

Before the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan Hearings Panel

In the Matter of

the Resource Management Act
1991 (**Act**)

And

In the Matter of

a submission (S941) and further
submission on the Proposed Te Tai
o Poutini Plan by Bathurst
Resources Limited and BT Mining
Limited

And

In the Matter of

Topic 7: Historic Heritage

Statement of Evidence of **Campbell David Robertson** for Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited

Dated: 9 November 2023

大成 DENTONS KENSINGTON SWAN

18 Viaduct Harbour Avenue P +64 4 472 7877
Private Bag 92101 F +64 4 472 2291
Auckland 1142 DX SP26517

Solicitor: C Sheard
E: Christina.sheard@dentons.com

lane neave.

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
Queenstown 9300
Solicitor Acting: Joshua Leckie
Email: joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz
Phone: 03 409 0321

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and Experience

1. My name is Campbell David Robertson.
2. I am an Environmental Manager (Resource and Development) at Bathurst Resources Limited.
3. I have a BSc Zoology (Canterbury University), MSc (Hons) Resource Management (Lincoln University) and a Post Graduate Certificate in Environmental Management Systems and Auditing (University of East Anglia).
4. I have worked for Bathurst Resources as an Environmental Manager since 2011. In this role I have been responsible for overseeing the consenting processes for the Escarpment Mine, as well as approvals at many of Bathurst's other sites.
5. Prior to working at Bathurst, I worked for the Department of Conservation for more than ten years in a variety of roles including ecological survey, planning, community relations and project management.
6. I am presenting this evidence as Bathurst's Environmental Manager with responsibility for managing and obtaining all necessary environmental approvals for activities in the general Buller District.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

7. I provide evidence on behalf of Bathurst Resources Limited (**BRL**) and BT Mining (together, **Bathurst**) on Bathurst's submission on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (**TTPP**).
8. The following evidence addresses Bathurst's submission and further submission points that relate to the Historic Heritage provisions in the TTPP.
9. My evidence is factual in nature and provides background information to support the amendments sought by Bathurst to HH-P7 to demonstrate that an investigation and assessment from a suitably qualified professional does not need to be undertaken in all cases, only when deemed necessary and appropriate by the consent authority.

ASSESSMENT BY A SUITABLY QUALIFIED PROFESSIONAL

10. In its submission,¹ Bathurst sought an amendment to HH-P7 of the proposed TTPP as follows:

Demolition and destruction of historic heritage items identified in Schedule One will not be allowed unless it can be demonstrated, ~~through investigation and assessment by a suitably qualified heritage professional that:~~

- a. ...c... been fully considered. A suitably qualified professional may be required to undertake an assessment where it is deemed necessary by the Consent Authority having regard to the nature of the protected heritage team.

11. The Section 42A Report prepared for Topic 7 recommends that this submission be rejected.
12. I recognise the addition of risk to public safety as an assessment matter and this addition to HH-P7 as recommended in the Section 42A Report. This is sensible.
13. However, Bathurst's concerns relate to the inefficiency and additional cost of requiring an independent assessment by a suitably qualified heritage professional in all cases irrespective of the circumstances or condition of the structure. As shown by the images of the structure attached as **Annexure One**, there are instances where it is obvious that the structure is not safe, nor reasonably able to be repaired. The additional burden of obtaining a report is not necessary where the matter could be determined by a council consenting planner.
14. Bathurst is not seeking to reduce the level of protection or remove the requirements for consents for identified historic heritage items, rather it is seeking to give the Council some discretion to determine whether an additional report should be required on a case by case basis.
15. The specific concern for Bathurst relates to a building on Section 2 SO Plan 14868 NL10A/582 owned by Bathurst and within the Denniston Historic Area (Schedule One HH5). This property was purchased in June 2014. While the building was occupied at the time of purchase, it has not been occupied since this time and no maintenance has occurred. As can be seen by the images attached as **Annexure 1**, the building has fallen into a complete state of disrepair. The state of this building is largely the result of unwanted attention from people visiting the area. Extreme weather events may have also contributed to some damage.

¹ Submission Number S491.011.

16. In this instance, and there may be others, given the extremely dilapidated state of the building, an assessment by a suitably qualified heritage professional will not necessarily be required by a Council processing planner to assess the values of the property and underlying safety risks.
17. Further to this, given it is a possibility that the building was constructed pre 1900, there may be a requirement under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 for an authority to modify or destroy any building within this area.

CONCLUSION

18. Bathurst is seeking that an amendment to HH-P7 for the enablement of Council discretion on whether a suitably qualified heritage professional report is required to accompany any application to demolish or destroy any structure within the Denniston Heritage Area (Schedule One of the TTPP).
19. I have provided the condition of the building owned by Bathurst as an example of a building where this discretion would be valuable. Without this amendment, and based on my experience of commissioning archaeological assessments, I consider there will be additional cost and time associated with the consenting process with no benefit in some instances where the values of a building are clear to a Council processing planner.



Campbell David Robertson

9 November 2023

Annexure One
Photos



Figure 1: Bathurst Property, Photo taken from valuation report August 2013



Figure 2: Photo taken similar location from driveway (1 November 2023)



Figure 3: Western side of house showing veranda (1 November 2023)



Figure 4: View looking inside of house from front door showing missing floorboards, damage to ceilings, walls, moss growing inside (1 November 2023)