscape Features

Looking north over Clent Hills Station towards the Arrowsmith Range (left) and through Lake Stream into the Upper Rakaia (right). The relative dominance of mountain ranges, tussock grasslands and other physical features, together with the typically extensive nature of pastoral farming, make it easy to perceive the High Country as being an entirely natural landscape. The cultural impacts are apparent, however, in the form of exotic tree plantations around homestead and building areas, the buildings and homesteads themselves, farm machinery, stock, fences, shelter belts, power lines, signs and roads. At least in terms of close up views, many smaller natural features have their definitions enhanced by the impact of grazing, which prevents them being submerged beneath what would otherwise be taller tussock.
1.6.3 Integrated Environmental Management

Integrated environmental management (IEM) is an approach to managing the environment that recognises its “complex, multi-facetted and interconnected nature” (Bührs, 1995, p. 1). It recognises that environmental problems are potentially complex and their solving often difficult (Bardwell, 1991, p. 603). This is because the above-mentioned complexities are seldom recognised in the one-dimensional, often short-term solutions applied. IEM, therefore, seeks to adopt a more holistic approach to environmental management, although it is recognised that this may be difficult to achieve absolutely, and no coherent theory on the concept yet exists (Bührs, 1995, pp. 1-2).

Born and Sonzogni (1995, pp. 166-172) have sought to offer a conceptual basis for IEM, suggesting the approach to it should be comprehensive and inclusive, interconnective, strategic and reductive, and interactive and co-ordinative. In other words, the aim is to be as comprehensive as possible in terms of following an approach that recognises interconnections to the greatest practical extent. At the same time, however, a strategic approach is required to scale down proposed solutions to the extent that they are manageable by those responsible and can be readily understood by stakeholders. Here begins the need for some individual trade-offs in the interests of attaining an outcome that is mutually acceptable to all involved to the greatest practical extent. The interactive and co-ordinative nature, therefore, ensures that stakeholders are very much a part of the process, in terms of information exchanged and conflict resolution initiatives, throughout its duration.

Stakeholder involvement is thus critical to the success of any IEM programme. As Margerum (1999, p. 156) points out, it is important that stakeholders participate in initiating solutions, communicate throughout the process on the basis of agreed protocols, and work towards outcomes that are both mutually owned and satisfactory to all. By contrast, “turf battles” within organisations and the failure of competing interests to compromise to any extent are real threats to effective implementation of an IEM approach (Cairns, 1991, pp. 14-15). Certain bottom-lines, particularly as imposed by legislation, will always exist, but the intention should be one of achieving the best possible outcome to the greatest mutual satisfaction of all parties involved.
Adopting an IEM approach to historic heritage conservation itself could be potentially challenging, given heritage is a somewhat subjective, and hence potentially contested, concept within itself (Swaffield, 2002). IEM would, however, appear to offer a useful means by which historic heritage interests and other potentially competing resource users could seek to mutually progress their concerns, within specific catchments such as the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge. IEM has also been referred to as “integrated catchment management”, because many examples of its successful application have been within specific river catchments (Born and Margerum, 1993, pp. 61-87; Born and Sonzogni, 1995, pp. 172-178; Margerum and Born, 1995, p. 371). The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area, being centred on two river catchments linked together by history, is a good case study area in this respect.

The separation of protection and production functions and resource uses, inherent in the environmental restructuring of the mid to late 1980s and imposition of the tenure review programme, may be seen by some as a potential obstacle to effective functioning of IEM. IEM is, however, very consistent with New Zealand’s overall resource management regime as provided for pursuant to the RMA. Regional councils are, for instance, required to manage river catchments on an integrated basis, while significant decision-making authority has been delegated to regional and local levels. It is important, therefore, that resource management agencies encourage potentially competing interest groups, such as historic heritage conservation proponents and High Country runholders, to work together in achieving wise resource use decision-making to the maximum possible extent.

1.6.4 Social Capital

The extent to which local communities are equipped to take advantage of devolved resource management decision-making is dependent upon their ability to function cohesively and mobilise resources. Although it is not the principal function of this report, some consideration must be given to the existence (and if so effectiveness or otherwise) of local landcare groups. Such organisations can potentially act as a means of historic heritage conservation, by taking on specific projects. At the same time, the structure and focus of such groups can itself provide useful insights into how runholders
perceive High Country heritage, particularly in terms of the landscape and their lifestyle. A greater understanding of runholder attitudes towards pressures for change, seemingly exerted by those outside the High Country itself, can then be better understood. This inevitably raises the issue of social capital.

The concept of “social capital” is based on the notion that relationships between people generate a resource, in terms of the capacity to act for mutual benefit or a common purpose (Spellerberg, 2001, pp. 8-9). Robert Putnam, an American political scientist, has undertaken significant research into the concept, in specific terms of explaining the decline in civic engagement, in sports clubs and other social activities, in the United States (Putnam, 1995a, 1995b, 2000). During the 1990s, New Zealand Governments of the so-called “New Right” began emphasising social capital as a means of fostering greater “dependence” on social initiatives at the community level, rather than “dependency” on the Welfare State. This ultimately lead to a series of publications and gatherings on the issue, including the Capital City Forum, as organised in Wellington by the Joint Methodist –Presbyterian Public Questions Committee, in 1997 (McIntyre, 1997). Such literature emphasises that while the concept does have merit in itself, it does not absolve governments of bottom-line health, education and welfare responsibilities (Davis, 1997; Gilling, 1999; McIntyre, 1997; Putnam, 1997; Witten-Hannah, 1999).

Social capital is arguably the “glue” that holds a society together (Gilling, 1999, p. 67). Its four principals include relationships of trust (to foster co-operation), reciprocity (through which goods and services can be mutually exchanged on a social, rather than financial, basis), norms (being the rules and sanctions governing group behaviour) and networks (affording linkages within and between groups, and thus facilitating access to other forms of capital and resources) (McCallum, Hughey and Rixecker, 2001, p. 119).

Landcare groups are community-based groups of farmers who work together to promote sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation on the areas they manage. A more comprehensive discussion of the infrastructure supporting such groups and the thinking behind such an initiative is discussed in Sections 4.10 and 5.7.
The issue of social capital _per se_ is clearly one far bigger than landcare groups and historic heritage conservation. Its extent will, however, be critical to the effectiveness or otherwise of such groups. A landcare group is far more likely to be effective if social capital is at a high level, because participants will more likely perceive that the group has a valuable purpose. A strong landcare group will not in itself necessarily facilitate historic heritage conservation. That will ultimately depend on the group’s priorities. Strong-willed individuals and/or runholder families sympathetic to a particular cause may themselves significantly influence a landcare group’s direction. Landcare groups are, however, likely to be powerful expressions of what runholders see as significant about their landscape and lifestyles, and so be an important statement of their perspectives on the High Country.

### 1.7 Report Structure

This introductory chapter has sought to highlight intentions and theory behind this study. Chapter two will briefly review the literature of relevance, moving from a generic issue to area specific level. Chapter three will then briefly outline the area’s history, and so attempt to better define those historic heritage values present. Chapter four will then consider the numerous and diverse stakeholders of the area, in terms of their own positions on and approaches to historic heritage conservation. Chapter five will then investigate some important themes in, and challenges to, historic heritage conservation in the area, with possible solutions aired. Chapter six will sum up by briefly highlighting the challenges to and options for progressing historic heritage conservation in the area, with several recommendations to effect such conservation offered. Just before concluding this chapter however, the study area will be briefly defined.

### 1.8 Study Area

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area essentially encompasses both the Upper Rangitata and South Ashburton Catchments. The initial intention had been to focus on what is popularly termed either the “Upper Ashburton” or “Ashburton Gorge”, being
that area accessed from Mount Somers via the Hakatere-Potts and Hakatere-Heron Roads. Such an approach would, however, have excluded Mesopotamia Station, which is significant in terms of Samuel Butler’s association with the area. Besides the historic heritage present, this area also has an interesting history in terms of access and hence local authority association (see Section 3.2.2). To include Mesopotamia and the Rangitata Gorge was also considered beneficial in terms of providing opportunities to examine relative associations between the two communities over time, and compare their existing historic heritage values and conservation potential.

It was also recognised that Lake Heron is actually within the Rakaia, rather than Ashburton, Catchment. It was recommended that on “community of interest” grounds, the study area be extended into the Lake Heron Basin to the extent that several stations commonly identified as part of the “Gorge” community be included. Such concerns were also influential in determining the study area’s eastern boundaries (Kerr, 2002). Consequently, the study area is one focussed on Erewhon, Mount Potts, Hakatere, Mount Possession, Mount Arrowsmith, Clent Hills, Castle Ridge, Barrosa, Edendale, Inverary, Tenehaun, Mesopotamia, The Tui, Forest Creek, Ben McLeod, Rata Peaks, Stew Point, Coal Hill and White Rock Stations.

Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that a study of this nature is difficult to contain within specific boundaries, particularly when station boundaries have altered over time. Certain events and/or personnel of significance have also had implications either for or within immediately adjacent areas. This relates particularly to Samuel Butler, whose exploration extended into the Upper Rakaia catchment, which was itself influential in his novel *Erewhon or Over the Range* that made him famous. It can be expected therefore, that brief reference will be made to events and/or initiatives of relevance in the adjacent Mount Peel, Mount Somers and Upper Lake Heron/Lake Stream areas, and particularly the conservation estate on the Arrowsmith Range and Main Divide to the west.

A study area with somewhat flexible boundaries, therefore, is illustrated in Figure 2. The “Erewhon country” (defined on the basis of Samuel Butler’s exploits) of approximately 280,000 hectares includes both 90,000 hectares of conservation estate on and immediately adjacent to the Main Divide, plus 25,000 hectares at the north-western
end of the Upper Rakaia catchment (Brassington and Maling, 1964, p. 14; Montgomery, 2002). The 165,000 hectares, being primarily the pastoral leasehold lands of the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge catchments, is the area in which the research for this study has been primarily undertaken.

Figure 2. Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge: Location Map (over page)

Adapted from Land Information New Zealand Topomap Database series NZMS 242+ at scale 1:1,826,388 (reduced from standard NZMS 242 scale 1: 500, 000).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The somewhat scattered nature of relevant secondary literature means that numerous specific books and papers have been consulted. It is impossible to cover these all individually. Instead, I have focussed on those sources of principal significance relative to particular issues. Legislation, policy documents, plans, and those publications with inherent “statement of intent” type-objectives will obviously receive substantial consideration in Sections 4 and 5, meaning their coverage will be excluded here. Rather, the focus will be on academic and generic literature. Section 1.6 has already covered the IEM and social capital literature sufficiently, although some additional sources on historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection still require brief coverage.

2.1 Historic Heritage Conservation and Cultural Landscape Protection

Sections 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 only briefly touched on Aplin (2002). Aplin (2002, pp. 1-2, 14, 27) reinforces the view that “heritage” is a subjective concept, being culturally constructed in relation to that which is inherited, multi-dimensional, and contested. Hall and McArthur (1998, pp. 41-55) reinforce this, while tending to approach heritage from an interpretation and marketing perspective. They advocate the concept of “integrated heritage management” (somewhat similar to IEM) in terms of involving stakeholders in key decision-making.

In terms of overseas examples and experiences with historic heritage and cultural landscape management, Fowler and Jacques (1995) investigate cultural landscape management in the United Kingdom. This includes coverage of the English Lake District and Scottish Highlands, in which human impacts are often less visible than in lowland Britain. The upland areas do, however, include evidence of significant historical events, such as the Highland clearances and important Roman military conquests. Such features can easily be destroyed by insensitive land use practices and poorly planned access routes (Fowler and Jacques, 1995, pp. 357-360). Buggey (1995) examines the Canadian experience, including the High Prairies. The Saskatchewan
Heritage Act provides for protection of the Tipperary Creek Valley and uplands to the north of Saskatoon. The area is inclusively one of Canada’s most important cultural landscapes, with over twenty archaeological sites relating to the at least twelve specific cultural groupings to have inhabited the area over a period of more than 5,000 years (Buggey, 1995, pp. 259-261). Taylor (1995) investigates Australian colonial landscapes. Perhaps in a way similar to the High Country in New Zealand, the Australian “Bush” (closer to the coast) and Outback (further inland) have become symbols of national identity, despite changes to farming practices since the pioneering days (Taylor, 1995, pp. 189-191).

Stokes, Watson, Keller and Keller (1989) is a “call to action” by the United States of America’s National Trust for Historic Preservation. The initiative builds on the Trust’s Rural Programme of 1979, aimed at encouraging rural and small town American communities to take the initiative in conserving their historic heritage (Stokes et al., 1989, p. xix). The focus is primarily on the more intensely farmed and densely settled areas, but “Rangeland” States, such as North Dakota, Nevada and Wyoming, in which significant areas are managed by the Federal Government in a manner similar to New Zealand’s High Country pastoral leases, are also included (Stokes et al., 1989, pp. 29, 34, 60).

Barber (2000), Barber and McLean (2000), Kelly (2000), McLean (2000a, 2000b), Salmond (2000), Trapeznik and McLean (2000) and Vossler (2000) apply much of the previously discussed heritage management theory to New Zealand, with a strong focus on the built environment. The concept (and enthusiastic development) of “heritage trails” is discussed (McLean, 2000a, pp. 88-89). This initiative is investigated in relation to the study area in Section 5.8. Warren-Findley (2001) is a report on New Zealand’s cultural heritage management, by the American-based recipient of the 2000 Ian Axford New Zealand Fellowship in Public Policy award. Principal conclusions are that historic heritage conservation in New Zealand requires greater Government commitment, more stable funding, greater consistency in policy making, better definition of conservation intentions, increased profile of specific sites, and the establishment of annual awards if it is to progress effectively. Greater co-ordination of heritage conservation initiatives, through the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, is recommended (Warren-Findley, 2001, pp. 35-49).
Turner’s (2001) comparative study of North Head (New South Wales) and Quail Island (near Christchurch) also applied the IEM concept to heritage management. Greater consultation amongst affected parties, stronger legislative backing, increased funding and a higher profile for heritage generally were seen as critical to progressing historic resources conservation (Turner, 2001, Exec. Sum.). The cultural, and hence subjective, nature of both landscape and heritage is further emphasised by Kirby (1996, 1997). She investigates the issue primarily in relation to the South-West New Zealand/Te Wahipounamu and Tongariro National Park World Heritage Areas. The term “place” is preferred to “landscape”, with place, identity and heritage seen to be closely interlinked (Kirby, 1996 pp. 239-240; 1997, pp. 40-52).

Evans (1993) offers a tourism perspective on historic heritage. This compares the Otago Goldfields Park to Sovereign Hill (near Melbourne), pointing out that significant potential exists to increase the former area’s historic heritage profile, if management can attain an appropriate balance between conservation and tourism objectives (Evans, 1993, p. 107). Hamel (2001) attempts to collate the archaeological information on Otago in a manner that it can be practically applied to High Country tenure review and other land use decision making. The hitherto strong emphasis on preserving those historic features from Central Otago’s gold mining era has tended to see insufficient attention given to protecting those archaeological remains from the area’s pastoral history (Hamel, 2001, pp. 116-126).

Jacomb (2002) briefly outlines the wider NZHPT interest in the protection of “pastoral landscapes”. Such a concept was instrumental in encouraging this project. An archaeologically based approach to Birch Hill (near Aoraki/Mount Cook) is used to illustrate the Trust’s desire to see better interpretation of New Zealand’s “pastoral past”. The NZHPT study thus helps to put this particular project into perspective. Effective protection of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge landscape and its historic sites should be a positive step towards pastoral landscape conservation. Pastoral landscapes are an important subset of cultural landscapes. High Country landscapes are in turn a subset of pastoral landscapes, which include a range of other more intensive land uses.
2.2 The South Island High Country

In terms of the High Country landscape generally, Ashdown and Lucas (1987, viii-ix) emphasise that landscape values are fundamentally cultural. New Zealand’s tussocks are, for instance, both “open, peaceful, nostalgic, tawny grasslands”, yet “seriously altered environments”. Some may perceive benefits arising from their development, while others may prefer that they be left in their present state.

Swaffield (1997) seeks to link New Zealand’s RMA planning framework to the arcadian “pastoral ideal”, while the subjective nature of landscape is also emphasised by him (Swaffield, 1998a). Much of his research has been High Country-based. Of significant value is a review of seventy previous investigations into High Country community perceptions of landscape values (Swaffield and Foster, 2000). This suggests the often portrayed scenic/iconic images are primarily urban-derived. Those derived from rural, localised settings, by contrast, are typically more diverse relative to the area concerned and management intentions (Swaffield and Foster, 2000, pp. 5, 34).

Swaffield and Hughey (2001) point to the High Country as an iconic but changing landscape. It remains to be seen whether changing management regimes as imposed by the RMA and Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998 (CPLA) will yield better management practices or a loss of landscape distinctiveness (Swaffield and Hughey, 2001, pp. 325-326). Interestingly, this article was included in the journal *Mountain Research and Development, 21*(4) (Nov. 2001). This special “International Year of Mountains” edition included eleven articles comparing the European Alps and Southern Alps. What is apparent is that while New Zealand is moving increasingly towards separation of productive and protective land uses, European (and most other) countries are continuing to support integrating such land uses to the greatest possible extent.

O’Connor (1978) is quick to emphasise the need to integrate potentially competing land uses. He expands on this further eleven years later, pointing out that High Country conservation must have a cultural, as well as natural dimension (O’Connor, 1989). Floate and Dennis (2001) (writing in the *FMC Bulletin*), by contrast, strongly advocate the more separatist view, calling for retirements of high mountain lands from grazing, associated provision of public access, and the incorporation of both in the conservation estate under enhanced levels of protection. Although the legislative framework now
favours the more separatist view of land use, such an issue would appear destined to remain one of considerable debate for some time yet.

Dominy (1996, 1999, 2001) adopts an ethnographic approach in seeking to ascertain the extent of attachment felt by runholders to the High Country. Her 1996 study suggested such attachment is very intense. This is backed up by her 2001 study. It must be emphasised, however, that her research was focussed on the Rakaia Gorge, an area dominated by two families having had long associations with the area. Her 1999 study dealt more with the issue of sustainability, pointing out that this is another concept that is highly culturally influenced, in terms of perceived meaning and management approach.

There are hundreds of books, written over many decades, which seek to convey aspects of High Country lifestyle and landscape, both through words and images. Barker (2000) is in fact an update of the classic *Station Life in New Zealand*, written by Lady Mary Anne Barker herself. Based on 25 letters she wrote while at the Upper Selwyn Station of Broomielaw (now Steventon) from 1865 to 1868, it became an English best seller at the time of its initial publication in 1870 (Barker, 2000, pp. 9-29, 55-260). Newton (1948, 1973, 1975) is an example of one who has written a number of books, particularly on mustering and other aspects of extensive pastoral farming, centred on numerous different High Country areas, over many years. Comparing the works of authors like Barker and Newton with those of more recent writers gives some idea of how farming practices and other aspects of High Country life have changed over time. Roberts and Turner’s *New Zealand High Country: Four Seasons* (1983) was popular when released, while Holden (1993, 1995, 1997), is an example of a recent series of High Country publications (under the title *Station Country*). Although paintings and black and white photography graced earlier publications, technological advances have greatly facilitated the use of larger scale colour photography. Alongside this has been a move to larger print, so that increasingly large publications exhibiting the High Country landscape and lifestyle have come to grace the coffee tables of many New Zealanders.
2.3 Wider Canterbury Region and the Ashburton and Timaru Districts

A number of such publications have been written to coincide with centennials and other special occasions. Holland and Hargreaves (2001) probably best represent the High Country in Cant and Kirkpatrick’s *Rural Canterbury: Celebrating its History*. Included are several images and references, albeit brief, to the study area. The Ashburton Gorge receives coverage in histories of the wider Ashburton area by Scotter (1972) and Brown (1940). While dated, the latter is based on a series of articles in the *Ashburton Guardian*, published over a preceding three year period. Its almost 600 pages include a number of references to both events and personnel of historic significance in the Ashburton Gorge (Brown, 1940). Scotter (1972) includes selected coverage of the Ashburton Gorge in what is an inclusive history of the former Ashburton County and Ashburton Borough. The Upper Rangitata (along with the Mount Harper Ice Rink on the river’s north bank) receives relatively scattered coverage in Kerr (1976). There is significantly less literary coverage of the former Strathallan and Geraldine Counties, while that which is published typically focuses more on the lower country.

The wider regional/local historical source of greatest relevance to this study is Acland (1975). Although the principal focus is North Canterbury, this extensively revised edition (by Scotter and MacDonald) includes coverage of most specific stations in the study area and significant information on the area’s history generally. Until Chapman first released his *The Stations of the Ashburton Gorge* in 1996, it would have been recognised as “the authority” on the area’s history, certainly in terms of pastoral farming.

Several archaeological investigations are of relevance to the study. Challis (1995) in respect of Canterbury and Trotter (1973) in respect of the Ashburton District focus primarily on the plains area, but note that scattered evidence of pre-European Maori activity exists at Forest Creek and the Mount Somers-Alford Forest area. Implications of such evidence will be discussed in Sections 3.1, 3.3.1 and 4.3. Jacomb (2000) investigates the development of Canterbury’s settlement patterns in relation to the bullock wagon trails. The principal focus is on the original Pukaki Inn and the Mackenzie Country, but both the importance of pastoralism to Canterbury’s early...
development and the influence of pastoralists on how the province’s transport and accommodation network developed are emphasised.

Literature focussed on the immediately adjacent areas, such as Mount Somers and Peel Forest, inevitably touches on the study area to an extent. Harte (1956, pp. 33-34) provides useful information on the emergence of those Upper Rangitata Stations east of Forest Creek, from the initially larger Mount Peel Station. The Methven Women’s History Group’s publication (2001, pp. 321-329), having been compiled from recorded memories of women in the Methven District, includes coverage of at least four persons with links to the Ashburton Gorge area. Vance (1976), written for the Alford Forest-Bushside-Springburn District Centennial, is concerned primarily with Mount Somers and the immediately adjacent areas, but does make numerous references to the Ashburton Gorge. Campbell and Fairweather (1991, pp. 23-31), meanwhile, provide a very succinct history of Mount Somers, including its development in relation to the Ashburton Gorge and the influence of the two, somewhat distinct, communities on each other.

2.4 The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area

Chapman (1999) is now the most recent and leading authority on the history of pastoral farming in the area. Each of the stations is covered in considerable depth, from initial establishment to the present. Unfortunately no similar publication yet exists with respect to the Upper Rangitata. Newton (1960) is, however, a useful history of Mesopotamia Station until that date.

In terms of recreational use, this is primarily in relation to mountaineering. Beckett (1978) comprehensively covers the peaks and their ascents, while including useful commentary on early exploration and the establishment of several stations immediately adjacent to the Main Divide and the Arrowsmith Range. Mannering (1999) covers the expeditions of James Robert Dennistoun in both the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge and Aoraki/Mount Cook areas. This includes his first successful climb of Mount D’Archiac in 1910 (Mannering, 1999, p. 96). The Canterbury Mountaineering Club (CMC) (1986) and New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC) (1967) each provide a series of
articles covering the physical features, early history and selected more recent climbing
appears to have been a comprehensive investigation into recreational use in the
Ashburton Gorge. The suggestion is that runholders and recreational users can achieve
their objectives without major conflict (Chapman, 1996, p. 211). The figures from this
survey were drawn on extensively by the then Canterbury Regional Council in its issues
and options report for the “Mt Arrowsmith/Ashburton Lakes Area” (CRC, 1992; see
Section 4.6).

