

Report: Summary of Submissions by Submitter Number/Name

Submitter Number:	559	Submitter:	Sherry Reynolds
On behalf of:	Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office		
Point Number	559.1		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend plan to provide for objectives policies and rules related to a topic e.g. Tangata Whenua or Historic Heritage values to be located within a single chapter.		
Decision Reasons:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This format allows the reader to view the framework and cascade of reasoning and related actions for a topic.• This type of format has been advocated as part of the proposed National Planning Standards.		
Point Number	559.2		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the format of a separate chapter relating to Tangata whenua values. AND Amend the format of the Proposed District Plan to include the related rules and matters of control and discretion that give effect to the objectives and policies into the Tangata whenua chapter. OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to include cross referencing to the rule numbers within the other chapters of the Plan that give effect to the objective and policies. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any other consequential amendments as required.		
Decision Reasons:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submitter seeks that plan objectives, policies and rules related to a topic, for example Tangata Whenua values or Historic Heritage values are located within a single chapter.• This format allows the reader to view the framework and cascade of reasoning and related actions for a topic.• This type of format has been advocated as part of the proposed National Planning Standards.• The plan would be easier to follow if the rules that give effect to these issues, objectives and policies were included within the same chapter, much as they are shown in the objective, policies and rules cascade within the s32 discussion documents.• In the alternative there needs to be a system to link the Objectives and Policies with the rules.		
Point Number	559.3		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the format of a separate chapter relating to historic heritage. AND Amend the format of the Proposed District Plan to include the related rules and matters of control and discretion that give effect to the objectives and policies to the chapter. OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to include cross referencing to the rule numbers within the other chapters of the Plan that give effect to the objective and policies. AND Add any other consequential amendments as required.		
Decision Reasons:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submitter seeks that plan objectives, policies and rules related to a topic, for example Tangata whenua values or Historic Heritage values are located within a single chapter.• This format allows the reader to view the framework and cascade of reasoning and related actions for a topic.• This type of format has been advocated as part of the proposed National Planning Standards.• Submitters supports that the plan retains the Historic Heritage Chapter, as the Plan is required to recognise and provide for the Resource Management Act 1991, Part 2 – s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular, s6(f) “<i>the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development</i>”• The plan would be easier to follow if the rules that give effect to these issues, objectives and policies were included within the same chapter, much as they are shown in the objective, policies and rules cascade within the s32 discussion documents.• In the alternative there needs to be a system to link the Objectives and Policies with the rules.		
Point Number	559.4		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include incentives and bonus provisions to encourage the retention of heritage, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Permitted activity status for repairs and maintenance, and		

- Appropriate activity status for adaptive reuse and earthquake strengthening, and
- The non-supply of car parking spaces at the time of the adaptive reuse, and
- Bonus provisions for the permanent protection of heritage sites.

Decision Reasons:

- The plan is required to recognise and provide for matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development"
- The submitter considers that there are many ways that a plan can support heritage, including the use of positive regulatory (incentive) measures.
- These provisions not only encourage the sustainable management of heritage, they are also an important way to gain support from owners and the public as sometimes provisions such as carparking requirements can be a disincentive for the reuse of heritage buildings, particularly in urban areas. Relaxing these requirements is a cost effective way for councils to incentivise the preservation of heritage buildings.
- The submitter notes that while the plan does provide a permitted activity status for some repairs and maintenance, there are no other incentive rules.

Point Number

559.5

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Chapter 12 How to use and interpret the rules, to clearly state that the design policies, rules and various design guidelines are subservient to the historic heritage rules and matters of assessment, which will ensure the maintaining of heritage values.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter has concerns regarding the relationship between heritage items identified in Schedule 30.1 and the vast range of design and heritage guidance in the Plan, which appear at various locations within the Plan.
- The plan does not state which provisions have priority if there is a conflict between design rules and heritage rules for development and works in relation to a heritage item.
- While it is appreciated that the design guidance seeks a cohesive look for a township or village, this should not be at the expense of heritage values. For example the requirement to provide a verandah at the time of development when such works could compromise the values of a heritage building.
- Amendments need to clarify the relationship of these measures, and to ensure the retention of heritage values at the time of development.

Point Number

559.6

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Chapter 1 Introduction, section 1.4 issues, to include a discussion relating to the Historic Heritage issues for the Waikato District and to use the Historic heritage issue contained within the S32 document as a basis for that discussion.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the resource management "issue" found in the s32 document (page 16) "*Activities that damage or destroy historic heritage lead to the loss of tangible connections to the communities social, cultural and economic past*" is not discussed within section 1.4 Issues for the Waikato District.
- Other issues have been discussed and a case made for the resolution of the issue.
- The two small references made to heritage as part of discussions related to other issues within section 1.4 of this Chapter are not a sufficient base on which to establish the policy and rule frameworks that exists in the plan.
- It is important that this section of the plan identify the historic heritage issue that is an existing or potential problem that must be resolved to promote the purpose of the Resource Management Act.
- A discussion around the historic heritage issue within this section would also assist the reader in understanding the cascade of resource management provisions related to heritage.

Point Number

559.7

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Strategic Objective 2.11 Tautoko te Whakatupuranga.

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Strategic Objective 2.11 Tautoko te Whakatupuranga as this objective gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number

559.8

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Strategic Objective 2.12 Whakapapa (connection to nature).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Strategic Objective 2.12 Strategic Objective Whakapapa (connection to nature) as this objective provides for the relationship of traditional resources on all lands not just Maaori owned land.
- It also gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number

559.9

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 2.12.1(a) Whanaungatanga (relationship to nature).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Policy 2.12.1 Whanaungatanga (relationship to nature) as it gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.10

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 2.13 Whenuatanga (land management).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Objective 2.13 Whenuatanga (land management) as it gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.11

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 2.13.1(a), (b) and (c) Tangata Whenuatanga (utilisation by landowners).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Policy 2.13.1(a), (b) and (c) Tangata Whenuatanga (utilisation by landowners) as it gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.12

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 2.14 Kaitiaki (steward/guardian).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Objective 2.14 Kaitiaki (steward/guardian) as it gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.13

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 2.14.1 Kaitiakitanga (stewardship/guardianship).

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Policy 2.14.1 Kaitiakitanga (stewardship/guardianship) as it gives effect to Part 2 matters, in particular s7(a).

Point Number 559.14

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 2.15 Waikatotanga (way of life)

Decision Reasons:

- Supports Objective 2.15 Waikatotanga (way of life) as it gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.15

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 2.15.1 Ngaa taonga tuku iho (Maaori sites and areas of significance), except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 2.15.1 Ngaa taonga tuku iho (Maaori sites and areas of significance) as follows:

Maaori sites and areas of significance and waahi tapu

(a) Ensure subdivision, use and development does not compromise the cultural and spiritual significance of areas, including waahi tapu, urupaa, maunga and other landforms, mahinga kai, and indigenous flora and fauna.

(b) Area and sites of significance to Maaori including waahi tapu sites and waahi tapu areas are protected from adverse effects of development or activities on those sites, including inappropriate modification.

(c) Avoid the destruction areas and sites of significance to Maaori and Waahi Tapu Sites and Waahi Tapu Areas.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter supports in parts Policy 2.15.1 as the submitter is concerned that these policies do not explicitly address the matters of modification or destruction.
- Inclusion of these matters within this policy would contribute to a policy and rules cascade that assesses these matters.
- Currently these activities are not addressed in the Plan rules and amendment is being sought to include these matters into the rules.

Point Number

559.16

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 2.16 Tikanga aa-iwi o te takiwaa o Waikato.

Decision Reasons:

- Gives effect to Part 2, s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.17

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 2.16.1 Whaanga Coast Specific Area.

Decision Reasons:

- Gives effect to Part 2, s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.18

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 2.16.2 Aahuatanga Motuhake (special features).

Decision Reasons:

- Gives effect to Part 2, s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).

Point Number 559.19

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.20

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.2.5.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.2.5.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

AND

Amend Rule 17.2.5.2 RD1 Earthworks - Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rule in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.21

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

- (i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;*
- (ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values*
- (iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.*

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.22

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.2.3.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 22.2.3.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:
(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.
(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:
(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;
(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values
(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.23

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.2.3.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 23.2.3.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:
(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.
(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:
(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;
(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values
(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.24

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 24.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:
(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.
(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:
(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;
(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values
(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

AND

Amend Rule 24.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks - Maaori Sites of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rule in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number 559.25

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 25.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND

Amend Rule 25.2.4.2 RD1 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori sites of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.

Point Number

559.26

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 16.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori Area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori Areas of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.27

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 17.2.5.2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.2.5.2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori site of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori Areas of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

AND

Amend Rule 17.2.5.2 RD1 Earthworks - Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rule in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.28

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 18.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori Area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori Area of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

- (i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;*
- (ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values*
- (iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.*

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.29

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 22.2.3.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.2.3.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori Area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori Areas of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.30

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 23.2.3.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 23.2.3.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori area of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.31

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 24.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori area of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

AND

Amend Rule 24.2.4.2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rule in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.32

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 25.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 25.2.4.2 RD2 Earthworks – Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance as follows:

(a) Earthworks ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks within a Maaori area of Significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori area of Significance) and shown on the planning maps.

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Nature, design, extent and location of activity in relation to the site;

(ii) Effects of the proposal on heritage and cultural values

(iii) The purpose and necessity for the works and any alternatives considered.

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter considers that the matters of discretion are not of sufficient breadth to understand the nature of the impacts on the Maaori Areas of significance of any proposed earthworks.
- The submitter is also concerned that works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks and rural ancillary earthworks could occur as a permitted activity within these sites.
- Considers that these other types of earthworks should also be assessed for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.33

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add a new earthworks rule to each zone chapter as follows:

D1 - Earthworks, new ancillary earthworks and new rural ancillary earthworks within a waahi tapu as identified in Schedule 30.6 (Significant Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu area) and shown on the planning maps.

AND

Provide recognition of the full extent of Waahi tapu Te Aukati ki Mangatawhiri, Meremere, Te Teo Teo and Rangiriri (as this relates to the schedules). (Refer to subsequent submission points).

Decision Reasons:

- Submitter seeks a revised rule and mapping framework to provide elevated recognition in the Plan of four well known wahi tapu site/areas, being Te Aukati ki Mangatawhiri, Meremere, Te Teo Teo and Rangiriri.
- This would assist the Plan to give improved effect to strategic objective 2.12(a).
- These wahi tapu sites/areas are already recognised within the Plan in part through the Maaori sites and areas of significance mapping and rule framework.
- The submitter considers that it is important within the Plan that there are examples of significant Maaori sites or areas, whose integrity is protected through full recognition in the Plan maps and an associated rule framework.
- As the wahi tapu sites/areas are of local, regional and national importance, it is appropriate to ensure that the entire site is mapped and protected to retain the footprint of the wahi tapu/wahi tapu area as the physical marker, which enables the continued understanding and identification of each site and its history.
- The submitter seeks that these four wahi tapu are recognised to the same extent as the Heritage New Zealand wahi tapu listing within the Plan maps, and the rule framework related to earthworks, and destruction-proposed through a HNZPT point of submission, is applied to the same extent.
- It may be over time that additional wahi tapu are included onto this schedule and recognised in this enhanced manner.
- The submitter also seeks that new works covered under the definition of ancillary earthworks, and rural ancillary earthworks are assessed within these sites for their suitability to occur within these sites and the effect that they will have on heritage values.

