

CHAPTER 10

THE RESIDUAL LANDS WEST OF THE TURANGI TOWNSHIP

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The residual lands between Turangi's residential area and the Tokaanu tailrace south of the oxidation ponds remained in Maori ownership but did not escape the impact of construction work (fig 31). The disruption to families and the damage to the land as a result of the construction of the oxidation ponds, sewer line, and stopbank have already been referred to. In spite of this, households along Hirangi Road (the old SH41) were not connected to services such as the water supply and sewerage. Nor was it possible to build any more houses on ancestral lands, because the Taupo County Council's planning policy was to concentrate urban uses, including residential areas, in Turangi and discourage any rural residential development.

The first group of issues concern zoning and the provision of services. The second group is related to the Hangarito Stream drain, which, with the construction of the stopbank, resulted in major modification of the drainage patterns in the residual lands. The third group is related to lands used for construction purposes but not taken or restored to their former condition. In the case of areas used for metal extraction, there were additional legal arguments about compensation for the metal taken. In this chapter, we consider these three groups of issues, which, in various ways, affected the residual lands and the remaining Maori households on them.

10.2 ZONING AND PROVISION OF SERVICES

10.2.1 Planned future of Turangi

A joint planning committee was set up in December 1966 following a meeting called by the Department of Internal Affairs to consider the arrangements to be made for the takeover of the local government of Turangi by the Taupo County Council in 1968. The committee produced a report in April 1967 which, in general, considered that all land whose use was not specifically rural, such as farming and forestry land, or which was not a reserve of some kind should be concentrated in the Turangi township in order to encourage a variety of occupations and ensure the township's economic viability. To this end, it was thought that land within the township should be made freehold to attract industrial and other commercial enterprises, as well as motel and hotel accommodation and related services. The report

Turangi Township Report 1995

proposed that any development in the Tokaanu village should be restricted to existing uses, on the grounds of inadequate water supply and sewerage services, and suggested that ‘the Maori Affairs Department be requested to discourage further Maori housing in this settlement’ (B2(a):247). In order to prevent any development west of the Turangi township, the report recommended that the boundaries described in the First Schedule to the Turangi Township Act 1964 should be redefined so that this area might retain a rural zoning and be rated accordingly. This was effected officially over a year later, under section 3 of the Act, by ‘the Minister of Internal Affairs, with the consent of the Taupo County Council’.¹ For local government purposes, the new boundary coincided with the Second Schedule boundary on the western side of the township.

10.2.2 Residential development

The background to this boundary change was a concern expressed in the Ministry of Works’ discussions with the Taupo County Council about the cost of providing water and sewerage services to homes west of the planned Turangi township but within the area covered by the Turangi Township Act 1964. As already noted, the water supply and sewage treatment systems were sufficient to serve the needs of the surrounding rural population. The issue was the cost of reticulation rather than any technical problem. In December 1966, Gibson suggested that possible ways of restricting development included the Crown purchasing this land, to be retained ‘as part of a green belt surrounding the town’; altering the Turangi township boundary to exclude the area so that rates levied in the town could not be spent on services outside it; or reaching some agreement with the Taupo County Council and the Department of Maori Affairs to restrict development (B8(a):125). There would be some difficulty with the latter option, as Gibson pointed out:

Taupo County Council cannot refuse permits for the construction of one house per title on present zoning (this could involve 30–40 houses in the area) and are not confident of their ability to resist applications for conditional use, eg service stations, camping grounds, motels etc. Maori Affairs are willing to cooperate as far as possible, but will obviously not refuse partitions where these are not in opposition to the District Scheme. They are willing to try to direct Maoris seeking finance for housing to sections which we make available in the new town, but they point out (i) the extra finance required for section purchase, and (ii) the sentimental attachment of Maori Owners to their own land, are major stumbling blocks.

The [Ministry of Works] District Land Purchase Officer will be kept informed meanwhile of all applications for Maori housing finance in this area and will offer applicants sections in the new town on a sale or exchange basis.

All present at these meetings have expressed their concern at the possibility of an extension of the town in the Tokaanu direction which is both expensive and contrary to good planning principles. (B8(a):125)

A report produced by the Town and Country Planning Branch of the Ministry of Works in February 1967 similarly noted that the build-up of dwellings around Turangi would lessen its role as a centre for the district and ‘lead to a demand for the uneconomic extension of services from the township, the cost of which would have to be borne by the Government or the local authority’ (B8(a):135). The report also noted the Taupo County Council’s policy of restricting lakeshore development by encouraging urban development in two major towns, Taupo and Turangi, and by implementing the lakeshore reserves scheme. It warned that there were as many as 72 partitions between Tokaanu and Turangi and that ‘haphazard residential development . . . could now occur in this area [which] would be undesirable from a town and country planning point of view’ (B8(a):137).

