

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF WAITANGI LIMITED

- 1.1 My name is **Simon Cocker**. I am a landscape architect and Principal of Simon Cocker Landscape Architecture.
- 1.2 I have prepared evidence on behalf of **Waitangi Limited** on the effects of the Proposed District Plan (as notified) on its management of the Waitangi National Trust Estate.
- 1.3 My summary statement will focus on Waitangi Limited's secondary 'fall-back' relief in respect of the parts of the (notified) Proposed Plan that apply to the Estate and are being considered at Hearing 4.
- 1.4 In February 2023, I was engaged by Waitangi Limited to undertake a landscape assessment to inform its submission on the Proposed Plan, which seeks to create a new special purpose zone (within the meaning of the National Planning Standards (November 2019)) to apply to the Estate.
- 1.5 I subsequently commenced my assessment of the landscape values and sensitivities throughout the Estate, to inform Ms Jacobs' evaluation of the appropriateness of a special purpose zone as a planning tool to protect those values and sensitivities. My assessment is in draft but is to be finalised and presented to the Panel for Hearing 19.
- 1.6 My draft assessment mapped the Estate, defined a number of character areas, and assigned landscape values to those areas.
- 1.7 Importantly, the assessment determined a range of values and sensitivities across the Estate, and this has, in my opinion, confirmed that a special purpose zone could be an effective way to protect those values and sensitivities.

Secondary relief for this hearing

- 1.8 I will now address Waitangi Limited's key matters of secondary relief where these apply to my area of expertise.

Permitted building size

- 1.9 Section 6.2.17 of the section 42A report (natural features and landscapes) has recommended that the permitted size of a building be increased to

50m² within the coastal environment and that it not be used for a residential activity.

- 1.10 I am accepting of this standard, however; I support the more restrictive permitted building size of 30m² for the Treaty Grounds.
- 1.11 Although the Treaty Grounds has an outstanding landscape classification, the character and values of this landscape differs from the majority of the ONL, being imbued with significant cultural and associative values rather than a high level of natural values.
- 1.12 The more restrictive permitted building size is proposed since the Treaty Grounds are of a smaller scale than the majority of ONL, and the small scale lends the landscape a 'finer grain'. This 'finer grained' cultural landscape is more sensitive to change occasioned by built form, where this may detract from the interplay between the existing historic / cultural structures and areas of open space and its vegetative framework.

Height restrictions for buildings or structures

- 1.13 The section 42A report relies on the recommendations of Melean Absolum Landscape Architects (**MAL**) to justify retaining a 5m height restriction within the coastal environment (excluding sites zoned as mixed use). In my view, while in some more visually sensitive locations (as mapped in the appendix to my evidence), the 5m height control is appropriate, in other less visually sensitive locations the height control should be less restrictive.
- 1.14 I agree with the opinion expressed in section 3.2C of the MAL report, which states that new development within ONL and ONF has the potential to undermine values identified for protection and support a maximum permitted height limit.
- 1.15 The 5m limit is relatively restrictive and is challenging to comply with where a building is to be constructed on a slope. As a result, the restriction has the potential to 'force' the location of buildings on flatter land, such as ridge crests. Notwithstanding this, I accept that the recommended discretionary status will allow for assessment of the potential adverse effects on landscape values.
- 1.16 I am therefore of the opinion that a 5m height restriction is appropriate where an area has been identified as having High or Moderate sensitivity.

However, outside of these areas, I am of the opinion that an 8m height restriction would be more appropriate.

Earthworks and Indigenous Vegetation Clearance CE-S3

- 1.17 The section 42A report has recommended, at section 5.2.14, that earthworks be restricted to 50m² if in an ONC area or an area of HNC. Outside of those areas, a 100m² restriction will apply. Cut heights are proposed to remain at 1m. I accept this recommendation where it applies to the wider district.
- 1.18 Vegetation clearance has been split from the earthworks standards and will remain at 50m² in a HNC area and 400m² outside of these areas. I generally accept this recommendation where it applies to the wider district.
- 1.19 I am of the opinion, however, that an approach based on landscape values and sensitivities will enable a more targeted, landscape appropriate approach to prescribing controls on earthworks and vegetation clearance as part of a Special Purpose zone for the Estate.
- 1.20 As provided in Ms Jacobs' evidence, more restrictive standards could apply to the Treaty Grounds given its landscape values (as signalled by the overlays for Outstanding Landscape, Coastal Environment, the Sites of Cultural Significance to Māori and the various heritage buildings in the Proposed Plan).
- 1.21 The earthworks standards could also be modified to acknowledge the sensitivities (in terms of the archaeological features) within the golf course.
- 1.22 Outside of these areas, the lesser restrictions (as proposed under CE-S3) could apply, except within those areas subject to HNCA.
- 1.23 I support the proposed WSZ-S5 rule from a landscape perspective.

Date: 5 August 2024

Simon Cocker