Point Number

559.34

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add a new non-complying rule NCI within each zone chapter to regarding the destruction of Maaori sites and areas of significance and waahi tapu sites and scheduled areas (as sought through the submission) as follows:

NCI – the destruction of a site or area of significance to maaori, or a Waahi Tapu or Waahi Tapu area.

AND

Amend the plan to provide for any other consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that there is no rule relating to the destruction of Maaori sites or area of significance.
- Considers that in the absence of this rule, results in the Plan being unable to give effect to Strategic Objective 2.12(a) and the requirements of Part 2, s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e) and s6(f).
- The submitter seeks that the plan is amended to include such a rule and that the proposed rule also covers the new proposed schedule of significant waahi tapu sites and areas.

Point Number

559.35

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 16.1.2 P2 - A Marae complex or Papakainga Housing development on Maaori Freehold land or on Maaori Customary Land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports these permitted activities as this gives effect to s6(e), s6(f) and 6(g) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.36

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 17.1.2 P16 - A Marae complex or Papakainga Housing development on Maaori Freehold land or on Maaori Customary Land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports these permitted activities as this gives effect to s6(e), s6(f) and 6(g) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.37

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 22.1.2 P1 - A Marae complex or Papakainga Housing development on Maaori Freehold land or on Maaori Customary Land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports these permitted activities as this gives effect to s6(e), s6(f) and 6(g) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.38

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 24.1.2 P2 - A Marae complex or Papakainga Housing development on Maaori Freehold land or on Maaori Customary Land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports these permitted activities as this gives effect to s6(e), s6(f) and 6(g) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.39

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 3.2.7(a)(vii) Managing Significant Natural Areas.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 3.2.7 (a)(vii) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.40

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 3.3.2 (a)(iv), (b)(iv) and (c)(iv) Recognising values and qualities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 3.3.2 (a)(iv), (b)(iv) and (c)(iv) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.41

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 3.3.4 (a), (b) and (c) The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 3.3.4 (a), (b) and (c) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.42

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 3.4.4 (a), (b) and (c) - The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 3.4.4 (a), (b) and (c) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.43

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 4.1.7 Character of Towns except for the amendments sought below.
AND

Amend Objective 4.1.7 Character of Towns as follows:

(a) Development in the residential, village, industrial and business zones is attractive, connected and reflects the existing character and historic heritage values of towns.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Objective 4.1.7 in part, as the policy does not reflect that many of the town contain important heritage items or have heritage precincts.
- These heritage values need to be recognised at the time of development and would not be fully captured through the use of just the word “character” within this policy.
- This policy needs to be amended to avoid adverse effects on heritage at the time of development.

Point Number 559.44

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 4.1.12 (b)(v) Te Kauwhata.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.1.12 (b) (iv) as this reflects an outcome of a recent plan change process and provides for the recognition of Tangata whenua within this new residential development.

Point Number 559.45

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks a new clause 'f' as follows:

(a) ...

(f) Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the RMA.

Point Number 559.46

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** a new clause 'f' to Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks as follows:

(a) ...

(f) Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the RMA.

Point Number 559.47

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 4.5.14 (a)(v)G. Raglan Town Centre.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.14 (a)(v)G. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.48

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 4.5.16 (a)(v)A. Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.16 (a)(v)A. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.49

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 4.5.17(a) Te Kauwhata Town Centre.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.17(a) as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.50

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 4.5.18 (a)(iv)D. Pokeno Town Centre.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.18 (a)(iv)D. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.51

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 4.5.19 (a)(iv)E. Tuakau Town Centre.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.19 (a)(iv)E. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.52

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Add a new clause 'b' to Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks as follows:

(a)...

(b) Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.53

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 4.7.2 Subdivision location and design, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Add a new clause 'viii' to Policy 4.7.2(a) Subdivision location and design as follows:

(a) *Ensure subdivision is located and designed to:*

(i) *Be sympathetic to the natural and physical qualities and characteristics of the surrounding environment;*

(ii) *Establish boundaries that avoid buildings and structures dominating adjoining land or public places, the coast, or fresh waterbodies;*

(iii) *Arrange allotments to allow for view sharing, where possible;*

(iv) *Retain existing access to public space;*

(v) *Promote safe communities through quality urban design;*

(vi) *Accommodate building platforms and vehicle accesses that are safe and stable; and*

(vii) *Promote consistent grid layout and*

(viii) Avoid adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 4.7.2 in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of subdivision location and design.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.54

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Add a new clause 'v' to Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks as follows:

(v) Avoid adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.55

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 5.6.7(e) Earthworks as follows:

(d) Subdivision and development occurs in a manner that maintains shape, contour, ~~and~~ landscape characteristics and avoids adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks activities in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks.
- The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.56

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 5.3.14 Signs, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 5.3.14(e) Signs as follows:

(e) Provide for appropriate signage on heritage items, notable trees and Maaori sites of significance for the purpose of identification or ~~and~~ interpretation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 5.3.14 Signs in part as the policy broadly assumes at (e) that signage can be placed on heritage buildings for both identification and interpretation.
- The policy needs to be amended to a slightly more cautious approach given the sensitive nature of heritage items, and Maaori sites of significance to an inappropriate design or quantity of signage.

Point Number 559.57

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 6.1.8 (a) Infrastructure in the community and identified areas.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Objective 6.1.8 as this policy gives consideration to the environment, which includes historic heritage and identified areas which can contain historic heritage or Maaori Sites or Areas of significance therefore giving effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.58

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 6.1.9 (a) Environmental effects, community health, safety and amenity.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Objective 6.1.9 as this policy seeks to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment, which includes historic heritage therefore giving effect to s6 of the RMA.

Point Number 559.59

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 6.1.10 (a) Infrastructure in identified areas, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 6.1.10 (a) Infrastructure in identified areas as follows:

(a) Ensure consideration of the values, qualities and characteristics of Significant Natural Areas, Landscape and Natural Character Areas and Heritage Items, heritage precincts, and Maaori Sites and Areas of significance, including Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu Areas when proposing new infrastructure or undertaking significant upgrades to existing infrastructure.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 6.1.10 as this policy aligns in part only with the identified areas included within the rules at Chapter 14: Energy and Infrastructure.
- The submitter seeks that this policy is amended to make reference to; heritage precincts, and Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance, including Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu Areas.

Point Number 559.60

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 6.1.11 (a) Undergrounding new infrastructure, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 6.1.11 (a)(iii) undergrounding new infrastructure as follows:

(iii) There are significant operational, functional, technical, cultural, historic heritage or economic reasons that require the infrastructure to be above ground.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 6.1.11 in part as this policy needs to be amended at (iii) to make reference to historic heritage reasons in addition to cultural reasons being relevant for the deployment of the infrastructure above the ground, to avoid adverse effects.

Point Number

559.61

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 6.1.12 (a) Co-location of compatible facilities, except for the amendments sought below

AND

Amend Policy 6.1.12 (a) Co-location of compatible facilities as follows:

(a) Encourage compatible infrastructure to share location or facilities where operational advantages can be achieved and adverse effects are ~~reduced~~ avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 6.1.12 in part.
- The submitter supports the co-location of infrastructure as a method that has the potential to minimise the adverse effects on historic heritage.
- The wording of this policy does not encourage the reduction of adverse effects and needs to be amended to reflect that this should be sought at the time of co-location of compatible facilities.

Point Number

559.62

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 6.2.2 (a) Recognise the national grid, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 6.2.2 (a) Recognise the national grid as follows:

(a) Recognise the operational, functional and technical constraints of the national grid, ~~and the interconnectedness of networks~~.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 6.1.12 in part.
- The submitter recognises the importance of the National Grid, Heritage New Zealand is concerned the policy appears to include unspecified network utilities as having the same status as the National Grid.
- Government has determined that the National Grid, as nationally important infrastructure, requires a greater level of recognition and protection than other regional and local infrastructure.

Point Number

559.63

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 6.2.5 (a) Environmental effects, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 6.2.5 (a)(v) Environmental effects as follows:

(v) Addressing the adverse effects on any heritage values, cultural values, outstanding natural landscapes, areas of high natural character, town centres, areas of high recreation value and existing sensitive activities including the avoidance of adverse effects ~~where practicable~~.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 6.2.5 in part, as the inclusion of the words “where practicable” serve to dilute the consideration of the protection of historic heritage and cultural values within this policy.
- These words also weaken the associated rule framework.
- This is particularly important given that the related energy and infrastructure rules of the Plan do not rely on the heritage protection framework found in the zone rules, rather there is reliance on a generic protection rules framework for “Identified Area” which includes scheduled historic heritage or Maaori sites or areas of significance in addition to such matters as significant natural areas.
- In addition within this framework, some activities are non-complying in “Identified areas” and this activity status should be supported by a robust policy.
- To give effect to s6 matters the policy and rule framework must ensure that development of infrastructure avoids adverse effects.
- To avoid adverse effects on s6 matters this policy also needs to include reference to “Cultural values”.

Point Number

559.64

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Objective 6.5.1 Land transport network, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 6.5.1(a)(ii) Land transport network as follows:

(ii) Adverse effects from the construction, maintenance and operation of the transport network are ~~managed~~ avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Decision Reasons:

- As transport projects can have adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values and adverse effects should be avoided and if they cannot be avoided should be remedied or mitigated.
- The use of the word managed does not provide sufficient guidance in this regard.

Point Number 559.65

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Chapter 7 Historic Heritage to include a reference to the individual rules that give effect to those objectives and policies.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the objectives and policies site in isolation from the Historic Heritage rules throughout the plan and vice versa.
- This does not enable a useful understanding of the overall framework for the protection of historic heritage at the time of resource consent application and provide guidance to avoid adverse effects.
- The submitter seeks that a reference is made in this section to the historic heritage rule framework and Schedule 30.1 Historic Heritage Items to which the rules are applicable.
- It would be preferable if a link could be made between the various policies and the rules which give effect to the individual policies.

Point Number 559.66

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 7.1.1 (a), except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Objective 7.1.1(a) as follows:

(a) A district that acknowledges its past by: recognising, identifying, protecting, conserving and promoting historic heritage.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Objective 7.1.1(a) in part as it considers that the policy also needs to include recognition of the need and role for “conservation” in the ongoing retention of heritage items into the future.
- The conservation of physical structures ensures the sustainability of the heritage resource for future generations.

Point Number 559.67

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 7.1.2 (a) - Identification, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.2(a) - Identification as follows:

(a) Identify ~~and~~ schedule, and develop a rule framework for historic heritage throughout the District that represent the heritage and cultural themes and activities of the district, where the values may include:

(i) Architectural;

(ii) Archaeological;

(iii) Cultural;

(iv) Technological;

(v) Scientific;

(vi) Intrinsic or amenity values; and

(vii) Any other significant feature.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.2(a) in part as this policy assists to ensure that the heritage recognised within the plan would contribute to the understanding of the District's heritage, however it would be appropriate to amend this policy by including the criteria for identification that are contained within the policy at Policy 7.1.3(b) Heritage Items.

Point Number 559.68

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 7.1.3 (a) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.3(a) Heritage Items as follows:

(a) The contribution of historic heritage to the Waikato District and its communities is maintained through the protection and conservation of its buildings, sites, structures, places and areas through maintenance and repair restoring, conserving and reusing.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(a) in part as this policy assists to ensure that the heritage recognised within the plan would contribute to the understanding of the District's heritage, however it would be appropriate to amend this policy by including the criteria for identification that are contained within the policy at Policy 7.1.3(b) Heritage Items.