Information on the area’s natural history is well summarised, in terms of both principal
facts and references available, in Burrows (2002). Its coverage of the Arrowsmith and
Hakatere Ecological Districts means the entire study area, except the Upper Rangitata
downstream of Forest Creek, is included. Despite focussing primarily on natural
heritage, the area’s diverse scenery and outstanding landscape qualities are also
remarked upon (Burrows, 2002, pp. 35-36). Significant information is drawn from the
initial Heron Ecological Region Protected Natural Areas Survey Report (Harrington,
Cooper, Davis, Higham and Mason, 1986). What was one of the earliest “trial”
protected natural areas (PNA) surveys does not appear to have been carried out in a very
informative manner. This probably explains the suspicion of runholders to subsequent
resource protection initiatives in the area. The PNA report, and Whelan (1990), the
historic resources survey equivalent, are themselves dealt with more fully in Sections 4
and 5. Graeme (2002) focuses on the wildlife values of the Ashburton Lakes, calling for
their coverage by a water conservation order (WCO). Ell (2002) offers similar support
in respect of the now in progress Rangitata River WCO application (see Section 4.12).
Burrows et al. (1997) is almost entirely focussed on natural heritage, particularly
wildlife values associated with the Ashburton Lakes. This report to the Council of the
University of Canterbury appears to have been stimulated by proposed tenure review on
the then University Endowment lands (see Sections 4.5 and 5.1).

Previous academic studies in the area have included Dixon (1978) and Murray (1984).
Both sought to apply a land systems approach to the reconciliation of potential land use
conflicts in the Arrowsmith Range and Lake Heron Basin respectively. Dixon includes
some interesting historical information, but does not envisage significant future changes
in land use (Dixon, 1978, pp. 1, 38-45, 98). Murray, meanwhile, includes significant
detail on the physical environment, as well as some history of the Basin’s use (Murray, 1984, pp. 30-74). Murray also discusses origins of the land systems approach, which originated from Christian (1957), and was refined by O’Connor, Batchelor and Davison as the “Mavora Planning Process” in 1982 (Murray, 1984, pp. 166, 172).

Howden (1995) is an unpublished booklet, including text and photographs, developed to assist with guiding tour groups in the area. It contains significant historical information on the area in a very succinct format.

2.5 Samuel Butler

Maling (1960) and Jones (1960) both investigate the history of Samuel Butler, in terms of his personality and undertakings in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, in considerable depth. Maling (1960, pp. 35-59) includes Butler’s own “Forest Creek” manuscript and his letters to Tripp and Acland, while Jones (1960, pp. 114-119) suggests the true “Erewhon” as described by Butler was probably in the Upper Rakaia, as opposed to Upper Rangitata. Ell and Ell (1995) retraces Butler’s travels, while McNeish (1990) seeks to investigate both Butler’s character and Mesopotamia Station, to ascertain just what inspired his satirical writing. Raby (1991) is a comprehensive biography of Butler, including his life and accomplishments in both New Zealand and England.

Butler’s own publications, including Erewhon (1872, 1932, 1960, 1981), Erewhon Revisited (1920, 1923a, 1932, 1965), A First Year in Canterbury Settlement (1923b) and his Notebooks (1951) typically include significant editorial comment on Butler’s character and the intentions of his writings. This is particularly the case with those subsequent editions published many years after his death. Garrett (1984, pp. 21-46) emphasises the highly satirical nature of the novel Erewhon. Claeys (2000, p. 236) refers to “Erewhon” as the “city of nowhere” in which those who escaped from the society of the time re-create its very ambiguities. Cannavo (2001) investigates the concept of a pastoral utopia, thus offering some insight into the wider context of utopian writing generally.
The above is only a brief overview of key secondary sources. Elaboration of those issues of relevance will take place in subsequent sections.
3. HISTORY AND HERITAGE

3.1 Maori History

Little of the pre-European Maori association with the area has been conclusively recorded. This may not necessarily relate to a lack of knowledge. It is possible that “silent files” remain, while much unravelling of myth from reality may yet be required. Ngai Tahu regard their history as a taonga (treasure), which they are keen to see recounted correctly and by themselves (NTNG, 1998, pp. 32-37; Waaka, 2002).

Beattie (1995, pp. 45-52) has applied a series of Maori names to various sites. These names are typically derived from the physical features themselves and/or personal associations. Based on evidence collated by Whelan (1990, pp. 16-21), the area was probably traversed by the initial Waitaha from around 750AD. They were followed by the Ngati Mamoe in the early sixteenth and Ngai Tahu in the mid seventeenth centuries. The extent of permanent settlement is speculative, while the degree of Maori impact on the natural environment is a potentially controversial subject. By the time of European settlement, however, Ngai Tahu (who appear to have assimilated their predecessors via both conquest and intermarriage) were a primarily coastal dwelling people. The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge appears to have become (if it wasn’t from the time of Maori presence in Canterbury) both a seasonal mahinga kai (food gathering) area and part of a trading route to the West Coast, where pounamu (greenstone) was attained. Trotter (1973, p. 141) confirms archaeological evidence of small oven sites, stone quarries, rock shelters and rock drawings, with associated artifact finds, in the nearby Alford Forest-Mount Somers area. Maori rock art sites are present on Inverary Station, but their condition is a point of contention (ADC, 1997, p. 510; Baker 2000; see Sections 3.3.1, 4.3 and 4.9). Challis (1995, p. 12) notes that archaeological evidence of moa hunting exists at Forest Creek. For some time maps referred to a “Maori fishing village” at Maori Lakes, but the reference was deleted in 1953 (CRC, 1992, p. 19).

Research into charcoal and wood remains suggests the High Country tussock grasslands resulted primarily from Maori-induced fires (Whelan, 1990, pp. 21-24). Whether any deliberate “slash and burn” phase ever existed is conjectural, but it is likely that fires
used to facilitate moa hunting and other management practices got out of control during strong north-westerly winds, droughts and/or other conducive conditions. Claims that the tussock landscapes are primarily Maori-induced seem realistic.

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area was sold by Ngai Tahu to the Crown in 1848, as part of the 5,484,300 hectare “Canterbury Block” or “Kemp’s Purchase”. The “Kemp” reference relates to the then Wellington-based Native Secretary, who negotiated the purchase on behalf of the Crown. The purchase price was £2,000 (NTNG, 1998, pp. 62-63). The purchase would remain contentious until the Ngai Tahu Settlement of 1997 confirmed its validity in terms of the so-called “hole in the middle”. Ngai Tahu alleged that the agreement extended to the Foothills only, by reference to Maungaterere (Mount Grey) in the north and Maungaatuwa and Kaihiku (east Otago) in the South. The Crown claimed Kemp had successfully negotiated an east to west purchase. Purchase of the 2,811,000 hectare Arahura Block for £300 in 1860 settled the issue in terms of the West Coast (NTNG, 1998, pp. 62, 65).

Ngai Tahu again raised the issue of how far west the Kemp Purchase extended, as part of its 1987-88 claim to the Waitangi Tribunal. The Tribunal’s investigation into both purchases concluded that Kemp had successfully purchased the area from west to east. The Tribunal also concluded that the Arahura purchase simply settled the issue for those Poutini (West Coast) Rangatira (chiefs) who may not have been present at Kemp’s Purchase itself (Waitangi Tribunal, 1991, pp. 516-517). The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, and other High Country areas from Selwyn District through to Central Otago, were thus confirmed to have been successfully purchased by the Crown in 1848.

3.2 Pakeha/European History

3.2.1 Early Exploration

Despite the above-mentioned contention at the time, purchase of the Canterbury Block successfully opened the area concerned to settlement. By the early 1850s, this had spread from Christchurch into South Canterbury, with the plains area rapidly taken up.
In 1855 John Barton Arundel Acland and Charles George Tripp set about investigating the possibility of suitable grazing country beyond the Foothills, exploring much of the area between the Ashburton and Rangitata rivers. They were followed in 1857 by Thomas Henry Potts, Henry Phillips and F.G.P. Leach, who entered the Lake Heron Basin via Lake Stream. Tripp, accompanied by Acland and Charles Harper, then pushed further up into the Rangitata. Maori had allegedly reported a “large inland basin” beyond. Tripp then teamed up with Butler to explore the Havelock Valley in 1860. Butler, then accompanied by John Baker, explored the Clyde and Lawrence Valleys, ascending to (and effectively naming) Butler Saddle in the process. The two subsequently explored what came to be known as the Whitcombe Pass, but did not proceed far beyond it. It was now apparent that the alleged “basin” did not exist. All were searching for grazing country. Acland and Tripp especially were optimistic that their own “discoveries” would absolve them of having to pay for a pastoral run (Beckett, 1978, pp. 107-108; Dixon, 1978, p. 38; Whelan, 1990, pp. 26-31).

The Canterbury Provincial Council, meanwhile, appointed Julius von Haast as Provincial Geologist in 1861. Immediately he was sent to explore the Ashburton and Rangitata Rivers, in search of gold. Accompanying him was Dr Andrew Sinclair, who was drowned while crossing the Rangitata River on 18 March 1861. Von Haast continued on, and while not discovering gold, made other geological and access route discoveries of interest, particularly in the Rangitata Headwaters. He named a number of the main physical features, including the Arrowsmith Range after English geographers, while exploring (Beckett, 1978, pp. 8-9; Dixon, 1978, p. 38; Vance, 1976, pp. 19-20; Whelan, 1990, pp. 26-27; 188-191).

Within little more than five years, the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge had been effectively opened to settlement.

3.2.2 Pastoral Farming

Exactly which station and which lessee was first into the Ashburton Gorge area is dependent on boundary interpretations. Inverary and Edendale Stations, for instance, were initially part of Anama, the first station taken up between the Ashburton and
Rangitata Rivers. Tenehaun was part of Shepherds Bush, first taken up in 1854. The Tripp-Acland partnership is, however, typically credited with initiating pastoral farming in the Gorge. Besides their explorations, they incorporated Mount Possession into a joint property, including Mount Somers, Orari Gorge and Mount Peel Stations, in 1856. Mount Possession was sold, however, in 1860, a year before the partnership itself was dissolved. Acland took Mount Peel, and Tripp Mount Somers and Orari Gorge. Tripp sold Mount Somers the following year (Acland, 1975, pp. 156-165; 294-296; Chapman, 1999, pp. 3, 7-11, 26).

In one way or another, the Ashburton Gorge was effectively taken up by 1861. The present day stations and ownership arrangements are the result of numerous changes in boundaries and management arrangements over subsequent years. Acland (1975) and especially Chapman (1999) provide excellent detailed histories of such transactions, which cannot be repeated in detail here. Of significance is the fact that management combinations in terms of adjacent stations have been a feature. Mount Potts has been combined with both Hakatere and Erewhon during the period. Mount Potts did not in fact become a Station in its own right until 1911. The Post-World War I subdivision of Barrosa from Clent Hills effectively created the last of the major Gorge stations, although the 2,700 hectare Castle Hill is the Gorge’s most recent station. This was subdivided from Barrosa in 1992. What were initially very grid-like boundaries have subsequently become far more oriented to natural features, while freeholding of areas, initially confined to those areas around homesteads and other improvements, is steadily increasing, particularly as tenure review advances (Acland, 1975, p.32; Chapman, 1999, inside cover, pp. 13-16, 21-28).

Each station has developed its distinctive characteristics, be this due to topography, farming operation or personnel. Erewhon is perhaps most significant in this regard. It is more difficult, “real high” country and in a higher rainfall zone than other Gorge Stations. Robinson (2001), recounting his involvement in the challenging Station musters, points out that such a task has become significantly facilitated by the use of helicopters. The name Erewhon (effectively “nowhere” spelt backwards) invokes memories of the once significant isolation faced by this Station. This has been reduced by modern transport and communications. Some link with Samuel Butler (in terms of his famous novel) is also apparent, but although he would have been familiar with the
area, Butler himself resided at Forest Creek and later Mesopotamia. The “forks country” (between the Clyde and Havelock Rivers) was, however, initially part of Mesopotamia, until passing to Erewhon in 1911 (Chapman, 1999, pp. 21-23).

In terms of the Upper Rangitata, Mount Peel Station initially extended up the Rangitata as far as Forest Creek. Government incentives aimed at closer settlement saw Waikari Hills, White Rock, Coal Hill, Stew Point, Rata Peaks and Ben McLeod Stations subdivided off in 1912 (Harte, 1956, pp. 33-34). Waikari Hills is just outside the study area. All specific stations remain today, although Coal Hill and Stew Point are jointly managed. The original Mesopotamia Station is now three separate properties, being Forest Creek, The Tui and Mesopotamia.

Despite some popular beliefs, Butler was not the first to settle Mesopotamia. Butler himself initially settled at Forest Creek. His Mesopotamia property was in fact transferred to him by John Henry Caton in 1861. Caton had himself acquired it from Henry Phillips (Jr) that same year. Phillips had acquired it in 1857, but never stocked it. Butler also had to acquire several other previous runs, including one held by Tripp and Acland. Butler was only at Mesopotamia for three years before selling his interest to William Parkinson and returning to England. Mesopotamia suffered a number of setbacks through to the early 1940s, through heavy winter snowfalls, rabbit plagues and difficult economic conditions. Difficulties were exacerbated by high management turnover. Management has remained, however, in the Prouting family since 1943. The benefits of such stability are to be seen in the numerous initiatives undertaken, in respect of farming operations, particularly on the Butler Downs (Maling, 1960, pp. 20-29; Newton, 1960, pp. 5-9, 44-45, 54-55.).

The Government gifted the then Canterbury Agricultural College (now Lincoln University) the most productive 16,200 hectares of the Butler Downs area as an endowment in 1898. This enabled the College to utilise the rental payments for agricultural research initiatives. All but 92.42 hectares of this area was freeholded in the early 1970s, as the then Lincoln College sought to rationalise its land assets. Priority was given to retaining land closer to the College and free of encumbrances such as lease agreements. The area retained was done so for strategic reasons, given its proximity to an acclimatised fish spawning stream. The University of Canterbury was similarly
endowed with 14,000 hectares on Mount Possession in 1873, but agreed to freehold this at the runholder’s request in 2000 (Acland, 1975, pp. 159-164; Burrows, Stout, Eunson and Ridgen, 1997, p. 7; Chapman, 1999, p.26; Gregg, 2002; Newton, 1960, pp. 8-9, 44-45, 54-55; Whatman, 2002).

As in the Ashburton Gorge, modern transport and communications have significantly reduced isolation in the Upper Rangitata. Booming early extractive industries and consequent population growth in and around Mount Somers during the mid to late nineteenth century meant such improvements came earlier for the Ashburton Gorge. The Mount Somers Road Board was established in 1864, and promptly raised £580 for the Stour and £2,797 for the Blowing Point Bridges. By contrast, Forest Creek was not bridged until the 1950s. Until then, Mesopotamia had to be accessed by crossing the Rangitata. Besides this being potentially dangerous in times of flood, it also had an interesting consequence for local authority boundaries. Until the early 1960s, Mesopotamia’s only “road link” was considered to be through the Ashburton Gorge and across the Rangitata River. Consequently, Mesopotamia was included in Ashburton, rather than the then Geraldine, County (Marshall and Kelly, 1986, pp. 1.5.8-1.5.10; Newton, 1960, pp. 49-51; Vance, 1976, pp. 29, 68-70).

3.2.3 Samuel Butler

Samuel Butler’s exploring and pastoral farming accomplishments have already been touched on in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. There is little doubt from the above that he deserves a place in New Zealand’s early exploration history. His name, and that of his famous novel *Erewhon* have been applied to several physical features and human developments in the area. Whether he could be seen as having made any lasting contribution to farming, even within the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, however, is questionable. He was only at Forest Creek, and then Mesopotamia, for four years after his arrival from England via Christchurch. There was little evidence of significant improvements to Mesopotamia, other than the buildings, when Butler sold the Station to William Parkinson in 1864 and returned to England. Even his buildings have virtually disappeared, with their few remains being posts marked with plaques (see Figure 3).
This plaque, laid at the time of the Canterbury Centenary in 1950, marks all that remains of Butler’s Mesopotamia homestead, erected in 1861. A plaque, installed by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, marks the site of his initial Forest Creek “V” hut site. Almost nothing remains at the latter site, while the former includes only four concrete posts (Whelan, 1990, pp. 169-175).
In terms of managing the Station itself, it would appear that most of the day to day tasks were delegated to his workers. Butler in fact spent considerable time in Christchurch. Perhaps the most significant “live” memory of his time as a runholder is the fact that his name remains on a title for twenty acres at Forest Creek. At least part of his initial Forest Creek purchase may well have turned out to be river bed, meaning he subsequently seized upon the opportunity to move to Mesopotamia in 1860. There in fact appears quite a convoluted series of undertakings required on his part before the Mesopotamia agreement was finally concluded in his favour in 1861 (Aubrey, 2002; Jones, 1960, pp. 58-62; Maling, 1960, pp. 11-29; Whelan, 1990, pp. 169-175).

Without doubt, where Butler really made his mark was in literature, while he is also understood to have been talented in art and music. He came to New Zealand to escape the constraints of Victorian society, and particularly the desire of his family that he pursue a career in theology. While at Mesopotamia he would find inspiration for his now famous novel Erewhon, this perhaps most apparent in the following phrase quoted from it:

\[
\text{I am there now, as I write; I fancy that I can see the downs, the huts, the plain and the river-bed – that torrent pathway of desolation, with its distant roar of waters. Oh wonderful! wonderful! so lonely and so solemn…. (Butler, 1981, p. 52).}
\]

Exactly where “Erewhon” is remains an issue of debate. The fact that the full title of the book is Erewhon or Over The Range would suggest, however, that it is relative to somewhere over a particular mountain range. Could this in fact be the so-called “great inland basin” Butler and his contemporaries were led to believe existed “over the range” (see Section 3.2.1)? Jones (1960, pp. 114-117) tends to agree, believing the Louper Stream and Whitcombe Pass is probably the area, meaning the setting is arguably an Upper Rakaia, rather than Upper Rangitata, one. It could well be that he simply created a “mirror valley”, similar to the Lake Heron Basin, on the West Coast side of the Whitcombe Pass (Montgomery, 2002). Whatever, the novel itself is profoundly English in its intentions, being a somewhat satirical critique of the very Victorian society Butler had sought to escape, yet as one so talented in the arts, found himself inevitably drawn back to (Garrett, 1984). The initial edition immediately sold out its 750 copies. There
have been numerous subsequent editions and reprints, although the extent to which alleged “revisions” are mere reprints remains controversial, while the fact that Butler’s own name was not initially put to the book makes it difficult to ascertain exactly what is the authentic version (Butler, 1981, pp. 11-45; 1920, p.1). Raby (1991, pp. 119-120, 318) confirms *Erewhon* was first published, initially anonymously, in 1872 and expanded in 1901. Recognised separate editions of it attributable to Butler himself include those published by Trübner and Co. in 1872, Grant Richards in 1901, Penguin Books (edited by Peter Mumford) in 1970, and University of Delaware Press (edited by Hans-Peter Breuer and Daniel F. Howard) in 1981. Whatever, this novel alone earned Butler his reputation. Over ten other novels, including *Erewhon Revisited*, met with somewhat mixed success, and usually took longer to be appreciated by society. The full title of *Erewhon Revisited* is *Erewhon Revisited Twenty Years Later, Both by the Original Discoverer of the Country and His Son*. Writing this was Butler’s major focus for 1900 and 1901. The book was published by Grant Richards in 1901, a year before Butler’s death in 1902 (Raby, 1991, pp. 134, 293, 319).

Over a century on, one could ask whether Butler left his mark on the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, or whether it was more vice-versa? Both possibilities have merit. The area certainly gave him inspiration in terms of the mythical “nowhere”, yet what he subsequently became through writing the novel has in no small way helped to make the area “somewhere” special.

3.2.4 Recreation and Tourism

To an extent, recreational mountain climbing was an inherent part of early exploration, despite the primary motivation for such travel being economic. From the late nineteenth century, a distinct recreational focus in climbing began to dominate the hitherto predominantly exploration and survey-motivated activity (CRC, 1992, p.27). J.R. Dennistoun, L.M. Earle and J.M. Clarke completed the first ascent of Mount D’Archiac in 1910, with Mount Arrowsmith ascended successfully for the first time by H.F. Wright and J.P. Murphy in 1912 (Beckett, 1978, pp. 36-43; 115-123). Dennistoun also climbed extensively in the Aoraki/Mount Cook –Westland/Tai Poutini area, and completed a nine-day journey across the major peaks between the Rangitata Headwaters
and Mount Cook Hermitage in early 1914 (Mannering, 1999, pp. 218-223). The Ashburton-based Erewhon Mountaineering Club was established in 1933. Together with the Canterbury Mountaineering Club (CMC) and New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC), they promoted the Rangitata Headwaters and Arrowsmith Range as favourable climbing areas, in terms of relative proximity to Christchurch, range of challenge in climbs and somewhat more wilderness climbing opportunities offered than in areas such as Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. Both the NZAC (1967) and CMC (1986) ran a series of promotional articles on the area in their club magazines.

Donations of land at Lake Clearwater, by Mount Possession runholders to the then Ashburton County Council in 1926, 1949, and 1964 encouraged growth of the Lake Clearwater bach settlement, with steady expansion through until the 1970s. The initial motivation was fishing, but use has diversified to include a range of boating-type activities (Bruorton, 2002; Singleton, 2002).

Increased boating use of Lakes Camp and Clearwater has encouraged the steady movement of fishing to the Lake Heron Basin. Because the Lake is a nature reserve, boating is excluded. A camping area, is provided by Mount Arrowsmith Station, and caters for year round casual and October to May longer term site occupancy. Besides Lake Heron itself, the Arrowsmith Range is a significant recreational attraction, especially for climbing. Consequently Mount Arrowsmith Station itself has traditionally been a site of significant recreational focus in the Basin.

Commercial recreation commenced with establishment of the then Erewhon Skifield in 1964. Accommodation was added to create the then Erewhon Park Lodge in 1972. The complex is now run by Mount Potts Station as the “Mount Potts Backcountry”. Other commercial activities have included station-based guided hunting, with sightseeing trips now beginning to make an appearance in the Ashburton Gorge (Chapman, 1999, p. 25).

Wyndham Barker’s promotion of ice-skating led to development of a 2.5 hectare rink on the south side of Mount Harper in the early 1930s. A naturally freezing rink, it is believed to have been the first outdoor-managed ice rink in the Southern Hemisphere. Regular sporting events included competitions with teams from the nearby Staveley rink and also the Mackenzie Basin, including Tekapo and Irishman Creek Station. The
complex has an interesting history, and one that effectively links the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge together. Initially accessed around the base of the Range from Mount Somers, a new access route through Mount Possession Station was negotiated after River erosion rendered the first route impassable. The site was permanently manned during the season. Ben McLeod Station agreed to collect the mail and raise the white flag when collection was required. A staff member would then row across the river and collect it. Access is now primarily by jet boat, although active use has long ceased. In the mid-1940s, the Barkers gifted the rink to the people of Canterbury. The Mount Harper Club took over responsibility for running it, but the steady decline in hands on management and use saw the rink fall slowly into disrepair. Facilities still on site include buildings and a small hydro-electric plant, but it is questionable whether natural freezing would now be sufficient to guarantee the rink’s viability in today’s warmer climate (Aubrey, 2002; Hill, 2002; Horsley, 2000; Kerr, 1976, p. 394; Kerr-North, 1984).

A study by Chapman (1985) suggests the Ashburton Gorge pastoral leases are used for a range of recreational activities. Visitor numbers are relatively low and a semi-wilderness type of experience is sought (CRC, 1992, pp. 27-31). No data is available on the Upper Rangitata, although Mesopotamia Station is the principal access point to the conservation estate beyond. Hunters and occasional trampers, besides climbers, make use of areas which back onto the recently gazetted Adams Wilderness Area.

Legal access to the adjacent conservation estate is not always well defined, and often through pastoral leases. Public access to pastoral leasehold land itself has typically been checked by the requirements to obtain runholder permission. Adequate but unsealed road access to both the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge, with no bridge between them, means that with the possible exception of the Lake Clearwater bach settlement in summer, visitor numbers to both areas are usually low. Enhanced access would realistically increase numbers, but such an increase could itself potentially compromise those semi-wilderness values visitors to the area typically seek.
3.2.5 Nature Conservation

Calls for better protection of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area have been led predominantly by the nature conservation and outdoor recreation lobbies. Natural values, public access and recreation opportunities have therefore tended to be emphasised. The last two mentioned have been touched on to an extent in Section 3.2.4.

