

**Before the Independent Hearings Panel
At Wellington City Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the Proposed Wellington City District Plan

Right of Reply statement of evidence of Clive Anstey

Date: 7 June 2024

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Clive Anstey. I have been self- employed as a Landscape and Resource Consultant since 1999. Prior to this I spent 31 years in the Public Service; the Forest Service, the Ministry of Forestry, and finally, the Department of Conservation.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of supplementary evidence on behalf of the Wellington City Council (the **Council**) in respect of technical related matters arising from expert evidence submitted by the people listed below to support the submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Wellington City District Plan (the **PDP**).
- 3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the matters of the Coastal Environment and Natural Features and Landscapes raised in [Minute 49: Stream 8 Hearing Follow Up](#) released by the Panel on 6 May 2024.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 4 Paragraphs 5 and 6 of my Evidence-in-Chief sets out my qualifications and experience as an expert.
- 5 I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023, as applicable to this Independent Panel hearing.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 My statement of evidence addresses responses to specific matters and questions raised by the Panel in Minute 49.

4(a) On the premise that the Hearing Panel considers the option he mooted of the Coastal Environment line being drawn to exclude the active quarry area on the Horokiwi Quarry site to have merit, can Mr Anstey please identify how that boundary should be joined at either end with the balance of the Coastal Environment line. We request that this will be done both with a map and a written explanation;

- 7 The Boffa Miskell Coastal Environment Boundary (shown in the PDP) follows an imagined 'pre-cultural' ridgeline across the Horokiwi Quarry. Quarrying has removed a substantial area of land however, including the imagined ridgeline. The commissioners have requested guidance on where the boundary might be located to better reflect the existing topography.
- 8 The Coastal Environment Boundary along the Western side of Wellington harbour tends to follow the ridgeline at the head of the steep gullies draining down to the sea. While this boundary does not strictly follow contours it does follow ridges and hilltops that are clearly subject to coastal influences. The boundary associated with the quarry site should be consistent with this. The boundary should be located to reflect the natural topography, either at the northern (inland) or the southern (coastal) edge of the quarry. In my opinion the 'inland' boundary would be beyond the zone of coastal influences (as Mr Shannon Bray argued in his evidence to the panel) as well as being inconsistent with the boundary along the western side of the harbour.
- 9 A boundary along the coastal edge of the quarry, while being well beyond where the original and 'natural' boundary would once have been, tends to be more consistent with the coastal boundary generally.
- 10 A revised boundary would need to join the Boffa Miskell Boundary in a manner that respects the natural contours and contains the visual effects of earthworks as far as possible. The revised boundary I have drawn (Appendix A) attempts to satisfy the objectives outlined.
- 11 The proposed revised boundary essentially excludes the working area of the quarry from the coastal environment, as proposed by Mr Shannon Bray. This boundary is located to include unworked ground and naturally regenerating indigenous vegetation within the Coastal Environment. This will protect the integrity and visual coherence of the 'skyline' from public roads and public spaces.

4(b) Can Mr Anstey please respond to the presentation of Dr Brent Layton in relation to both the SAL and Ridgeline and Hilltop overlays applying to his land on South Karori Road.

12 I have read the written submissions of Mr Layton and I listened to his verbal submission to the panel (on day 3 of Hearing Stream 8.) Mr Layton would appear to have two grievances. While he clearly recognises the value and significance of the Indigenous Forest Protection and Restoration work he and his partner have undertaken on their 65 Ha property he feels that their efforts should be more broadly appreciated and the costs carried by the wider community. Mr Layton's second grievance is that having invested so much time and energy adding value to their property they now face overlays restricting what they are allowed to do with their land.

13 In responding to Mr Layton I think it only fair that I should provide some reference to my background experience as it relates to the wider economic issues he raises as well as to the more immediate and local context of his activities.

14 The first twenty years of my career was spent with the NZ Forest Service, the first five as a 'technical' officer in Otago. Much of my time was spent acquiring land for afforestation, a process requiring that certain levels of economic return be guaranteed for Treasury to approve a purchase. This provided me with an excellent grounding in the economics of land use, farming and forestry. Following the completion of a post graduate course at Lincoln College I established a planning and design advisory service within the NZFS. After a brief period as a Regional Manager within the Ministry of Forestry during the 1980's I became National Planning Manager for the Department of Conservation. This involved overseeing the development of 14 Conservation Management Strategies covering NZ, and establishing an advocacy function addressing RMA matters of relevance to the department.