Point Number 559.69

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 7.1.3 (b) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.3(b) Heritage Items as follows:

(b) Protect scheduled heritage items and their values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development of land ~~where the values may include:~~

~~(i) Architectural;~~

~~(ii) Archaeological;~~

~~(iii) Cultural;~~

~~(iv) Technological;~~

~~(v) Scientific;~~

~~(vi) Intrinsic or amenity values; and~~

~~(vii) Any other significant features.~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(b) in part as the submitter considers that the list of values for which a heritage item could be selected for protection is better suited to being included as part of policy 7.1.2(a), which relates to the identification of items for protection.
- Policy 7.1.3(b) covers the protection of heritage items at the time of subdivision, use and development.

Point Number 559.70

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 7.1.3 (c) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Add new clauses (i), (ii) and (iii) to Policy 7.1.3(c) Heritage Items as follows:

(c) Relationships between heritage buildings, sites, structures, places and their settings, are:

(i) Not adversely affected at the time of site development, and

(ii) Retained within one lot at the time of subdivision, and

(iii) including the view of the identified heritage items are retained.

AND

Clarify the phrase “the view of the identified heritage item are retained”.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(b) in part as the submitter recognises that the relationship between heritage items, sites structures, places and their settings is very important to the retention of heritage values. This relationship can be adversely affected by additional buildings, inappropriately placed buildings or structures and subdivision processes.
- The submitter seeks that the policy is amended to reflect the following:
 - various processes that may adversely affect these important relationships; and
 - the aspirational goal of retaining the building and its entire setting in one lot.
- These amendments will create improved guidance and create a link between this policy and the related rules of site development and subdivision of land containing heritage items.
- The submitter also seeks clarification of the following part of the statement “including the view of the identified heritage item is retained”.
- It is unclear if this is the view of the identified heritage item within the site or beyond the site or both?
- Clarification of this aspect would be helpful for those administering these policies and giving advice to building owners.

Point Number 559.71

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 7.1.3 (d) Heritage Items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(d) as this gives effect to the need to provide appropriate protection to historic heritage as required under s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.72

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Policy 7.1.3 (e) Heritage Items as follows:

(e) Protect scheduled heritage items from demolition, relocation or removal, ~~unless:~~

AND

Delete Policy 7.1.3(e)(i) and (ii) Heritage Items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(d) in part.
- The first line of the policy only refers to demolition and removal of items, whereas the related suite of rules also refers to relocation of items, therefore the policy needs to be amended so guidance is available for relocation.
- It would also be helpful to include the world heritage within the policy.
- The remainder of the policy provides instances of exemptions where protection is not considered necessary.
- It is considered that this direction is not appropriate as each instance should be reviewed and assessed on a case by case basis through a resource consent application.
- The Resource Management Act already allows for the consideration of these matters.

Point Number

559.73

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 7.1.3(f) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.3(f) Heritage Items as follows:

(f) Ensure alterations and additions to identified heritage items and curtilage are:

(i) Consistent with the scale, detailing, style, materials and character of the heritage item;

(ii) Retain cultural and historic heritage values;

(iii) Do not compromise the heritage item, or have a design that competes with its heritage item, or have a design that competes with its historic heritage values; and

(iv) Do not compromise the heritage setting of the item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(f) in part as the policy only refers to alterations, whereas the related rule framework also refers to additions.
- For consistency and for the policy framework to be applicable to both additions under s6 of Resource Management Act, the policy should be amended.

Point Number

559.74

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 7.1.3(g) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.3(g) Heritage Items as follows:

(g) Ensure maintenance and repairs protects ~~the significant features~~ the heritage values of the heritage items in (Schedule 30.1 Heritage Item)

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(g) in part.
- The wording of the policy relates to the permitted an restricted discretionary activities relating to maintenance and repairs and significant features of a heritage item.

Point Number

559.75

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 7.1.3(h) Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.3(h) Heritage Items as follows:

(h) Ensure signs on scheduled heritage items are only for the purposes of identification or ~~and~~ interpretation, and ...

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.3(h) in part as this policy seeks to limit the content and nature of the signage that can occur on a heritage item.
- The submitter considers that the policy needs to adopt a more cautious approach as a heritage building may not have the capacity to accommodate both identification and interpretation signage.
- The change to the policy is sought in conjunction with amendments to the rules ensuring that the adverse effects cannot occur to the heritage item, in fulfilment of s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.76

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 7.1.4(a) Matangi and Huntly Heritage precinct, except for amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.4(a) Matangi and Huntly Heritage precinct as follows:

(a) Ensure the design of the new buildings and structures and external alterations or additions to buildings are compatible with the settings, detailing, style, materials and character of the precinct and protect heritage values within:

(i) Matangi Heritage Precinct

(ii) Huntly heritage precinct

(iii) Rangiriri Heritage precinct.

AND

Amend the planning maps to include the Rangiriri Heritage Precinct guidelines, with additional information to protect the relationship of the cemetery to the village.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.4(a) as the policy recognises these heritage precincts and the importance of ensuring that new builds do not detract from the elements for which the precinct is recognised.
- The submitter is aware that the Proposed Plan does not include a heritage precinct for the Rangiriri township as found in the Operative Plan.
- Council have advised that as the Rangiriri Hotel and heritage cemetery are now both included in the heritage schedule, that a precinct is no longer required for the protection of these heritage items.
- The submitter considers that the rules that relate to heritage items, while protecting the heritage item and the relationship with its own site, do not protect a heritage from the potentially adverse effect of activities for adjacent sites, or protect the relationship between separate heritage items in the same locale.
- The heritage cemetery and the Rangiriri Hotel are very disparate in nature. Therefore any proposed development needs to be carefully managed to ensure that the heritage values of both items are protected and not eroded.
- The submitter seeks that the Rangiriri heritage Precinct guideline and map is reinstated to the plan, with additional guidance to protect the relationship of the heritage cemetery to the village.

Point Number

559.77

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Policy 7.1.5 Subdivision, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Policy 7.1.5(a) Subdivision as follows:

(a) Subdivision and development should retain the heritage item or features and their setting within one lot within an identified precinct do not compromise and are sympathetic to the existing historic heritage items or features.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Policy 7.1.5 in part.
- The submitter is concerned that the policy does not:
 - Include the aspirational goal that the heritage item and its setting are retained within one lot at the time of subdivision and development, and
 - Provide guidance as to the desired outcomes at the time of subdivision and development in relation to a heritage item and its setting in other zones.
- The submitter considers that both matters need to be addressed to provide appropriate protection to meet the requirements of s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.78

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add a new policy to Chapter 7 Historic Heritage as follows:

Earthquake strengthening and safety works

Encourage and facilitate the strengthening of buildings included in the heritage schedule to increase their ability to withstand future earthquakes while minimising the significant loss of associated heritage values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter considers that there is an obligation under the Resource Management Act, not just the Building Act to provide for the consideration of earthquake strengthening and safety works.
- It is acknowledged that these works could be undertaken under the current provisions, but seeks to have them specifically identified through policy and rules, with an associated restricted discretionary activity status.

Point Number

559.79

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add a new policy to Chapter 7 Historic Heritage to include the following:

Fire safety works

Encourage and facilitate the planning and implementation of fire safety works to buildings in the heritage schedule to increase their ability to withstand fire while minimising the significant loss of associated heritage values.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter considers that there is an obligation under the Resource Management Act, not just the Building Act to provide for the consideration of fire safety works.
- Fire safety works do have the potential to be very intrusive on historic heritage values and consideration of these works needs to be undertaken early if considering works on an historic heritage item.
- It is acknowledged that these works could be undertaken under the current provisions, but seeks to have them specifically identified through policy and rules, with an associated restricted discretionary activity status.

Point Number 559.80

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 16.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 RD1 to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.81

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.82

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 18.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.

- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.83

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.84

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.85

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 22.2.6.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.

- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.86

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.87

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 24.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Amend Rule 23.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.
AND
Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage.
- While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.
- The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site.
- The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance.
- To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).

Point Number 559.88

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.3.11.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.89

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.3.8.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.90

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.3.10.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.91

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 20.3.5.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.92

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.3.8.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.93

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.3.9.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.94

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.3.8.1 NCI Group A heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying rule as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.95

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 18.3.10.2 PI Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the permitted status of this rule.
- It is unclear why the Council considers that they should exempt from the Resource Management Act assessment process that all other landowners are required to be subject to, should they wish to demolish a heritage building.
- The submitter seeks that this exemption is deleted from the plan and the Council owned building is subject to the assessment required in this plan for the demolition of a “B” category item.

Point Number 559.96

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.3.11.2 DI Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.97

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.3.8.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.

Point Number 559.98

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.3.10.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.
-

Point Number 559.99

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 20.3.5.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.
-

Point Number 559.100

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.3.8.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.
-

Point Number 559.101

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.3.9.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.
-

Point Number 559.102

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.3.8.2 D1 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity rule for the demolition, removal or relocation of a Group B heritage item as this activity status recognises that demolition, removal or relocation of a heritage item must be subject to a high level of scrutiny.
-

Point Number 559.103

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 18.3.10.2 D2 Group B heritage item – Demolition, removal or relocation to ensure that item 104 Ngaruawahia Plunket rooms is subject to the same demolition rules as other “B” ranked items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the Discretionary activity and considers that item 104 (Ngaruawahia Plunket rooms) should be subject to the same demolition rules as any other scheduled item.
-

Point Number 559.104

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 23.3.9.3 P1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.

- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.105

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 24.3.8.3 P1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.106

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 16.3.11.3 RD1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.3 RD1 as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 16.3.11.3 P1. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items.~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number 559.107

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 17.3.8.3 RD1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.3.8.3 RD1 as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 17.3.8.3 P1. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number 559.108

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 18.3.10.3 RD1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions except for amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.3.10.3 RD1 All heritage items - alterations or additions as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 19.3.10.3 PI. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to recognise this, to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number

559.109

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 20.3.5.3 RDI All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 20.3.5.3 RDI as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 20.3.5.3 PI. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values;

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to recognise this, to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number

559.110

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 22.3.8.3 RDI All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.3.8.3 RDI as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 22.3.8.3 PI. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items.~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values;

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number

559.111

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 23.3.9.3 RDI All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 23.3.9.3 RDI as follows:

(a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 23.3.9.3 PI. Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items~~

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~

(ii) Effects on heritage values;

(iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number 559.112

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.3.8.3 RD1 All heritage items – Alterations or additions, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.3.9.3 RD1 as follows:

- (a) ~~Any activity that does not comply with Rule 24.3.9.3 PI-~~ Any alteration or addition to a heritage item in Schedule 30.1 Heritage items
- (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:
- (i) ~~Location, Form, scale,~~ style, materials and appearance; ~~and~~
- (ii) Effects on heritage values;
- (iii) Effects on the setting of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that additions and alterations are a restricted discretionary activity.
- The existing restricted discretionary activity should be amended to include any alteration or addition to a heritage building to ensure that any potential to negatively impact on the building is captured through the resource consent process.
- Further amendments are also required to address relevant matters to achieve an appropriate level of assessment.

Point Number 559.113

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** a new Restricted Discretionary Activity rule to the District Plan as follows:

Rule RD1

- (a) Any activity required to be undertaken to provide for building or fire safety and/or earthquake strengthening.
- (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:
- (c) Effects on heritage values, including appearance and integrity of the heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter considers that there is an obligation under the Resource Management Act, not just the Building Act to provide for the consideration of earthquake strengthening and safety works.
- It is acknowledged that these works could be undertaken under the current provisions, but seeks to have them specifically identified through policy and rules, with an associated restricted discretionary activity status.
- The suggested rules framework seeks to minimise the effects on heritage values.

