

Earthworks – My point on this one is that all the exemptions we are asking for are minor in nature. This is acknowledged by the S42A report writer. And while in most cases they would not trigger consent, if you are on a larger site or are maybe doing a staged development, or are wanting to do some landscaping within 12 months of undertaking the earthworks these minor activities could be the reason in which you trigger resource consent. Imagine needing to put up 2 pou associated with a new build and the earthworks associated with this pou are the sole reason you require resource consent. Its reasons such as this which is why we would like to see the exemptions re-looked at.

Community signs – Is a new definition. In the definition the last sentence includes advertising of events. Signs advertising events would also be captured as a temporary sign. As such there will be a double up where you could be classified as both. This could be fixed by deleting the last sentence of the definition, meaning community signs would cover permanent signs instead. It is also important to point out that, the associated community signs rule only allows for one Community sign per site. If you had signage associated with that community facility, and then an additional sign advertising an event at this location, you would trigger the need for resource consent. This does not seem logical.

Temporary Signs – I've recommended a few changes to the rule layout to provide clarity, as it is not clear from reading Sign-S1 and Sign-S3 what rules take precedence. I note normally you would default to the most restrictive standard which on the Treaty Grounds would be the Overlay standards which I don't think was the anticipated outcome. To fix this for temporary signs I have suggested that there be a separate standard covering this activity.

Signs not visible from a public place – This was quite an important part of the Operative District Plan definition as it meant internal signage, such as within the museum, within the forest, within the café at Waitangi was not counted as forming the sum total of signage on the site. With these signs now being captured as meeting the definition it adds a lot to the total area of signage especially on the Waitangi Estate which has a number of different activities (some public) all which require some form of signage. I think this particular issue, is something that will have impacts across the wider district and is something Council needs to carefully consider how this is dealt with. When it comes down to it, if a sign can't be seen from a public place, then is it causing an adverse effect? I note that the definition of Sign is a national template definition, hence why our request has been to change the rules in this regard.

Signs located within an overlay – I have added community signs to PER-2 such that they can be regarded as a Permitted activity, as any sign within the Coastal environment or any other overlay for that matter which meets the definition of a community sign would otherwise need resource consent which seems very restrictive.

Sign-S1 Minimum sign area per site & Sign-S3 Minimum number of signs – I've recommended that the first standard be deleted and be moved to new Sign-S7. I've added in new wording for the Waitangi estate exception such that a new sign less than 1m² can be installed as a permitted activity as sought within the s42A recommendation. As detailed above, I've asked for some additional exemptions regarding signs not visible from a public place and signs in general on the Waitangi Estate.

Heritage Areas and Scheduled Heritage Resource – In Sign-S1 these two terms are used. However, it is not clear what exact resources they apply to. For clarity I seek that the terms used are those in the plan already or that the two terms are clear in the features in which they cover.

Temporary Activity – The Treaty Grounds on the Waitangi Estate is a national gathering site of remembrance of significant historical events and important cultural celebrations. Year on year Waitangi Day celebrations grow and in 2024 the festivities attracted around 60,000 people. On the days leading up to Waitangi Day over 10,000 people flocked to the Treaty Grounds and the surrounding estate each day. As part of Waitangi Limited's primary relief we are seeking a special purpose zone that will properly reflect its function under the Waitangi National Trust Board Act 1932 as a place of historic interest, recreation, enjoyment and benefit that has been gifted to all New Zealanders. As discussed at Hearing 4, providing this space for New Zealand's National celebration places a large burden on the Waitangi Estate, not only to co-ordinate and accommodate kiwis from across the motu, but also to fund. I would like to acknowledge the support we have had from the section 42A report writer on this topic. However, as discussed in detail within my evidence we are now seeking a further amendment to ensure the rules properly reflect the national significance and special nature of the Estate as a whole. We are seeking a rule which specifically relates to Waitangi celebrations on and within a week of Waitangi Day. This rule would enable events on the estate while at the same time ensuring proper traffic controls are in place. There would also be a requirement to remove temporary structures within a week of the event concluding. I note that in appendix 1 of my evidence where I have provided the rules I have accidentally referenced Lot 1 DP 326610 in this rule. This should not be referenced for this rule as other allotments such as the golf course are also used on Waitangi Day for carparking. TA-R1 would remain applicable to all other temporary activity events on the Estate. I note that while we initially sought a concession for 5 events, we are now seeking that this limit does not apply to events on Lot 1 DP 326610 which is the main allotment on the Estate. This is due to the nature of the site and its important role in facilitating events. On this allotment alone there is the treaty grounds, yacht club, sports field, boat ramp and Bledisloe domain all of which could host temporary events using up the available limit of 5 quite quickly. Some of the events would be provided for under existing consents, others may not, which could pose an issue.