The only way the Maori Land Court could be restrained from allowing further partitions was by a change in legislation, but this was a longer term aim and not an

immediate solution to the perceived problem. It was also possible that the Taupo County Council could tighten up on the allowance of conditional uses in the rural zone. Another option for the council was to refuse to issue building permits on health grounds. Although there was a restriction zone around the oxidation ponds, the report observed that 'there is no suggestion that the ponds are a direct threat to public health' (B8(a):138). This zone did not cover the whole area of concern and a building ban probably could not be enforced anyway. The purchase of the lands was a remote possibility but was unlikely because of the complexity of negotiations over lands in multiple ownership. It was considered that one way to achieve Crown ownership could be by extending the lakeshore reserves scheme to include all the land between Tokaanu and Turangi, but it was felt that it would be difficult to justify reserve status for all of it and no source of finance was immediately available. The encouragement of Maori to build their houses in the Turangi township would have to be based on 'some attractive financial inducement'. Nevertheless, a 'cheap (or even free) section' in town would have to be weighed 'against the traditional desire to build on ancestral land' (B8(a):138).

The report concluded with some comments on land tenure and relationships with local Maori in the Turangi district:

It is also clear that to win the co-operation and understanding of the Maori owners will be an important element in the successful planning of the district. An uninformed and resentful local population could effectively hinder much that needs to be done. At present, consultation with the Maori people in the area is maintained through the Liaison Committee set up under the Turangi Township Act 1964, through the Department of Maori Affairs, and by direct contact with individual owners on specific questions, and this policy of consultation should be continued to the utmost was at Turangi Park next to the Hirangi Marae. There, water was freely available to keep the fields well-watered in the summer. But the residents of Hirangi Road who lived further along towards Maunganamu were told that a connection could be made only at their

own expense . . . it would have meant laying a pipeline across the park and through the swampland . . . this was an expense which they could ill afford.

At the State Highway 41 end of Hirangi Road, the water supply ran along the opposite side of the State highway to reticulate the Ministry of Works buildings which serviced the construction crew for the Tokaanu Power House and the tailrace. Residents at this end of the road sought permission to connect to the water supply at that end of Hirangi Road but were told this would not be possible. . . .

In 1975 we sought permission again to make a connection to the water supply only to be told by Mr John Thorby of the Turangi District Community Council that this was not possible because the pipeline carrying the water to the sewage pond was not large enough to reticulate the homes in this area and anyway the water supply was not in sufficient quantity to allow any more connections in the Turangi area. Our area was known as a 'buffer zone' between the township, our people approached them to seek a connection of these houses along Hirangi Road to the water supply. The nearest connection was at Turangi Park next to the Hirangi Marae. There, water was freely available to keep the fields well-watered in the summer. But the residents of Hirangi Road who lived further along towards Maunganamu were told that a connection could be made only at their own expense . . . it would have meant laying a pipeline across the park and through the swampland . . . this was an expense which they could ill afford.

At the State Highway 41 end of Hirangi Road, the water supply ran along the opposite side of the State highway to reticulate the Ministry of Works buildings which serviced the construction crew for the Tokaanu Power House and the tailrace. Residents at this end of the road sought permission to connect to the water supply at that end of Hirangi Road but were told this would not be possible. . . .

In 1975 we sought permission again to make a connection to the water supply only to be told by Mr John Thorby of the Turangi District Community Council that this was not possible because the pipeline carrying the water to the sewage pond was not large enough to reticulate the homes in this area and anyway the water supply was not in sufficient quantity to allow any more connections in the Turangi area. Our area was known as a 'buffer zone' between the townships of Turangi and Tokaanu, and Mr Thorby said there were definitely no plans to reticulate this area as the people living there should purchase homes in the town. This made no sense to us at all. We chose to live in Hirangi Road because ours was a family home on Maori land. To us it was important that we be there to care for our family home and land.