Point Number 559.114

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.3.11.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.4 PI All heritage items - Maintenance or repair as follows:

- (a) ~~Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). where:~~
- (i) ~~No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged; and~~
- (b) ~~Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces, form, style and appearance.~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 16.3.11.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number 559.115

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.3.8.4 PI All heritage items - Maintenance or repair as follows:

- (a) ~~Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). where:~~
- (i) ~~No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;~~
- (b) ~~Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces, form, style and appearance.~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 17.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.

- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number 559.116

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.3.10.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.3.10.4 PI All heritage items - Maintenance or repair as follows:

(a) Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). ~~where:~~

~~(i) No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;~~

~~(b) Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces. ~~form, style and appearance.~~~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 18.3.10.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number 559.117

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 20.3.5.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 20.3.5.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair as follows:

(a) Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). ~~where:~~

~~(i) No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;~~

~~(b) Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces. ~~form, style and appearance.~~~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 20.3.5.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number 559.118

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair as follows:

(a) Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). ~~where:~~

~~(b) No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;~~

~~(b) Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces. ~~form, style and appearance.~~~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 22.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number 559.119

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.3.9.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 23.3.9.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair as follows:

(a) Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items). ~~where:~~

~~(i) No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;~~

(b) Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces, form, style and appearance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 23.3.9.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number

559.120

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 24.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair as follows:

(a) Maintenance or repair of a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items), where:

(i) No significant feature of interest is destroyed or damaged;

(b) Replacement materials are the same as, or similar to, the original in terms of colour, texture, form and design to the original that it replaces, form, style and appearance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 24.3.8.4 PI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair in part only.
- The permitted activity of maintenance and repair should occur in alignment with the definition of such works.
- Any proposed works not within the scope of the defined term should be assessed as an alteration or addition.
- The permitted activity and definition both need to be amended to offer a greater level of guidance to plan users.

Point Number

559.121

Summary of Decision Requested:

Delete Rule 16.3.11.4 RD1 All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair , they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number

559.122

Summary of Decision Requested:

Delete Rule 17.3.8.4 RD1 All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair , they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number

559.123

Summary of Decision Requested:

Delete Rule 18.3.10.4 RD1 All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair , they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number

559.124

Summary of Decision Requested:

Delete Rule 20.3.5.4 RD1 All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair , they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.

- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number 559.125

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 22.3.8.4 RDI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair, they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number 559.126

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 23.3.9.4 RDI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair, they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number 559.127

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 24.3.8.4 RDI All heritage items – Maintenance or repair.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned regarding the restricted discretionary activity relating to repairs and maintenance.
- When works on a heritage building no longer fit within the defined terms of maintenance and repair, they elevate into additions or alteration that are assessed under a related rule.
- Using this type of rule cascade sets a clear framework for those undertaking works on their heritage building.

Point Number 559.128

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 18.3.10.5 PI All heritage items – Site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.129

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 22.3.8.5 PI All heritage items – Site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.130

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 23.3.9.5 PI All heritage items – Site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not

defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.

- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.131

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 24.3.8.5 P1 All heritage items – Site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.132

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 20.3.5.5 P1 All heritage items – Site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.133

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 18.3.10.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.3.10.5 RD1 All heritage items - all site development as follows:

~~(a) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity~~ Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.

~~(b)~~ Discretion is restricted to:

- (i) Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item
- (ii) Location, design, size, materials and finish
- (iii) Landscaping
- (iv) The relationship of the heritage item with the setting.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports only the restricted discretionary activity, as this allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- The submitter is concerned that the matters of discretion are slightly different between the zones.
- The submitter seeks that the matters of discretion are amended to be consistent throughout the zones.

Point Number 559.134

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 22.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development as follows:

~~(a) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity~~ Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.

(a) Discretion is restricted to:

- (i) Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item
- (ii) Location, design, size, materials and finish
- (iii) Landscaping
- (iv) The relationship of the heritage item with the setting.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports only the restricted discretionary activity, as this allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- The submitter is concerned that the matters of discretion are slightly different between the zones.
- The submitter seeks that the matters of discretion are amended to be consistent throughout the zones.

Point Number 559.135

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.3.9.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments as sought below:

AND

Amend Rule 23.3.9.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development as follows:

~~(e) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity~~ Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.

(a) Discretion is restricted to:

(i) *Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item*

(ii) *Location, design, size, materials and finish*

(iii) *Landscaping*

(iv) *The relationship of the heritage item with the setting.*

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports only the restricted discretionary activity, as this allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- The submitter is concerned that the matters of discretion are slightly different between the zones.
- The submitter seeks that the matters of discretion are amended to be consistent throughout the zones.

Point Number 559.136

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments as sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development as follows:

~~(e) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity~~ Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.

(a) Discretion is restricted to:

(i) *Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item*

(ii) *Location, design, size, materials and finish*

(iii) *Landscaping*

(iv) *The relationship of the heritage item with the setting.*

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports only the restricted discretionary activity, as this allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- The submitter is concerned that the matters of discretion are slightly different between the zones.
- The submitter seeks that the matters of discretion are amended to be consistent throughout the zones.

Point Number 559.137

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 16.3.11.5 PI All heritage items – site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from the adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.138

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 17.3.8.5 P1 All heritage items – All site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from the adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.139

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 20.3.5.5 P1 All heritage items – all site development.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule.
- While the parameters of the rule are clear for a permitted activity, it is unclear how this rule effectively protects each heritage item and its setting from the adverse effects of the proposed activity in every specific instance, as the nature of the site development is not defined and the special features of the heritage items varies from the whole item in some instances to particular facades or specific features for others.
- The protection of heritage items from potential adverse effects of site development would be better achieved through the case by case analysis of a restricted discretionary activity resource consent assessment.

Point Number 559.140

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 16.3.11.5 RD1 All heritage items – site development, except for the amendments as sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.5 RD1 All heritage items – site development as follows:

~~(a) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.~~

(b) Discretion is restricted to:

(i) *Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item*

(ii) *Location, design, size, materials and finish*

(iii) *Landscaping*

(iv) ~~The relationship of the heritage item with the setting, including the area between the front of the heritage item and the road.~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity as this rule allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- The zone rules included the area between the front of the heritage item and the road.
- It is considered that all of the setting is important therefore this aspect should be deleted to ensure the entire setting is equally considered.

Point Number 559.141

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 17.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.3.8.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development as follows:

~~(a) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.~~

(b) Discretion is restricted to:

(i) *Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item*

(ii) *Location, design, size, materials and finish*

(iii) *Landscaping*

(iv) ~~The relationship of the heritage item with the setting, including the area between the front of the heritage item and the road.~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity as this rule allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- It is considered that all of the setting is important therefore this aspect should be deleted to ensure the entire setting is equally considered.

Point Number 559.142

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 20.3.5.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development, except for the amendments as sought below.
AND

Amend Rule 20.3.5.5 RD1 All heritage items – all site development as follows:

~~(a) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity~~ Site development is a restricted discretionary activity.

(b) Discretion is restricted to:

(i) Effects on the values, context and setting of the heritage item

(ii) Location, design, size, materials and finish

(iii) Landscaping

(iv) The relationship of the heritage item with the setting, including the area between the front of the heritage item and the road.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity as this rule allows for the appropriate level of assessment of the possible impacts that site development could have on the heritage values of the heritage item and its setting.
- The trigger for the rule will be the activity of site development itself, rather than not meeting the permitted activity performance standards.
- It is considered that all of the setting is important therefore this aspect should be deleted to ensure the entire setting is equally considered.

Point Number 559.143

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 16.3.11.6 C1 Heritage Precincts-Matangi and Huntly by changing the activity status from a Controlled Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.6 C1 (b) Heritage Precincts- Matangi and Huntly as follows:

(a) Construction of a building in the Matangi and Huntly Heritage Precincts identified on the planning maps that is set back at least 8m from road boundaries.

(b) Council's ~~control~~ discretion is reserved over the following matters:

(i) Effects on historic heritage, amenity values and character of the precinct; and

(ii) Building height, side setbacks, scale, form, materials and architectural style to be consistent with the relevant part of Appendix 3.6 (Matangi Heritage Precinct Design Guide) or Appendix 3.5 (Huntly Heritage Precinct Design Guide)

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part only the controlled activity heritage precinct rules.
- The submitter cannot support the controlled activity status of this rule, which allows a building set back 8m into the site.
- There could be significant impacts on the heritage items a restricted discretionary activity status would be more appropriate in the event that the proposal should be declined.

Point Number 559.144

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** the definition of "Maintenance and Repair" in Chapter 13: Definitions.

AND

Replace the definition for "Maintenance and Repair" in Chapter 13: Definitions with the following definition:

Means (for historic heritage items listed in Appendix 30.1) work for the purpose of weatherproofing, plumbing and electrical work restoration and for the purpose of repair which includes patching, piecing in, splicing or consolidating of any original structure including the repair of materials and replacement of minor components where there are beyond repair or are missing. The replacement should be original or similar material and maintain a consistency in colour, texture, form and design as the original it replaces.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter opposes the defined term "Maintenance and Repair".

Point Number 559.145

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** the definition of "Restoration" in Chapter 13: Definitions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the defined term for "Restoration" does not appear to be reflected within the rule framework and is already included as part of the proposed definition of maintenance and repair.
- Some of the activities within the defined term would warrant scrutiny as part of a resource consent process as there would be potential for adverse effects to occur to heritage values when undertaking these activities
- These activities are already covered by the defined terms of maintenance and repair or additions and alterations.

Point Number 559.146

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend the definition of “Significant feature of interest” in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows:

Means those parts of a historic heritage building, which is shown on the planning maps and listed in Appendix 30.1, that area described in the individual historic heritage item record form.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter generally supports the recognition of significant features of interest as part of the historic heritage item record form and in relation to the Heritage Items identified in the Plan.
- The submitter is concerned that listing the significant features and developing a rule framework around the significant features risks encouraging a piecemeal approach and not considering the heritage place holistically.
- Changes to non-protected elements can incur negative effects on significant features if they are compromised by what happens around them.
- The column in the schedule referring to significant features implies that everything else is not of particular significance.
- This approach is not helpful to the retention of the heritage values of the whole of the heritage item.
- It would be more appropriate if the schedule is tied to the record form descriptions and the significant features are seen in the context of the entire building.

Point Number

559.147

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Chapter 14 Infrastructure and Energy to make the activities subject to the relevant zone rules as they apply to Heritage Precincts, Heritage Items, Maaori sites of significance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned with the statement at (i).
- While provision has been made within this Infrastructure and Energy Chapter for the assessment of activities on Identified features, as outline in section (3) of the introduction, that includes:
 - h. Heritage Precincts,
 - i. Heritage Items
 - j. Maaori sites of significance
 - k. Maaori areas of significance
- This level of assessment is not as robust as the assessments that would take place as if the actual rules related to Heritage Precincts, Heritage Items, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance.
- Such assessment would provide greater protection as required under s6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number

559.148

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add the following advice note to Chapter 14.1 Introduction:

The New Zealand Archaeological Association

Archaeological sites are included on the planning maps for District Plan information purposes only. However these sites are subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must be contacted regarding development on or in proximity to these sites and the need to undertake an archaeological authority.

