BEFORE A PANEL OF INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS IN THE WAIKATO REGION

I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHEKE WAIKATO

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Variation 3 to the Waikato Proposed

District Plan (PDP)

STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF DR ANN MCEWAN FOR WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL (HISTORIC HERITAGE)

Dated 19 JULY 2023



INTRODUCTION

- My name is Dr Ann McEwan and I am the Principal of Heritage Consultancy Services.
- 2. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence in chief (EIC), which is dated 20 June 2023.
- 3. I reaffirm the commitment in my EIC to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.
- 4. I have read the evidence provided by the submitters to the Independent Hearing Panel that is relevant to my area of expertise.
- 5. This statement of rebuttal will respond to the evidence of:
 - (a) Giles Boundy on behalf of Tuurangawaewae Marae and Te Whakakitenga O Waikato in regards to the potential re-zoning of The Point and Tuurangawaewae House; and
 - (b) Michael Campbell on behalf of Kāinga Ora in regards to buffering scheduled heritage items and increased height overlays in Huntly.
- 6. The fact this rebuttal statement does not respond to every matter raised in the evidence of a submitter within my area of expertise should not be taken as acceptance of the matters raised. I have focused this rebuttal statement on the key points that warrant a response.

SUMMARY

- 7. This rebuttal evidence reconfirms that in my expert opinion:
 - (a) My evidence stands and has been supported, in as much as it relates to historic heritage, by expert evidence from

Tuurangawaewae Marae and Te Whakakitenga O Waikato and Kāinga Ora; and

(b) I remain concerned that the height overlays proposed for Huntly Town centre zone (TCZ) and Commercial zone (COMZ) have not taken into account the receiving urban form, which includes a number of scheduled heritage items.

REPONSE TO GILES BOUNDY

- 8. At paragraph 11 of his evidence, Mr Boundy supports future consideration by the Council of what would constitute the appropriate zoning for The Point and Tuurangawaewae House in Ngaaruawaahia. He reiterates 'the need for engagement and consultation with mana whenua on this matter given the significance of this area'.
- 9. I concur with the position put forward by Mr Boundy and agree that engagement and consultation with mana whenua should be central to any future plan change process.

RESPONSE TO MICHAEL CAMPBELL

- 10. Mr Campbell agrees (see section 8) with my conclusion that the provision of historic heritage item buffer sites is not warranted or merited, on the basis that the mapped extent of scheduling is sufficient to protect the heritage values of scheduled items.
- 11. I note that Mr Campbell states Kāinga Ora has withdrawn its submission regarding the provision of High Density Residential Zones in Ngaaruawaahia and Huntly. This position nullifies, in part, my recommendation (EIC paragraph 31) that Kāinga Ora be asked to provide further information and assessment about how such a zone could impact historic and cultural heritage values.

- 12. Kāinga Ora is, however, still seeking changes to the height overlays in Huntly. At paragraph 5.4 of his EIC, Mr Campbell proposes that the Huntly TCZ height overlay should be 24.5 metres, with a slightly reduced 22 metre height overlay applicable to that part of the COMZ directly east of the TCZ.
- 13. The height overlays are shown in the maps for Huntly North and Huntly South appended to Mr Campbell's EIC on pages 56 and 57. There are seven scheduled items within the relevant sections of the TCZ and COMZ and, in principle, I remain of the view that the extent of scheduling for each item provides the appropriate means by which to protect the heritage values of each.
- 14. As stated in my EIC, the commercial zoning of the east side of William Street, on which the scheduled villa at 46 William Street is located, 'arguably poses a greater risk to its ongoing use as a dwelling, which use upholds its historic heritage value' (paragraph 13) than a change to the height overlay in this area. That said, as I went on to say at paragraph 30, I consider 'mapping of the overlay areas in both Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia by Kāinga Ora should be reviewed in light of the extent of scheduled heritage items and the existing urban form, particularly in regard to the east side of William Street in Huntly and the west side of Great South Road in Ngaaruawaahia'. While I acknowledge that Kāinga Ora has changed its position somewhat, and that current zonings cannot be altered by way of Variation 3, I am still of the opinion that any increase in height overlays should be cognisant of, and sensitive to, the scheduled heritage items and the existing urban form in which they are located.

CONCLUSION

15. I acknowledge and accept the expert evidence provided by Messrs Boundy and Campbell, in as much as it relates to 'Qualifying Matters – Historic Heritage'.

16. I remain concerned that the height overlays sought by Kāinga Ora in Huntly have not taken into account the receiving environment, which is typified by one- and two-storey buildings, some of which are scheduled heritage items, and is in close proximity to the east bank of the Waikato River. I defer to Mr Meade to discuss the interrelationship between heritage and amenity values in historic town centres in terms of the way in which scheduled heritage items help to define the character of a town centre such that it can continue to provide a sense of place and community identify.

Dr Ann McEwan

19 July 2023