Thomas Potts was a naturalist, and noted especially the presence of white herons on Lake Heron during his exploration of the Basin in 1857, thus naming the Lake (Chapman, 1999, p. 24). Initial land protection was of a de facto nature and somewhat by default. What were initially termed “unalienated” or “unoccupied” Crown lands on the immediate Main Divide and higher Arrowsmith Range were essentially left as such because they were considered unsuitable for inclusion in pastoral runs. This was similarly the case with small adjacent areas of primarily beech forest, which became State forests. Particularly as the soil and water conservation values of such areas became better appreciated, the former Department of Lands and Survey and New Zealand Forest Service assumed greater management responsibility for such areas. Until wild animal control became an issue in the 1950s, however, the management presence of such agencies was typically far less conspicuous than in higher profile areas, such as national parks, forest parks and reserves.

Passing of the Wildlife Act 1953 and establishment of the former Wildlife Service stimulated interest in wildlife values of particularly the Ashburton Lakes, but only Lake Heron (nature reserve and wildlife refuge, plus a marginal strip), and Maori Lakes (nature reserve) have formal protection for such values. Lake Camp is a recreation reserve, while the water conservation order (WCO) over the Rakaia River covers the Lake Heron Basin (DOC, 2000, Vol. 1, pp. 85-93; Vol. 2, pp. 104, 108, 136).

The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (RFBPS) is keen to see the entire Ashburton Lakes Area better protected, be this via further specific reservations or a WCO, or both (Graeme, 2002, p. 31). Federated Mountain Clubs on New Zealand Inc (FMC), meanwhile, wishes to see more formal protection of what are now “stewardship areas” (subject to Section 62 of the Conservation Act 1987) by at least a conservation park (under the Conservation Act 1987) or national park. Such a
protected area, FMC argues, should include subsequently retired pastoral leasehold lands in the area and also the Ashburton Lakes (Floate and Dennis, 2001, pp. 24-28). The Department of Conservation (DOC) favours conservation park status for the stewardship lands on the Main Divide and a WCO for the Ashburton Lakes (DOC, 2000, Vol. 1, pp. 88-92). Both FMC and DOC had long supported setting aside of the Adams Wilderness Area, which was finally gazetted in 2002. This is centred primarily on the Adams Range, Garden of Eden and Garden of Allah snowfields, and Adams River to the west of the Main Divide, but a small strip along the immediate eastern side of the Southern Alps is included. DOC, RFBPS and FMC, meanwhile, all support the joint Central South Island Fish and Game Council (CSIFGC) and Fish and Game New Zealand (FGNZ) initiated WCO application for the Rangitata River. A decision on this is still to be made.

Burrows (2002) and Stokes and Grant (1992) probably best summarise the area’s nature conservation values. These are primarily in respect of wetland vegetation and wildlife in and around the numerous lakes, while the Main Divide, Arrowsmith Range and other mountainous areas serve important water catchment functions.

### 3.3 Historic Heritage and Landscape Values

#### 3.3.1 Principal Historic Sites

Following the protected natural areas survey of the Heron Ecological Region (Harrington et al., 1986) a somewhat rapid historic site survey equivalent was commissioned by the Department of Conservation (DOC) in 1989 (Whelan, 1990). The report is based primarily on discussions with runholders, suggesting that certain details were no doubt selectively conveyed. This is almost certainly a function of runholders’ concerns at the growing demands of both management agencies and environmental and conservation groups for increased incorporation of identified areas into the conservation estate. Site and building significance was thus assessed on the basis of runholder advice in terms of identification, and discussions with historians plus assessment against
similar examples elsewhere, in terms of inventory and classification. Physical condition, historical information, comparative examples, and associational status (relative to events and people) were the principal assessment criteria used. Despite being the result of a rapid survey, Whelan’s findings do provide a useful basis for determining historic sites within the study area (Whelan, 1990, pp.10-14; see Table 1 and Figure 4).

Table 1: Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area: Historic and Archaeological Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Whelan Report?</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mt Arrowsmith Homestead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Parts date back to 1860. Of local significance</td>
<td>Homestead itself declared unsafe and demolished 1996-97. Path remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Erewhon Homestead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Individual keen to restore. Had an assessment of restoration work required completed in 1998</td>
<td>Nil – has been declared unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emma Hut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some (but unlikely) claim to being the original Hakatere Homestead. Former mustering, subsequent recreational use</td>
<td>On Mt Harper Conservation Area, recently retired from Mt Possession Station. DOC researching history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mt Harper Ice Rink</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Operated commercially 1933-1946, then fell into disrepair. Historic sporting use</td>
<td>As with Emma Hut. DOC investigations less advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hakatere Station Married Quarters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stone building, probably the first in the Ashburton Gorge. Excellent example of early station buildings. Of regional significance</td>
<td>ADC attempted to list in District Plan, but removed at runholder’s request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hakatere Station Single Quarters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Similar to married quarters, but wooden. Of regional significance</td>
<td>As with married quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mt Possession Woolshed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Superb example of 1860s woolshed construction. Of regional significance</td>
<td>ADC attempted to list in District Plan, but removed at runholder’s request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barrosa Woolshed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>May date back to 1860s or 1870s, but some modification. Of local significance</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Listed?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Barrosa Sheep Dip/Shower</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unusual example of sheep shower, probably designed around 1850s-1860s. Of regional significance. ADC sought to list in District Plan, but removed at runholder’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr Sinclair’s Grave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Grave of former Colonial Secretary, who drowned crossing the Rangitata River, 1861. Of regional significance. Is a DOC-managed cemetery reserve. Listed as an archaeological site in Proposed Timaru District Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mesopotamia Men’s Quarters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good example of early station buildings, but very run down. Of local significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mesopotamia Cookshop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rear chimney of old cookshop. Of local significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Butler Homestead Site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Commemorated site of Samuel Butler’s second hut. Of regional significance. Nil – but Centennial plaque in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Forest Creek “V” Hut Site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Commemorated site of Samuel Butler’s first hut. Of regional significance. Nil – but NZHPT plaque in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mt Peel Boundary Hut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>One of few surviving station boundary keepers’ huts. Of regional significance. NZHPT registered as Category I Historic Place. Listed as Category B Heritage Building in Proposed Timaru District Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hakatere Midden</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No site-specific comments. CRC (1992, pp. 18-19) makes some generic-type references. NZAA archaeological site database upgrade may help clarify. ADC sought to list in District Plan, but subsequently agreed to remove all such sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Inverary Rock Art Shelters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NZAA report (Trotter, 1973, p. 141) notes three such sites on Inverary Station. Present condition of sites is debated by runholder and DOC. Likely to receive attention in Ngai Tahu’s South Island Maori rock art project. NZAA archaeological site database upgrade may help clarify. As with 16 – all such sites removed by ADC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Forest Creek Moa Remains</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Moa bones and egg shell. Evidence suggests related to moa hunting activity. Nil – identification in literature somewhat ill-defined and inconsistent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| 19 | Mesopotamia | Douglas Firs | No | Two such trees, adjacent to Mesopotamia School, listed as “significant trees” in Proposed Timaru District Plan | Plan yet to be finalised |


The above would suggest that the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s historic sites are neither numerous in terms of identification nor well protected. Considerable further research is needed to determine a wider, potentially more representative picture. Back country areas (particularly in terms of huts and former sites), and Maori and other archaeological sites of significance (for which a number of “silent files” potentially exist) are definitely under-represented. There is also, however, considerable further work required in respect of pastoral lease areas. In particular, it is noted that the Whelan report was based on the Heron (Oturoto) Ecological Region, meaning the Upper Rangitata area to the east of Forest Creek is excluded.

In terms of those areas highlighted above, those on the conservation estate are afforded the best protection. Maintenance levels obviously depend on priorities elsewhere, but it is unlikely that such areas will be destroyed. Significant assessment work is still required in respect of the Mount Harper Ice Rink and Emma Hut. Both sites have passed to DOC management through the surrender of Mount Harper from the now freeholded Mount Possession lease. Dr Sinclair’s Grave (see Figure 5) is within a “cemetery reserve”, which has not yet been classified pursuant to Section 16 of the Reserves Act 1977. Classification is required before a management plan can be prepared. DOC had sought to classify the area as an historic reserve, but realises it cannot do this while the cemetery itself remains an “open” one. The site is, therefore, likely to be classified as a “local purpose (historic cemetery) reserve” (Hill, 2002).

Elsewhere, the situation is somewhat more complex. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust has registered the Mount Peel Boundary Hut (see Figure 6) as a Category I Historic Place (NZHPT, 2002). The Hut is also listed as a Category B Heritage Building
in the Proposed Timaru District Plan. In terms of resource consent applications, minor modifications are permitted, with major modifications and demolition discretionary activities (TDC, 1995, pp. 324-325; 2002a, Map R1).

Registration of an historic place does not in itself afford protection to the site concerned. Rather, registered historic places must be noted in regional plans (which, with the exception of regional coastal plans, are optional in any case), pursuant to Section 66(2)(c)(iaa) of the RMA and district plans (which are compulsory) pursuant to Section 74(2)(b)(iaa) of the RMA. Councils often do consult NZHPT when and where resource consent decisions impinge on registered historic sites (and the Trust itself can lodge a submission in the case of notified consent applications), but the decision ultimately rests with the Commissioner (conducting the hearing) in the case of a Council consideration, or the Environment Court (should Council’s decision be appealed to this higher authority). The bottom line is that registration in itself does not necessarily guarantee protection of a site against modification or destruction. Rather, the decision rests with Council on the basis of how it words and ultimately interprets relevant sections of the district plan concerned. Experience to date is that only nationally significant sites or buildings (which are typically Trust or public authority managed in any case) are sufficiently protected by district plan rules (Hill, 2002).

Pursuant to Section 10 of the Historic Places Act 1993, it is an offence to destroy, damage or modify archaeological sites, unless so authorised by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT). This applies irrespective of whether or not the site concerned is registered by the Trust. Such authorisations are typically considered by NZHPT in consultation with local Iwi. There is no statutory requirement to notify archaeological sites in district plans (unless the Trust has registered the site), although particularly North Island councils have hitherto often chosen to do so (Hill, 2002).

Certainly at this stage, the Ashburton District Council (ADC) would appear to have consented to runholders’ wishes, by removing several structures it initially proposed to identify in its “Schedule of Heritage Items” (ADC, 1995, pp. 409-419; 1997, pp. 501-511; 2001, pp. A.58-A.66; see Figure 7). The Timaru District Council’s (TDC) decision to list two of the Mesopotamia Douglas Firs on its “Schedule of Significant Trees” may offer a useful precedent in historic site identification and protection (TDC, 2002a, Map R1).
R1; see Figure 8). Exotic woodlots, such as poplars, Douglas Firs and willows, are often evidence of previous settlement and/or activity in High Country areas. Poplars in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park, for instance, mark the first Hermitage site, while exotic trees are a feature of many past and present High Country homestead sites (Hill, 2002). How “historically significant” such trees are is obviously a subjective matter. The nature conservation lobby is typically not sympathetic to such initiatives, particularly when and where species concerned hinder nature conservation initiatives. Wilding pines have, for instance, become a management concern in some High Country areas.

If the track record of protecting the area’s historic heritage thus far is any guide, further protection of any historic sites or buildings will not be easy.
Figure 4. Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area: Map of Historic and Archaeological Sites (Site numbers as in Table 1; Scale 1:1,826,388)

Figure 5. Dr Sinclair’s Grave (Cemetery Reserve adjacent to Mesopotamia Station)

Being located within a DOC-managed cemetery reserve, the future of this heritage item is relatively secure. The challenge is probably more in terms of providing better access to and interpretation of such sites.
Identification of this site in Whelan (1990) led to its registration as a Category I historic place. At this stage, however, no such action has been taken with respect to other sites so identified.
One of the higher profile sites identified by Whelan, this site is close to the road and includes what is believed to be the oldest building in the Ashburton Gorge. The runholder has, however, successfully had its listing as a “Heritage Item” removed from the Ashburton District Plan. The site is also under threat from a proposed dam (see Section 4.11).
Included in the area are two Douglas Firs, (adjacent to the now closed Mesopotamia School) listed in the Proposed Timaru District Plan’s “Schedule of Significant Trees”. Exotic trees are a common feature around homestead and building areas in the study area.

Figure 8. Homestead and Buildings Area, Mesopotamia Station (looking south)
The building itself is now declared unsafe, and faces an uncertain future. The number of such buildings in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge is significant, but no such building has been given formal protection as yet.
3.3.2 Outstanding Landscapes

Landscape protection is often simultaneously advocated by those pushing for heritage conservation in the High Country. Some would argue that preserving existing landscapes is an integral part of nature conservation, and that it is better aligned with this rather than conserving the somewhat more culturally influenced historic heritage. This probably reflects the popular notion that tussock grasslands are a natural phenomenon, notwithstanding the fact that they have resulted from Maori-induced fires and been subsequently further modified by Europeans (Ashdown and Lucas, 1987).

Natural processes are of unquestionable significance, but human decisions will also profoundly influence the nature and extent of change in the tussock landscapes of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge. It is important, therefore, that historic heritage conservation initiatives consider the wider landscape picture.

Canterbury’s Regional Landscape Study (Boffa Miskell Ltd. and Lucas Associates, 1993) classified almost the entire Canterbury High Country as “regionally significant”, while most river valleys and inner montane basins were classified as “regionally outstanding”. The study was prepared for the then Canterbury Regional Council (now Environment Canterbury). The report divided Canterbury into 24 “lowland” and twenty “high country” land types. These were assessed against natural science, legibility, transient, aesthetic, shared/recognised and Tangata whenua values, with a range of potential impacts on such values considered. While it was noted that Section 6(b) of the RMA specifically refers to protection of outstanding landscapes as a matter of national importance, the consultants emphasised that Council should also concern itself with protection of those landscapes of regional significance (Boffa Miskell Ltd. and Lucas Associates, 1993, pp. 12-13; 67-74).

Such classifications have tended to be replicated by councils in their district plans. The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s situation is outlined in Table 2, with several examples highlighted in Figures 10 to 13. The approach is essentially one of seeking to protect such areas by imposing controls on development within them via the district plan. As with historic sites, the effectiveness of protection is both a function of the strength of controls and their interpretation by councils concerned.
Ashburton finalised its District Plan in 2001. Consistent with the Boffa Miskell Ltd. and Lucas Associates report, almost the entire valley and basin areas have been mapped as regionally outstanding, with the adjacent mountain ranges mapped as regionally significant. Outstanding landscape areas have also been specifically listed. The Plan states that:

\[\text{The visual coherence, harmony and spiritual, cultural and natural values of the District’s High Country landscapes and natural features are of significant value within the District and the Region, but are vulnerable to adverse change as a result of the effects of land use activities (ADC, 2001, p. 3.6).}\]

Almost the entire Ashburton Gorge has been zoned Rural C: High Country (the Lake Clearwater bach settlement has been zoned Residential). The erection of buildings, undertaking of earthworks and planting of trees are, with few exceptions, controlled activities (ADC, 2001, pp. 3.6-3.7, 7.68-7.69 A.98-A.100, Maps 1-20, 23-24).

Timaru’s Proposed District Plan of 1995 was varied in 2002 to create a Rural 5 (Hill and High Country) Zone. In terms of this zone, the Plan states that:

\[\text{The Rural 5 Zone covers the principal areas of the hill and high country within the District, including most of the areas recognised as having outstanding natural landscape values or significant amenity landscape values. ...Controls on activities in this zone aim to ensure that any major land use change or developments are well designed and compatible with existing landscape values and the hill and high country environment... (TDC, 2002a, p. 172[a]).}\]

Outstanding or significant amenity landscape areas can also be identified outside the Rural 5 Zone. In terms of the Upper Rangitata, this includes the Rural 1 Zone areas (zoned as such in recognition of more intensive land use potential) on the lowlands immediately adjacent to the Rangitata River (such as Butler Downs). The only difference in terminology to that used in the Ashburton District Plan is the use of the term “amenity” in relation to those other landscapes of regional significance. In terms of the Upper Rangitata area, the entire southern side of the river valley has been given an outstanding landscape designation. Resource consent applications in respect of areas so
identified are subject to more stringent criteria in terms of buildings and structures, tracks and roads and tree planting (TDC, 2002a, pp. 172[a]-172[c]).

The extent to which such provisions will be tested remains to be seen, but tenure review is likely to increase the demands of runholders for greater land use flexibility on those areas they retain. Inherent intentions of both the Ashburton and Timaru District Plans, and for that matter the Boffa Miskell Ltd. and Lucas Associates (1993) study itself, appear primarily concerned with protecting scenic landscapes. Scenery preservation appears to have become conflated with nature conservation in this respect, with historic heritage seemingly a secondary consideration. The wider cultural landscape is protected almost by default, given that what are effectively outstanding High Country tussock landscapes have resulted from human intervention in any case.

Table 2. Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area: Outstanding Landscapes as Identified in the Ashburton and Timaru District Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hakatere Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Heron Basin</td>
<td>Lake, adjacent features, wildlife, recreational/tourist use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Emily Basin</td>
<td>Series of lakes in secluded basin, fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Lakes Basin</td>
<td>Lakes and wetlands sequence, wildlife, good views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakatere</td>
<td>Road junction, gateway to High Country “experience”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudding Hill</td>
<td>Lake Denny, isolated side valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Emma Basin</td>
<td>Numerous/varying lakes, extensive tussocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater/Camp Basin</td>
<td>Raw/dramatic views, including lakes and Main Divide (esp. Mt D’Archiac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rangitata Basin (Ashburton District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potts River</td>
<td>First views of Rangitata River and landforms below Dogs Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rangitata Valley</td>
<td>Dramatic valley, exceptional landforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitata Gorge Area (Timaru District)</td>
<td>Distinct landforms, broadening views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rangitata Basin (Timaru District)</td>
<td>Sense of wilderness and space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Remaining landscapes of the entire Ashburton Gorge, and most of the Upper Rangitata are regionally significant.

Figure 10. Lake Heron Basin: Outstanding Landscape Area

Looking north, towards Lake Stream. Mount Sugarloaf, to the right, is a prominent feature of the Lake’s surrounds.
Figure 11. Lakes Clearwater and Camp: Outstanding Landscape Area

Looking east, towards Lakes Clearwater (left) and Camp (right), and the Lake Clearwater bach settlement. Despite the presence of buildings and exotic trees, the landscape is still regarded as one offering outstanding scenic vistas. This would suggest scenic, as opposed to natural, features are most significant in terms of identifying areas for such recognition.
Figure 12. Upper Rangitata Valley: Outstanding Landscape Area

Looking west, towards the Main Divide and Havelock/Clyde Confluence. Dramatic peaks and the wide, open river valley offer spectacular contrasts in scenery.
Figure 13. Rangitata Gorge: Outstanding Landscape Area

Looking west from Coal Hill, towards the Harper Range. The Main Divide can also be seen in the far distance.
4. AGENCIES AND PERSONNEL: INTERESTS AND APPROACHES

If an IEM approach is to be successfully applied to historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, it is essential that the interests of key stakeholders be considered Margerum (1999, p. 156). Besides being in a position to better incorporate such agencies and personnel in any systematic initiatives towards achieving the desired goals, such consideration enables their interests and concerns to be better understood from the outset. Communities and interest groups will then be more likely to support such initiatives, because they will know at least that their concerns have been listened to. At the same time, it could be that the stakeholders themselves can contribute ideas in terms of how to achieve the desired outcome and overcome any inherent concerns. In this way, problems can be shared and goals owned, as progress is made.

In terms of historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, the number of stakeholders is potentially large. Some, such as DOC and NZHPT, are specialised agencies, with mandates to focus strongly on such an intention. Others, such as Environment Canterbury and the Ashburton and Timaru District Councils, must consider this issue within the context of a much broader range of resource management responsibilities required of them under the RMA. Runholders are likely to have very property-specific concerns, while a number of NGOs will probably be concerned that those very specific concerns they stand for are not lost sight of.

An IEM approach to any problem in any location is likely to be challenging and time-consuming, particularly in its initial stages, and when and where it has been adopted for the first time Born and Sonzogni (1995, pp. 166-172). Resolution of difficulties early on and the establishment of clearly defined procedures should, however, provide the opportunity to learn from experience, progress the issue in a way that it is supported, and achieve a long-term outcome that is satisfactory to all concerned. Stakeholder involvement, with respect to historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, is illustrated in Figure 14.
Figure 14. Historic Heritage Conservation and Cultural Landscape Protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area: Major Stakeholders

The interests and approaches of the agencies and personnel concerned all require consideration in the development of an IEM approach.
4.1 Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation (DOC) is empowered by the Conservation Act 1987 to both manage the conservation estate and advocate for resource protection elsewhere. In terms of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, the former has been primarily with respect to the Southern Alps and alpine Foothill areas, and the latter in respect of wildlife values of the Ashburton Lakes and their surrounds. The Department does, however, recognise the high landscape values of particularly the Ashburton Gorge in its *Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy, 2000-2009* (CMS) (DOC, 2000, Vol.1, pp. 85-93), while the Heron Ecological Region protected natural areas (PNA) survey identified 31 separate areas, totalling 34,728 hectares (within the study area) as worthy of protection (Harrington et al., 1986; see Appendix 2). Some of the latter have already passed to DOC via tenure review, which is slowly but surely increasing the Department’s management role east of the Main Divide. Existing conservation estate in the study area is illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3. Conservation Estate Within and Immediately Adjacent to the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (Hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Heron Nature Reserve (and Wildlife Refuge)</td>
<td>685.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Lakes Nature Reserve</td>
<td>28.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Camp Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>49.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sinclair’s Grave Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reserves</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Reserves</strong></td>
<td>768.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginal Strips</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Heron</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Lakes</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Marginal Strips</strong></td>
<td>45.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conservation Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangitata/Rakaia</td>
<td>52,246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Forest</td>
<td>1,105.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Forest</td>
<td>1,511.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havelock Forest</td>
<td>6,122.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>10,599.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Pastoral Lease Retirements</td>
<td>16,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>332.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Conservation Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>88,667.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 89,481.20

NB: Recent retirements include the Harper Range (formerly part of Mount Possession) and part Hakatere (presently being formalised)

Rangitata/Rakaia Conservation Area extends between the Rakaia and Rangitata Headwaters


DOC estimates that sixty per cent of the study area may ultimately pass to it via tenure review (Stewart, 2002). So far this has seen Emma Hut and the old Mount Harper Ice Rink transferred to DOC management, but retired land is typically at higher altitudes. Most sites of historic significance, and all specifically identified thus far, are on lower country, which is likely to remain with runholders and probably be freeholded. Many homestead and other improvements sites are already freehold, including the Forest Creek “V” hut site in Samuel Butler’s name. Advocacy will realistically be the means by which DOC will need to seek further protection of such sites (Hill, 2002).

Consistent with its Historic Heritage Strategy (DOC, 1995), the Department has reduced its advocacy role to one of natural heritage. Historic heritage advocacy is now seen as being the role of NZHPT, with DOC focussing its historic heritage initiatives on the conservation estate. A potential gap exists in such an arrangement in terms of High Country tenure review, given this is land presently outside the conservation estate but including areas likely to be transferred into it. At this stage, NZHPT has tended to leave
tenure review to DOC, which has sought to rapidly survey High Country areas when and where possible. DOC historic resources staff can accompany tenure review staff (who typically have ecological backgrounds) on property inspections, but such opportunities can seldom be taken up, due to insufficient funding and pressures of existing work on historic resources staff (Hill, 2002).

During the 2002-2003 financial year, DOC’s Science and Research Unit in Wellington is co-ordinating a national investigation into the history of High Country land use (both Maori and European) and the process of tenure review. The intention is to come up with both a detailed report on these matters, plus a template for better identifying key historic heritage themes and features that should be taken into account during tenure review surveys (Dingwall, 2002; Hill, 2002; Swaffield, 2002). Given that the tenure review process is less advanced there, the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area could be a useful area in which to apply the results of this research.