The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter considers that as many of the proposed activities in this chapter will include earthworks, some of which are potentially substantial in terms of depth and area, that an advice note relating to the obligations and requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 should be included within the introduction section of the chapter.

Point Number

559.149

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 14.2.3 NC3 Non-Complying Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.2.3 NC3 as this catch all rule will ensure that the Identified Areas are protected from the adverse effects of energy and infrastructure activities.

Point Number

559.150

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 14.3.1 P4, condition (1)(h), except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 14.3.1 P4 condition (1)(h) Permitted Activities as follows:

(h) Earthworks are not located within any Historic Heritage sites identified within Appendix 30.1, or any Maaori Sites or areas of Significance as identified in Appendix 30.3 and 30.4.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part only permitted activity specific condition (h), as the reference to only Appendix 30.1 does not cover the identified items of both Historic Heritage and cultural importance and the activity specific condition needs to be amended to

Point Number 559.151

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 relating to P8 Service Connections.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part permitted activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 as this activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.152

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 relating to P9 Minor infrastructure structure.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part permitted activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 as this activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.153

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 relating to P10 Closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems attached to existing buildings and structures.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part permitted activity specific condition 14.3.1.7 as this activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.154

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.3.3 RD2 Earthworks associated with infrastructure that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 14.3.1.3, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 14.3.3 RD2 Earthworks associated with infrastructure that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 14.3.1.3 as follows:

Discretion is restricted to:

(a) Management of sediment and dust, including the staging of works;

(b) The volume, extent and depth of the earthworks activities;

(c) The location of the earthworks activities, taking into account any effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of the site, including sites and areas of Significance to Maaori and any Heritage Items;

(d) Any flood or land stability risks; and

(e) Visual, landscape and amenity effects.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part only the Restricted Discretionary rule RD2 and the matters of discretion.
- While the matter of discretion (c) could be applicable in part to heritage items and cultural sites, it is considered that the clause should be amended to be readily applicable to heritage items and cultural sites so as to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.155

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.3.3 RD6, subject to the acceptance of any related submission points identified elsewhere in the submission.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Restricted Discretionary Rule RD6.

Point Number 559.156

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** new clause '(c)' to Rule 14.4.1(1) P3 Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard as follows:

14.4.1.3(1) *Earthworks for National Grid support poles and any stay wires that comply with the following conditions:*

(c) are not located within an Identified area.

AND

Add new clause '(f)' to Rule 14.4.1(2)P3 Earthworks within the National Grid Yard as follows:

14.4.1.3(2) *Earthworks for National Grid support towers (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower) that comply with the following conditions:...*

(f) are not located within an Identified area.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required to ensure that these earthworks that are located within an identified area will be a restricted discretionary activity.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity status of earthworks for National Grid support poles and any stay wires at Rule 14.1.1.3(a) and for support towers at 14.4.1.3(2).
- These permitted activity rules do not exclude earthworks in identified areas and this approach could cause adverse effect to historic heritage and Maaori sites and Areas of significance.
- An amendment is required to ensure these works cannot occur as a permitted activity.

Point Number 559.157

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.4.3 D1 Discretionary activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary activity Rule D1, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.158

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.4.4 NCI Non-complying activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Non-complying activity Rule NCI, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.159

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.5.3(a) D2 Discretionary activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary activity Rule D2, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.160

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.6.1.1(a)(a) relating to P1 Small-scale electricity generation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P1, as the activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.161

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.6.1.1 (a)(a) relating to P2 Community-scale electricity generation.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P2, as the activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.162

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.6.1.2(a)(v) relating to P3 Research and exploratory-scale investigations for renewable electricity generation activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P3, as the activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.163

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 14.6.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities RD1, RD2 and RD3 to become Discretionary Activities for works in an identified area that do not comply with the permitted standards.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter does not support the Restricted Discretionary activity status for Rule 14.6.2 RD1, RD2 and RD3 for activities that do not comply with the permitted standards, as this level of resource consent activity would not provide the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection for works in an "identified area" as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.164

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.6.4 NCI Non-Complying Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Non-Complying Rule NCI, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.165

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.7.1.1(a)(iii) relating to P1 Below ground pipelines for the conveyance of liquid fuels and gas.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports permitted activity P1 and specific activity condition (a)(iii) as this condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.166

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 14.7.1 P2 and activity specific condition 14.7.1.2(a) Below ground pipelines located within an Identified Area.

AND

Amend Rule 14.7.1 P2 Below ground pipelines located within an Identified Area by changing the activity status from a permitted activity to a discretionary activity.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support permitted activity P2, as it is not clear why the below ground pipelines are able to be located within the identified areas as a permitted activity.
- This appears to be inconsistent with the similar activities that are only permitted if they are not located within the identified areas.

Point Number 559.167

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.7.1.3(a) relating to P3 Storage facilities and pump stations for liquid fuels and gas.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports permitted activity P3 and specific activity condition 14.7.1.3(a), as this activity specific condition ensures that the activity will provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.168

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.7.2 D1 Discretionary Activities, subject to amendments sought elsewhere in the submission.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary Rule D1, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.169

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.7.2 D2 Discretionary Activities, subject to amendments sought elsewhere in the submission.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary Rule D2, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.170

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.8.1.1 (a)(iii) relating to P1 Meteorological enclosures and buildings including automatic weather stations.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted Rule P1 and the activity specific conditions 14.8.1.1.

Point Number 559.171

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.8.1.2)(iii) relating to P2 Meteorological and air quality monitoring structures and devices.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted Rule P2 and the activity specific conditions 14.8.1.2.

Point Number 559.172

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 14.8.3 D1 Discretionary Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary Rule D1 as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.173

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 14.8.3 D2 Discretionary Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary Rule D2 as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.174

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.9.1.1 (a)(iii) relating to P1 Antennas associated with amateur radio configurations.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P1 Antennas associated with amateur radio configurations, activity specific condition 14.9.1.1 (iii) as this condition will ensure the integrity of the identified areas is retained.

Point Number 559.175

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.9.1.2(a)(vii) relating to P2 Aerials associated with amateur radio configurations.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P2 Aerials associated with amateur radio configurations, activity specific condition 14.9.1.2 (vii) as this condition will ensure the integrity of the identified areas is retained.

Point Number 559.176

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.9.1.3 (a)(v) relating to P3 Permitted Activities - Support Structures associated with amateur radio configurations.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity Rule P3, Support structures associated with amateur radio configurations activity specific condition 14.9.1.3 (v) as this condition will ensure the integrity of the identified areas is retained.

Point Number 559.177

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 14.9.3, D2 Discretionary Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Discretionary activity D2, as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.178

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.10.1.1 (a)(i) relating to P1 - Ancillary equipment and activity-specific condition 14.10.1.1.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.
-

Point Number 559.179

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.10.1 P2 - Below ground telecommunications and radiocommunications facilities, lines, cables and ducts, except for the amendments sought below

AND

Add a specific activity condition to Rule 14.10.1 P2 - Below ground telecommunications and radiocommunications facilities, lines, cables and ducts as follows:

not located within an identified area

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support P2 as currently proposed. This activity requires an activity specific condition to ensure that there are not adverse effects to an identified.

Point Number 559.180

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.2 (a)(i) relating to P3 Cabinets.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.181

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain activity specific condition** 14.10.1.3 (a)(i) relating to P4 - Antennas and line attached to retaining walls, tunnels, bridges and other structures located within the road

AND

Delete activity specific condition 14.10.1.3(b) relating to P4 Antennas and line attached to retaining walls, tunnels, bridges and other structures located within the road.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support Rule 14.10.1 Permitted Activity P4, activity specific condition 14.10.1.3(b) as this allows antennas and lines to be attached to a heritage item.

Point Number 559.182

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.4 (a)(l) and(b) relating to P5 - Antennas attached to a building and/or structure.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.183

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.5(a)(iii) and (iv) relating to P7 - Antennas attached to a building and/or structure.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.184

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.6 (a)(ii) and (iii) relating to P8 Small cell units exceeding the permitted volumetric dimension of 0.1 m² regulated in the NESTF.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.185

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.7 (a) (i) and (iii) relating to Permitted Activities P9 - Poles, antennas and headframes.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.186

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.8 (a)(iv) relating to P10 - Externally-mounted telecommunication satellite dishes and ancillary components.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.187

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.9 (a)(ii) and (iii) relating to P11 - Telecommunication kiosk.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.188

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.10 (a)(v) relating to P12 - Telephone exchanges, including the installation and operation of equipment inside existing telephone exchanges.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.189

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.11 (a)(i) and (ii) relating to P13 - Self-contained power units.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.190

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.10.1.13 (a)(ii) relating to P15 - Lightning rods.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments as required.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the permitted activity conditions as they will ensure the integrity and the historic heritage values of the identified areas are retained.

Point Number 559.191

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** matters of control 14.10.2(a)(iv) relating to Controlled Activities C1, C2, C5, C6, C7, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend matters of control 14.10.2 (a)(iv) relating to Controlled Activities C1, C2, C5, C6, C7 as follows:
(iv) Effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of the site and/or items in Schedule 30.1.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the controlled activity status of the activities C1, C2, C5, C6, C7 and supports in part the associated matters of control.

Point Number 559.192

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 14.10.2 Controlled Activities C8 activity status to become a restricted discretionary activity status.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the controlled activity status of activity C8 as it is considered that compliance with the Rule 14.10.1.7, which would allow poles and head frames of a height of between 15-30m, dependant on the zone, within an identified area has the potential to cause adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.
- While there are relevant assessment criteria, the activity should have restricted discretionary activity status to ensure that the activity could be refused, if inappropriate.

Point Number 559.193

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.10.2 (iii) Controlled Activities C9, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 14.10.2 Controlled Activities C9 as follows:
(a) Externally-mounted telecommunications satellite dishes and ancillary components:...
(iii) Are not located within an Identified Area
AND
Amend Rule 14.10.2 Controlled activities, C9 activity status to become Restricted Discretionary activity status.
AND
Provide for any consequential amendments.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the inclusion of the identified areas within the controlled activity status of activity C9 as the activity has the potential to cause adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.
- While there are relevant assessment criteria relating to effects, the activity should have restricted discretionary activity status to ensure that the activity could be refused, if inappropriate.
- An amendment is sought to ensure that identified areas are not included as part of the controlled activity.

Point Number 559.194

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.10.2 C10 Telecommunication kiosks, located within road or unformed road adjacent to an Identified Area, that complies with the conditions for a new infrastructure activity and associated structures under Rule 14.2.1.1.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports this controlled activity and the need to comply with the conditions for new infrastructure.

Point Number 559.195

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.10.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities RD1, RD2, RD3, RD4, RD6, RD7, except for the amendments sought below
AND
Amend matters of discretion 14.10.3 (e) relating to RD1, RD2, RD3, RD4, RD6, RD7, as follows:
...
(e) Effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of the site, the heritage item or area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the restricted discretionary status of the activities at 14.10.3.
- The submitter supports in part only the matters of discretion, as it is considered that the matters of discretion need to reflect the items or areas that are part of the identified areas, for the assessment to provide for the protection required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.196

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.10.4 Discretionary Activities D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of the activities at 14.10.4, as these activities are located within the Identified areas, which include heritage items and Maaori sites and areas of significance.
 - This is an appropriate level of resource consent activity providing the appropriate level of protection and assessment as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
-

Point Number 559.197

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.11.1.4(a)(ii) relating to P4 Below ground pipelines for the conveyance of water, wastewater and stormwater.