It was interesting to note that the 'buffer zone' area was changed in later years to become '10 acre farmlets'. One can only speculate what this was supposed to mean. Unfortunately, it hasn't meant that we've been connected to the services. (A12(5):1-3)

Ms Chapman also noted that a further effort was made in the mid-1980s 'to see if homes could be reticulated using health grounds as a reason', but this came to nothing. A continuing concern was the pollution of groundwater and local wells caused by run-off from the industrial area flowing into the rerouted Hangarito Stream drain and by the cutting off of natural flows by the

construction of SH41. Hirangi Road families ‘provided land for the township and the power project’ but had not benefited from any services in this development. As Ms Chapman stressed:

The least they should have got out of all the disruption we experienced was to have their homes connected to the water supply. . . .

We are also well aware that the connection to the water system was made available to the people of the River Road (Taupahi Road) area where many European people lived or had holiday homes. In later years, while denying us access to the water, Herekieke Street and Hautu Prison were connected. To us, this looked as though connection to the water supply was necessary for Europeans but not for the Maori, the tangata whenua. (A12(5):3–4)

10.3 THE HANGARITO STREAM DRAIN

10.3.1 Effects of industrial area construction

By the late 1960s, the new SH41 had been built, work was continuing on the tailrace excavation and powerhouse construction, and the Hangarito Stream, which formerly flowed into the Tokaanu River, had been diverted into a drain running alongside SH41. When the Ministry of Works moved into the industrial area, it was inevitable that the earthworks associated with the levelling and consolidating of the land would result in pumice silt being carried into the Hangarito Stream, which flowed across the site. The Wildlife Service was anxious to protect the upper reaches of the Tokaanu River, with its valuable trout spawning grounds, and had already proposed a fishery reserve in this area. The potential pollution problems were exacerbated by stormwater drainage from the industrial area. By December 1964, the District Conservator of Wildlife in Rotorua, Pat Burstall, was thanking Gibson for the Ministry’s

prompt remedial response to a silting problem in the Tokaanu headwaters which threatened the fishery (B8(a):158).

The Ministry of Works' solution to pollution threats from the industrial area was to divert the Hangarito Stream into a drain which ran across the Waipapa 1J2A and 1J2B blocks and then alongside the new route of SH41. Just before the tailrace, the drain turned sharply to the right, ending in the swamp lands west of the oxidation ponds. Te Reiti Grace, who leased Waipapa 1J2A and 1J2B, sought compensation for damage caused by pumice silt and industrial pollution overflowing her pasture. Part of Waipapa 1J2B was also being used for the extraction of metal by the Ministry of Works. The damage and disturbance to the block was acknowledged by the Ministry of Works in 1970 and compensation was assessed:

First entered March 1965 to extract metal most of which was used in the construction of the new deviation of SH41 carried out by Project. The property consisted of approximately 12 acres dry terrace sloping to 27 acres drained swamp. Pasture on the terrace was good and in the swamp fair. Fencing was adequate over the whole block. The metal extraction has virtually destroyed all the good grazing on the higher ground and, in addition, approximately 1.4 acres has been taken for State highway. . . .

Run-off from the area being worked caused considerable silting on the lower land and this was aggravated to a considerable degree when storm water from the Town was diverted to a small stream which meandered over this land. Damage to pasture accounted for a further five acres and some 17¼ chain of fencing became buried in silt. Remedial work has been carried out by the Department but pasture restoration on the metal area has been unsuccessful. The meandering stream has been replaced by a deep 15–20 feet wide channel into which approximately 75% of the Town's run-off is discharged. (B8(a):74)

10.3.2 Access to land prevented

The drain alongside SH41 also had the effect of preventing access to adjacent blocks from the highway. While the impact of the diversion of the Hangarito Stream and the silting was acknowledged, the issue of whose responsibility it

was to maintain the drain along SH41 and into the swamp was not resolved. The adjacent block, Waipapa IJ2A, was also affected by the same drainage and silting problems. By 1969 the Ministry of Works had cleaned out the drain in response to complaints by Mrs Grace and others, but there were some longer term problems to do with the gradient of the drain. The loss of the natural flow towards the Tokaanu River and the diversion to the SH41 drain had slowed the water flow and exacerbated the flooding and silting problems. In 1979 and 1986, the Ministry of Works again cleaned out the drain in response to complaints made to Ministers by local people, but the issue of whose responsibility it was remained unresolved.

In 1967 a Department of Lands and Survey plan (B8(a):112) showed the drain as part of the road reserve. In other plans prepared in the 1970s, the drain was shown separately from the roadway of SH41 (B8(a):113–115, 118–121). In March 1969, the Ministry of Works had begun discussions with the Taupo County Council on the legalisation of the drain that carried the Hangarito Stream and Turangi township storm water. In May 1969, the county engineer responded, saying that the council considered that the drain was for the improvement of adjacent farm land and it refused to accept liability. The District Commissioner of Works' response in June 1969 was that the channel had been cut 'to improve the storm water drainage and as such is part of the drainage system' (B8(a):89).