### 4.2 New Zealand Historic Places Trust

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) is a somewhat unique agency. Although it is 75 per cent Government funded and entrusted with statutory responsibilities pursuant to the Historic Places Act 1993, it is a membership-based organisation, responsible to an eleven member Board and eight member Maori Heritage Council (Aplin, 2002, p. 297). In terms of infrastructure, it perhaps compares most closely with Fish and Game New Zealand (FGNZ), which is similarly a membership-based organisation with statutory responsibilities under the Conservation Act 1987. FGNZ does, however, have a greater operational presence, both absolutely and relative to the extent of its functions for sports fish and game.

Enthusiasm and the number of potential opportunities for involvement are high, but insufficient staff and financial resources have too often constrained initiatives. The Historic Heritage Management Review of 1998-1999 (DOC, 1998a, 1998b; see Section 5.4) transferred responsibility for administering the Historic Places Act 1993 and oversight of the Trust to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH). It also provided the Trust with a Southern Regional Office in Christchurch. Up until then, the
organisation had been almost entirely centralised, with regional presence typically small and ad hoc. The Trust had become significantly dependent on DOC co-operation and goodwill to perform a number of operational tasks effectively.

When compared with DOC, however, the Trust still lacks significant operational presence, particularly in more remote areas. MCH, meanwhile, is a highly centralised, policy-oriented agency, with no operational function or presence. This has forced the Trust to focus its efforts on urban areas and the lower country. Beyond there, the Trust has sought to at least retain, on an informal basis, the working relationship it had with DOC prior to the Review.

Particularly in Canterbury, DOC has felt some need to continue advocating the historic heritage cause, particularly given the Trust’s desire that it continue to be represented on the Ashburton and Timaru Branch Committees. The above-mentioned changes mean such rights of representation are no longer automatic. Particularly in terms of the High Country, DOC Canterbury has agreed that it would still consider acquisition of an historic site if the property is of national significance. A covenant would typically be sought in terms of regionally significant properties. Seeking their listing in district plans, however, would be the best means by which DOC could advocate protection of locally significant properties (Hill, 2002).

Although the Trust is empowered to control and manage, and even own, properties, this is seldom the case. Particularly in High Country areas, the Trust is required to be an advocate for, rather than manager of, historic heritage. In terms of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area specifically, the Trust has given the Mount Peel boundary hut a Category I historic place listing, and is monitoring possible future developments with respect to the Hakatere Corner buildings (D[erek] Howden, 2002; NZHPT, 2002). The Trust recognises, however, that it cannot do the task alone. Its lack of financial resources and operational presence also leave it in a potentially vulnerable position, should property managers choose to react adversely to its initiatives. Clearly there is a need to work together with DOC, runholders and other interested parties, if NZHPT is to champion the cause of High Country historic heritage conservation effectively.
Despite its predominantly urban area and lower country emphasis thus far, NZHPT is presently scooping an archaeologically based study of High Country pastoral landscapes. It is hoped that such research will lead to better identification of important features worthy of preservation at a general High Country level. A representative sample of such sites can then be selected for preservation action (Jacomb, 2002, p. 34; Jacomb, 2002). As with the above-mentioned DOC project, the outcome is awaited with interest. Again, however, the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area could well offer significant implementation opportunities, should it be possible to set aside such areas through either tenure review or other protection initiatives.

It is desirable that DOC and NZHPT seek to work together on projects of this nature, in the interests of both rationalising potentially scarce resources and coming up with a common set of goals. In this instance, both projects would appear to be working towards better identification of High Country historic heritage at a cultural landscape scale.

4.3 New Zealand Archaeological Association

The New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) is an incorporated society, which includes both professional and amateur members. It is responsible for maintaining an archaeological site recording scheme database, which presently includes over 50,000 entries, to assist with both identification of and research on specific sites (NZAA, 2002).

Historically, NZAA has undertaken archaeological surveys on a territorial local authority basis. One was undertaken for the former Ashburton County in 1973 (Trotter, 1973). This extended into, but not beyond, the Foothills area. It did, however, make mention of three rock art sites on Inverary Station. Oven, quarry and other rock art sites, together with associated artifact finds, in the adjacent Mount Somers and nearby Surrey Hills-Alford Forest areas, were also mentioned (Trotter, 1973, p. 141). Challis (1995, pp. 12, 87) mentions that moa bone and egg shell remains found at Forest Creek are believed to be evidence of Moa hunting activity there.
Timaru District Council (2002a, Map R1) has included Dr Sinclair’s Grave as an archaeological site in its Proposed District Plan, but the Ashburton District Council decided to remove archaeological sites from its District Plan unless and until further evidence was forthcoming (ADC, 1997, pp. 510-511). The NZAA sought to upgrade its site information on the Ashburton area during the winter of 2000, but a lack of resources prevented the survey including the Ashburton Gorge (Watson, 2002). No plans have been made in respect of the Timaru District as yet. The Association would be well advised to consult with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, in the interests of information and resource sharing for projects such as the Ngai Tahu South Island Maori rock art project and other archaeological initiatives (see Sections 3.3.1 and 4.9).

4.4 Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust

The Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII Trust) was established by the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977:

...to encourage and promote the provision, protection and enhancement of open space for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of New Zealand (QEII Trust, 2002b – from long title to the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977).

It undertakes such a mandate by the negotiation of open space covenants over private land. Over 1,450 such covenants, covering 54,500 hectares, have been registered since 1977. A small Wellington-based staff is supported by volunteer regional field representatives, who are usually farmers or persons prominent in nature conservation (QEII Trust 2002a, p. 2; QEII Trust, 2002b).

The QEII Trust is thus similar to both NZHPT and FGNZ, in that it is both a statutory organisation (in this case empowered by a specific Act of Parliament), but also one that is membership-based and reporting to both Parliament and a Board of Trustees. “Open space” may relate to a wide range of areas, and covenants may be negotiated for the protection of a range of features, pursuant to Section 22 of the Queen Elizabeth the
Second National Trust Act 1977. Open space covenants may be negotiated over both private land and land held on Crown (including pastoral) lease (QEII Trust, 2002b).

At this stage the Trust has tended to focus its efforts on biodiversity conservation, particularly in terms of the protection of forest remnants on lowland and hill country farms. General landscape features are considered to “add value” in terms of areas that may be considered for covenanting. In terms of historic and archaeological features, however, the Trust sees protection of these as the responsibility of NZHPT. The QEII Trust is, however, seeking to increase its High Country presence. It now includes a specific “South Island High Country” Regional Representative. A recent High Country achievement was negotiation of a 1,185 hectare covenant over tarn, wetland, shrubland and tussock grassland communities on the Ohau Downs Station (Molloy, 2002; QEII Trust, 2001a, pp. 1-3, 32). If it decides to match its growing interest in the High Country with extension of its definition of open space to incorporate historic and archaeological sites, the QEII Trust could yet become a significant stakeholder in terms of historic heritage conservation initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area. Potential for this is discussed further in Section 5.3.

4.5 Land Information New Zealand

Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) is responsible for administering the tenure review process via the Commissioner of Crown Lands (CCL). The agency is effectively the decision-making authority with respect to future land allocation in the High Country. Given that much of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area is still to pass through tenure review, its decisions have potentially enormous consequences for the success or otherwise of historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area.

LINZ is quick to point out, however, that it is fundamentally manager of the tenure review process per se. Its role is that of a neutral and independent decision maker, based on objective considerations of the evidence as submitted by all parties concerned. Runholders and other interested parties both have rights and obligations as provided for in legislation (Greedy, 2002; Mackenzie, 2002). The challenge is, therefore, one of
historic heritage advocates ensuring that they are familiar with what is a potentially complex process and its requirements, and presenting their case effectively.

University of Canterbury and Lincoln University former endowment lands in the area have now been almost entirely freeholded, meaning any historic heritage conservation initiatives on such properties will be entirely at the discretion of the owner (Gregg, 2002; Whatman, 2002).

4.6 Environment Canterbury

As Canterbury’s regional council, Environment Canterbury (ECAN) is the agency charged with responsibility for soil conservation and water management, and mitigating against the effects of both hazardous substances and natural hazards. Pursuant to the RMA, it is expected to manage catchments in an integrated manner (Glennie, 2002). This gives the agency a broad resource management brief, and the potential to be an effective co-ordinator in terms of implementing an integrated environmental management approach.

ECAN’s Regional Policy Statement (RPS), with which regional and district plans must be consistent, includes a chapter on “landscape, ecology and heritage”. “Heritage” is defined in a way that includes historical, archaeological and cultural, as well as ecological, scientific and other interests, but the emphasis is primarily on natural heritage. Principal intentions are that ecological values and landscape qualities be protected, with water bodies maintained in their natural state to the greatest practical extent. The Ashburton Catchment receives specific mention in this regard (CRC, 1998, pp. 99-119). Inherent in the RPS is a desire that “areas and/or sites of regional significance be identified”, with their protection to be achieved primarily via district plan provisions (CRC, 1998, pp. 106-109). This has met stern opposition from landowners, forcing ECAN to reconsider what is likely to be a more thematic (eg. wetlands) approach based on stricter qualifying criteria (Glennie, 2002; Ross, 2002). Landscape appears likely to be a theme, but the extent of historic heritage inclusion, certainly in High Country areas, is as yet uncertain.
The then Canterbury Regional Council did co-ordinate an issues and options investigation into the “Mt Arrowsmith/Ashburton Lakes Area” back in 1992, at the instigation of DOC and the then Aoraki (now Canterbury/Aoraki) Conservation Board (CRC, 1992). The report and its discussion have assisted ECAN in its input to tenure review and catchment development proposals, but no co-ordinated follow-up has been forthcoming. As district plans have progressed, ECAN has sought to draw back from area-specific initiatives, focussing instead on more trans-regional matters (Miller, 2002).

ECAN is currently preparing its Natural Resources Regional Plan (NRRP). This identifies the Ashburton Gorge as a “high naturalness area”, suggesting that dams be excluded from the area, but submissions on the draft have included strong opposition to such provisions (ECAN, 2001, Ch. 5, pp. 5-27 – 5-31; Glennie, 2002). ECAN remains convinced, however, that its NRRP will provide an effective means of catchment management. It therefore sees the proposed water conservation order for the Rangitata River as being unnecessary. The proposal was jointly submitted by the Central South Island Fish and Game Council (CSIFGC) and Fish and Game New Zealand (FGNZ). A decision from the special tribunal, appointed pursuant to Section 203 of the RMA to consider the proposal, is expected in the next few months. Reports recently commissioned into both the Ashburton and Rangitata Catchments (Boffa Miskell Ltd., 2001; Mosley, 2001) suggest ECAN is concerned to protect the natural character, amenity values and flow regimes of both rivers, consistent with their sensible use. How effective such initiatives will be against pressure from developers remains to be seen.

ECAN is likely to continue playing a significant role in the future of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, particularly in relation to catchment management. Being an agency focussed on integrated resource management, it is in a good position to draw together competing interests over issues such as historic heritage conservation. Whether it would be prepared to return to the more hands on role it envisaged back in 1992, however, will depend on its internal politics, and the extent to which it can reach common agreement on the boundaries of responsibilities, with both the Ashburton and Timaru District Councils.
It is desirable that the Ashburton and Timaru District Plans achieve the greatest possible degree of consistency in High Country heritage management. To an extent this process has already commenced through the Timaru District Council’s initiative to achieve consistency with the Ashburton District Plan over the management of outstanding landscapes (see Sections 3.3.2 and 4.8). Useful guidance would, however, be provided by a Regional Heritage Plan. Preparation of this would in turn be facilitated by a National Policy Statement (NPS) on heritage (Hill, 2002).

At this stage, however, there is no commitment by either the Ministry for the Environment (MFE) or MCH to take the initiative on what is an optional and potentially expensive process pursuant to the RMA. MFE is responsible for preparing NPSs per se, but MCH would realistically be expected to take a significant, if not the lead, role should a decision be made to prepare one for heritage (McKenzie, 2002; see Section 5.4). The stern opposition which ECAN received to the heritage identification initiatives when preparing its RPS suggest it is unlikely to contemplate an even more specific Regional Heritage Plan at this stage. In the meantime, therefore, it appears that the Ashburton and Timaru District Councils themselves need to take the initiative in terms of achieving a consistent approach to historic heritage management in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area.

4.7 Ashburton District Council

With the Rangitata River marking its southern boundary, the Ashburton District Council (ADC) is responsible for land use planning within the Ashburton Gorge. Its District Plan (ADC, 2001), completed in 2001, must be consistent with the RPS. The ADC is expected to take responsibility for more site-specific matters, such as historic heritage conservation. Consistent with ECAN’s approach, the ADC sought to identify both outstanding landscapes and “areas of significant nature conservation value” (ASNCVs) in its district planning approach from the outset. The outstanding landscapes, as identified by the Boffa Miskell Ltd. and Lucas Associates Report (1993) and incorporated in the Ashburton District Plan (2001), are listed in Table 2 (see Section 3.3.2). The ASNCVs themselves are listed in Appendix 3. The ASNCVs recognise nature conservation values, and are derived primarily from recommended areas for
protection (RAPs), as identified in the Heron Ecological Region PNA report (Harrington et al., 1986; see Appendix 2) and DOC submissions on the draft versions of the District Plan (ADC, 1995; 1997). Considerable runholder concern at the extent and location of many proposed areas has seen Council adopt an approach of compromise. Group 1 sites are officially listed in the Plan from the outset. Those in Group 2, plus a list of “geopreservation sites” (highlighting interesting geological phenomena), are to be further investigated, in consultation with affected runholders, over the next five years, before a final decision on inclusion or exclusion is made (ADC, 2001, pp. A.40 – A.57; Singleton, 2002; see Appendix 3).

Historic heritage, certainly within the Ashburton Gorge, however, has not fared so well. The ADC identified the Hakatere Station buildings, Mount Possession woolshed and Barrosa sheep shower (see Figure 15) in its 1995 draft Plan’s “Schedule of Heritage Items and Archaeological Sites”. In response to runholders’ concerns, however, these were removed in the 1997 revision and remain excluded from the final Plan. At this stage anyway, Council acknowledges that runholders have legitimate concerns about such buildings being listed. Of concern to runholders is the potentially high costs involved in maintaining “heritage” buildings, particularly when and where materials used have to be consistent with heritage fabrics. Modification sufficient to adapt a building to modern uses or technologies can also be rendered costly or even impossible by controls on the extent to which structures concerned can be altered (ADC, 1995, pp. 409-419; 1997, pp. 501-511; 2001, pp. A.58-A.66; Singleton, 2002).

Also removed were the Hakatere midden and four Inverary rock art shelter sites (ADC, 1997, pp. 510-511). Council similarly responded to runholder concerns, and conceded that more research is required before such listings can be justified (Singleton, 2002). In fact all archaeological site listings were removed from the Plan. Given that it is an offence pursuant to Section 10 of the Historic Places Act 1993 to destroy, damage or modify any known archaeological site, it could be argued that such sites are protected in any case. Their listing would, however, help to ensure they are better known and so assist in mitigating against their accidental damage by unsuspecting persons.

It appears that Council sees the ASNCVs, including those still in dispute, as a higher priority for the Gorge at present. The ASNCVs are predominantly High Country
located. Relatively greater accessibility of historic sites in the lower country and urban areas, meanwhile, tends to encourage greater enthusiasm, and hence finance, for historic heritage conservation outside the High Country. The consequence is that in terms of attention, High Country historic heritage tends to lose out to both High Country natural heritage conservation and lower country historic heritage conservation. Realistically, greater Council support for High Country historic heritage conservation initiatives is required before the Ashburton District Plan will offer any effective protection to historic sites within the Ashburton Gorge.
This construction is representative of innovation in sheep drenching. Interpretation would be required to effectively convey such details to the public. Listing of this site in the Ashbuton District Plan was successfully contested by the runholder.
4.8 Timaru District Council

The Upper Rangitata area falls within the Timaru District Council’s (TDC) boundaries. Council is still finalising its District Plan, meaning both the Proposed Plan (1995) and the former Strathallan County’s District Scheme (1982) require consideration in district planning decisions. The former document is, however, of greater relevance in terms of Council’s long-term intentions.

The Proposed Plan has recently been amended by Plan Variation No. 18 (TDC, 2002a). This creates a new “Rural 5 (Hill and High Country) Zone, similar to that of the Ashburton District’s “Rural C” Zone. As discussed in Section 3.3.2, most of this zone has been designated as “outstanding landscapes” or “significant amenity landscapes” areas, although such designations are also possible in other zones. Butler Downs (being much of the freehold area of Mesopotamia Station), for instance, is an outstanding landscape in the Rural 1 Zone. Such areas are considered to be both capable of more intensive farming and less sight-sensitive in terms of landscape change. The outstanding landscape designation is considered compatible with greater flexibility in land use there (TDC, 1995, pp. 22-27, 171-172, Map R1; 2002a, pp. 36[a]-36[d], 172[a]-172[d], 203[a]-203[f], Map R1s; 2002b).

In the longer term, Plan Variation No. 18 (TDC, 2002a) is also aimed at enhancing riparian management and the setting aside of “significant natural areas” (SNAs). Better riparian management is to be achieved by the application of specific performance standards with respect to cultivation, stock grazing, tree planting, native vegetation clearance and earthworks. The SNAs will include both “significant indigenous vegetation” and “significant habitats of indigenous fauna”, with “coastal wetlands”, “freshwater wetlands”, “forest remnants and woodlots”, “shrublands and shrubs”, “grasslands” and “rivers and their margins” to be the specifically defined areas. Specific criteria are numerous, but it is likely that all indigenous vegetation (including tussock grasslands) above 900 metres will qualify for SNA designation. Council believes, however, that the Plan Variation itself is only the first step, with considerable further work required to identify specific SNAs. Council intends to undertake a District-wide survey of ecological values (based on individual property assessments), before deciding on SNAs and offering assistance with their protection where required (TDC, 2002b).
The process by which the above-mentioned Variation was effected and the follow-up to it proposed is one consistent with IEM. This could offer scope for future historic heritage conservation initiatives in the Rangitata Gorge. The Variation resulted from investigations by Council planning staff, in consultation with representatives from the “Rural 3 Working Party” (Rural 3 being the initial zoning for the hill and high country and other areas of “high natural value”, as defined in the Proposed Timaru District Plan [TDC, 1995]). This included representatives from the Farm Forestry Association, South Canterbury Federated Farmers, ECAN, New Zealand Tree Crops Association, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Agriculture New Zealand, Arowhenua Runanga, RFBPS, DOC, FMC, CSIFGC, Peel Forest Enhancement Group and TDC (TDC, 2002b).

Unfortunately, neither NZHPT nor any other historic heritage representatives participated in the Rural 3 Working Party. NZHPT cannot recall being invited to take part, while TDC appears to have seen the concern as being one of natural heritage and landscape (Eunson, 2002; Jackson, 2002; TDC 2001). Once again, the tendency has been to consider the landscape from an entirely natural perspective, with little regard for its cultural dimension. Presence of NZHPT and/or a local historic heritage group on the Working Party could ensure an historic heritage perspective is added to subsequent initiatives, aimed at identifying those areas requiring specific protection via the District Plan. IEM type-initiatives would appear to have born some success with respect to landscape values and the ecological dimension. Participation by NZHPT and/or other local historic interest groups in such discussions is, however, vital to the historic heritage perspective being adequately represented in future resource protection decision-making.

At this stage, the Proposed Plan does identify Dr Sinclair’s Grave as an archaeological site. The Mount Peel Boundary Hut is listed on the “Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Structures”, with two Douglas Fir trees adjacent to the (now closed) Mesopotamia School identified on the “Schedule of Significant Trees” (Doole, 2002; TDC, 2002a, Map R1).
4.9 Ngai Tahu

It is important that both the Arowhenua Runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (TRONT) be involved in any decision-making with respect to progressing historic heritage conservation initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area. TRONT is the Ngai Tahu Iwi’s (tribe’s) tribal governing body based in Christchurch, while Arowhenua Runanga is the local Papatipu Runanga (sub-tribe) exercising manawhenua (local identification, and hence influence for and on behalf of the Iwi) over the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area. Besides the opportunity to speak to many “silent files” on the area’s Maori history, the partnership approach is enshrined in legislation, via references to principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in relevant Acts of Parliament. TRONT advice is that a common interest between the Rakaia and Hakatere (Ashburton) Rivers is shared by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (based at Tuahiwi, North Canterbury) and Arowhenua Runanga (based at Temuka, South Canterbury), but this is contested by Arowhenua (Beaven, 2002; Waaka, 2002). Addressing any disputes arising from this would be Ngai Tahu’s concern.

The Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 provides for “Statutory Acknowledgements” in terms of certain areas of particular significance to Ngai Tahu. Planning authorities are required to consult with Ngai Tahu over resource consents sought for those areas subject to Statutory Acknowledgements. The entire Hakatere (Ashburton) and Rangitata Rivers are covered by these. One also applies in respect of O Tu Wharekai, being the Ashburton Lakes (see Figure 16). Although the extent of pre-European permanent settlement in the area remains in question, the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area is referred to by Ngai Tahu as an area of significance, both in terms of its importance for mahinga kai (seasonal food gathering) and tribal mythological and spiritual history (ADC, 2001, pp. A.106-A.114; Schedule 46, Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998). It is appropriate, therefore, that Ngai Tahu be invited to participate in any initiatives to raise the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area’s historic heritage profile.

Ngai Tahu’s South Island Maori rock art project should go some way towards resolving the significance, condition and future management of Maori rock art shelters on Inverary Station. It is desirable that both TRONT and NZAA also work closely together
in terms of initiatives to update the latter’s database (see Section 4.3). This applies particularly in respect of details on the Hakatere Midden, the precise location(s) of moa hunting evidence in the Forest Creek area (Challis, 1995, pp. 12, 87) and any other sites of Maori and/or archaeological significance. While it is desirable that TRONT and NZAA co-operate in research initiatives and share information to the greatest possible extent, NZAA needs to be sensitive to TRONT’s right to retain its “silent files”. It is highly desirable that a greater Maori dimension be added to what is at present a strongly biased Pakeha/European history of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area. The right of Ngai Tahu to interpret their heritage as they see fit must not, however, be lost sight of.
Lake’s Heron, Clearwater, Emma and Emily are also included. Maori Lakes, however, is where reference to a Maori fishing village existed on maps until the early 1950s.
4.10 Federated Farmers, Runholders and Related Organisations

Particularly since the demise of former Rabbit Boards, the South Island High Country Committee (SIHCC) of Federated Farmers has become the united voice for High Country runholders (Cornelius, 2002). It sees itself as an organisation promoting sustainable management consistent with the RMA, becoming involved in the planning process when and where necessary to defend members’ interests. It also emphasises that the High Country is a vast and diverse area, in which local situations are highly varied and require local adaptations of best farming practices. SIHCC believes those with an interest in, but residing outside, the High Country need to understand the position of both SIHCC itself and the members it represents (Douglas, 2002).

SIHCC has sought to respond fairly and positively to the mounting public criticism of High Country farming practices, particularly since conservation and recreation NGOs have increased their demands for land to be surrendered and access opened up. Spirit of the High Country: The Search for Wise Land Use (SIHCC, 1992) and Tussock Grasslands: Our Heritage (Mulcock, 2001) are publications aimed at demonstrating above all that runholders do care about the High Country environment and seek to manage it sustainably. Through this literature, SIHCC acknowledges that exploitation and consequent degradation were features of the first century of High Country pastoralism, but application of better management practices and greater security of tenure have significantly reversed this trend in the post-World War II years. Greater awareness of soil conservation techniques, more managed grazing regimes, increased use of fertiliser on lower, more intensively used areas, technological advances in on-farm machinery and access, and passing of the Land Act 1948 have all facilitated this. Inherent also is the notion that while inevitably changing, the High Country farming lifestyle is a valued one, which participants involved in wish to preserve to the greatest practical extent. In other words, High Country farmers do value “their heritage” as being one which bonds them to a land resource which they are required to manage sustainably, consistent with being able to adapt to the demands of a harsh climate, and somewhat unstable and changing market conditions. The work may be hard and the environment challenging, but what may be third generation or more High Country farming families are there because they enjoy the environment, revel in the challenges
of High Country farming, and above all, love the lifestyle that goes with it (SIHCC, 1992; Mulcock, 2001).