15 As a Resource and Landscape Planning Consultant one of my early contracts was with WCC, working with Graeme Mc Indoe to produce the

'Rural Design Guide'. The guideline was developed in consultation with the 'Rural Communities' of Wellington, the South Makara Community being one of these. The 'rural life style' and land management practices of Mr Layton and his partner are entirely consistent with the community's vision back in 2002. I would also say that the scale and extent of development Mr Layton envisages in order to consolidate and further enhance their restoration efforts would be readily accommodated by the PDP.

16 Having worked with both central and local government I have observed an ever-increasing reluctance to accept responsibility for the management of additional 'public land' beyond that required for hard infrastructure. Simultaneously however there has been an increasing awareness of the monetary value of 'ecological services'. 'The market' has largely failed to provide for such services and conventional economics has tended to locate such services in the 'public good' domain. Declining water quality and the effects of climate change are seeing an urgent revision of 'conventional economics', the separation of the 'public' and the private 'domains', at least in the context of land management; we live on a commons and ecological services transcend both realms. Mr Layton resides in both and finds himself caught between the two, looking to a sustaining future while caught in a fragmented past of unsustainable contradictions.

17 There are clear signs of a shift in the direction Mr Layton seems to suggest, a shift towards greater integration across the public and private sectors. Public land is accessible to private enterprise, to extract resources such as timber and minerals, as well as to establish tourism ventures. The public sector helps fund the management of private land where there is a public benefit and 'the market' facilitates carbon transfers and directs more 'resilient' futures.

18 I would suggest that Mr Layton and his partner are at the forefront of this reorientation. Their land is located at the upper end of a critical catchment so their land management activities make a major

contribution to the quality of the water available to their downstream neighbours. They provide desperately needed habitat for endangered species. While the overlays may be focused on the protection of indigenous habitat, visual coherence, and quality, such landscapes are being increasingly valued for their contribution to land stability and resilience. Such things matter in 'the market'. Insurance companies are telling us so, or at least their economists are.

19 Unless the criteria are changed I see no reason to re-visit the extent of the overlays on Mr Layton's land. I agree with the values identified by Boffa Miskell, in particular the identified RPS Policy 28 Aesthetic Sensory Value: *"The hill blocks are part of the central ridge forming the undeveloped skyline backdrop to the city and western residential suburbs. Both hilltops are iconic landmarks within the community"*. This value speaks to both the important values of the SAL as well as the ridgeline and hilltops overlay.

20 In practical terms I cannot see how the activities of Mr Layton and his partner are constrained by the overlays. In my opinion the overlays are a recognition of the values Mr Layton and his partner are protecting, and enhancing. The fact that the overlays extend beyond their property and out across the wider landscape is an endorsement of their efforts, adds value to their enterprise, and adds weight to the example they have set.

21 I hope I have made it clear that I have some sympathy with Mr Layton's request for greater recognition of the contribution he and his partner make to the wider community and the need for markets to attribute monetary value to the services they provide. This is however beyond my brief and out of scope.


Date: 7 June 2024

Clive Anstey

**Appendix A: Coastal Environment Overlay – revised option Horokiwi
Quarry**



Legend

 Coastal Environment Overlay – revised option

PDP Stream 8: Coastal Environment

Map shows the Horokiwi Quarry Region with the Coastal Environment Overlay – revised option.


Date: 5/06/2024
Credit: City Insights GIS Team

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Basemap credits: Esri Community Maps Contributors, LINZ, Stats NZ, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, Foursquare, METI/NASA, USGS, Maxar



Legend

 Coastal Environment Overlay – revised option

PDP Stream 8: Coastal Environment

Map shows the Horokiwi Quarry Region with the Coastal Environment Overlay – revised option.

Date: 5/06/2024
Credit: City Insights GIS Team

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Basemap credits: Esri Community Maps Contributors, LINZ, Stats NZ, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, Foursquare, METI/NASA, USGS, Maxar