AND

Delete activity specific condition 14.11.1.4(b) relating to P4 Below ground pipelines for the conveyance of water, wastewater and stormwater.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports 14.11.1 Permitted activities P4 and the activity specific condition, as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or Maaori sites or areas of significance.
 - The submitter cannot support the exception in activity specific condition 14.11.1.4(b), as some of the bridges within the Waikato District are heritage items and an assessment should take place to consider the impact on heritage values.
-

Point Number 559.198

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 14.11.1 Permitted Activity P5 Below ground pipelines for the conveyance of water, wastewater and stormwater located within an Identified Area from a permitted activity status to become a Restricted Discretionary Activity status.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter cannot support the permitted activity rule P5 and the associated Activity specific condition 14.11.1.5(a) as the pipes both above and below ground have the potential to impact on cultural and heritage values and need to be assessed.
-

Point Number 559.199

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.11.1.6(a)(i) relating to P6 Pump stations for the conveyance of water, wastewater and stormwater.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.11.1 Permitted activities P6 and the activity specific condition 14.11.1.6(a)(i), as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items and Maaori sites or areas of significance and will avoid adverse impacts on heritage values.
-

Point Number 559.200

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.11.1.8(a)(i) relating to P9 Ventilation facilities, drop shafts and manholes.

AND

Amend numbering of specific activity condition to 14.11.1.9.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.11.1 Permitted activities P9 and the activity specific condition 14.11.1.8(a)(i), as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items and Maaori sites or areas of significance and will avoid adverse impacts on heritage values.
-

Point Number 559.201

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** activity specific condition 14.11.1.9 (a)(i) relating to **P10** Below ground reservoirs.

AND

Amend numbering of specific activity condition to 14.11.1.10.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.11.1 Permitted activities P9 and the activity specific condition 14.11.1.9(a)(i), as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items and Maaori sites or areas of significance and will avoid adverse impacts on heritage values.
-

Point Number 559.202

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 14.11.2 RD4, RD5, RD6, RD7, RD8 and RD9 Restricted Discretionary Activities and the associated matters of discretion (e).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.11.2 Restricted Discretionary activities RD4, RD5, RD7, RD8 and RD9 and the associated matter of discretion (e)
- The submitter considers this is an appropriate level of resource consent activity, providing the appropriate level of protection and assessment as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.203

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain Rule 14.11.1 NCI, NC2 and NC3 Non Complying Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 14.11.4 Non-Complying activities NCI, NC2 and NC3 as this level of resource consent activity provides the appropriate level of protection and assessment to provide protection as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.204

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific conditions 14.12.1.5(1)(d) relating to P5 Operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing public roads, State Highways and associated road network activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity P5 and the activity specific condition 14.12.1.5(1)(d) as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or, subject to the acceptance of the related Heritage New Zealand submission point, Maaori sites or areas of significance, and therefore adverse impacts on heritage values will be avoided.

Point Number 559.205

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.12.1.6 (1)(g) relating to P6 New public roads, including where the road has been identified on the planning maps as an Indicative road, and associated road network activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity P6 and the activity specific condition 14.12.1.6(1)(g) as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or, subject to the acceptance of the related Heritage New Zealand submission point, Maaori sites or areas of significance, and therefore adverse impacts on heritage values will be avoided.

Point Number 559.206

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.12.1.7(4) relating to P7 Access and New Roads – Te Kowhai Airpark Zone.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Permitted activity P7 and the activity specific condition 14.12.1.7(4) as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or, subject to the acceptance of the related Heritage New Zealand submission point, Maaori sites or areas of significance, and therefore adverse impacts on heritage values will be avoided.

Point Number 559.207

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.12.1.8(iv) and(v) relating to P8 Off-road pedestrian and cycle facilities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports permitted activities P8 and activity specific condition 14.12.1.8(iv) and (v) as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or Maaori sites or areas of significance, and therefore adverse impacts on heritage values will be avoided.

Point Number 559.208

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain activity specific condition 14.12.1.9 (1)(a) and (b) relating to P9 Stock underpasses located within (a) Road and unformed road (b) Rural Zone.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports permitted activities P9 and activity specific condition 14.12.1.9(a) and (b) as this will ensure that works are not located within the Heritage items or Maaori sites or areas of significance, and therefore adverse impacts on heritage values will be avoided.

Point Number 559.209

Summary of Decision Requested: Retain matters of discretion 14.12.2(g) relating to RD5 Operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing public roads, State highways and associated road network activities that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 14.12.1.5.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports activity RD5 and the matter of discretion (g).
- This is an appropriate level of resource consent activity providing the appropriate level of resource consent activity providing the appropriate level of protection and assessment as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point Number 559.210

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 14.12.2 RD6 Restricted Discretionary Activities.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports activity RD6, as new roads are excluded from the restricted discretionary activity status.
- This is appropriate as new roads have the potential to cause significant adverse effects on heritage and cultural values and should be assessed with a more stringent level of resource consent activity to ensure the protection as required under s6 of the Resource Management Act is achieved.

Point Number 559.211

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** matters of discretion 14.12.2(i) relating to RD7 Access and New Roads – Te Kowhai Airpark Zone that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 14.12.1.7 as follows:

(i) The location of the earthworks activities, taking into account any effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of the site or area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the restricted discretionary activity status of activity RD7 and the associated matters of discretion in part.
- While this is an appropriate level of resource consent activity providing the appropriate level of resource consent activity providing the appropriate level of protection and assessment as required under section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the matters of discretion need to be expanded by including the word "area" as some sites are part of larger Maaori areas and this larger context needs to be acknowledged and considered as part of the consenting process.

Point Number 559.212

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** a new matter of discretion (e) to 14.12.2 relating to RD8 Off-road pedestrian and cycle facilities that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 14.12.1.8 as follows:

(e) The location of the earthworks activities, taking into account any effects on the values, qualities and characteristics of the site or area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary Activities RD8 do not include any assessment related to the identified areas as found for example in Rule 14.12.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities RD7, matters of discretion (i).

Point Number 559.213

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 18.3.5 P1 Verandahs as follows:

P1

(a) Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, except a building included in Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage Items, on land with a verandah line identified on the planning maps, must be provided with a verandah that complies with the following conditions:

...

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter opposes Rule 18.3.5 Verandahs in part as this rule has the potential to undermine the heritage values of items contained within Schedule 30.1 Historic Heritage Items and cause adverse effects.
- The plan does not provide clear guidance that Heritage items should be exempt from these types of design rules, Heritage New Zealand seeks that the rule is amended to exclude Heritage items from being subject to the Verandah rules.

Point Number 559.214

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.3.5 D1 Verandahs (subject to historic heritage items being excluded from these requirements).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of Rule 18.3.5, subject to historic heritage items being excluded from these requirements, as identified in the submission point relating to 18.3.5 P1 Verandahs.

Point Number 559.215

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the proposed District Plan Planning Maps the Rangiriri Heritage precinct as per the mapping included in Attachment 2 (refer to submission – Attachment 2: Reinstatement of Rangiriri Heritage Precinct).

AND

Add to the proposed District Plan the Rangiriri Heritage Precinct and the associated rule framework as per the Operative Plan.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the Rangiriri Heritage precinct has been deleted from the Plan.
- The submitter seeks that the Rangiriri Heritage precinct is reinstated into the Plan.

Point Number 559.216

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage Items, except for the amendments sought below
AND
Amend Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage to include an advice note regarding the extensive heritage and archaeological information held by Council that can be obtained on request.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the proposed Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage items which includes 74 new items.
- This Schedule contains a wide range of heritage items from within the Waikato District.
- Extensive work has been undertaken to research and record these items to include them as part of the schedule, which helps to ensure their protection from inappropriate subdivision, development and use into the future.
- Other heritage related work also undertaken includes the recording of additional heritage items which on evaluation did not meet the heritage assessment criteria for inclusion in the plan, and other work on heritage overviews of various parts of the district.
- There are also extensive studies related to archaeological sites, and therefore useful as part of the matters that an applicant may have to consider as part of their application proposals.
- Consideration needs to be given to making applicants aware of the additional heritage information that the Council holds. This could assist with the development of application proposals including heritage impact assessments or as background to inform structure plans or similar at the time of development.

Point Number 559.217

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** the third column heading in Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage Items from “H.P.T. to “HNZPT”.
AND
Add the Heritage New Zealand listing numbers as identified in Attachment 3 to this submission into Schedule 30.1 (refer to Attachment 3 of the submission).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter seeks that the heading in the third column is amended from “HPT” (the old acronym for Historic Places Trust) to “NZHPT” to recognise Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
- The submitter also seeks that in addition to the category of the Heritage New Zealand listed items that the Heritage New Zealand list number is also included. This will assist plan users to more readily access information regarding the listing and ensure that its heritage values are protected.

Point Number 559.218

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** schedule 30.1 Heritage Items by deleting the column containing the significant features to be protected and replacing with a notation or hyperlink to refer the reader to the relevant Heritage record forms for information relating to the history, setting, extent of scheduling and significant features of the building to all be given regard at the time of works on the Heritage Item.
AND
Add to Schedule 30.1 Heritage Items the heritage record form to be part of Schedule 30.1-Historic Heritage Items in the Plan.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned at the inclusion of the “significant features to be protected” column, within Schedule 30.1-Historic Heritage Items and how this column is used in conjunction with the rule framework, which allows works on the building that do not impact on the significant feature.
- As currently worded the rules would allow unfettered works on the parts of the building not identified as special features.
- The submitter is concerned that a listed property, Riverdale is proposed to be removed due to modifications which would indicate that the rules framework is not working.
- This approach risks encouraging a piecemeal approach and not considering the heritage place holistically. Even changes to non-protected elements can incur negative effects on protected features if they are comprised by what happens around them.
- The column in the schedule referring to significant features implies that everything else is not of particular significance, which is not helpful or correct. If the schedule is tied to the record forms, one can understand that the significant features are part of the total heritage values.

Point Number 559.219

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to Schedule 30.1, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga List item number 4256 – Riverdale, known in the Operative Plan as former FH Edgumbe Residence, Heritage item 115 as a 'B' ranking.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that a Heritage New Zealand listed item, known as Riverdale and also known as Former FH Edgumbe Residence, a Category A scheduled item, is proposed to be deleted from the Operative District Plan.
- Council's heritage expert suggests that it could be retained within the Plan as a “B” item.

- The submitter considers that the item is worthy of being retained within the Plan, despite the modifications and seeks that the item is retain with a "B" ranking.

Point Number 559.220

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga List item number 7129 – Komakorau Hall located at 50 Woodlands Road, Gordonton.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that this item continues to not be recognised within the District Plan, and considers that while this item has been relocated to 50 Woodlands Road, Gordonton, it will still retain some heritage values worthy of recognition in the schedule.
- The submission details historical points of note for this heritage item (refer to the submission).
- The submitter considers that the hall should be recognised in Schedule 30.1.

Point Number 559.221

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga List item number 4250 – Former Burnett Residence located at 11 Luff Place, Ngaruawahia, Heritage Item number 116 in the Operative District Plan.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that this item has not been retained within the Heritage Schedule.
- The c1875/80 building has historic heritage values and despite relocation has been retained within the same general locale. The building still retains some heritage values worthy of recognition in the schedule.