In terms of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, the perception of the Committee and the runholders involved is that the tenure review process and other land protection initiatives have not been well handled. Although application of the tenure review process to the area is seen as inevitable, runholders have become concerned at what they perceive as being unrealistic ambitions of the conservation and recreation lobbies, particularly in terms of areas to be surrendered. Of particular concern was the fact that findings of the Heron Ecological Region PNA Report (Harrington et al., 1986) were simply incorporated into the Draft Ashburton District Plan (ADC, 1995; 1997) without any consultation (see Section 5.5). They have consequently become very reluctant to discuss property-specific values, be these of an historic, landscape, or any other nature, fearing that such disclosure will lead to yet more pressure to surrender land. The ultimate result, they fear, could be their being forced out of business (Aubrey, 2002; W. and L. Burdon, 2002; Grigg, 2002).

Runholders become particularly frustrated at what they see as undue interference in High Country affairs from, and popular misunderstanding of their intentions by, outside agencies. This has become more apparent since the environmental restructuring and wider State Sector reforms of the mid to late 1980s. Up until then, they considered themselves well served by the then Department of Lands and Survey and local Catchment Boards, which tended to maintain a “hands-off beyond essential regular inspections” oversight-type role, with respect to lease agreements and soil and water conservation “run plans”. Advice, usually free, was available from agencies such as the then Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries as and when desired by the runholder. Runholders themselves usually had a significant stake in the community via membership of what were very local, community-specific Rabbit Boards. Establishment of DOC, growing NGO interest in the High Country, enactment of the RMA and the reform of local government have added a new dimension to High Country management, principally in terms of a growing interest in nature conservation and recreational values of the area. With this has come the demand from DOC, NGOs and territorial local authorities for greater hands-on involvement in High Country management. Runholders are not necessarily averse to such interest and involvement per se, but they do become
frustrated at allegations by the organisations concerned that they are unsympathetic to conservation and recreational causes by simply trying to prolong a land use and lifestyle that is unsustainable. In keeping with the general view of SIHCC, runholders do believe they manage the land well, and are concerned to see that land is used sustainably, in the interests of preserving their High Country lifestyle, maintaining a productive economic base, and protecting the High Country environment. To consistently achieve all three aims, however, requires them to have the flexibility to adapt to change, be this driven by technological, market or other outside forces. Denial of recreational access, they argue, is typically the exception to the rule, and usually on account of adverse behaviour by those to whom the privilege was granted. They also emphasise that production from the land and protection of its natural values are compatible objectives. It is pointed out, for instance that light grazing of tussock landscapes typically protects them from what is now somewhat more rapid regeneration to secondary species (a process perhaps induced by climate warming) and degeneration (from invasive weed species). Noting that DOC, environmental and recreational NGOs and territorial local authorities are keen to protect tussock landscapes, runholders are quick to point out their local knowledge with respect to such processes. As persons with knowledge of and experience in what is a dynamic High Country environment, the contribution by runholders to its future sustainable management is potentially valuable (Aubrey, 2002; Cornelius, 2002; W. and L. Burdon, 2002).

In terms of historic heritage specifically, those spoken to agree that the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area has many an interesting story to tell, but if and how such a profile needs to be raised is an issue of some debate. A balance, it is felt, must be retained between the protecting and interpreting of such values, and allowing for privacy and progress. The extent to which the area has changed in recent times, and will do so in the near future is an interesting point. Actual surrender of land via tenure review will realistically be greater towards the western end of the Ashburton Gorge, while those properties further away from the Main Divide and Arrowsmith Range are likely to be less affected. In terms of the Upper Rangitata, the impact is a little less certain, because higher, steeper areas and lower river flats are a feature of all properties from west to east. Diversification by some runholders into outdoor recreational type activities, such as guided hunting and fishing, is apparent, but this should not be exaggerated. Mount Potts Backcountry, by far the most visible such venture, has a long
history, while the fact that both the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge are only accessible via no-exit metal roads means that the area is unlikely to become one of mass tourism (Aubrey, 2002; W. and L. Burdon, 2002; Grigg, 2002).

Perhaps the most visible change in the immediate future will be the conversion of Forest Creek Station to Douglas Fir plantation forestry, but whether such initiatives are implemented elsewhere in the area remains to be seen. Both the Ashburton and Timaru District Councils have included rules in their District Plans to prevent undue compromising of significant and outstanding landscape areas by plantation forestry (ADC, 2001, pp. 7.68-7.69; TDC, 2002a, pp. 203[a]-203[d]; see Section 3.3.2). The Forest Creek consent is understood to be conditional on contour-type planting and the use of Douglas Fir only. Forest Creek is also the one foreign-owned property in the area, but there is not yet any indication that this will become an inevitable trend (Aubrey, 2002; W. and L. Burdon, 2002; Grigg, 2002).

If the desire of runholders to see the area’s landscape character retained requires any evidence, it has been demonstrated by the Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group (RGLG). This includes all the Upper Rangitata Gorge stations, plus the immediately adjacent Waikari Hills and Mount Peel. The Group recently won the annual Canterbury/Aoraki Conservation Board award for regional heritage conservation initiatives. This commended the Group for its programme aimed at eradicating broom from the Rangitata Riverbed. Several stations on the Ashburton Gorge side have joined the initiative. The Gorge itself has not yet established its own landcare group (Aubrey, 2002; J. and R. Acland, 2002). The success of this and future projects is likely to be watched with interest by management agencies and other stakeholders in the area. It could yet be that the RGLG becomes a medium for fostering historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area at the grassroots level. This is investigated in Section 5.7.

4.11 Other Resource Use and Development Interests

Early pioneers, as well as national and local government officials, had high hopes for the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s economic potential in the mid-nineteenth
century. In some respects such ambitions were typical of most early settlements, but as with most places, there were specific local reasons for such optimism. Perhaps the hope was that mineral reserves found in and around Mount Somers may extend inland, or perhaps that gold discovered on the West Coast could be from a source extending through the Main Divide (Whelan, 1990, pp. 26-31; see Section 3.2.1). Now, however, tapping the water resources of both the Ashburton and Rangitata Rivers, for increased irrigation on the Canterbury Plains, would appear to be the only resource development proposition likely to threaten the area’s semi-remote qualities in any way.

The Rangitata River is presently the subject of a water conservation order (WCO) application (see Sections 3.2.5 and 4.6). Should this fail to succeed, it is rumoured that a development company is keen to proceed with a project that would see an upper and a lower dam constructed. The former would be installed just downstream of Mesopotamia Station, and the latter immediately below White Rock Station. Given that the Rakaia River is already subject to a water conservation order, the Rangitata is seen by many as the best option. Its snow-fed source in the Southern Alps ensures its flow is reliable, while its relatively high gradient would be ideal, should any diversification into hydro power be subsequently contemplated. At this stage, the project is one aimed at addressing the ever increasing demand for irrigation on the Plains, due to the dairying boom (Aubrey, 2002). Present consideration of the WCO application means the proponent concerned is probably keeping relatively quiet about any further specifics.

Proposals for the Ashburton have been rather more open and longer in their conception. Back in the mid-1980s, the then South Canterbury Catchment Board and Regional Water Board commissioned an investigation into possible options for harnessing water resources in the Upper Ashburton, in order to boost stockwater irrigation potential in the Lower Ashburton (Gabites Porter and Partners, 1984; 1986). The sixteen options considered included possible diversions of Lake Heron, the Cameron River, or Potts River, the creation of reservoirs at Lake Heron, Lakes Emma and Roundabout, or Maori Lakes, dams at Blowing Point or Stour Bridge, and several options elsewhere. It was recommended, however, that upgrading the existing stock water race system on the Plains be considered first (Gabites Porter and Partners, 1986, pp. 1-35). Indications are that the Blowing Point or Stour Bridge options would be most likely to proceed, should
the need for diversions, reservoirs or dams be revisited (Derek Howden, 2002; Jowett, 2002).

A dam at Stour Bridge would almost certainly flood that area on which the Barrosa Station woolshed and sheep shower stand, while the Blowing Point option would realistically spell the end of the Hakatere Station buildings. DOC appears keen to pursue a WCO for the Ashburton Lakes area or even the entire Upper Ashburton Catchment (DOC, 2000, Vol.1, pp. 88-89), but it is important that NZHPT and others with an interest in the area’s history be aware of the potential consequences of either damming option proceeding. Damming the Rangitata River along the lines envisaged would certainly impact on the area’s landscape features, while the Mount Harper Ice Rink would almost certainly be lost. Here again, it is essential that DOC, NZHPT and others interested be prepared to act in defence of heritage sites and the landscape generally, should the Rangitata WCO application ultimately be rejected.

4.12 Nature Conservation, Recreation and Tourism Interest Groups

These organisations are somewhat numerous, sharing interests in respect of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area which may be both complementary yet potentially conflicting.

The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (Inc.) (RFBPS) supports better protection of the Ashburton Gorge’s lakes, wetlands and associated wildlife. Its members make frequent visits to the area (Graeme, 2002; Derek Howden, 2002). It has also strongly supported the application for the Rangitata River WCO, which the Central South Island Fish and Game Council (CSIFGC) and Fish and Game New Zealand (FGNZ) have instigated. The application itself has generated significant public interest At least one supporter has argued in support of the application on the basis of the catchment’s historic significance (McKenzie, 2001).

Federated Mountain Clubs of New Zealand (Inc.) (FMC) also has a strong interest in the area. It sees significant potential for eastward extension of the protected area network into especially the Ashburton Lakes area, in the mutual interests of protecting tussock
landscapes and wildlife habitat, and enhancing recreational opportunities (Floate and Dennis, 2001). Now that gazettal of the Adams Wilderness Area has been achieved, incorporating several major snowfields primarily on the western side of the Main Divide, action is once again being focussed on the High Country to the east.

The High Country lands debate generally has gone a long way towards uniting RFBPS, FGNZ and FMC in a common cause. To them the High Country is public land. They consider it quite unreasonable for pastoral lessees to “lock up” numerous areas seldom used and quite unsuitable for grazing in lease agreements, particularly given the land’s high conservation and recreational values. Tenure review and the increasing presence of foreign ownership has only served to strengthen such a common bond. The three parties are now a most effective “High Country coalition”, which was initially formed in response to concerns over the land allocation process back in the mid to late 1980s. Their perceived representation of the “public” conservation and recreation interest has seen their involvement in the tenure review process more or less institutionalised by LINZ. The three organisations are now automatically sent free copies of DOC’s Conservation Resources Reports (CRRs) once LINZ decides they can be released for public comment (Barnett, 2002; Henson, 2002; Mackenzie, 2002).

FMC emphasises that coalition partners apply a “holistic” perspective to the High Country, but their principal concerns are nature conservation, public access and recreational opportunities, to be achieved primarily through the retirement of mountainous areas, and the provision of access to both them and water bodies via access easements. Particularly where a coherent theme is apparent, such as gold mining in Central Otago, strong arguments for protection on grounds of historic heritage values may be advanced. Back country huts, particularly those with a recreational history of use, are also considered to be of heritage value, while there is a desire that former mustering huts be retained for both their heritage and recreational values. Protection of historic sites at lower altitudes is, however, seldom advocated, particularly when and where the consequence of success there would be the need to forgo conservation and recreation opportunities elsewhere. As it is, the majority of homesteads and other improvements are on areas already in freehold tenure, and hence not part of the tenure review process. The existing High Country landscape is valued in itself, but its ecologically dynamic nature is also recognised. Allowing High Country ecosystems to
function naturally is accorded greater significance than protecting a pastoral farming landscape and lifestyle that is often perceived to have resulted from unsustainable use (Barnett, 2002; Henson, 2002).

NZHPT, by contrast, has yet to develop the same High Country profile. FMC in particular acknowledge they have not, yet anyway, been able to engage the organisation in such a common cause to anywhere near the extent that has been possible with fellow coalition partners (Henson, 2002). It is highly desirable that NZHPT does raise its High Country profile, and becoming part of such a coalition could be a positive step in that direction. In terms of RFBPS, FGNZ and FMC, however, it is questionable whether sufficient common ground would exist to successfully stretch an effective nature conservation-acclimatised sports fishing-outdoor recreation alliance’s brief still further to embrace historic heritage. The above would suggest that were it to succeed, a degree of compromise may be necessary to establish a coherent common purpose.

At the same time, NZHPT is aware that both the High Country coalition and its member organisations have become viewed with suspicion by runholders, due to somewhat unrealistic demands for concessions in their favour. NZHPT does, therefore, believe it may be better off pursuing its High Country initiatives alone. Both NZHPT and NZAA, whether independently or jointly involved in a project, have at times been able to establish good working relationships with landowners and generate good community support for projects in areas outside the High Country (Jacomb, 2002). How easily such success could be translated to the High Country remains to be seen. NZHPT and other historic heritage advocates do, however, face a challenging decision in terms of initiatives to increase their High Country profiles. Do they go it alone (and possibly unite together) as a single, more defined historic heritage cause, or do they seek to join the High Country Coalition? Doing the latter could provide significant scope for information and other resource sharing, including free access to CRRs if wishing to increase their participation in tenure review. Such a common association could, however, necessitate their becoming less specifically focussed on the historic heritage cause, in return for a somewhat more generic High Country profile, potentially dominated by nature conservation and outdoor recreation causes.
Particularly at the local level, NZHPT could potentially benefit from a closer working relationship with the Lake Clearwater Hut Holders Association (LCHHA). This represents the owners of baches, located on the 7.7 hectare ADC-administered “reserve” (formerly gifted) land at Lake Clearwater (see Section 3.2.4). Formed in 1966, the Association enjoys strong support from the approximately 180 hut holders, and acts primarily as a lobby group for recreational access to Lakes Clearwater and Camp. No baches have yet been identified as being of historic significance, in what is a settlement developed primarily from the 1940s onwards. Although no further baches are permitted, existing ones may be modified (Bruorton, 2002; Singleton, 2002). The settlement at this stage would appear to be neither threatened nor one of any historic heritage significance, but both scenarios could change over time.

It will be interesting to see whether concerns about perceived exclusive “squatting” on public land, as has been the case with similar settlements at Loch Katrine (Lake Sumner Forest Park) and Taylor’s Mistake (near Christchurch), will arise with respect to the Lake Clearwater Settlement. Should this in fact occur at Lake Clearwater, historic heritage conservation initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area could well be provided with both a further theme and a new ally. Past threats by DOC and territorial local authorities to remove baches elsewhere have increasingly seen the historic heritage lobby come to the support of bach owners, arguing that such structures are of historic significance. In the case of Taylor’s Mistake, RFBPS argued strongly for removal of the baches on the grounds that public foreshore land was being exclusively occupied, whereas NZHPT argued for their retention on historic heritage grounds (Hill, 2002).

Such contestability is probably less likely at Lake Clearwater, given that the reserve on which the baches are located was specifically gifted to the then Ashburton County Council for the bach settlement. In other words, the settlement has been specifically authorised, with its growth managed from the outset, rather than having resulted from unplanned “squatting” on public land. Providing the settlement can be operated in an ecologically sensitive manner, there appear no grounds for removal of the baches. The ADC has agreed to such an approach. Further expansion of the settlement is prohibited on the grounds that the reserve is fully occupied. Further expansion is seen as likely to place undue stress on the Lakes Camp and Clearwater Environment. The ADC is
particularly concerned to mitigate against threats of natural hazards, lakeside erosion and effluent disposal (ADC, 2001, p. 7.169; Singleton, 2002).

How historically significant the baches ultimately become remains to be seen. Both DOC and NZHPT consider any structure of thirty or more years to be eligible for historic heritage protection (DOC, 2000, Vol. 1, p. 165; DOC, 1998d, pp. 20, 22; Hill, 2002 [based on information from Challis, NZHPT, 2002]). If such criteria is strictly applied, a number of the Lake Clearwater baches could potentially be considered for historic heritage identification now, with more likely to be able to be so in the future. Whether or not any such structures could ultimately be considered worthy of protection would depend upon a number of criteria, including significance as a feature of the area’s history, extent and timing of modification, and uniqueness relative to similar structures elsewhere. At this stage, however, none of the baches have been identified as being of historical significance. Maintenance is, therefore, permitted to proceed subject to the ADC’s above-mentioned management for the settlement (Bruorton, 2002; Singleton, 2002).

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge could not yet be seen as an area enjoying any historic heritage tourism profile, although it is noted that both club organised and commercially operated guiding trips, taking in particularly the Ashburton Gorge, do include details of the area’s history (D[avid] Howden, 2002; D[erek] Howden, 2002; Jowett, 2002). More recent events, including the siting of a scene set on Mount Sunday for filming of the Lord of the Rings Trilogy in 2000, have enhanced the area’s public profile (Henzell, 2002; see Figure 17). Future events of this nature can only increase public interest in, and hence the desire to visit, the area. Despite the above-mentioned thirty year requirement for historic heritage designation, the range of what can be considered historic heritage is very large. Historic heritage conservation and tourism interests could potentially find themselves sharing common ground, in terms of protecting the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s historic heritage and promoting the area to visitors generally.
Figure 17. Mount Sunday: Scene Setting for Filming of the “Lord of the Rings” Trilogy

Looking west towards the Black Mountain Range (left), the Havelock-Clyde Confluence (centre) and Cloudy Peak Range (right). This prominent site in the Upper Rangitata Riverbed had a prominent scene set located on it, during filming for the famous “Lord of the Rings” Trilogy in 2000.
4.13 Other Historic Heritage Interests

Protection of historic heritage inevitably raises the “bring in here” (to keep it safe) versus “leave out there” (where it belongs) debate. The fact that many museums, libraries and other accumulators of heritage items are becoming pressed for space to house anything more means that the latter approach is one finding increasing support. It can also be far more cost effective to retain items on site, rather than have to go to the expense of relocation. At the same time, it is becoming more and more recognised that much heritage significance relates to setting. Such values risk being lost when items are removed from where they were found (Lowenthal, 1985; 1998). The ICOMS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (1995) supports retention of the historical setting of a relic to the greatest practical extent. Relocation is considered legitimate when and where the site itself is not of associated value, relocation is essential to saving the structure, or relocation provides continuity in terms of the item’s value (ICOMOS NZ, 1995, p.2).

The ICOMOS charter recognises that appropriate centralised storage is essential for some literature, records and other archival materials (ICOMOS NZ, 1995, p. 3). The Christchurch Public Library has a special collection of Samuel Butler’s literature and its critics. The Canterbury Museum holds a collection of Samuel Butler’s manuscripts, while numerous items in the biographical, original documents, art and photography and old map collections may be of relevance. The same applies with respect to land ownership records and Crown property management documentation, which may be held by either LINZ or Archives New Zealand (Adams, 2002; Shearer, 2002; Smith, 2002).

There is little doubt that unless it can be protected on site, much of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s historic heritage does risk being lost, but there are and will always remain opportunities for off-site preservation initiatives. The Geraldine Historical Society has recently sought to boost its collection of farm history items, particularly personal diaries, photographs and other “life-history” materials. The initial focus is on the Plains, given increasing property transactions and land use change brought about by the dairying boom, but the initiative could well spread into the Upper Rangitata (Jarvis, 2002). The Ashburton Museum was given custody of the Mount Harper Ice Rink’s visitors book in 2002. This could easily have become damaged
beyond repair if left on site (Hill, 2002; Horsley, 2002). In 1999, John Barton Arundel Acland’s ladder was recovered from the Upper Havelock River. Following a decision by the Acland Family at a reunion, the ladder, was handed over to the Canterbury Museum (Aubrey, 2002; Hill, 2002). In this case, the decision was between maintaining it in a setting of significance, where it would be seen by fewer people and left to decay, or removing it from its significant setting to place it in an institution, where it can be both preserved and interpreted for visitors. Such decisions are not easy to make, because there are clearly arguments in favour of both options. What is more important - setting that gives the item its significance or preservation and interpretation? The decision realistically needs to be made on a case by case basis.

It would appear that significant historical information, attained either through inheritance or personal research into aspects of the area’s history, is in private hands (Derek Howden, 2002; Hunter, 2002). There is also a potentially huge amount of relevant information at numerous sources beyond the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area itself. In order that the area’s historic heritage can be effectively and systematically researched, it is important that this be made accessible to interested persons to the greatest practical extent. Agencies themselves need to work together to achieve consistency in terms of what information remains on site and what is housed at locations elsewhere. On-site interpretation itself should identify an appropriate research trail, whereby those wishing to investigate something in greater depth can be readily directed to appropriate information sources.
5. THE HIGH COUNTRY LANDSCAPE AND ITS
HISTORIC HERITAGE: CONSERVATION INITIATIVES
IN CHANGING TIMES

5.1 Sustainable Management and Tenure Review

Passing of the Crown Pastoral Land Act (CPLA) in 1998 institutionalised an approach that had been extensively debated over the preceding twenty or more years. Before New Zealand’s environmental administration was comprehensively restructured in the mid to late 1980s, the former Land Settlement Board’s High Country Policy (1984) and former National Water and Soil Conservation Authority’s Hill and High Country Policy (1980) had attained a significant degree of consistency. Class VIII and badly eroding class VII lands, they suggested, should be retired from grazing and returned to full Crown management. Runholders would in turn be given the right to freehold what remained (LSB, 1984; NWASCA and LSB, 1985). The Resource Management Law Reform process, culminating in enactment of the RMA in 1991, brought the overarching concept of sustainable management into the debate over the High Country’s future. Reports released by the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) in 1991 (concerned primarily with the drier areas of Inland Marlborough, the Mackenzie Basin and Central Otago) and 1995 (concerned primarily with tussock burning) emphasised that the High Country needed to be more sustainably managed (PCE, 1991; 1995).

The Ministers of Conservation, Environment and Agriculture, meanwhile, convened a South Island High Country Review Working Party to progress better definition of the intended management regime and means for attaining it. Its final report of 1994 concluded that ecological considerations had to take precedence over social and economic concerns. Pastoral leasehold tenure, it suggested, had constrained initiatives by and inhibited accountability of runholders. The tenure, it acknowledged, required review, but with careful consideration being given to the most appropriate management regime for retired lands. DOC, it believed, would not necessarily be the ideal manager of certain areas with somewhat less conservation significance, where provision could be...
made to incorporate low impact seasonal grazing. Provision, it recommended, should be made for the identification of historic and cultural sites, besides landscape, nature conservation and recreational values, in terms of those areas to receive formal protection under DOC management. Above all, the need for stakeholders to work together in achieving a common goal of better High Country management was emphasised. Barrow-pushing by affected parties thus far, the Working Party argued, had only hindered progress (SIHC Review Working Party, 1994, pp. v-ix, 61-70).

The SIHC Review Working Party’s approach, in terms of involving parties co-operatively from the outset, is reasonably consistent with an IEM approach in terms of process. The decision to place ecological considerations ahead of economic and social concerns, however, suggests a move away from the balancing of ecological, social and economic concerns typical of IEM. If it is to truly co-ordinate human activities in a defined environmental system, in search of the broadest possible range of short and long term options, then the ecological, social and economic dimensions of the environment need to be considered in a balanced manner (Cairns, 1991, p. 5). The Working Party appears to have been guided somewhat by the RMA, which defines sustainable management as:

...managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while –

(a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and

(c) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment (Section 5(2), Resource Management Act 1991).

This suggests emphasis of a biophysical bottom line over and above social and economic concerns.
Tenure review, as provided for by Part 2 of the CPLA, is an extremely complex and potentially drawn-out process. The numerous links and stages are outlined in Appendix 4. Section 33 of the Act provides for reviews to be discontinued at any stage, at the pleasure of either the CCL or the runholder, meaning that potentially significant effort devoted to a particular review by interested parties may ultimately be for nothing. This emphasises the need to avoid an adversarial approach and so lose the co-operation of runholders. The opportunity to incorporate protection of historic heritage values is provided for by the Act’s definition of “inherent value”, this being:

A value arising from –
(a) A cultural, ecological, historical, recreational or scientific attribute or characteristic of a natural resource in, on, forming part of, or existing by virtue of the conformation of, the land; or
(b) A cultural, historical, recreational, or scientific attribute or characteristic of a historic place on or forming part of the land (Section. 2, Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998).