10.3.3 Responsibility for drain contested

The county engineer, however, maintained the position that the drain across Waipapa IJ2B was the responsibility of the landowners and had never been ‘a “public drain” in either its function or its purpose, but is purely a private drain to facilitate the drainage of a privately operated farm’. With regard to the open watercourse cut along the new SH41, the council saw this as:

purely a drain to provide shoulder drainage and intersection run-off from adjoining land for the protection of the highway, and therefore this becomes a liability of National Roads Board. (B8(a):90)

The Ministry of Works, however, continued to argue that it was the council’s responsibility. Because it served as a stormwater drain for the Turangi township, it was a public drain and the Ministry’s opinion was that ‘the County is trying to evade its responsibility’ (B8(a):91). As a stormwater drain from a town, it could not be regarded as the responsibility of the National Roads Board. The Taupo County Council, however, still asserted that it had no obligation to maintain the drain.

Following more complaints and a ministerial visit to Turangi in 1986, an engineer’s report was commissioned. The silting problem caused by the gradient and the amount of sediment carried into the stream along its length was acknowledged. The flow was irregular and aggravated by periodic floods, which also eroded the banks of the drain. Several possible solutions to the

problem were suggested. One was to redirect the Hangarito Stream through a culvert under SH41 back into the Tokaanu River, but it was acknowledged that ‘the fisheries people would probably object, a water right would be required, and some degree of maintenance would be required as well’. Alternatively, the drain could be directed into the tailrace, increasing the gradient. Unfortunately, this would create a problem with sediment in the tailrace and would need continuing maintenance and a water right. Other possibilities included purchasing the approximately 100 hectares of affected land, constructing a stopbank to protect the farm land, putting sediment traps in the drain, or maintaining the existing drainage system. All these options would also require some continuing maintenance (B8(a):60–61). Flooding and sedimentation are part of the natural flow pattern of the Hangarito Stream, but the addition of storm water, the diversion alongside SH41, and the lower gradient aggravated the problem. The cheapest solution was for the local authority to take over the maintenance of the existing drain and clear it periodically.

The Taupo County Council’s urban resources engineer responded to this report in December 1987, noting that the natural drainage pattern had been altered by the construction of SH41. ‘The basic legal liability,’ he said, ‘is therefore between the landowner, who is affected, and the constructors/owners of the road, being the National Roads Board.’ His conclusions were unequivocal:

1. Any work done to alleviate flooding/sedimentation of the land provides a benefit to that land.
2. The maintenance of drains through private property is a responsibility of the landowner.

3. The maintenance of a drain alongside State Highway 41 is the responsibility of the National Roads Board.

4. The ratepayers of the Taupo County as a whole should not be required to contribute to the cost of the maintenance as there is no benefit to them. (B8(a):111)

Following the ministerial visit in 1986, an investigating committee was set up to gather relevant information. The committee was chaired by Murray Black (chairman of the Waikato Catchment Board and Taupo County Council) and comprised representatives from various Government departments. In May 1988, Black reported to the Minister of Lands, Peter Tapsell, that the original water rights for the diversion were obtained by an Order in Council issued to the Electricity Department and were now, presumably 'the property of Electricorp who assume all responsibilities and liabilities with regard to this water right' (A21(1):E).

10.3.4 Problems continue

It seems that the responsibility was thrown back on the Order in Council issued in 1958 under section 311 of the Public Works Act 1928, which authorised entry on lands for the TPD. No 'water right' had been issued, nor any permit sought or given from the Pollution Advisory Council. The diversion works preceded the Water and Soil Conservation Act 1967. In the circumstances, it is difficult to understand Black's further comment that he had 'advised Mr Grace of the possible future cancellation of a water right' (A21(1):E).

