

Further Submission (additional) on Variation 3 to the Proposed Waikato District Plan, pursuant to Schedule 1, Clause 8, of the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waikato District Council

via email: [districtplan@waidc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@waidc.govt.nz)

Submitter: Queen's Redoubt Trust  
(Contact details and address for service below)

This is an (additional) further submission (to submission # 116) on Variation 3 to the Waikato District Council (WDC) Proposed District Plan (PDP), operative in part.

1. The Queen's Redoubt Trust, in as far as Variation3 (and the relevant primary submission) relates to the Queen's Redoubt, has an interest greater than the interest of the general public. The Queen's Redoubt Trust represents a relevant aspect of the public interest via its objectives.
2. The Queen's Redoubt Trust has the following main objectives: a) to preserve and maintain for the benefit of the public the site of the Queen's Redoubt, Pokeno; b) to make the Queen's Redoubt accessible to the public by development of the historic site as a major educational and visitor destination; c) to promote knowledge and understanding of the 19<sup>th</sup> century New Zealand Wars between Māori and Europeans, and their consequences.
3. The details of the (additional) further submission are set out below.
4. The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
5. The submitter would consider presenting a joint case with another submitter should that submitter have made a similar and relevant submission.

Dated 23 January 2023

Queen's Redoubt Trust

By its duly authorised agent, Hayman Consulting: Jennifer Hayman

Primary contact person: Jennifer Hayman

Email address for service: [archaeologist@haymanconsulting.co.nz](mailto:archaeologist@haymanconsulting.co.nz)

Postal address for service: P O Box 12-450, Auckland 1642

## The further submission of Queen's Redoubt Trust

- Relevant provisions: Application of MDRS to all residential land within urban environments (subject to any legitimate qualifying matters) – Pokeno.
- Name of original submitter: Pokeno West Ltd and West Pokeno Ltd.
- Original submission number: 116.

It is noted that submission 105 of Havelock Village Ltd (see para 1.6 of submission 105) was prepared jointly with the advisors of Pokeno West Ltd and West Pokeno Ltd. Also see para 6 of the Pokeno West/West Pokeno submission 116 on this matter.

The particular area of interest for the Queen's Redoubt Trust, relative to this submission point, appears to lie within the land holdings of Havelock Village Ltd.

The Queen's Redoubt Trust does not involve itself in matters of RMA legislation (including RM-EHS) except to the extent that it may impinge on the Trust's stated objectives.

The objectives of the Trust, as outlined above, indicate a focus on preserving and maintaining the site of the Queen's Redoubt, with development of the historic site as a major educational and visitor destination, in order to promote knowledge and understanding of the 19<sup>th</sup> century New Zealand Wars between Māori and Europeans, and their consequences.

Position: Oppose in part

Reasons for opposition:

At essence here is the understanding of "qualifying matters". The submitters (both 105 Havelock village Ltd and 116 Pokeno West Ltd and West Pokeno Ltd) are concerned about the use of the "urban fringe" as a qualifying matter. In contrast, the Queen's Redoubt Trust is concerned about the potential to fail to acknowledge (known or highly probable) archaeological presence on sites - as a qualifying matter.

It is noted that the possibility of archaeological evidence on the Havelock Village Ltd site has been referenced during the PDP Hearings.

At 4.29 of the evidence of Mark Tollemache (planning evidence for submitter 862 Havelock Village Ltd through the Hearings of the Waikato PDP -dated 19 February 2021) – there is reference to the "assumed location of an orally recorded, but not located Pa".

Now, in January 2023, very recent evidence, as a result of archaeological research, points to the likely location of Te Wheoro's Pa and the signal station. Such evidence is still subject to confirmation by detailed on-ground investigation but cannot simply be ignored for the sake of obedience to the directives.

While this is submitter 105 not 116, the same principle applies when considering qualifying matters.

Given the extent of planning already undertaken on the Havelock Village Ltd site, it would seem prudent to incorporate known archaeological sites into the planning as early as possible. Rather than

embarking on an assumed planning direction, it would assist the concept development organisation to know that archaeological values would require a different concept in the spatial planning.

Relief sought:

Decline the original submission, in as far as it relates to qualifying matters, particularly in Pokeno, to the extent that such an approach may hinder an appropriate and early identification of “legitimate” qualifying matters, as outlined in this further submission. See also the example previously provided in further submission (FS211) of the Queen’s Redoubt Trust.

Specifically, the concerns of the Queen’s Redoubt Trust are where the provision, under the legislative requirements of intensification, relates/may relate to part or parts of land where archaeological evidence remains and there is evidence, either in historical records, or from preliminary or known investigations of the history of an area.

Amend the provisions of the variation in a manner that recognises (taking the example provided herein) the purported location of the specified features, and the archaeological values that may be evident in parts of these sites. Early acknowledgement of such heritage elements will help inform the early stages of planning, and better enable the development process.