“Significant” inherent value, meanwhile, is defined as an:

... inherent value of such importance, nature, quality or rarity that the land deserves the protection of management under the Reserves Act 1977 or the Conservation Act 1987 (Section 2, Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998).

Notwithstanding subsequent feedback from interested parties, it is DOC’s responsibility to identify such areas in the first place, by way of its Conservation Resources Reports (CRRs). A standard format for these, which includes provision for identifying historic and landscape, as well as a range of natural, values, is included in the Department’s Tenure Review Pastoral Manual (DOC, 2002b; see Appendix 5).

In practice, natural heritage values dominate when it comes to identifying areas. Historic heritage and/or landscape qualities typically “add value” to sites so nominated. Unless such a feature is of national significance, it would not be likely to attain formal protection itself. Such information may, however, be used to support a case for covenanthing or protection via listing in the relevant district plan. Pastoral lease
inspections are also typically undertaken by staff with ecological management-type backgrounds. There is no guarantee that persons with historic resources expertise will necessarily be present (Hill, 2002; Stewart, 2002).

In terms of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, the process is in its early stages. Six CRRs have been completed, with runholder consultation underway on four of these. Work is yet to commence on a further eight properties, while three are already freehold land. In actual fact, progress to date has been more rapid in respect of the former University endowment lands. Tenure review in respect of these is now completed.

Although many specific details remain confidential at this stage, indications are that historic heritage has received little consideration in the CRRs. In terms of the overall area to pass to DOC, this is presently difficult to estimate beyond what has typically been a sixty per cent resumption of pastoral lease land by the Crown for those High Country areas where tenure review has been completed. Progress to date is illustrated in Figure 16. It is likely that retirement of land will be greater in the higher western foothills of the Ashburton Gorge and southern back ranges of the Upper Rangitata. DOC hopes the process will be completed by 2008, but acknowledges this could be optimistic, given the complexities of tenure review afford huge potential for slippage. At this stage at least, it appears unlikely that any presently identified historic sites will pass to DOC, because those identified to date are typically on lower altitude areas likely to be freeholded if not already done so (Stewart, 2002).

Figure 18. Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area: Map of Conservation Estate and Pastoral Leases (over page)

Most of the conservation estate shown has been managed by the Department since its inception, although the Harper Range was surrendered from the former University of Canterbury endowment lands. The Hakatere surrender is close to being finalised, but exact boundaries have yet to be formally agreed to (Stewart, 2002).

Source: DOC (2002a).
5.2 Possible Changes in Land Use and Lifestyle

Lack of progress with tenure review thus far means its potential impact on land use and lifestyles in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area can only be speculated on at this stage. Given tenure review will inevitably reduce the size of properties, however, opportunities to intensify and diversify use on what remains will realistically be sought. Viability of options will itself be a function of soil fertility, market conditions and planning controls imposed. Pastoral lease tenure only affords rights to pasturage, there being no right to disturb the soil by cultivation.

This impediment notwithstanding, changes in the High Country landscape have been ongoing, and did accelerate somewhat following passage of the Land Act in 1948. Consistent with the Act’s encouragement of a more managed approach, runholders were increasingly permitted to plant shelter belts and use introduced grasses on the lower areas, At the same time, the then Catchment Boards increasingly encouraged runholders to concentrate their farming activity on the river flats and valleys, in return for retiring badly eroding, mountainous areas from grazing. This progressively led to the “green below, brown above” scenario, relative to a line around approximately 1,000 metres (Henson, 2002).

The cost-effectiveness of options would need to be investigated to determine likely possible scenarios, and such an exercise is beyond the scope of this report. In terms of visual impacts, however, commercial forestry would appear to be the land use most likely to impact on the visual amenity to any significant extent. Exotic trees are already present in the area, particularly around homesteads. As discussed in Section 4.10, Forest Creek Station has been authorised to plant Douglas Firs in a contoured regime, but there is no evidence of further demands for large scale exotic tree planting rights in the area as yet. Major commercial plantations would significantly alter existing scenic vistas, particularly if their extent, location and species were not sufficiently regulated. This reinforces the need to retain protection of outstanding landscapes through appropriate district plan provisions.

Desirable as this may be, it must be recognised that tenure review inevitably implies a trade-off. In surrendering the higher altitude lands and other areas with significant
inherent values to the conservation cause, it can only be expected that the then former runholders will anticipate greater freedom of choice in terms of managing their properties. District plans may be varied, and the RMA requires councils to consider the perspectives of potentially competing interest groups in coming to decisions over resource consents. This emphasises the importance of stakeholders working together to achieve the best possible outcome in planning for the area’s future. Certainly if the present situation is anything to go by, protection of most of the area’s remaining historic heritage items will require the goodwill of landowners. Attaining this can be challenging but is not impossible, providing stakeholders are willing to involve themselves and other affected parties in the planning process from the outset.

Potential lifestyle changes are even more difficult to speculate on without knowing the likely changes in land use with any real certainty. Many would argue, however, that just as the landscape is constantly but incrementally changing, so to are the lifestyles of its inhabitants. After all, significant changes in the lives of the area’s residents have occurred since the first runholders moved into the area less than 150 years ago. Only one thing is certain and that is that change will inevitably take place. Its nature and extent will be dependent upon a number of environmental, social and economic factors impinging on the lives of those who call the Upper Rangitata or Ashburton Gorge home. Just as the history books of today recall with gratitude or regret how life was back then, the historian a century or more on will similarly look back to this present time in analysing what critical events and decisions ultimately shaped “where to from here”.
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### 5.3 Mechanisms for Protecting Historic Heritage

Legislative provisions for the protection of historic heritage are detailed in Table 4.

Table 4. *Historic Heritage Protection: Statutory Mechanisms Available*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Historic Places Act 1993 | • Historic places (land [including archaeological sites], buildings, structures - in whole or part or in combination)  
• Historic area (interrelated group of historic places)  
• Wahi tapu (place sacred to Maori)  
• Wahi tapu area (area containing one or more wahi tapu) |
| Sec 5: Heritage Orders | NZHPT may require territorial local authority to provide one to cover either historic place, historic area, wahi tapu or wahi tapu area, or area immediately adjacent to one of these |
| Sec 6: Heritage Covenant | Negotiated by NZHPT with owner |
| Secs 9-10: Archaeological Sites | Must apply to NZHPT to destroy, damage or modify |
| Secs 22-37: Registration | • Of any historic place, historic area, wahi tapu or wahi tapu area  
• Categories I (special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value) and II (historical or cultural heritage significance or value) apply to historic places |
| Secs 97-104: Offences | To destroy damage of modify any:  
• Historic place, historic area, wahi tapu, wahi tapu area under the control of or vested in NZHPT  
• Area subject to a heritage covenant  
• Any archaeological site |
| NB: | Registration of areas as historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu or wahi tapu areas does not imply ownership (must be separately vested in NZHPT, or NZHPT specifically asked to control and manage) |
| Resource Management Act 1991 | Includes (e) Recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, buildings, places or areas |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Matters to be Considered by Regional Council (when preparing regional plans)</td>
<td>Includes (2)(c)(iia) Relevant entry in the Historic Places Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Matters to be Considered by Territorial Authority (when preparing district plans)</td>
<td>Includes (2)(b)(iia) Relevant entry in the Historic Places Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187-198: Heritage Orders</td>
<td>Provided for in District Plan (at request of Heritage Protection Authority)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administered by “Heritage Protection Authority” (Minister of the Crown, local authority, NZHPT, body corporate may become one)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in district plans, with their provisions overriding those of plans and resource consents in relation to the area covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Plans</td>
<td>Specific site listings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Plans</td>
<td>Specific site listings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reserves Act 1977**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Historic Reserves</td>
<td>Primarily set apart to protect places and/or things of historic, archaeological, cultural, educational, related interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Recreation Reserves</td>
<td>Historic, archaeological, cultural, educational, related interests may be protected compatible with reserve’s primary purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Scenic Reserves</td>
<td>Local purpose can include cemetery reserves eg. Dr Sinclair’s grave site (presently an unclassified “cemetery reserve”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nature Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Scientific Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Government Purpose Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Local Purpose Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Protected Private Land</td>
<td>May be entirely for or inclusive of historic, cultural, archaeological and/or related purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Conservation Covenants</td>
<td>May be entirely for or inclusive of landscape amenity, historical and/or related purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Nga Whenua Rahui Kawanata</td>
<td>May be entirely or inclusively for landscape amenity, historical and/or related purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual/cultural association of Maori important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applies to Maori land and/or Crown land under lease to Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Act 1987</td>
<td>Natural and/or historic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 23: Amenity Areas</td>
<td>• Definition of “conservation” includes natural and historic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can conserve historic resources compatible with area’s primary purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 19: Conservation Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 20: Wilderness Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 21: Ecological Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 22: Sanctuary Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 23: Watercourse Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 24: Marginal Strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 61: Specially Protected Former State Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec 62: Stewardship Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 27: Covenants</td>
<td>• For “conservation purposes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation includes natural and historic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 27A: Nga Whenua Rahui Kawenata</td>
<td>• Natural and historic values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maori spiritual and cultural values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applies to Maori land and/or Crown land under lease to Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 28: Resources Other Than Land</td>
<td>• May be acquired for “conservation” purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation includes natural and historic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 29: Management Agreements</td>
<td>May be entered into to facilitate the conservation of natural and historic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Zealand Walkways Act 1990               |                                                                         |
| Sec 3: General Purpose                     | Includes enjoyment of “natural pastoral beauty and historical and cultural qualities” of areas passed through |
| Sec 6: Walkways Over Public Land           | Above-mentioned purpose applies                                        |
| Sec 7: Walkways Over Private Land          | Above-mentioned purpose applies                                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2: Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 22: Open Space Covenants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998

Sec 2: Interpretation

“Inherent value” includes:

- A cultural, ecological, historical, recreational or scientific attribute or characteristic of a natural resource in, on, forming part of, or existing by virtue of the conformation of, the land; or

- A cultural, historical, recreational, or scientific attribute or characteristic of a historic place on or forming part of the land

“Significant” such values deserve protection under the Conservation Act 1987 or Reserves Act 1977

Non-Statutory

| Conservation Plans | Site-specific restoration plans, prepared in accordance with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value |

Source: ICOMOS NZ (1995); Acts as listed.

The above table suggests that legislation itself is not lacking when it comes to provisions for the protection of historic heritage. The Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA) provides for heritage covenants, site registration, archaeological site recognition and heritage orders. Of critical significance is the fact that registration of an historic place or area neither implies NZHPT jurisdiction over the site nor guarantees its protection. Rather, the Trust must have the site vested in it or be asked to specifically control and manage it. Only by these means or covenanting does it then become an offence to damage or destroy such places or areas. It is only archaeological sites that are given automatic protection, (ie. irrespective of tenure and management arrangements), under the HPA. As discussed in Section 3.3.1, listing of a registered historic place or area in a regional or district plan, while a statutory requirement, is also no guarantee in itself that the site will not be modified or destroyed. Ultimate protection in this instance is a function of the plan’s wording and its interpretation by the council concerned (Hill, 2002).
Heritage orders, as provided for in both the HPA and RMA, are potentially complex. Section 5 of the HPA permits either the Minister for Culture and Heritage or NZHPT to require a territorial local authority to seek a heritage order over an historic place, historic area, wahi tapu or wahi tapu area. (Pursuant to Section 2 of the HPA, wahi tapu is defined as a “place sacred to Maori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual or mythological sense”, with wahi tapu area being an area containing one or more wahi tapu sites). The Heritage order provisions themselves are found in Sections 187 to 198 of the RMA. Ministers of the Crown, territorial local authorities, NZHPT or bodies corporate may become heritage protection authorities (on successful application to the Minister for the Environment), in order to assume responsibility for the site to which a heritage order applies. Heritage orders are notified in district plans, with the site offered protection irrespective of other plan provisions. In other words, the heritage protection authority must give permission for the site to be modified. Provision even exists, pursuant to Section 197 of the RMA, for compulsory acquisition of sites subject to heritage protection orders. Such acquisitions are almost certain, however, to be subject to compensation. As it is, the entire heritage order process is a potentially very costly one for the heritage protection authority concerned, given the high probability of lengthy legal proceedings involved in concluding the case. There is also no guarantee that the outcome will be in the authority’s favour.

Protection mechanisms are otherwise scattered across several different Acts. Protection responsibility rests primarily with DOC, NZHPT or district councils. While DOC administers the Acts, procedures such as appointments to control and manage and vestings under the Reserves Act 1977 mean that management authority can be delegated. The Reserves Act 1977 provides for historic reserves, while other specific reserves can include protection of historic heritage compatible with the primary purpose for which the reserve was set aside. The latter applies similarly to a range of designations under the Conservation Act 1987, covenant-type arrangements provided for under both the Conservation Act 1987 and Reserves Act 1977, and access agreements under the Walkways Act 1990. The primary purpose of land protection, covenanted or easement agreements in these cases is typically in relation to nature conservation and/or recreational access.
The Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977 is also administered by DOC, but its covenanting provisions are the responsibility of the QEII Trust itself. Given DOC is not directly involved (although its staff do seek to co-operate and work with the Trust on various projects) and local Trust representatives are often from the rural sector, open space covenanting pursuant to Section 22 the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977 may alienate runholders less than protection mechanisms directly involving DOC or NZHPT. The Trust appears to have established a good rapport with lowland and hill country farmers, and is keen to increase its presence in the High Country. As discussed in Section 4.4, however, the Trust does not yet see historic heritage conservation as its responsibility. Despite the mention of “cultural” in the definition of open space (Section 2, Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977), the Trust sees its principal responsibilities as being natural heritage conservation and associated landscape protection (Molloy, 2002; QEII Trust, 2001a, pp. 1-3, 32; see Section 4.4).

The CPLA identifies areas as worthy of protection under the Conservation Act 1987 or Reserves Act 1977, as part of the tenure review process. Notwithstanding the inclusion of natural and historic heritage in the definition of “inherent value” (Section 2, CPLA), CRRs completed for tenure review proposals thus far have focussed strongly on natural heritage values (see Section 5.1). “Conservation plans” have no statutory backing themselves. Rather, they are plans to guide site-specific restoration initiatives, consistent with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (1995). It is desirable that such plans be completed for at least those sites of significant historic heritage value (ICOMOS NZ, 1995, p. 3).

The almost total absence of historic heritage protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area would suggest such opportunities are being grossly under utilised. The obvious first step is to attain such opportunities, and this is difficult without the co-operation of existing resource managers. Notwithstanding this, it would appear that DOC should seek to better incorporate the historic heritage dimension into its tenure review initiatives, while NZHPT needs to raise its profile in the area. Critical to such initiatives bearing fruit, however, is the creation of an environment where stakeholders representing a diverse range of interests can come together and develop a more integrated approach to the area’s management as a whole. An IEM approach could
go a long way towards meeting this end. If it is to succeed, however, there needs to be a clear sense of direction.

Providing direction in terms of historic heritage conservation initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area would be facilitated considerably by deciding upon the best possible legislative option to achieve the desired goal. The above-mentioned range of options needs to be thoroughly sifted through, in a consultative and informative manner, in order to ascertain the relative efficiencies of, preferences for and difficulties with each of them. Such a task is significant and impossible to attempt within the confines of this study. Conclusion of the Historic Heritage Management Review (HHMR) of 1998-1999, however, could be an important step in this process.

5.4 The Historic Heritage Management Review

The HHMR was a response to the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment’s (PCE) report *Historic and Cultural Heritage Management in New Zealand* (PCE, 1996). The report followed complaints to the PCE, from individuals, Iwi and community groups about New Zealand’s historic and cultural heritage management system. The report concluded that the system was performing poorly, due to a lack of integrated management and insufficient policy direction. Principal recommendations included the establishment of a separate culture and heritage portfolio, development of a national strategy for culture and heritage (by the proposed new agency), recognition of heritage as a matter of national importance under the RMA, and the transfer of principal responsibility for heritage protection (as opposed to identification and assessment, which would remain with the HPA) to the RMA. The management framework at the time, including DOC, NZHPT, the Department of Internal Affairs, MFE and regional and local authorities was seen to be lacking the co-ordination and direction necessary to promote effective historic and cultural heritage management (PCE, 1996, pp. 91-99).

DOC, being the agency responsible for administering the HPA at the time, released the document *Historic Heritage Management Review: A Discussion Paper for Public Comment* (DOC, 1998a) in January 1998. This put forward four possible options, including status quo (under which heritage management responsibilities would remain
split between the RMA and HPA in terms of legislation, and DOC, NZHPT and the Department of Internal Affairs as management agencies), small modification (including a national policy statement for heritage, and greater interaction between both NZHPT and local authorities as managers, and the HPA and RMA processes), a more centralised model (giving the proposed new agency a “hands-on” management role) or what it called the “RMA model” (under which the RMA would be the sole focus for heritage protection, which would rest primarily with regional and local authorities (DOC, 1998a, pp. 42-44). The report received 961 written submissions and considerable oral feedback at specially convened public meetings and hui (Maori gatherings). Support for a single Crown heritage management agency, with rationalisation of heritage protection mechanisms within the RMA, was apparent (DOC, 1998c, pp. 7-8). This was reflected in the document **Historic Heritage Management Review: Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee** (DOC, 1998b). Besides the two principal findings from the submissions, a national policy statement (NPS) for historic heritage was advocated DOC, 1998b, pp. 29-30). Public submissions on the Ministerial Advisory Committee’s report were then sought. A total of 637 submissions were received, with support for the Committee’s recommendations apparent (DOC, 1999, p. 6).

Notwithstanding a seemingly clear mandate, subsequent progress has been limited. To an extent this has been due to the tortuous process involved in considering the RMA Amendment Bill of 1999, which did include provisions to supposedly implement the review’s findings. After more than three years, what is a significant Amendment (covering a number of issues besides heritage) has still not been passed. Although both MFE and MCH envisage the Bill will be passed “soon”, no specific date has been given. Heritage is likely to be recognised as a matter of “national importance”, pursuant to Section 6 of the RMA (it is presently an “other matter” pursuant to Section 7), but it is apparent that the Government no longer wishes to transfer archaeological controls from the HPA to the RMA, or alter the statutory role of NZHPT (McKenzie, 2002; MFE, 2002). The small, policy-oriented MCH was established in 2000, but unless pushed to do so by MFE, it has no intention of producing an NPS for heritage. At this stage anyway, MCH believes the task is too expensive in terms of staff time and operating finance to be justified, and feels it is really over to MFE to co-ordinate the process should such an NPS be desired (McKenzie, 2002).
Certainly at this stage and definitely at an operational level, the HHMR appears to be the case of an initiative that promised much but delivered little. NZHPT’s oversight has been moved from an operationally focussed DOC to the highly centralised MCH, which has yet to provide the national direction envisaged. Raising heritage to a matter of national importance in the RMA can only be of benefit in itself. Implementing procedures to give effect to this will not be easy, however, without the more comprehensive overhaul of legislation initially envisaged. What remains for those seeking to enhance heritage conservation initiatives in areas such as the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge is a plethora of legislation, which needs significant rationalisation to find the best practical option to achieve more integrated and consistent management of historic and cultural heritage in New Zealand.

5.5 Nature Conservation Initiatives and Runholder Frustrations

If progress is to be made in terms of better protecting the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge’s historic heritage, then much needs to be learned from difficulties encountered in efforts to protect natural heritage. As discussed in Section 4.7, the ADC has been forced to compromise in terms of the number and extent of ASNCVs it initially intended to include in its District Plan. The source of that problem, however, went back further. Because the Council based such decisions on the RAPs (as advocated by the former Department of Lands and Survey in the PNA report and DOC in its subsequent District Plan submissions), it assumed that these had been proposed in consultation with runholders. In fact this turned out not to be the case. Promises by DOC and the former Department of Lands and Survey of informed consultation following surveys had either not or only superficially been followed up on. Most runholders had no idea of the extent of areas involved until the draft District Plan was released. The ADC has consequently been left with a significant mediating role to play in progressing nature conservation in the Ashburton Gorge (Singleton, 2002). This unfortunate consequence is a legacy of the failure to undertake the comprehensive consultation phase of an IEM approach (Born and Sonzogni, 1995, p. 170). A more informative and inclusive process at the beginning would have prevented the subsequent impasse from developing.
The TDC appears to have learned from such difficulties. It has sought to involve stakeholders from the outset by setting up the Rural 3 Working Party to develop what ultimately became Variation No.18 to the Proposed Timaru District Plan (TDC, 2001; 2002a; 2002b; see Section 4.8). Although the process itself cannot be judged a success or failure until such time as the SNAs have been established, the consequence of a more inclusive and informed approach to identifying such areas is likely to see DOC, runholders and other interested parties at least more aware of each other’s positions. The stakeholders are thus more likely to remain confident that their concerns will continue to be taken into account throughout the process. Runholder frustration with heritage conservation initiatives is typically not in terms of conservation per se, but the way in which such initiatives are undertaken (Chapman, 2002). If historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area is to be achieved without major conflict, it is crucial that runholders and other interested parties be included in the process from the outset.

5.6 Integrated Environmental Management: A Possible Solution?

Historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge must be advanced within the context of a range of other management issues affecting the area and involving a diverse range of stakeholders. An IEM approach takes account of such complexities and inter-linkages, recognising that to progress such intentions alongside those aspirations of other interest groups requires trade-offs in terms of opportunities and directions (Margerum and Born, 1995, pp. 377-379, 385-386). The best course of action needs to be decided on, and not all decisions made in this regard can possibly be to the absolute satisfaction of everyone involved. By involving all affected stakeholders and taking the range of possible opportunities into account from the outset, however, at least all will know that their perspectives have been considered in the context of a wider resource management picture (Born and Sonzogni, 1995, p. 171).

What is effectively stage one in the implementation of an IEM process inevitably raises the question of how such a process is to be effectively worked through. The TDC has opted for a working party approach, in terms of Plan Variation No 18 (TDC 2002a;
In this way, interested parties were able to participate in a process co-ordinated by Council itself as an effective “neutral” agency. Historic heritage management is, by nature, a conservation-oriented concern, which makes it difficult for any agency with a specific resource protection mandate to co-ordinate an IEM process, particularly when it involves a diverse range of stakeholders including farming and other development interests. Pursuant to the RMA, both regional councils and territorial local authorities are expected to balance the potentially competing demands of conservation and development in implementing a wise and integrated resource management regime. This makes them well placed to take on a co-ordinating role in this regard. The working party approach appeals as one in which interested stakeholders can play a part, but unless it is well managed, the process can be costly and time-consuming, with no guarantee of ultimate success (Cairns, 1991, pp. 13-19). An alternative approach could be to place co-ordinating responsibility in the hands of a “neutral” person. Such a person would, however, require the trust of stakeholders involved to take a balanced perspective in terms of goals pursued and issues arising. The person would also require significant standing, both amongst the community and across a range of highly divergent stakeholder interests, in order to be given the trust and support necessary to advance the process.

Because it inherently separates protective from productive land uses, tenure review tends to convey the idea that such uses are incompatible and must not be allowed to conflict with each other. Common sense would suggest that most farming activity can be better undertaken on the more fertile and accessible river flats and lower valleys, with the steeper, more erosion prone upper valleys and mountainous areas better devoted to the conservation cause. Taking this to the absolute extreme, however, will only see the conservation estate continue to be unrepresentative of New Zealand’s range of ecosystems generally, and runholders continually frustrated at having to concede what they regard as quite compatible opportunities in terms of less intensively grazing some higher areas. Conservation, recreation and other interests, meanwhile, will be faced with continual battles to protect lowland ecosystems, negotiate public access and conserve historic heritage and landscape values, against farmers quite legitimately able to argue “we’ve given you what you wanted higher up, you can’t have it both ways” (J. and R. Acland, 2002; W and L. Burdon, 2002).
As previously discussed, almost all the area’s sites of historic significance are on lands unlikely to pass to DOC management via tenure review. If their future is to be assured, it is essential that DOC, NZHPT and others with an interest in their conservation develop sound working relationships with runholders. The same applies in terms of protecting what are likely to become the more intensively farmed areas of the High Country landscape. By seeking to unite an area’s stakeholders together in considering the wider resource management picture, IEM offers a useful means to this end.