The diversion of the Hangarito Stream was not required for hydroelectric power generation at Tokaanu Power Station and the Electricity Corporation of New Zealand had no interest in it. The whole Hangarito Stream diversion is within the area described in the First Schedule to

the Turangi Township Act 1964. The Taupo County Council (now the Taupo District Council) has remained firm in refusing to accept any responsibility for the drain. The drain needs regular cleaning out – that much is agreed by all parties – and it was last cleared in 1986. Arthur Grace stated to the Tribunal:

Currently it requires cleaning, but I have been told that its nobody's responsibility. Transit New Zealand has come to visit. They did some measurements, but told us that the stream is too far from the centre line of the road for Transit New Zealand to take responsibility for its maintenance. Likewise, the Taupo District Council say it's not their road so they have no responsibility. We need to know who will take responsibility for ongoing maintenance, because as far as we are concerned the original agreement with the Ministry of Works was that they would take that responsibility. This means that the responsibility lies with the Crown. (A21(1):21)

10.4 COMPENSATION FOR METAL EXTRACTION

In the 1960s and early 1970s, the Ministry of Works took the line that compensation would not be paid for metal extracted for the Turangi township or the TPD. This was an interpretation of section 29(1)(c) of the Finance Act (No 3) 1944, which stated:

The special suitability or adaptability of the land for any purpose shall not be taken into account if that purpose is a purpose to which it could be applied only in pursuance of statutory powers, or for which there is no market apart from the special needs of a particular purchaser or the requirements of any Government Department or any local or public authority.

This was translated in the 1965 edition of the

Ministry of Works' instructions concerning entry on land as follows:

Royalty for metal may be paid only where there is a demand for the material in the locality disregarding demands for Government or local works. The approval of Head Office is a prerequisite to the payment of any royalty. If there is not already an established market for the material outside all requirements for Government or local

works royalty should not be paid. If the metal has no value to anyone except the local body or the Department, then the Department's liability is limited to damage done to the land in obtaining the metal. (B10:6)

The Maori Trustee challenged this view and claimed that pumice and metal taken from Maori blocks should be assessed for compensation purposes. There was some discussion in the Department of Maori Affairs over the right of the Maori Trustee, or the Board of Maori Affairs in the case of lands under Part XXIV of the Maori Affairs Act 1953 in the Tokaanu development scheme, to sue the Ministry of Works. The matter came to a head in litigation over metal extracted by the Ministry from the Rangipo North 6C block, about 38 kilometres south of Turangi. A meeting to discuss Turangi township and TPD compensation matters was held within the Department of Maori Affairs in Wellington in September 1971 and was attended by district officer J E Cater. The meeting resolved to ask the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board:

to support us in a general claim in respect of metal particularly that taken from Te Reiti Grace's lease. If the Board agreed we would invite Mr Feist to undertake the work. (D12:1549)

In the meantime, trustees were appointed for Rangipo North 6C by the Maori Land Court under section 438 of the Maori Affairs Act 1953, and the Maori Trustee was relieved of any further obligation. It was also decided that negotiations on other metal extraction areas would await the outcome of litigation on Rangipo North 6C, although claims were made by the Maori Trustee for damage, injurious affection, rent, and the restoration of several areas where pumice and metal had been extracted.

However, Cater had argued in an earlier report that the Ministry of Works could not sustain its position:

It could not be argued that there is no actual or potential market apart from the Works. It must be remembered that demographic survey taken before the commencement of the work showed that it was expected that Turangi, by natural growth, would have grown into a sizeable town. This was the real reason for the siting of the construction town at Turangi. On these grounds it could be argued that there would be a substantial market for metal. (D12:1549)

The litigation over metal extracted from Rangipo North 6C (*Minister of Works and Development v Hura* [1979] 2 NZLR 279) eventually reached the Court of Appeal in October 1979 (C6). The Supreme Court had held that the appellants, Pat Hura and the other trustees and beneficial Maori owners of the block, did have a claim against the Crown under section 17 of the Public Works Act 1928, which provided:

Where any public work has been authorized to be carried out by or on behalf of Her Majesty and gravel or stone is required in the construction of such work, any land may be taken under this Act for the purposes of a gravel-pit or quarry to be used in connection with such work, or the Minister may by his servants or agents after twenty-four hours' notice to the occupier enter on any such land, other than land occupied as a garden or ornamental shrubbery, and dig and take any stone, gravel, or other material therefrom. Reasonable compensation shall be paid for any injury done to or material taken from the land entered upon. . . .

The question then arose as to the basis on which any compensation should be assessed:

- (i) with reference to the commercial value of metal determined with reference to prices paid by private purchasers from owners or licensees of metal pits?
- (ii) by taking as a maximum the capital value of the land affected by the extraction of the metal?
- (iii) by having regard to the fact that the only demand for such metal from this particular pit is created by the requirements of a Government department?

