

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** Plan Change 50 (Queenstown Town Centre Zone  
Extension) to the Queenstown Lakes District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF Dr HAYDEN CAWTE**

---

## 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 I have identified the presence/absence of heritage and archaeological sites within the Lakeview and Isle Street Subzones subject to the plan change. There are at least 11 archaeological sites within the Lakeview and Isle Street sub zones. I have also identified a number of extant post-1900 heritage buildings within the Freehold and Lynch Blocks of the Lakeview Zone. These cribs reflect an important period in Queenstown's development. I have evaluated the cribs in each block, considering most significant the section including Thompson Street.
- 1.2 I have similarly considered the threats posed to these heritage and archaeological features in light of the plan change and offered mitigation options. The most significant archaeological site identified is that of Glenarm Cottage on the corner of Man and Camp streets. I recommend that the existing protections of this cottage be reevaluated in light of a review of the district plan with a likely increase to level one protection. Any modification to the areas around and including the 11 archaeological sites will first require an archaeological authority to be issued from Heritage New Zealand. I recommend that the Thompson Street cribs be retained where possible or recorded prior to removal.
- 1.3 With these mitigation options considered, historic heritage is protected from inappropriate development and thus, I support the proposed plan change.

## 2 Introduction

- 2.1 My name is Dr Hayden Cawte. I am principal archaeologist and director of New Zealand Heritage Properties Limited. I have over 10 years' experience in national and international heritage and archaeological consulting, cultural resource management, heritage resource management, heritage building and structure recording and analysis, research design, material culture analysis and have lectured in archaeology and anthropology at the University of Otago and James Cook University, Australia. I have a first class honours degree in Anthropology, a post-graduate diploma in commerce and a doctorate in archaeology from the University of Otago. I have attended University College London as a Marie Curie Fellow and the University of Cambridge as an Evans Fellow. I am a member of the New Zealand Archaeological Association.
- 2.2 I have conducted, supervised and reviewed over 50 projects in the last 12 months that require a written assessment of the impact each project will have upon both extant heritage sites and archaeological resources.
- 2.3 I became involved in the current matter in May 2014 when my company, New Zealand Heritage Properties was asked to assess the impact that a rezoning of the Lakeview zone would have upon extant heritage sites as well upon both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites. Further investigation was undertaken into Isle Street subzone and 34 Brecon Street in July 2014. Having previously consulted on similar projects in Queenstown (Inner Links Project) and for adjacent sites, conducted archaeological excavations and monitoring, my knowledge of both the region and the areas to be rezoned is high.
- 2.4 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Consolidated Practice Note and have complied with it in preparing this evidence. I also agree to follow the Code when presenting evidence to the Council. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.

### **3 Scope of Evidence**

- 3.1 Having completed the heritage impact assessment for land covered by the plan change, the scope of my evidence is two-fold. Firstly, consider the presence/absence of heritage and archaeological sites within the areas subject to the plan change, and secondly assess the threats posed to said sites in the event of the rezoning.

### **4 The Plan Change**

- 4.1 I note that the plan change has been described in detail by Mr Speedy of the Queenstown Lakes District Council.

### **5 Statutory Framework**

- 5.1 In preparing this evidence I have considered whether the plan change will impact upon archaeological sites as defined in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA). Sites, areas or structures that are likely to have witnessed human occupation prior to the year 1900 are considered archaeological sites and are protected under the HNZPTA. Modification of such sites first requires an archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand (formerly New Zealand Historic Places Trust). Any authority application to modify or destroy a site, must include an assessment of the site's value. An assessment of value is constructed by considering the following criteria:

- (a) Condition,
- (b) Rarity/uniqueness,
- (c) Contextual Value,
- (d) Information Potential,
- (e) Amenity Value,
- (f) Aesthetics/Character,
- (g) Significance.

- 5.2 The Resource Management Act (1991) (RMA) considers historic heritage to be a matter of national importance under Section 6. The Act defines historic heritage as those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, derived from archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, or technological qualities. It should be noted that this definition does not include the 1900 cut-off date for protected archaeological sites as defined by the NZHPTA. Historic heritage includes:

- (a) Historic sites, structures, places and areas,
- (b) Archaeological sites,
- (c) Sites of significance to Maori, including Wahi Tapu; and,
- (d) Surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.