In terms of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge, there are both challenges to and opportunities for an IEM approach. Certainly in terms of the Ashburton Gorge, there is a need for DOC especially to win back the trust of runholders. Given the District Plan was only finalised in 2001, it is early days yet in terms of reconciliation initiatives being undertaken by the ADC with respect to the ASNCVs. The initiative, however, is a good one. Once the ADC believes that sufficient progress has been made, it would be appropriate to consider broadening the perspective of this into a wider resource management planning focus group for the Ashburton Gorge. DOC, NZHPT and others with an interest in the area’s historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection should then be able to become involved, alongside others promoting their specific interests. ADC should be well placed to continue convening such a group in a neutral manner.

In terms of the Upper Rangitata, TDC appears to have implicitly begun an IEM type of approach with respect to progressing nature conservation and landscape protection initiatives. Even if the approach may not have been strictly founded on IEM theory per se, and the issue of concern is specifically in terms of protecting SNAs and outstanding landscapes, the desire to involve affected stakeholders has been apparent from the outset (TDC, 2001; 2002b). By including representatives from NZHPT and local interest groups, the working group’s focus could be broadened to incorporate an historic heritage dimension.

Both the ADC and TDC would be well advised to consider initiatives used by the Selwyn District Council in compiling the list of heritage items for its District Plan during the mid to late 1990s. A draft schedule was compiled in 1995, from both Council knowledge and community nominations. The sites were then assessed with the
assistance of consultants. Opportunities for informed debate were provided at two specific public meetings and further with individual landowners on site if necessary. The focus was primarily on built heritage, and included evaluations on the basis of physical and architectural design, historical association, environmental setting and integrity of the feature concerned. Although it is likely that much detail was selectively conveyed, particularly in terms of less visible items and more remote locations, the process of listing was undertaken in an informed, consultative manner. Meeting participants and individuals followed up had both the assessment criteria and intended heritage rules explained to them. The consequence was that potential adverse reaction to initial and revised listings was reduced significantly, because the community could feel a sense of informed participation in decisions on both the definition of and management directions for the District’s heritage (Nahkies, 2002).

It is desirable that the Ashburton and Timaru District Council-convened groups, with respect to the Ashburton Gorge and Upper Rangitata respectively, maintained dialogue to achieve a degree of consistency in their approaches. In terms of a trans-Rangitata River co-ordinator, should this ultimately prove to be necessary, Environment Canterbury, as catchment manager, would appear best placed to take on such a neutral and integrative responsibility.

5.7 Social Capital: Possible Support Through Landcare Groups

By its very nature, IEM involves a range of government agencies, regional and local authorities, NGOs and other interested parties in the planning process. This can be a crucial problem in implementing an IEM approach effectively in areas such as the High Country. As discussed in Section 4.10, runholders are keen to minimise bureaucratic involvement in resource use decision making, preferring instead to see locally developed institutional capacity harnessed when and where possible. If runholders are to be encouraged to support historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection initiatives in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area, it is important that their local organisational capacity be both recognised and utilised at the operational level to the greatest practical extent.
As noted in Section 4.10, a strong Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group (RGLG) exists, but the equivalent is yet to be replicated in terms of the Ashburton Gorge. Indications are that a greater sense of common purpose is felt amongst runholders of the Upper Rangitata, whereas a correspondingly greater sense of independence is felt between those of the Ashburton Gorge. Further research would be required to ascertain exactly why this is. One argument advanced is the relatively greater residential stability in the Upper Rangitata, although both it and the Ashburton Gorge appear to have a range of long term residents and recent arrivals (J. and R. Acland, 2002; Cornelius, 2002; Grigg, 2002; W. and L. Burdon, 2002). Potential explanations and their justification, however, are numerous, and a comprehensive investigation, which is not possible here, would be required to ascertain the reason(s) beyond doubt.

The RGLG’s recent award-winning broom control initiative (see Section 4.10) has encouraged involvement from those runholders at the western end of the Ashburton Gorge. The Group, therefore, appears to have the potential to both co-ordinate local resource management initiatives successfully and generate support for them beyond its boundaries. Due to previous station management associations of certain personnel, there remains a degree of common bonding across the Rangitata River, between Mt Potts and Erewhon Stations to the north, and Mesopotamia and The Tui Stations to the South. This linkage is somewhat reminiscent of Samuel Butler’s days, and seems to have never quite been lost. Both communities also rally to help each other in times of critical need, such as snow raking of stock in major snowfalls. It is intended that both the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge be banded together on a common radio network in the near future (J. and R. Acland, 2002; Grigg, 2002; NZLT, 2002a). Possible options for the Ashburton Gorge would be to join the RGLG, form its own specific landcare group or perhaps join the Foothills Landcare Group centred on the Alford Forest area. Such a decision is one for the Ashburton Gorge runholders to make, both in terms of whether or not such an initiative is needed in their area and if so, which of the three options is the best one. The RGLG, however, appears well placed to advise the Gorge runholders in this regard.

Whether the RGLG would have the desire to diversify its activities into historic heritage conservation remains to be seen. Landcare groups receive logistical support from the New Zealand Landcare Trust (NZLT). The organisation was established as an MFE
initiative in 1996, but is an independent body overseen by seven trustee organisations, including Federated Farmers, Rural Women of New Zealand, FGNZ, FMC, RFBPS, the Ecologic Foundation and the Federation of Maori Authorities. It receives funding from both MFE’s Sustainable Management Fund and corporate sponsorship. The Trust works with community-based landcare groups to encourage both sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation on private land. Specific projects promoted by the Trust include Integrated Catchment Management, which is itself an IEM-type project, given its catchment focus and involvement of landowners and other stakeholders in implementing a sustainable management approach across catchments concerned. This initiative was only commenced in late 2001, and its finer logistics are still being worked on. NZLT is seeking to increase its commitment to High Country-based landcare groups. Sustainable management and biodiversity conservation are expected to remain the principal focus. NZLT does not see historic heritage conservation as a Landcare Trust function in itself, but would be supportive of landcare groups incorporating such initiatives, to the extent that they are compatible with their principal ecological focus (NZLT 2002a; 2002b; Washington, 2002).

If its members can be encouraged to recognise the benefits that could result from historic heritage conservation, the RGLG would appear well placed to take the initiative at the grassroots level. Convincing them of such benefits, in terms of potential raising of the area’s profile and the consequent opportunities through heritage tourism and its possible spin-offs, will be an important task for the historic heritage management agencies and other interested stakeholders. Significant potential exists to better interpret the area’s heritage to visitors, on the basis of themes such as Samuel Butler, early pastoral development and alpine recreation. Careful planning would be necessary, however, to ensure that the extent of profile and consequent visitation would be at levels the area’s residents felt comfortable with.

5.8 Other Initiatives and Their Advocates

A potential “catch 22” situation exists with respect to historic heritage conservation and its benefits. Raising the profile of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area’s historic heritage will realistically generate greater public interest in the area. Many, however,
value the area for what it is, in terms of a less readily accessible, less well known area, where visitors can attain a semi-wilderness experience for all but perhaps the summer season immediately adjacent to Lakes Camp and Clearwater (Grigg, 2002). At the same time, however, to not raise the area’s historic heritage profile could see historic sites and the wider cultural landscape they are an integral part of all too easily lost. It is important, therefore, that a range of different practical options be considered.

DOC and NZHPT, as the two management agencies involved, face a significant challenge in terms of “where to from here”? It is apparent that DOC is no longer expected nor resourced to play a major role in advocating the historic heritage cause off the conservation estate (Hill, 2002). That inevitably places greater responsibility on NZHPT, but protection via the HPA, the RMA or district plan provisions is ineffective without runholder co-operation (see Section 5.3). Besides reiterating the need for an IEM approach as advocated in Section 5.6, with possible backing from the RGLG as discussed in Section 5.7, the situation also necessitates a willingness to be innovative in the interests of making progress.

The Mount Somers Walkway Society (MSWS) focuses its attention primarily on the Mount Somers Sub-Alpine Walkway itself and adjacent Mount Somers area, but its members have a strong interest in especially the Ashburton Gorge area. Members agree that DOC and NZHPT can only progress historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area with the co-operation of runholders, who themselves typically know the area well and have potentially much to contribute in terms of personal knowledge and access to features of significance. At least as an interim approach, the MSWS suggests extending the existing Mount Somers Historic Trail (perhaps as the Hakatere Historic Trail) from its present conclusion at Woolshed Creek to the end of both the Hakatere-Potts and Hakatere-Heron Roads. Four to five appropriately located interpretive panels, the Society suggests, would probably be sufficient to tell the area’s story in a succinct way, without intrusion onto private property. The existing Trail’s interpretive panels are typically roadside located (David Howden, 2002; Jowett, 2002). While greater protection may be desired in the longer term, such an initiative would at least be a positive start. A potential spin-off could be the encouragement of greater support for subsequent initiatives, which may be more costly and/or require the co-operation of runholders. DOC has installed panels interpreting the area’s wildlife values at several
sites around the Ashburton Lakes. The MSWS’s initiative would provide useful complementary information for visitors on the area’s history.

It should be pointed out that the Mount Somers Historic Trail, as created by the MSWS (with sponsorship from the Mount Somers Tavern and DOC assistance with graphics), is not a “heritage trail” *per se*. The design of heritage trails is overseen by the Heritage Trails Foundation (HTF), established in 1989. This charitable organisation is overseen by trustees, representing territorial local authorities and regional tourism organisations. Any group wishing to establish a heritage trail can purchase their membership of the Foundation, which will in turn assist with the development of standard signs and route guides. NZHPT, territorial local authorities, the New Zealand Automobile Association and the tourism industry all participated in developing the concept, which aims to promote both heritage awareness and heritage tourism through a consistent brand of site interpretation. Interpretation panels can include descriptions of the wider landscape, besides the immediate site’s historical association, although historic heritage, as opposed to cultural landscapes *per se*, is the principal theme of the interpretation (Collier and Harraway, 2001, p. 103; Evans, 1993, p. 148; McLean, 2000a, pp. 88-89). Formalising the present or even extended Mount Somers Historic Trail as a heritage trail does not appear necessary unless the local community feels it wants or needs the HTF’s oversight. Such a decision would require an analysis of the costs and benefits involved.

A similar such initiative could be possible for the Upper Rangitata, in terms of an historic or heritage trail including both Mount Peel and the Rangitata Gorge. No such trail presently exists in respect of the Gorge or Mount Peel, so assistance from the HTF would be an option if the initiative could not be implemented locally. A possibility could be an inclusive “Samuel Butler Heritage Trail” (*Montgomery, 2002*). Given the high profile of Butler’s name, the nationally consistent approach provided by the HTF would be desirable. To be true to its name (in relation to Samuel Butler’s area of influence), such a trail would realistically need to include the Upper Rangitata and the Ashburton Gorge, and probably even the Upper Rakaia. How supportive the HTF would be of what would at least initially be a trail of three physically separate sections would be interesting. Should linkage be desirable, both a road through the Lake Stream area and a bridge across the Rangitata Headwaters, would appear to be very optimistic
proposals at this stage. Such a bridge, together with sealed roads through both areas, would certainly facilitate accessibility to, and hence greater appreciation of, the area’s historic heritage, cultural landscape, and other values. Again, however, it is questionable whether such enhanced accessibility would be in the best interests of retaining the area’s existing semi-wilderness qualities, meaning any such proposal would require very careful consideration. In any case, upgraded road access and bridging in the area is an issue that would encompass a range of concerns far wider than historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection. Any such proposal would need to be subject to a comprehensive environmental impact assessment and thorough cost-benefit analysis, taking into account a wide range of issues and interests, before proceeding.

Whether or not the “protected landscapes” concept (Foster, 1988; Lucas, 1992; see Section 1.6.2) could be considered as a management approach requires significant further research. Its approach of essentially “protecting what is there” and “retaining it the way it is” does permit production activities, such as pastoral farming, to continue, consistent with provision for public recreation and protection of the existing natural environment and landscape. As discussed in Section 1.6.2, the concept was developed by the IUCN, primarily as an alternative form of protection to the more stringent (in terms of criteria applying to naturalness and absence of human influence) national park designation. Its intentions are thus inherently biophysical, although the landscapes to which it has been applied have tended to be strongly culturally influenced. It can, therefore be seen as an approach that has historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection intentions at heart.

Whether it would find favour with runholders, however, would be the critical issue. Tenure review includes in it the notion that runholders can expect greater freedom to “get on and modernise” on those areas ultimately freeholded to them. They are unlikely to appreciate being “museumised” into maintaining a status quo operation irrespective of market conditions. Such practices are realistically far easier in Europe, where the concept has been principally applied thus far. Farmers there often enjoy significant government subsidies. Particularly since their abuse (for vote catching purposes) in the late 1970s and early 1980s, subsidies in New Zealand agriculture have been strongly denounced by Government and the rural sector. At the same time, even European
countries, faced with the need to modernise farming irrespective of subsidies, are finding it difficult to retain extensive areas under the protected landscapes designation (Primdahl, 2002).

Runholders are also unlikely to favour opening their gates to unrestricted public access, fearing potential adverse impacts on farming operations if trespass rights were lost. Again, their argument is likely to be that if the conservation and recreation lobbies get their way in the mountains, they must expect farmers to retain quiet enjoyment to what remains at lower altitudes. Should introduction of the protected landscapes concept be contemplated, the situation would realistically be an “either, or” scenario. Either tenure review would continue to be pursued or the protected landscapes concept would be introduced. It would be unreasonable and unrealistic to expect runholders to have their properties made subject to both such requirements. Although tenure review has not progressed in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge to the extent it has in many High Country areas, it has probably gone too far for there to be an about face now. Conservation and outdoor recreation groups themselves are also strongly in favour of retired lands passing into the public conservation estate, and unlikely to support any compromise in this regard.

In summary, the protected landscapes concept should not be entirely dismissed as an option for the area, but it is likely to require considerable discussion amongst affected parties and significant modification to suit local conditions. It could be argued that initiatives by the ADC and TDC to protect regionally significant and outstanding landscapes via district planning provisions (see Section 3.3.2) incorporate elements of the concept to some extent. This approach is aimed, however, at the broader, landscape scale, primarily for the protection of scenic vistas which qualify the landscapes for such recognition. While such provisions afford some protection to the cultural landscape generally, specific initiatives are still required to protect historic heritage at the site-specific level.

A potentially huge range of financial incentives, in terms of criteria and source, either exist or potentially could be developed to reward runholders and others for heritage protection initiatives. A very thorough analysis of qualifying criteria for existing funding, and technicalities in terms of establishing new schemes would be required to
ascertain precisely what specific opportunities exist, and which would be the best practical option to pursue. Such a lengthy and technical task is not possible here. It is desirable, however, that DOC, NZHPT, MCH and other agencies responsible for protecting historic heritage consider High Country areas and initiatives in the allocation of present funding and development of new schemes. The awarding of finance must ultimately be on merit, but it is desirable that such funding be managed in a way that at least some incentives can be given to further the historic heritage conservation cause in areas where it is lacking, such as the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 The Challenge: Seeking Co-operation

It is apparent that through both tenure review and the district planning process, relationships between runholders of the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge Area and DOC have become somewhat strained. A lack of informed discussion from the outset, particularly in relation to PNA surveys and subsequent recommended listing of RAPs in district plans, has led to runholders believing such initiatives are not being undertaken in a consultative manner. Runholders have also become frustrated with the conservation and recreation lobbies generally, which they see as being quite unrealistic about their expectations from tenure review. Certainly in terms of the Ashburton Gorge, time will be required to rebuild that sense of trust which has been lost.

This suggests that those agencies required to undertake a broader, more integrated resource management approach to the area, rather than those with specific heritage conservation mandates, may, at this stage anyway, be better placed to co-ordinate historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the area. The ADC initiative seems to be going some way towards resolving runholder concerns over the ASNCVs. The TDC has wisely sought to involve stakeholders in its programme of identifying outstanding landscapes and SNAs from the outset. ECAN, through both its NRRP process and catchment management responsibilities generally, appears well placed to encourage an integrated and consistent approach to resource management decision making across territorial local authority boundaries.

The complexities of tenure review notwithstanding, it is hoped that all interested parties can begin to work together for a mutually positive outcome. Reconciliation of differences and the seeking of common ground will be essential to progressing initiatives for historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection throughout the area. It is apparent that the area possesses some outstanding landscapes and a fascinating history, but some key historic sites in particular, and to an extent the distinctive landscape character that makes the area what it is, are in danger of being lost if stakeholders don’t seek to work towards a more common purpose. NZHPT needs to
become more involved in the area’s historic heritage conservation initiatives, with the support of DOC, regional and local authorities, Ngai Tahu and NGOs. The co-operation of others with an interest in the area’s future, and especially runholders, however, will be essential to such initiatives succeeding. Most of the area’s historic features are presently on lower altitude pastoral leasehold lands, meaning tenure review is unlikely to see them transferred to DOC management. On the contrary, in freeholding the lower altitude lands, tenure review will grant greater flexibility in land use, and hence greater responsibility for historic heritage conservation and landscape protection, to landowners. It is important that all with a stake in the area seek to work towards a common goal that is not exclusively about, but includes as an important component, that of protecting those historic heritage and landscape features that make the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge the special area it is.

6.2 The Options: From Initiatives at the Local Level to More Formal Protection

Previous discussion throughout this report suggests that a range of possible options exist to enhance historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area. These range from what are essentially locally driven initiatives to those which depend upon more formal protection by a variety of different agencies. Although there may ultimately be one preferred option, this need not necessarily rule out the use of other options at particular times in a site-specific manner.

6.2.1 Do Nothing

It is important that any action decided upon is considered necessary before resources are committed. Care must also be taken to ensure the action does not end up worsening the problem it is intended to solve. This emphasises the need for careful planning in terms of both site-specific intentions and a strategic approach to the area as a whole. Doing nothing is probably the best option if such concerns cannot be addressed.
Findings of this report indicate that some action is required to prevent what is the area’s valuable, but almost completely unprotected, historic heritage from being lost. Before acting, however, it is desirable that the necessary research be undertaken, to better inventory the area’s range of historic heritage and identify the important themes and priorities, at both site-specific and wider landscape levels.

6.2.2 Informing and Educating

This approach would not seek to implement any systematic programme of formal protection, certainly in its initial stages. Rather, the intention would be one of providing information about the area’s historic heritage to runholders and other interested stakeholders, and encouraging them to take their own conservation initiatives at a site specific level. Groups of such persons would similarly be encouraged to co-ordinate their initiatives at a wider landscape scale. Information on various financial rewards and other assistance could be simultaneously distributed. Agencies such as DOC, NZHPT and territorial local authorities would adopt more of an advocacy role, in terms of providing advice and detail as and when it was sought.

Such an approach in its entirety is not likely to result in what must be the devotion of significantly more resources and greater effort to protecting the area’s historic heritage. Once an historic heritage conservation programme is up and running, however, there appears no reason why runholders and other interested parties should not be encouraged to complement it with their own initiatives. The strategic approach inherent in a more formal programme would help to direct financial resources and human effort from a variety of sources towards achievement of the area’s wider historic heritage management goals. Success with locally instigated projects can only encourage a greater sense of pride in the area’s historic heritage, through ownership of initiatives to conserve it.

6.2.3 Case By Case Adaptive Management

Certainly unless and until the area’s historic heritage can be better inventoried and a systematic conservation programme implemented, this will probably be the best way to
In other words, it will be a case of undertaking a specific preliminary project and
learning from the experience, in terms of both its level of success and any difficulties
encountered. The ADC, for instance, has been forced to develop a specific consultative
approach with runholders, in order to resolve concerns over the listing of ASNCVs in
the District Plan.

In terms of the area’s historic heritage, the Mount Somers Walkway Society’s
suggestion of extending the Mount Somers Historic Trail up the Ashburton Gorge is a
project worth proceeding with. Sufficient historical information is available to be
incorporated in the suggested panels, which would be sited off private property. This
should avoid any antagonism from runholders and other stakeholders in the area. The
project itself could also be the genesis of further interest in the area’s historic heritage
by runholders and other stakeholders. This could in turn lead to further historic heritage
conservation initiatives of a more site-specific and higher profile nature.

6.2.4 Involvement of Landcare Groups

This option offers a more systematic approach, but one that is not highly regulated in
terms of legislation and external agency involvement. Consistent with the NZLT
approach, the RGLG (and its equivalent in the Ashburton Gorge, should one be formed
there) would be encouraged to include an historic heritage conservation element in its
local sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation initiatives. Specific
projects, and the extent to which they included an historic heritage element, would
depend upon group resources and priorities.

Success or otherwise would ultimately depend on the extent to which the RGLG and
any other landcare groups involved felt able and inclined to take on historic heritage
conservation projects. Achievements could have potentially positive spin-offs, in terms
of building enthusiasm for further such initiatives. Although it is likely that guidance at
a higher level would be necessary to guarantee consistency with any strategic approach,
there appears no reason why such groups should not be encouraged to participate in
better conserving the area’s historic heritage if they wish to.
6.2.5 Co-ordination by Local Authorities

This option would see the ADC and TDC assume the principal responsibility for the area’s historic heritage conservation, primarily by means of relevant provisions in their district plans. ECAN, via its NRRP could also become involved, should it and the two territorial local authorities feel such involvement was desirable to better guarantee a consistent approach between the Upper Rangitata and Ashburton Gorge. Historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection would be considered alongside a range of resource management issues for the area. The number and diversity of stakeholders involved would suggest a working group would be desirable. This would ideally be led by a trusted individual, who could ensure that progress was achieved relative to an agreed strategy. Of all the options, this would go closest to achieving an IEM approach.

Success would depend upon the priority the ADC and TDC (and ECAN if involved) gave to historic heritage conservation relative to other resource management issues. Indications at this stage suggest such rankings are not high. ADC and ECAN have both abandoned initiatives to better identify historic heritage after pressure from runholders, while TDC has not extended its IEM-type initiative on the SNAs and outstanding landscapes to include historic heritage. The important point to note, however, is that all three organisations have planning infrastructure to enhance nature conservation and landscape protection generally, which can be easily broadened to include historic heritage. This may take time, in terms of resolving the nature conservation and landscape protection issues first, but such initiatives themselves appear likely to establish good working relationships with runholders and other stakeholders in the area. When the time is considered appropriate, the briefs of such groupings could be widened to include historic heritage as an important resource management issue for the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area.

6.2.6 Involvement of the QEII Trust

The QEII Trust’s situation is similar to that of the landcare groups, in that it must decide for itself whether or not it wishes to incorporate an historic heritage dimension into its
hitherto predominantly ecological emphasis. If willing to do so, it has the potential to become a significant stakeholder in the area, both in terms of historic heritage and resource management generally. The use of covenanting, pursuant to the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977, means that a degree of legislative regulation now becomes an issue. Principal management responsibility remains, however, with the landowner, while oversight is by an organisation strongly focussed on and experienced in working with the rural sector.

At this stage anyway, it is probably unrealistic to expect the QEII Trust to take a lead role in historic heritage conservation initiatives in the area. Its participation should not, however, be entirely ruled out. Certainly if runholders in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area decide to enter into open space covenants with the Trust, there is no reason why both parties should not at least be encouraged to include sites of historic heritage significance in areas covenanted.

6.2.7 Site-Specific Protection by Legislation

This would involve identifying and specifically protecting sites, principally pursuant to the Historic Places Act 1993 and Reserves Act 1977. Provisions of several other Acts could also be used, particularly if the site was set aside for other primary purposes and included historic features. Of significance to note is that management responsibility pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 can be delegated, both Acts include covenanting provisions, and registration pursuant to the HPA does not convey ownership. In other words, the use of such provisions need not necessarily “lock up” areas in DOC or NZHPT management in an ownership type of arrangement.

