

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MARK A.B. LILE

On behalf of

THE O'CONOR INSTITUTE TRUST BOARD

(S466)

Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP)

Historic Heritage

(Hearing: 7th – 8th December 2023)

Section A – Introduction and Scope of Evidence

Name, qualification and expertise

1. My full name is Mark Addie Bernard Lile.
2. I have a Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning (Hons), along with a Postgraduate Diploma in Business and Administration, both from Massey University. In 1998 I became a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI) and have served on the local committee of the NZPI and RMLA.
3. My professional planning career started as a Planning Officer with the Nelson City Council, where I worked between March 1994 and the end of March 2000. On 1 April 2000 I established Landmark Lile Limited which I have operated since. This company has now operated for 23 years. Over the course of the last 23 years I have been involved in numerous projects involving historic heritage.

Expert Code

4. While this is not an Environment Court hearing I have met the standards in that Court for giving expert evidence
5. I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses issued as part of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 (part 8). I agree to comply with the Code of Conduct. I am satisfied that the matters addressed in this statement of evidence are within my expertise. I am not aware of any material facts that have either been omitted or might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this statement of evidence.

Role for The O’Conor Institute Trust Board

6. Over the last two years I have been assisting The O’Conor Institute Trust Board (hereafter referred to as ‘The O’Conor Institute’) with its development plans involving the addition of a new hospital care wing and dementia care wing to the western side of the existing facility. This work has also included a review of the then forthcoming TTPP and making submissions (#466) on the proposed TTPP.

Scope of Evidence

7. My evidence has taken care to ensure it addresses the matters identified as outstanding in the s42A report.

Section B – Executive Summary

8. The O’Conor Institute fully supports the collective efforts and significant investment of time and resources into the preparation of the TTPP. It also greatly appreciates the opportunity to become directly involved with this process which will result in a much more efficient and integrated set of provisions that will take the West Coast forward in a positive direction in years to come.
9. It is also very clear that the process of preparing the hearing reports and organising the hearings have been professionally managed.

Section C - Evidence

10. With respect to the topic of Historic Heritage, The O’Conor Institute only made submissions in relation to Rules R1 and R2. I address those aspects of the s42A report and the associated recommendations in my evidence that follows.

HH- R1 Repairs and Maintenance of a Historic Heritage Item

11. As a matter of background, the O’Conor Institute building is a Category 2 listing (#5034, Heritage NZ) and is also identified at HH19 in Schedule One (p598) of the pTTPP. However, of all of the items listed in the TTPP as historic heritage, only 8 have internal “fixtures and fittings” identified as a part of their significance. Those 8 items are listed in paragraph 95 of the s42A with The O’Conor Institute not being one such item.
12. The O’Conor Institute submission is that the proposed rule does not distinguish between interior and exterior works. This created the potential for resource consent to be required for internal alterations even if the interior was not part of the protected heritage value. The s42A report supports this submission and noted the importance of clarifying the intent of the rule.
13. The s42A recommends that R1 be amended as follows:

Activity Status Permitted Where:

1. *There is no*
 - a. *Changes to the extent, floor levels, form, proportion and scale of the item;*
 - b. *Changes to the design, texture, or form of the fabric;*
 - c. *Use of materials other than those that are the same as the original, or most significant fabric, or the closest equivalent; or*
 - d. *Damage to the building or structure as a consequence of affixing scaffolding.*

[Advice Note: This rule applies only to the exterior of the heritage item except where the Extent in Schedule One includes fixtures and fittings. The rule applies to fixtures and fittings for those specific scheduled items, including interiors²⁹.](#)

14. I agree that this recommended change provides appropriate clarification and will ensure the administration of the rule is focused and efficient.

HH – R2 Earthquake Strengthening, Fire Protection and Accessibility and Supply of Energy³⁰ Upgrades to a Historic Heritage Item identified in Schedule One

15. As set out in the submission (S466), it was considered that the reference to ‘heritage architect’ was not appropriate and that this should be replaced with ‘*suitably qualified and experienced architect*’. For the most part this submission is supported by the reporting officer as the s42A recommends that the rule be amended as follows:

Activity Status Permitted

Where:

1. *All performance standards for Rule HH – R1 are complied with; and*
2. *An assessment from a [Heritage Architect suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional³¹](#) is provided to the relevant council confirming the works are consistent with the*

values of the Historic Heritage item at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of the work

16. The s42 report explains the reason for using the words 'heritage professional' rather than 'architect' in paragraphs 98-100 of the report. I agree with that reasoning, also as directly sought by Federated Farmers (S524.009).

Overall Assessment

17. Overall, for the reasons set out above, The O'Connor Institute is satisfied that the recommendations of the s42A report are appropriate.
18. I will be available to answer any questions at the scheduled hearing.



Mark A. B. Lile
9 November 2023