- 5.3 The Queenstown Lakes District Council Plan protects the region from development that results in a loss of character and historical understanding of the district. Therefore, consideration is given to archaeological and heritage features that allow the public to interpret Queenstown's development.
- 5.4 Heritage features such as buildings, sets of buildings, and monuments (among others) are identified in the Inventory of Protected Features included as Appendix A3 of the Queenstown District Plan (QLDC 2013). Built features are assigned to one of three council categories, each of which affords a different level of protection when alteration or demolition is considered.
- (a) **Category 1** – The heritage warrants the highest level of protection because it is extremely significant to the District and demolition is not contemplated;
  - (b) **Category 2** – The heritage warrants permanent protection because of its significance to the District. The council would be unlikely to approve any significant alteration but would take steps to arrange compensation or acquisition if the owner's property rights are unreasonably restricted;
  - (c) **Category 3** – Preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged. The council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations.

## 6 The Site

- 6.1 The Lakeview site and the Isle St sub-zones are made up of seven blocks. These blocks are situated along the western edge and the southern end of the Queenstown strip exiting the town. They sit at the base of Ben Lomond overlooking the main town centre. For the purpose of my assessment the blocks are named the Holiday Park Block, Reserve Block, Freehold Block, Lynch Block, Block XI, Block XII and Block LV (See Appendix A). These blocks are located in parts of Queenstown that were surveyed prior to 1900 and therefore have the potential for featuring archaeological sites. Post-1900 heritage sites have the potential to occur across all blocks.

## 7 Key Findings

- 7.1 My technical report identified archaeological sites through survey and historical research for each block in the Lakeview sub-zone and Isle Street sub-zone. The identification of heritage sites (as opposed to archaeological sites) relate to understanding key periods in Queenstown's development. Two obvious periods of development are; the gold rush period (which in itself is archaeological) which saw a large increase in population related to this primary industry, and the second, the genesis of Queenstown as a holiday destination based on recreation. The identification of these latter sites was largely based upon the survey for extant structures relating to the period between 1900 and 1960 that allow for an understanding of this important industry development.
- 7.2 The Holiday Park Block, Reserve Block and Block LV contain no obvious archaeological features. These blocks were, however, originally zoned for public use and enjoyment. Holiday Park and Reserve Blocks contain historic trees that directly relate to Queenstown's early colonial period. A further 12 protected trees are present within the boundaries of the Freehold Block. The trees provide the simplest form of historic interpretation available to the public, that is to say, the public can look upon a tree and associate its size to its age. In each case, these trees have almost certainly come from the pre-1900 nursery that was once

on this site and therefore provide a good link between the former use of the area, its occupants, and the beautifying attempts of the earliest settlers. The plan change will not affect these trees as they are to remain subject to the same District Plan protections that they now have.

- 7.3 My research shows there are at least 11 archaeological sites within the Lakeview and sub zones. Archaeologically, Block XII contains the most evidence for pre-1900 occupation on and around Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 14.
- 7.4 The Lynch Block has a further four archaeological sites on each of Sections 1, 2, 4, and 13, sites which included known structures built prior to 1900. Those who owned and operated businesses on the Freehold Block and Lynch Block had an obvious and enduring impact on the township of Queenstown. The archaeological sites specifically relate to two particular businesses; McConnachie and Rowell's arborist company and J.W Robertson and Co. Their combined legacy, to which much of Queenstown's early prosperity is attributed, include the Queenstown Botanic Gardens, the region's first saw-mill, the Antrim Steamer, Brunswick Flour Mills and the first wharf site on the lake. Block XI has evidence for at least one archaeological site in and around Section 4 which was a public pound for stock.
- 7.5 A plan change will pose little added threat to these sites or will be of little consequence as there are few, if any, above ground or visible features and these sites are already zoned for High Density Residential use. Previous development on these blocks has removed the early buildings, structures or features. While it is likely that remnants of this pre-1900 occupation are still present beneath existing structures, a plan change will have no greater impact than that which exists now. It may, however, expedite the redevelopment of these blocks. Any subsequent development on these sites would simply require an Archaeological Authority from Heritage New Zealand.
- 7.6 The most significant archaeological site identified, based upon an evaluation of assessment criteria, is an extant 1880's cottage (Glenarm Cottage) on the corner of Man and Camp Streets. It is a rare type of archaeological site in that the dwelling is one of few remaining structures from this period and still occupied for its intended purpose. The public are able to easily interpret this site as a historic structure and thus understand elements of Queenstown's early development. The cottage is currently protected under the QLDC District Plan at a Category 2 level. The building's small footprint and single storey does mean that this site would be threatened by a plan change that would allow for more intensive development than currently allowed under existing plan rules. Therefore, mitigation should be such that there is no greater threat to this cottage as a consequence of a plan change, than that which existed before. To achieve this goal, the district plan protection of this cottage should be elevated to Category 1. I understand that the QLDC is reviewing its District Plan and I recommend as part of that review, that a fresh assessment be conducted to ensure that the broader contextual issues are considered including the efficacy of existing protections.
- 7.7 Further to the archaeological sites, post-1900 building elements are considered extant heritage under the QLDC district plan and RMA. The Freehold and Lynch Blocks contain character cribs that are not covered by the pre-1900 protections of the HNZPTA but do reflect an important period in Queenstown's history; the transition from a mining town to holiday destination. These cribs reflect the intermediary period in this growth whereby the majority of tourists were domestic and based around the family unit. Subsequently, there was a shift from majority domestic tourists, to a larger number of international visitors. Thus, the cribs are a remnant of an interesting and important period in Queenstown's history. Thompson Street, within the Freehold Block, is lined with the best examples of