Point Number 559.222

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga List item number 4241 – Former Post office (Relocated) located at 10 Amber Lane, Puketaha.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the list item 4241, Former Post Office, originally located in the South Waikato District at the Arapuni Dam station and then moved to Arapuni Village, then moved off site in the 1990s to a relocatable building haulage yard and relocated to Puketaha in early 2000, is not included in Schedule 30.1, Heritage items.
- The item is also not scheduled in the Operative Waikato Plan 2013.
- The submitter considers that the item does retain sufficient heritage values to be recognised through the scheduling process.

Point Number 559.223

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Heritage Schedule 30.1 to include the setting of heritage item number 98 – Potatau Monument as shown on Attachment 4 to the submission (refer to submission).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports that the Potatau Monument and its immediate setting are part of Schedule 30.1 Historic Heritage Items.
- While this item is not on the Heritage New Zealand list, Heritage New Zealand has indicated publicly that it is interested to list this site for both its historic and wahi tapu values.
- While this listing work is in the early stages of development and consultation, it is considered that the extent of the Heritage New Zealand listing would likely extend beyond the current "setting" on the Potatau Monument record form, to the edge of the grassed reserve area in recognition of the many aspects, including the ancestral footprint and archaeological values that contribute to the importance of this item.
- It is considered that there is merit in seeking that the current recognised setting of heritage item number 98 is extended as shown on Attachment 4.
- This is important as the current setting is contained within one allotment and the way that the rules are written there is no opportunity to control development and avoid adverse effects on the immediate area, which is the reserve but on another allotment.

Point Number 559.224

Summary of Decision Requested: **Consider** how heritage Item number 17A (of the Operative District Plan) – First Industries cottage and site located at 92 B Te Onetea Road, Rangiriri, which has a current "B" ranking can be retained in Council's records.

AND

Consider how any additional information can be captured at the time of demolition.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned at the proposed deletion of this pre 1881 item from the schedule.
- While the submitter acknowledges what appears from a desktop review to be the very, very poor condition of the building, the early date of the site/building does indicate that the site/building is of heritage interest.
- An archaeological authority will be required potentially for the demolition of the building if it is pre 1900 and any earthworks required on the site at the time of demolition or for new development.

Point Number 559.225

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage Item number 76 - Former government departmental building from the Operative District Plan, located at 78 Matangi Street, Matangi and rank the building as a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned at the proposed deletion of this building from the plan.
- The submitter appreciates that the building has been relocated, however considers that the building has significant architectural qualities.
- While relocated it has connections to a particular style of government building nationwide, at the time playing an important function in the development of New Zealand.

Point Number 559.226

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage Item number 125 – Former Mines/King House from the Operative District Plan, located at 14 Galileo Street, Ngaruawahia and rank the building as a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the building is proposed to be deleted from the heritage schedule.
- The building appears to be in very original condition and has been maintained.
- It is very visible, and has architectural value, including the bull nose verandah feature.
- The submitter considers that it retains sufficient interest and heritage values to be retained within the schedule.

Point Number 559.227

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage Item number 155 – Former Gilmore Bros Shop from the Operative District Plan, located at 11 Bow Street, Raglan and rank the building as a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the building is proposed to be deleted from the heritage schedule.
- The submitter considers that while some of the features have been modified there are still distinctive architectural features such as the gable, with the shingles and rounded arch.
- The building has significant historic and social significance and contributes to the local identity.
- The modifications have not fundamentally damaged the character and design of the building.

Point Number 559.228

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1, Heritage Item number 161 – Former AR Langley building from the Operative District Plan, located at 19 Bow Street, Raglan and rank the building as a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the post 1906 building is proposed to be deleted from the heritage schedule.
- The building is located on a prominent corner site and is part of the community history.
- The modifications have not totally compromised the building and it retains sufficient interest to be retained within the schedule.

Point Number 559.229

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Marist Juniorate Training College building, located at 139 Dominion Road, Tuakau and rank the building as a 'A' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the 1925-26 buildings identified as the Former Marist Juniorate Training College building, Lavalla College, recommended to have a "A" ranking has not been included within the Heritage Schedule, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.
- The submitter considers that this is a very distinctive building with strong architectural values and decorative brick work and forms part of the social history of the district and the wider catholic church warrant the items included within the Schedule.

Point Number 559.230

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Kosoof building bungalow/Rimu house, located at 40 Main Street, Huntly and rank the building as a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the c1929 building which has a recommended "B" ranking has not been included within the Heritage Schedule, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.

- The submitter considers that this is a very distinctive building with strong architectural values and decorative brick work and forms part of the social history of the district.

Point Number 559.231

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Taupiri Post office & postmasters residence, located at 3 the Crescent, Taupiri and rank the building a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the 1920-21 building has not been included within the Heritage Schedule, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.
- The submitter supports the advice contained in the Adam Wild report that despite modifications the building has architectural values and is part of the history of the district.

Point Number 559.232

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Robinsons Boarding House, located at 79 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey and rank the building a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the 1914 building has not been included within the Heritage Schedule, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.
- Many buildings do have the potential to be restored and it's premature for the building to not be included onto the Heritage schedule.

Point Number 559.233

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Cavanagh Residence, located at 67 Ellery Street, Ngaruawahia and rank the building a 'B' category building.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter that the 1912/14 building has not been included within the Heritage Schedule, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.
- Many buildings do have the potential to be restored and it's premature for the building to not be included onto the Heritage schedule.

Point Number 559.234

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** the Proposed District Plan to administer the Ngaruawahia Centennial Memorial Plunket Rooms and Women's Rest Rooms in the same manner as other items in Schedule 30.1.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter that the 1940 building has not been included within the Heritage Schedule as a regular heritage item, despite being supported as an item for inclusion in the Plan in the peer review by conservation architect Adam Wild.
- Many buildings do have the potential to be restored and it is premature for the building to not be administered in the same manner as the other heritage buildings included in the Heritage Schedule.
- The submitter seeks that this building is recognised and administered in the same way as other items in the schedule.

Point Number 559.235

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** in the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the Former Huntly Railway worker's Cottages as follows:

- Heritage Item number 64 from the Operative District Plan located at 47 Harris Street, Huntly.
- Heritage Item number 65 from the Operative District Plan located at 41 Harris Street, Huntly.
- Heritage Item number 66 from the Operative District Plan located at 39 Harris Street, Huntly.
- Heritage Item number 67 from the Operative District Plan located at 37 Harris Street, Huntly.
- Heritage Item number 68 from the Operative District Plan located at 35 Harris Street, Huntly.
- Heritage Item number 69 from the Operative District Plan located at 33 Harris Street, Huntly.

AND

Amend the Proposed District Plan to recognise collectively the Huntly railway workers cottage, located on Harris Street, Huntly as a Precinct.

AND

Add rules as found in the Hamilton City Council Plan, Special Heritage Zone - Frankton Railway Village.

AND

Provide further information in regards to the status of the Historic Heritage Items changing status from "A" to "B".

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is supportive of the recognition of the cluster of former Huntly Railway worker's Cottages within Schedule 30.1 Historic Heritage Items.
- These items are part of the Operative Plan and recognised as "A" items, whereas the proposed plan demotes those items to a "B" status.
- No explanation has been provided in the available background material as to why they are considered to now only have a "B" status. Some information on this would be helpful.
- The submitter considers that there is merit in recognising the particular features of railway cottages such as their plain simple style and aspects of the sites such as lack of garaging and typical low fencing.
- There would be benefit in rules, such as those contained within the Hamilton City Council Plan, Special Heritage Zone – Frankton Railway Village that seek to maintain the important elements of these building, with rules allowing addition at the rear only, garaging at the rear of the house and maintaining low fencing. This already established type of rule framework would ensure the retention of the heritage values of the cottages and the group of houses as a whole.

Point Number 559.236

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** to the Heritage Schedule 30.1 the following NZ War Memorial Heritage inventory items as follows:

- Kariotahi School Roll of Honour
- Ngaruawahia NZ Wars Memorial
- Otatau War Memorial Bowling Green
- Otatau Hall
- Tauwhare War Memorial Hall
- Te Hoe Memorial Hall
- Te Uku & District Memorial Hall
- Tuakau Services Memorial
- Waikaretu War Memorial Hall
- Whatawhata Cemetery NZ Wars Memorial
- Whitikahu Memorial Hall

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that there has only been partial recognition of the NZ War Memorial inventory supplied to the council, within Schedule 30.1 – Historic Heritage Items.
- The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga NZ War Memorial Heritage inventory project sought to capture a range of monuments and memorials to the World Wars.
- Many of these items have been funded in part or whole by their local communities and placed on land donated by communities.
- This type of heritage has sometimes not been included within Heritage Schedules and this has led in some instance to their demise or relocation.

Point Number 559.237

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Schedule 30.3 - Maaori sites of Significance within the Plan, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend the introductory notes to Schedule 30.3 to include the following advice note:

The Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance are also recorded archaeological sites and may also contain unrecorded archaeological sites. These sites are subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must be contacted regarding development on or in proximity to these sites and the need to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter typically supports protection for the whole extent of a scheduled site.
- The submitter understands that the methodology used by Waikato District Council for the Maaori Sites and Areas of significance is largely a desktop methodology.
- There are risks to using desktop survey only to identify archaeological sites in that the fullest extent of the site may not be protected or there may be inaccuracies in historical record.
- As these sites are not being scheduled for their archaeological values along but instead their cultural significance to tangata whenua, the submitter considers it appropriate that the extents of these sites be identified by tangata whenua.
- As stated by Dr Des Kahotea in his methodology, these sites are being scheduled for more than just their archaeological values and "low archaeological values have no influence on cultural significance and sections 2(1) and 6(e) assigns tangata whenua, hapu and iwi the role and status.
- While the plan is recognising these sites for their cultural values, the plan needs to acknowledge these sites are also New Zealand Archaeological Association recorded archaeological sites and therefore subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, which provides for the protection of both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites. While the plan provides the recording number on the Plan maps and in the schedule, it would be helpful for the reader to be advised of the need to contact Heritage New Zealand in relation to their proposed works and the need or otherwise for an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority.

Point Number 559.238

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Schedule 30.4 – Maaori Areas of Significance within the Plan, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend the introductory notes to Schedule 30.4 to include the following advice note:

The Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance are also recorded archaeological sites and may also contain unrecorded archaeological sites. These sites are subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must be contacted regarding development on or in proximity to these sites and the need to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter typically supports protection for the whole extent of a scheduled site.
- The submitter understands that the methodology used by Waikato District Council for the Maaori Sites and Areas of significance is largely a desktop methodology.
- There are risks to using desktop survey only to identify archaeological sites in that the fullest extent of the site may not be protected or there may be inaccuracies in historical record.
- As these sites are not being scheduled for their archaeological values along but instead their cultural significance to tangata whenua, the submitter considers it appropriate that the extents of these sites be identified by tangata whenua.
- As stated by Dr Des Kahotea in his methodology, these sites are being scheduled for more than just their archaeological values and "low archaeological values have no influence on cultural significance and sections 2(1) and 6(e) assigns tangata whenua, hapu and iwi the role and status.
- While the plan is recognising these sites for their cultural values, the plan needs to acknowledge these sites are also New Zealand Archaeological Association recorded archaeological sites and therefore subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, which provides for the protection of both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites. While the plan provides the recording number on the Plan maps and in the schedule, it would be helpful for the reader to be advised of the need to contact Heritage New Zealand in relation to their proposed works and the need or otherwise for an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority.