The use of such legislative provisions for site-specific protection in the area is potentially valuable and should not be discounted. The fact that runholders are wary of regulatory approaches should not, however, be overlooked. For that reason, it is desirable that historic heritage conservation initiatives for the area be considered alongside wider resource management issues. In this way, the range of possible management options for a particular site can be considered, before the best practical one is selected.
6.2.8 Legislative Protection for the Entire Area

Initiatives for better protecting the area generally, as advanced primarily by RFBPS, DOC and FMC, need clarification in terms of boundaries. In terms of a conservation park, DOC does not appear to be looking beyond those areas it already manages and is likely to be allocated via tenure review. It sees a water conservation order as the best means by which further protection can be given to the Ashburton Lakes. RFBPS also supports a water conservation order for the Ashburton Lakes. FMC is keen to see the Ashburton Lakes included in a possible national park centred on existing and subsequently allocated DOC estate, but the precise eastward boundary has not been defined (DOC, 2000, V.1, pp 88-92; Floate and Dennis, 2001, p. 28; Graeme, 2002, p. 31). Management of the area as a specific “protected landscape” (IUCN protected area category V; see Sections 1.6.2 and 5.8) requires considerable further research before being considered as a possible option.

Inclusive protection of the entire area would realistically be draconian, certainly at this stage. The tenure review process needs to be worked through, while further site specific protection initiatives need to be better defined by their proponents and more rigorously debated by the area’s stakeholders. Only after such informed discussion has taken place, in which the issues and options are thoroughly considered, can a proposal to impose any form of blanket protection over the entire area hope to proceed, certainly without vigorous opposition from runholders and other resource development stakeholders. Enhanced protection of specific areas has merit, but needs to be well defined in order that such proposals can be discussed by stakeholders in an informed manner.

6.2.9 World Heritage Listing

Significant further research is required to determine whether or not any specific sites are worthy of identification on the World Heritage List. Certainly at this stage, such recognition would be optimistic.

The important point to realise here, however, is that such listing is not in itself a protection mechanism. While the World Heritage Committee expects such sites and
areas to be managed in a way that recognises their status, management remains the responsibility of the sovereign country, by means of its own protection mechanisms.

In summary, all of the options discussed above would appear to have some merit, although opportunities to implement 6.2.9, or 6.2.8 in its entirety, appear remote at this stage. 6.2.1 and 6.2.3 don’t appeal as long-term options, while 6.2.2, 6.2.4, 6.2.6 and 6.2.7 can all be utilised effectively. Some overall co-ordination of initiatives is necessary, however, while stakeholders need to be able to air their concerns over the various possibilities and intentions. Option 6.2.5 can provide both the co-ordination and opportunity for dialogue required, through regional and district plans which take into account broader resource management issues for an area, involving numerous and diverse stakeholders. It therefore appeals as the approach by which initiatives for historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection in the Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area can be developed consistent with an IEM approach. This can only facilitate the identification of opportunities, setting of priorities development of a strategic approach at both the site-specific and wider landscape levels, and informed decision making as to the best practical option for each specific project.

6.3 The Opportunities: Integrated Environmental Management and Social Capital

An integrated approach to management, involving stakeholders from the outset, offers significant scope for resolving potential conflicts in resource management before they become too difficult. The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge offers an excellent opportunity for the practice to be applied, because it is essentially a catchment area in which productive and protective land uses are present and likely to continue. Some trade-offs by interest groups in reaching a common goal will be inevitable, but there is a greater chance of the intentions of potentially competing interests being better understood by one another. Major conflicts should thus become less likely.

On issues such as historic heritage conservation and cultural landscape protection, success is highly dependent upon the actions and intentions of those outside the
immediate interest group. By enabling all stakeholders to see the bigger picture from the outset, greater opportunity exists to achieve common understanding of, and hence support for, such causes.

The TDC has already successfully adopted an IEM-type approach with respect to its process of identifying outstanding landscapes and SNAs in the Upper Rangitata. This can easily be slightly broadened to include an historic heritage dimension. The ADC, meanwhile, is seeking to address the concerns of runholders over intended protection initiatives in the Ashburton Gorge. This can realistically be expanded into an IEM-type forum, once its initial purpose has been accomplished and runholders feel they are ready to progress the issue with other interested parties. A joint forum, perhaps convened by ECAN, can also be considered in the interests of attaining consistency across the inter-District Council boundary.

Success of the RGLG to date suggests a significant level of social capital exists amongst those runholders of the Upper Rangitata. While apparently not so strong in the Ashburton Gorge, certain runholders still appear willing to be included in the Group’s initiatives. If it were interested in considering such initiatives, the RGLG could become an important means of progressing historic heritage conservation and landscape protection at the grassroots level. This would foster a greater sense of area ownership of specific projects, thus reducing the perception that demands for such initiatives are being externally driven.

6.4 Recommendations

6.4.1 Better Identification of Values

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area possesses both outstanding scenery and an interesting history. While district plan coverage of most of the area as outstanding landscapes recognises the former, it would appear that historic heritage identified thus far barely scratches the surface of the area’s unique and diverse past. It is recommended
that further research be undertaken to identify the existence of other historic heritage sites and areas, and appropriate measures for their protection.

6.4.2 Greater Liaison Amongst Stakeholders

The Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge area is one in which many different interests potentially compete for its resources. It is recommended that representatives of the area’s stakeholders, including DOC, NZHPT, NZAA, QEII Trust, ECAN, ADC, TDC, Ngai Tahu, runholders SIHCC, RGLG, NGOs, and others with an interest in the area’s future come together in a working party, to plan for the area’s future integrated management. Historic heritage conservation interests would appear to have been hitherto excluded from previous initiatives of this nature. It is highly desirable that they be better represented henceforth.

6.4.3 Co-ordination by a Neutral Agency

It is essential that all interest groups involved have confidence in the working party as one that takes a balanced account of competing interests. ADC and TDC would appear best placed to convene such groups with respect to the Ashburton Gorge and Upper Rangitata respectively. ECAN would be the logical organisation to co-ordinate a combined group across both catchments. Both areas have a degree of linkage to each other, while regional councils are established with the intention that an integrated approach to resource management be undertaken across catchments. It is recommended, therefore, that Environment Canterbury convenes a single, combined Upper Rangitata/Ashburton Gorge working party, if ADC and TDC both support this. ADC, TDC and ECAN should first meet together to decide upon responsibility for convening the group, the timing for its establishment, and other logistical arrangements, including an appropriate leader.
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## APPENDIX 1: ORGANISATIONS AND PERSONNEL RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRES AND/OR SPECIFIC QUERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Status/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>Roy Montgomery</td>
<td>Supervisor; Environmental Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion Read</td>
<td>Assessment Panel; Landscape Architecture Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Swaffield</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jørgen Primdahl</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Whatman</td>
<td>Director of Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin O’Connor</td>
<td>Former Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Kerr</td>
<td>Former Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Ian Hill</td>
<td>Assessment Panel; Historic Resources, Canterbury Conservancy Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joy Comrie</td>
<td>High Country Tenure Review, Canterbury Conservancy Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Stewart</td>
<td>High Country Tenure Review, Canterbury Conservancy Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Baker</td>
<td>Planner, Canterbury Conservancy Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Dingwall</td>
<td>Scientist, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</td>
<td>Chris Jacomb</td>
<td>Assessment Panel; Archaeologist, Southern Regional Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicola Jackson</td>
<td>Southern Regional Office, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ireland</td>
<td>Chairperson, Ashburton Branch Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Jacomb</td>
<td>Volunteer Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Watson</td>
<td>Volunteer Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Archaeological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Molloy</td>
<td>High Country Field Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Nahkies and Associates Ltd</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Greedy</td>
<td>Crown Property Management, Head Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Mackenzie</td>
<td>Crown Property Management, Christchurch Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gregg</td>
<td>Director, Business and Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Wisternoff</td>
<td>Personal Assistant to Director, Business and Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Glennie</td>
<td>Regional Policy Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Henderson</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cornelius</td>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Miller</td>
<td>Timaru Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Singleton</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipa Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District Council</td>
<td>Phil Doole</td>
<td>District Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiona Eunson</td>
<td>Senior Planner/Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>David O’Connell</td>
<td>Natural Resources Project Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Beaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arowhenua Runanga</td>
<td>Gary Waaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare Research</td>
<td>Grant Hunter</td>
<td>Researching Samuel Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Mountain Clubs of New Zealand (Inc.)</td>
<td>David Henson</td>
<td>Pastoral Lands Co-ordinator, North Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Barnett</td>
<td>Executive Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allan Evans</td>
<td>Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</td>
<td>Maureen McCloy</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Clearwater Hut Holders Association</td>
<td>Adair Bruorton</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District Tourism</td>
<td>Caroline Blanchfield</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Somers Walkway Society</td>
<td>Warren Jowett</td>
<td>Also Chairperson, Mt Somers/Foothills Promotions Association and Local Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton Museum Society</td>
<td>David Howden</td>
<td>Also Member of Mt Somers Walkway Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum</td>
<td>Jane Shearer</td>
<td>Manager, Museum Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo-Anne Smith</td>
<td>Curator of Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives New Zealand</td>
<td>Chris Adam</td>
<td>Regional Archivist, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Landcare Trust</td>
<td>Shelley Washington</td>
<td>Central South Island Regional Co-ordinator, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Peel Station/Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>John Acland</td>
<td>Former Station Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare Group</td>
<td>Rosemary Acland</td>
<td>Chairperson, Landcare Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitata Rafts</td>
<td>Tussock Gaulter</td>
<td>Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers</td>
<td>Ali Undorf-Lay</td>
<td>Christchurch Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Douglas</td>
<td>Executive Secretary, High Country Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Aubrey</td>
<td>High Country Committee Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben McLeod Station</td>
<td>Don Aubrey</td>
<td>Station Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrosa Station</td>
<td>Robin Grigg</td>
<td>Station Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverary Station</td>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td>Station Manager (brief comments only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock Station</td>
<td>William Burdon</td>
<td>Shareholder (one of three)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Burdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Derek Howden</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge Historian and Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Hallifax</td>
<td>Personal interest in restoration of old Erewhon Homestead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2. HERON ECOLOGICAL REGION:
PRIORITY NATURAL AREAS (AS RECOMMENDED
FOR PROTECTION IN THE PROTECTED NATURAL
AREAS SURVEY REPORT, 1986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present Tenure (pastoral lease if station)</th>
<th>Reason for Recommended Protection</th>
<th>Area (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrowsmith Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lawrence</td>
<td>DOC/Erewhon Station</td>
<td>Mountain totara, shrub and tussock in higher rainfall area</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage Boulderfield</td>
<td>Erewhon Station</td>
<td>Geomorphological event record</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizard Gully</td>
<td>Erewhon/Mt Potts Stations</td>
<td>Various vegetation communities and their fossil remains</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewhon Beech Remnants</td>
<td>Erewhon/Mt Potts Stations</td>
<td>Remnant beech forest</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Range</td>
<td>DOC/Hakatere Station</td>
<td>Remnant mountain totara</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harding Stream</td>
<td>Hakatere Station</td>
<td>Red tussockland</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron River</td>
<td>DOC/Mt Arrowsmith and Upper Lake Heron Stations</td>
<td>Altitudinal vegetation sequence</td>
<td>7,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy Peaks</td>
<td>Erewhon Station</td>
<td>Altitudinal vegetation sequence</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Arrowsmith Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Station/Freehold</td>
<td>Vegetation Type</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakatere Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Stream/Cameron Fan/Lake Heron</td>
<td>DOC/Mt Arrowsmith and Upper Lake Heron Stations</td>
<td>Wetland communities</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swin Fan</td>
<td>Clent Hills Station</td>
<td>Alluvial vegetation sequences</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longman Range</td>
<td>Clent Hills Station</td>
<td>Shrub and tussock on till bedrock</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Emily</td>
<td>DOC/Clent Hills Station/Freehold</td>
<td>Wetland communities</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Lakes</td>
<td>DOC/Mt Arrowsmith Station</td>
<td>Wetland communities and systems</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato</td>
<td>Barrosa Station</td>
<td>High moraine vegetation</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clent Hills Boulderfield</td>
<td>Barrosa Station</td>
<td>Boulderfield shrub and tussock</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddle Hill Creek</td>
<td>Hakatere Station</td>
<td>Short and tall tussock on outwash landform</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton Fans</td>
<td>Hakatere/Clent Hills Stations</td>
<td>Vegetation succession on outwash fans</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spider Lakes</td>
<td>Hakatere/Clent Hills Stations</td>
<td>Moraine tarns with associated vegetation communities</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Emma</td>
<td>DOC/ Freehold</td>
<td>Extensive lake and wetland system</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater Moraines</td>
<td>Hakatere/clent Hills Stations</td>
<td>Vegetation succession on moraines</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stour Shrub Remnants</td>
<td>Barrosa Station</td>
<td>Kanuka/mountain beech on volcanic rocks</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhouse Range</td>
<td>Tenehaun Station/Freehold</td>
<td>Altitudinal vegetation succession</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branch Hinds</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Shrubland and pink broom</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler Downs</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Remnant mountain beech</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Stream</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Riparian wetland vegetation</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potts Gorge</td>
<td>Mt Potts/ Hakatere Stations</td>
<td>Remnant mountain beech and shrubland succession on terraces</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitata River</td>
<td>Crown land (riverbed management)</td>
<td>Extensive braided river habitat</td>
<td>8,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Denny</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Wetland vegetation and habitat</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Hakatere Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Thumb Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Creek Beech Remnants</td>
<td>Forest Creek Station/Freehold</td>
<td>Remnant mountain beech</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Stream</td>
<td>Forest Creek/The Tui/Mesopotamia Stations</td>
<td>Wetland tarns and tussocks</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Birch Gully</td>
<td>Mesopotamia Station/Freehold</td>
<td>Landforms, remnant mountain beech, representation of wetter north-west area</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Two Thumb Ecological District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Heron Ecological Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Areas identified as being within the study area.

Source: Harrington et al. (1986).
APPENDIX 3. ASHBURTON DISTRICT: AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE (AS LISTED IN THE ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN, 2001)

Group 1 Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No in Plan</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason for Listing</th>
<th>RAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 (Pt)</td>
<td>Lake Heron/Lake Stream (part)</td>
<td>Red tussock, wetland complex, vegetation succession, tussockland communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Maori Lakes</td>
<td>Wetland system, waterfowl habitat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Upper Harding Stream</td>
<td>Red tussock, moraine surfaces</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Upper Lawrence</td>
<td>Forest, shrubland, tussock in higher rainfall area of catchment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hermitage Boulderfield</td>
<td>Unique vegetation on stable rockfall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lizard Gully</td>
<td>Altitudinal sequence of vegetation succession</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Erewhon Beech Remnants</td>
<td>Representative of original vegetation, bird habitat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Potts Gorge</td>
<td>Remnant shrublands and tussocklands on terraces and in gullies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Upper Ashburton</td>
<td>Free of exotic vegetation, significant native bird habitat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lake Emma</td>
<td>Extensive wetland system and significant native bird habitat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Lake Denny</td>
<td>Small lake system on outwash surface, and native bird habitat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 (Pt)</td>
<td>Upper Rangitata River (part)</td>
<td>Extensive area of braided river, significant habitat value</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Group 2 Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No in Plan</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason for Listing</th>
<th>RAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>East Branch Stour River</td>
<td>Unique vegetation and landform sequences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cameron/Middle Hill</td>
<td>Extensive representation in ranges of altitudinal succession in vegetation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (Pt)</td>
<td>Lake Heron/Lake Stream (part)</td>
<td>Values as for Group 1 listing. Immediate Lake and Stream have been listed as Group 1, with adjacent (pastoral lease) areas listed Group 2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lake Emily</td>
<td>Small lake wetland, with adjacent tussock, of wildlife significance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Clent Hills</td>
<td>High moraine terraces and relic scree with interesting vegetation succession</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Stour Shrub Remnants</td>
<td>Vegetation succession on volcanic rocks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cloudy Peaks</td>
<td>Altitudinal succession of vegetation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dogs Range</td>
<td>Moraine sequence, supporting mountain totara, kanuka and tussock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lake Clearwater/Clearwater Moraines</td>
<td>Altitudinal succession of vegetation</td>
<td>Partial (moraines; Lake a SSWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Spider Lakes</td>
<td>Unique moraine tarns and vegetation communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Moorhouse Range</td>
<td>Vegetation succession across altitudinal and aspect variations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>North Branch Hinds River</td>
<td>Shrubland remnants, including Canterbury pink broom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pudding Swamp</td>
<td>Modified rush and sedge wetland</td>
<td>No - SSWI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48 (Pt) Rangitata River (part)  | Values as for Group 1 listing. Main riverbed has been listed as Group 1, several immediate areas (pastoral lease) listed as Group 2. | Yes

**Geopreservation Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No in Plan</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason for Listing</th>
<th>Within RAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cameron Valley Loop in terminal moraine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ashburton River Rock Avalanche Splash</td>
<td>Feature below what was once believed the critical size for mass movement</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Rock Gully, Mt Potts</td>
<td>Triassic macroflora</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mt Potts Triassic Plant Beds</td>
<td>Well preserved fossil beds</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Balmacaan Triassic Faunas</td>
<td>Torlesse rock with middle Triassic faunas, important in international correlation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lake Heron Alluvial Terrace Offset</td>
<td>Offset of degradational terrace along reverse fault</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Lake Heron Fault, Ashburton River</td>
<td>Offset of degradational terrace along reverse fault</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Swin River Alluvial Fan</td>
<td>Unusual fan on drainage divide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SSWI = Special site of wildlife interest (as identified by DOC)
- Group 1 ASNCVs are as presently agreed to. Those in Group 2 require further investigation over a five year period (from Plan approval in 2001). If to be retained, they will be incorporated into Group 1 via a Plan Change.
A similar approach (to the Group 2 ASNCVs) will be adopted with respect to the Geopreservation Sites. The present list is an interim one only; significant further research required to confirm such a listing.

NB: Areas identified as being within the study area.


START

Section 27 CPLA
CCL/holder(s) reach agreement on undertaking a review

Section 26 CPLA
CCL invites consultation on undertaking a review

(Optional)
Other persons provide views on undertaking of a review

(Mandatory)
DGC provides view on the undertaking of a review

Section 31 CPLA
CCL seeks agreement to inclusion of land in a review

Section 31 CPLA
MOC agrees to inclusion of conservation area or reserve

A
A

Section 26 CPLA (Mandatory)
CCL invites consultation on putting a preliminary proposal

(Optional)
Other persons provide views on putting a preliminary proposal

Sections 40 and 41 CPLA
DGC provides views on putting a preliminary proposal

Sections 40 and 41 CPLA
CCL seeks consent to designation

Sections 40 and 41 CPLA
MOC considers any consents to:
- Concessions over existing or proposed conservation area or reserve;
- Conservation area or reserve exchange;
- Appointment of marginal strip manager;
- Section 73 lease;
- Protective mechanisms

Sections 40 and 41 CPLA
Other parties consider consents to covenants

Section 34 CPLA
CCL, if consents given, puts the preliminary proposal

B
Section 33 CPLA
CCL decides whether or not to discontinue review

Sections 43 and 44 CPLA
CCL, if holder(s) do not request discontinuance:
- Gives public notice of preliminary proposal;
- Invites consultation with Iwi authority

Sections 43 and 44 CPLA
Person/organisation/Iwi authority provide views on preliminary proposal

Section 45 CPLA
CCL considers submissions, and provides information to MOC on submissions and Iwi consultation

Section 26 CPLA
CCL invites consultation on putting substantive proposal

(Optional)
Other persons provide views on putting substantive proposal

(Mandatory)
CCL invites consultation on putting substantive proposal

C
Sections 48 and 56-59 CPLA
CCL seeks consent to any designations

Sections 48 and 56-59 CPLA
MOC considers any consents to:
- Concessions (Sec. 48);
- Easements (Secs. 49 and 59);
- Conservation covenants (Sec. 59);
- Exchange of conservation areas (Sec. 56);
- Appointment of manager of marginal strip (Sec. 57)

Section 46 CPLA
CCL, if consent given, puts the substantive proposal

Section 60 CPLA
Holder(s) accept(s) or decline(s) proposal

Section 61 CPLA
CCL, if accepted, registers notice of proposal against title and gives notice to Chief Surveyor

D
Section 62 CPLA
Chief Surveyor determines if survey needed and notifies CCL

Section 62 CPLA
CCL arranges survey, prepares final plan and provides two copies to Chief Surveyor

Section 63 CPLA
Chief Surveyor approves plan and returns one copy to CCL

Sections 64-82 CPLA
CCL:
- Registers accepted proposal and approval plan;
- Arranges payments;
- Gives written notices as appropriate;
- Disposes of land under Land Act 1948 to a specified person;
- Tries to dispose of land to any person;
- Grants special lease or grazing permit;
- Gives MOC Reserves Act 1977 easement;
- Agrees to acquisition of Conservation Act 1987 easement;
- Gives DGC a New Zealand Walkways Act 1990 easement;
- Executes open space covenant;
- Creates conservation covenant;
- Executes heritage covenant

E
Sections 66-68, 70-72, 75-79 and 80 CPLA
MOC as appropriate:
- Grants concession(s);
- Appoints marginal strip manager(s);
- Disposes of conservation area by exchange;
- Disposes of reserve by exchange;
- Accepts Reserves Act 1977 easement;
- Acquires Conservation Act 1987 easement

Sections 66-68, 70-72, 75-79 and 80 CPLA
Other parties:
- QEII Trust enables creation of creation of open space covenant
- NZHPT enables creation of heritage covenant;
- DGC enables creation of New Zealand Walkways Act 1990 easement

NB:
- The CCL may (or at the request of the holder(s) shall) discontinue a review at any stage of the process before the holder(s) acceptance of the substantive proposal (Secs. 33 and 60(5) CPLA).
- The CCL cannot include a conservation area or reserve in a tenure review proposal without the agreement of the DGC and cannot include certain designations (in a proposal to be put) without the prior consent of the MOC.

Source: Department of Conservation (2002b, Part I, Section B, Appendix 1).
APPENDIX 5: FORMAT FOR CONSERVATION RESOURCES REPORTS (AS OUTLINED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION IN ITS TENURE REVIEW PASTORAL MANUAL, 2002)

DOC CONSERVATION RESOURCES REPORT ON
----------------------- -----------------------
PASTORAL OCCUPATION LICENCE/CROWN LAND

PART 1
Introduction
1.1

PART 2
Inherent Values: Description of Conservation Resources and Assessment of Significance
2.1 Landscape
2.2 Landforms and Geology
2.3 Climate
2.4 Vegetation
2.5 Fauna
2.6 Historic
2.7 Public Recreation
  2.7.1 Physical Characteristics
  2.7.2 Legal Access
  2.7.3 Activities

PART 3
Other Relevant Matters
3.1 Consultation
3.2 Regional Policy Statements and Plans
3.3 District Plans
1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- That the proposals described below be submitted to the CCL’s Agent, during the consultation process on the preliminary proposal for this review, as representing the views developed under delegated authority from the Director-General of Conservation. [Note that additional proposals, developed after the initial consultation is written, may also be put forward at the consultation stage.]

- Note that statutory consents will be required before the CCL can include (in the preliminary proposal for this review) the designations(s) set out in paragraph below.

- Note that any disposition of land by the Crown will be subject to the relevant provisions of Part IVA of the Conservation Act 1987.

2. PROPOSALS AND JUSTIFICATION

2.1 Land to be Retained in Full Crown Ownership and Control

Name
Existing Status
Authority - Section 86(5)(a) Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998
Proposal
Description
Justification
Management and Boundary Issues

2.2 Land Being Disposed of Subject to a Protective Mechanism
Name
Existing Status
Authority – Section 88(a) Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998
Description
Justification
Management and Boundary Issues
Attachments
Terms and Conditions

3. EXEMPTION OR VARIATION OF A MARGINAL STRIP WIDTH
Name
Existing Status
Description
Justification
Management and Boundary Issues

4. OTHER MATTERS

5. SUPPORTING MATERIAL

5.1 Additional Information
Terms and conditions of protective mechanism

5.2 Illustrative Map(s)

Source: Department of Conservation (2002b, Part III, Section E, Appendix 1).