these cribs. Other examples of extant heritage relating to this period exist at 52, 54, and 56 Camp Street. There will also be an increased threat to the Camp Street properties. As a mitigation measure, commensurate to their heritage value, it was my recommendation to the Council that the Thompson Street cribs should be recorded to the equivalent of a Level 4 recording of the Heritage New Zealand Guidelines for Investigation and Recording of Buildings (2006) as a measure of understanding this formative period of Queenstown's development. The Council has already undertaken this work and it provides interesting insight into the emergence of the tourism industry as it relates to domestic, crib dwelling families.

## 8 Submissions and Further Submissions

- 8.1 A total of four submissions (5, 21, 42 & 51) address six matters relating to the impact of the change upon the heritage and archaeological values of the zones. All four submissions include a concern for the heritage value of the leasehold cribs within the Freehold and Lynch blocks. All request that the cribs be allowed to remain or that certain streets and areas be excluded from the rezoning on heritage grounds. Submission 21 requests that if in place protection is not viable, they would like the council to consider relocating a number of the cabins to a new location. Two further submissions (6 & 7) wish to exclude Antrim and Earnslaw Streets from the change on the basis that the cribs are considered "kiwiana". I have considered "kiwiana" as a term used to reflect heritage values that relate to New Zealand's more recent past and thus, these concerns have been considered together with those directly noting heritage values.
- 8.2 Our Heritage Impact Assessment (McPherson and Cawte 2014) has identified the cribs as having heritage value and suggests protection of the best examples if possible, or for appropriate mitigation (recording of the best examples) to be implemented to offset the loss of these cabins. I assessed the value of each block of cabins separately noting their overall condition, rarity, contextual value, information potential, amenity value, and aesthetics/character which, when combined, provided a level of significance for each block. This assessment did identify that the Lynch block (including Earnslaw and Antrim Streets) were considered of medium significance, a level similar to that of the Freehold Block which does however, contain the more prominent Thompson Street examples. However, if the council, as landowner, were able to protect cribs in place, then it is recommended that these be the line of dwellings along Thompson street. This is because these better reflect the character of the period and the ethos behind the crib culture, they have a greater amenity value, and overall are in better condition thus making them more readily accessible to the public and allowing the public to easily interpret and understand their original use. Submission 21 requests that the council consider protecting one or more of the Thompson Street cribs in place to aid in the ongoing interpretation and understanding of the importance of this period to Queenstown's growth. While protecting one or more cribs is desirable, it is the 'complex' of cribs that contribute to the overall understanding of the importance of domestic tourism had in the emergence of Queenstown's important tourism industry. Thus, the completion of the building recording project (as undertaken by the QLDC) has been effective at documenting the range of dwellings, their style and their importance in the development of this industry. However, protection of one or more of the Thompson Street cribs would be a useful physical reminder to the public of the importance of early domestic tourism in the region's growth. If relocation of the cribs is viable, the number of cabins relocated should be such that the breadth of styles and material types are represented.
- 8.3 Submission 21 requests that consideration be given to the effects the Plan Change may have upon the historic Queenstown cemetery. I have addressed this submission below.