The Crown had argued that, if compensation were to be paid under section 17, the maximum amount should be

the value of the land at the time of entry for the extraction of metal, after taking into account the potential value of the resource. The Court of Appeal upheld the decision of Justice Mahon in the Supreme Court that the question should be answered in terms of clause (i) above, that reasonable compensation should be paid for the material extracted, not for the remaining metal or for the land containing the metal. It was the Crown's choice whether to take the land by proclamation or to extract the metal and pay for it. Rangipo North 6C, like other blocks around the Turangi township, such as Waipapa 1J2B and 1D2B3B on Te Reiti Grace's leasehold, Waipapa 1F4 and 1M (the rubbish tip, formerly known as Pumice Pit No 2), and part of Hautu 3E4A (a Maori-owned island in the Tongariro River), had not been taken by the Crown under the Public Works Act 1928. However, pumice and metal were extracted over several years in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The only basis for compensation for metal extraction in the 1960s was damage to the land and/or loss of the use of it. In the case of Waipapa 1J2B, some restoration work was carried out, but insufficient topsoil was replaced and the grass sown did not take. The damage was assessed on the basis that there had been good pasture before. After a good deal of correspondence, in 1972 the Maori Trustee finally accepted the negotiated figure of \$360 for the damage, leaving open the question of payment for the metal extracted (B10(c): doc 25). No compensation had been paid on Hautu 3E4A and, in 1976, the owners took the matter to the Supreme Court. The matter did not proceed to a full hearing but was settled in chambers in March 1978, where compensation was set at \$7500. This settlement was described by

Crown counsel in a letter to the Commissioner of Works as ‘a judgment of the Court rather than a negotiated settlement, notwithstanding it has some of the characteristics of a settlement’ (B10(c): doc 15). This ‘settlement’ predated the Rangipo North 6C case.

On Waipapa 1D2B3B, the Ministry of Works had assessed the disturbance and loss of income to the lessee, Te Reiti Grace, at \$800 in 1968, but considered the ‘only equitable solution’ on this block was ‘to pay the proportionate rent for the unexpired term of the lease’ (B10(c): doc 19). In 1977 trustees appointed by the Maori Land Court in 1975 lodged a formal claim with the Ministry of Works for \$40,998, including \$37,000 for the value of the metal, \$2648 for the replacement of topsoil, and the balance for survey and valuation costs (B10(c): doc 17). In August 1978, a revised claim was lodged in the Supreme Court for a total of \$40,700, reducing the value of the metal extracted to \$35,802. The Ministry’s response was to suggest an offer based on ‘loss in value to the whole block’ in the order of \$950 (B10(c): doc 17)). However, by this stage Justice Mahon had delivered his judgment on Rangipo North 6C and the Crown was in the process of taking this matter to the Court of Appeal. It was decided to wait until this had been heard.

Negotiations did not resume until 1984. In December of that year, the Ministry of Works offered to make an ex gratia payment of \$17,000. This was accepted and paid in 1985, with a further payment of \$1275 interest for six months in 1986 (B10(a): doc 7). No compensation was assessed or paid for Waipapa 1F4 and 1M. It is clear that there remain unresolved issues in relation to metal extraction and compensation

not yet paid. Moreover, the manner in which the compensation was assessed was inconsistent and inequitable.

10.5 UNRESOLVED MATTERS

There are still many unresolved matters derived from the construction of the Tokaanu Power Station and tailrace and the development of the Turangi township that remain a burden on the residual lands between the township and the tailrace. The Maori homes along Awamate Road and Hirangi Road (the old SH41) are still not connected to a town water supply. The oxidation ponds are close by, but there is no connection to a sewer line. There are severe constraints on any residential development in this area because of the rural zoning. Access to blocks fronting on SH41 is restricted to some specific points by segregation strips on either side of the highway and, on the northern side, by the location of the Hangarito Stream drain. Much of the land is low-lying and swampy and has limited potential for farm development. The natural drainage patterns have been altered by the construction of SH41, the Hangarito Stream diversion, and the stopbank along Awamate Road between the oxidation ponds and the Tongariro River. Some areas are no longer usable because of silting or flooding or because they were not fully restored following metal extraction. These remain as unresolved impacts of construction work on both the Turangi township and the Tokaanu Power Station and tailrace. The Tribunal considers the Crown has a responsibility to take all reasonable steps to resolve these outstanding matters. To this end, the work of David Alexander as a facilitator has been a useful start. The outstanding matters need further effort on the part of all concerned.

References

-
1. *New Zealand Gazette*, 1968, p 1029