- 8.4 The cemetery at the top of Brecon Street, while not directly impacted by the proposed plan change, could be negatively impacted by adjacent developments facilitated by the plan change. The cemetery is considered a large archaeological site and an important heritage place bordering 34 Brecon Street and the Lakeview zone.
- 8.5 Cemeteries are places where nationhood is portrayed and the public get a physical sense of history and chronology through mortality. They are a rare type of archaeological site in that they; are relatively few in number, they contain sensitive connections to the past, and are added to through time. Thus the ability for the public to interpret, understand, and enjoy these spaces is high. They have significant contextual value and being public spaces, their amenity value is considerable. Much of the heritage value in a cemetery is in the user's experience of these historic places and how they make people feel.
- 8.6 Cemeteries in New Zealand were, for the most part, designed in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century during a time in which the design, layout and symbolism was well considered and of considerable importance. Cemeteries were often located in outlying areas to provide a sense of separation from day to day living, of peace and tranquility. When planned, the Queenstown cemetery was of considerable distance from the town centre and with the lack of trees, was a prominent visual feature on the landscape for those "looking up" from the town centre below. Subsequent development has seen the efficacy of this 19<sup>th</sup> century quality and symbolism reduced. Similarly, the layout and orientation of a cemetery and the graves and headstone within it, were laid out "appropriate" to symbolic convention. Culture and religion also determined "appropriate" ritual and in terms of the Queenstown cemetery, many variations are represented. Graves were often orientated towards the entrance and the entrance gates fixed open as a symbol for the passage to the after-life.
- 8.7 Therefore, adjacent development, including that which borders the approach to the cemeteries main entrance, should be considerate of these qualities and of the user's experience. Building heights should be such that the effects of shading are reduced, and don't "enclose" the area or significantly impact upon the views, especially from the main orientation, which could impact upon the user's experience. Consideration should also be given to noise and consistency of din at boundary – a potentially significant detractor from the values of such place.
- 8.8 Accordingly, it is recommended that maximum height restrictions at the boundary with 34 Brecon Street be imposed (unless a land swap and realignment of cemetery road can proceed), that do not pose a risk of shading, create a "tunnel" upon approach or unduly enclose this area of the cemetery. It is recommended that each development proposal adjacent to the cemetery, be considered for its effects upon the setting and values of the cemetery.
- 8.9 If a realignment of Cemetery Road were possible, there could be heritage benefits. It would create a buffer zone between the cemetery and private property reducing the impact of adjoining structures and their ability to enclose the cemetery as well as improve the connectivity to the township. It would allow for the main entry to be reinstated and highlighted – improving to reorientate the cemetery in its historic format.
- 8.10 If realignment of Cemetery Road were possible, an archaeological authority would be required prior to works.
- 8.11 Submission 21 requests that any development within the Lakeview and associated subzones comply with the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. The completed Heritage Impact Assessment (McPherson and Cawte 2014) has identified the areas within the Lakeview and subzones that are subject to these provisions, namely areas in

which pre-1900 human activity is likely to have taken place. While survey produced few visual signs of archaeological sites, (save for Glenarm Cottage in Block XII of Isle Street Blocks), historical research has identified possible dense archaeological sites. Sections 6.1 to 6.7 above outline the nature and number of likely archaeological sites within the Lakeview and Isle Street sub zone. In each case, prior to works in these blocks, an archaeological authority must be applied for from Heritage New Zealand.

## **9 Conclusion**

- 9.1 For the reasons outlined in my evidence I support the proposed plan change, subject to mitigation measures which reduce the threat to both Glenarm Cottage (to be considered as part of the District Plan review) and the Queenstown Cemetery, and record the heritage cribs along Thompson Street. Completion of this mitigation preserves the historic heritage from inappropriate use and destruction.

**DATED** the 10th day of November 2014

Dr Hayden Cawte  
Principal Archaeologist  
New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd  
Salisbury House  
106 Bond Street  
Dunedin, 9016



## Appendix A.



Holiday Park Block highlighted in yellow, Reserve Block in red, Freehold Block in blue and Lynch Block in green.

## Legal Descriptions of the areas to be rezoned

The pre- and post-1900 legal descriptions of the blocks and sections to be rezoned.

Block name	Block #	Subdivisions
Holiday Park	Pt Block LVI TN of Queenstown	Section 1
		Section 1 SO 122299
Reserve	Pt Block XXXII TN of Queenstown	Lot 1 DP 7498
Freehold	Block XX Section 3, Shotover District	Lot 1 DP 354070
		Lot 2 DP 354070
		Lot 3 DP 354070
		Section 1 SO 24298
		Section 2 SO 24298
		Section 3 SO 24298
		Section 4 So 24298
		Marked D SO 24298
Lynch	Block XXIX TN of Queenstown	Section 6
		Section 7
		Section 8
		Section 9
		Section 10
		Section 11
		Section 12
		Section 13
		Section 14
		Pt Section 15