Point Number

559.239

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Schedule 30.3 - Maaori sites of Significance by extending SS60 as depicted in Attachment 4 of the submission (refer to the submission).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the inclusion of SS60 Maaori Areas of Significance that includes the Potatau Monument and the immediate reserve surrounds.
- While this item is not on the Heritage New Zealand list is not on the Heritage New Zealand list, Heritage New Zealand has indicated publically that it is interested to list this site for both its historic and wahi tapu values.
- While this listing work is in the early stages of development and consultation, it is considered that the extent of the Heritage New Zealand listings would likely extend beyond the SS60 to the edge of the grassed reserve area in recognition of the many aspects, including the ancestral footprint and archaeological values that contribute to the importance of this item.
- It is considered that there is merit in seeking that ss60 is extended as shown on Attachment 4 of this submission, which would align with the likely footprint of the proposed wahi tapu listing.

Point Number

559.240

Summary of Decision Requested:

Add a new schedule to the Proposed District Plan entitled Schedule 30.6 – Significant Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu areas and include the following Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga listed waahi tapu sites:

- [Te Aukati ki Mangatawhiri - Waahi Tapu Heritage New Zealand list number 9632,](#)
- [Meremere - Waahi Tapu Heritage New Zealand list number 9609,](#)
- [Te Teo Teo - Waahi Tapu Heritage New Zealand list number 9607, and](#)
- [Rangiriri- Waahi Tapu Area Heritage New Zealand list number 7720.](#)

AND

Add maps in the District Plan Maps showing the same extent as the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga listing as included in Attachment 6 (refer to submission).

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter requests a new schedule in the plan to be known as Schedule 30.6 – Significant Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu areas.
- The submitter requests that these wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas are to be mapped as per the extent shown in Attachment 6 to this submission.

Point Number

559.241

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain the archaeological advice note in the Introduction to Section E, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend the archaeological advice note in the Introduction to Section E to read as follows:

Advice Note

A designation does not exempt a requiring authority from first obtaining an authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga if an archaeological site is to be destroyed, ~~damaged~~ or modified.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the advice note contained within the Introduction to section E – Designations.
- It is important that parties undertaking works are aware of their obligations with regard to the protection of archaeology, both recorded and unrecorded.
- The wording in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, s42, relates to a person "modifying or destroying" an archaeological site. The word damaging is not included within this section of the Act.
- The submitter therefore seeks that the wording of the advice note is amended to reflect the language of the Act.

Point Number 559.242

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** condition 5 of designation for the Minister of Corrections as follows:

5.0 Archaeological

5.1

If any urupa, traditional sites, taonga (significant artefacts), koiwi (human remains), or other archaeological sites are exposed during site works the following procedures shall apply:

- Immediately it becomes apparent that an urupa, traditional site, taonga, koiwi or other archaeological site has been exposed, all site works in the immediate vicinity shall cease;*
- The site supervisor shall immediately secure the area in a way that ensures that any artefacts or remains are not further disturbed; and*
- The site supervisor shall notify the Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust and a nominated Ngati Naho hapu representative, ~~the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga~~ the Department of Conservation, the Waikato District Council, the Waikato Regional Council and in the case of human remains, the New Zealand Police, that an archaeological or traditional site has been exposed so that appropriate action can be taken.*

~~*This includes such persons being given reasonable time as determined by the Waikato District Council to record and recover archaeological features discovered before work may recommence on the site. The Minister of Corrections shall not be in breach of this condition if Ngati Naho hapu does not nominate or cannot agree to a representative.*~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter seeks amendments within the conditions of the Minister of Corrections designation to correct the naming of Heritage New Zealand as changed under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and as the regulatory authority related to archaeology remove from the condition the decision making role that has been incorrectly assigned to the Waikato District Council.

Point Number 559.243

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 16.3.11.6 C2 Heritage Precincts-Matangi and Huntly by changing the activity status from a Controlled Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.6 C2(b) Heritage Precincts- Matangi and Huntly as follows:

- Alteration of a building in the Matangi or Huntly Heritage Precincts identified on the planning maps.*
- Council's ~~discretion~~ ~~controls~~ will be reserved over the following matters: ...*

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part only the controlled activity heritage precinct rules.
- The submitter considers that the activity status, as a controlled activity presents no clear trigger point at which the activity tips to a restricted discretionary activity.
- Given the sensitive nature of these works the activity status should be restricted discretionary to allow a more robust assessment and be able to decline inappropriate activity.

Point Number 559.244

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 16.3.11.6 C3 Heritage Precincts-Matangi and Huntly by changing the activity status from a controlled activity to a restricted discretionary activity.

AND

Amend Rule 16.3.11.6 C3 (a) as follows:

- ~~*Attachment*~~ *Placement of an advertising sign(s) to a building or located within the 8m setback from the road boundaries in the Matangi or Huntly heritage precincts identified on the Planning Maps.*

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part only the controlled activity heritage precinct rules.
- The submitter is concerned that the rule allows advertising signage on buildings within the precinct, which has the potential to erode heritage values of individual buildings and the precinct.
- It would be appropriate that this type of signage was on the site only to minimise the adverse effects and the status of the rules was restricted discretionary to allow the application to be declined.

Point Number 559.245

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 16.3.11.6 RD1 Heritage Precincts-Matangi and Huntly.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has sought that the previous controlled activities related to the precincts are amended to restricted discretionary activities, the restricted discretionary activity, (which contains a typo in the first line with the additional word “to”) can be deleted.

Point Number 559.246

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.4.1.5 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) *Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)*

(b) *The Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:*

(i) *Effects on heritage values;*

(ii) *Context and setting of the heritage item;*

(iii) *The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.*

AND

Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items, to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number 559.247

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.4.6 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.4.6 RD1 Subdivision - land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) *Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)*

(b) *Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:*

(i) *Effects on heritage values;*

(ii) *Context and setting of the heritage item;*

(iii) *The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.*

AND

Amend Rule 18.4.6 RD1 Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number 559.248

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 20.4.5 RD1 Subdivision of land containing a heritage item, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 20.4.5 RD1 Subdivision of land containing a heritage item as follows:

(a) *Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)*

(b) *Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:*

(i) *Effects on heritage values;*

(ii) *Context and setting of the heritage item;*

(iii) *The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.*

AND

Amend Rule 20.4.5 RD1 Subdivision of land containing a heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number

559.249

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 23.4.6 RD1 Subdivision of land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 23.4.6 RD1 Subdivision of land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Effects on heritage values;

(ii) Context and setting of the heritage item;

(iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.

AND

Amend Rule 23.4.6 RD1 Subdivision of land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number

559.250

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 24.4.8 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.4.8 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Effects on heritage values;

(ii) Context and setting of the heritage item;

(iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.

AND

Amend Rule 24.4.8 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number

559.251

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 16.4.10 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.4.10 RD1 Subdivision – land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(i) Effects on heritage values;

(ii) Context and setting of the heritage item;

(iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.

AND

Amend Rule 16.4.10 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number

559.252

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 22.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items as follows:

(a) *Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items)*

(b) *Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:*

(i) *Effects on heritage values;*

(ii) *Context and setting of the heritage item;*

(iii) *The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained within one lot.*

AND

Amend Rule 22.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy.
- An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot.
- The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.

Point Number

559.253

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 17.4.1.5 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number

559.254

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Rule 18.4.6 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to reflect a non-complying activity status for proposals that cannot achieve compliance with RDI.

AND

Amend Rule 18.4.6 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number

559.255

Summary of Decision Requested:

Retain Rule 20.4.5 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 20.4.5 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number 559.256

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.4.6 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.
AND

Amend Rule 23.4.6 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number 559.257

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** Rule 24.4.8 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to reflect a non-complying activity status for proposals that cannot achieve compliance with Rule 24.4.8 RDI.

AND

Amend Rule 24.4.8 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number 559.258

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.4.10 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 16.4.10 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number 559.259

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.4.8 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.4.8 NCI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved.
- This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.

Point Number 559.260

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.4.9 RDI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of significance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 16.4.9 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2 section 6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).

Point Number 559.261

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.4.9 NCI Title boundaries – Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 16.4.9 NCI Title boundaries – Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.

- This rule applies a more stringent activity status therefore giving effect to Part 2 section 6 Matters of National Importance.

Point Number 559.262

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below

AND

Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.

AND

Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.263

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries – Maaori sites and areas of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Maaori sites and areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.

AND

Amend Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Maaori sites and areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.264

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.4.3 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage Items, Maaori sites of Significance and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendment sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 22.4.3 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.

AND

Amend Rule 22.4.3 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 22.4.3 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.265

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.4.6 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage Items and Archaeological sites, sites of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 24.4.6 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.

AND

Amend Rule 24.4.6 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 24.4.6 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.266

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 28.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 28.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.
AND
Amend Rule 28.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 28.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.267

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the provision of heritage items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.268

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the provision of heritage items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.269

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of Significance., except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including the retention of heritage items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.270

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below.
AND
Amend Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the retention of heritage items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.271

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 28.4.5 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendment sought below.

AND

Amend Rule 28.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the provision of heritage items.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 28.4.5 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas and Maaori sites of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.272

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.4.5 RD1 Site boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 23.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.273

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 23.4.5 NCI Site boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 23.4.5 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.274

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas and Areas of Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.
- This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.275

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas and Maaori sites of Significance.
- This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).

Point Number 559.276

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.3.3.2 PI Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 16.3.3.2 PI Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area as this height range would allow for a reasonable sized building within the large view shafts, yet is not so large that the entire battlefield could be obscured. Therefore the heritage values of the battle sites will be retained.

Point Number 559.277

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.3.4.4 PI Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports Rule 22.3.4.4 PI Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area as this height range would allow for a reasonable sized building within the large view shafts, yet is not so large that the entire battlefield could be obscured. Therefore the heritage values of the battle sites will be retained.

Point Number 559.278

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 16.3.3.2 D1 Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity Rule 16.3.3.2 D1 Height - Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.
- It is appreciated that as a discretionary activity the assessment can be very broad.
- This can ensure that buildings, structures or vegetation are developed in such a manner that the view of the battlefield will be protected into the future, therefore meeting the requirements of section 6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.279

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Rule 22.3.4.4 D1 Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the discretionary activity Rule 22.3.4.4 D1 Height – Building and vegetation in a battlefield view shaft area.
- It is appreciated that as a discretionary activity the assessment can be very broad.
- This can ensure that buildings, structures or vegetation are developed in such a manner that the view of the battlefield will be protected into the future, therefore meeting the requirements of section 6 of the Resource Management Act.

Point Number 559.280

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** a new advice note to zone rules for Land use – Effects that directs the plan reader to the signage rules relating to heritage items and Maori sites of significance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the rules that relate to signage on heritage buildings are located within another part of the zone chapter as part of the Land use effects rules – historic heritage and may not be readily located by the plan user.
- Signage can cause adverse effects on heritage building the same as buildings can.

Point Number 559.281

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** a new cultural and heritage based objective and policy to Chapter 8: Reserves as follows:

Objective – Cultural and Heritage Values

The cultural and historic heritage values of public open space, natural reserves and parks are maintained and conserved.

Policy – Cultural and Heritage Values

(j) Ensure the conservation of cultural and heritage values at the time of the consideration of proposed works through consultation with Tangata Whenua and Heritage New Zealand.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that Chapter 8: Reserves contains no Objectives and Policies in recognition of cultural or heritage values that are often prevalent within Reserves, particularly Heritage Reserves, and reserves adjacent to river or coastal locations.
- The submitter acknowledges the role of reserve management plans, however considers that just as natural values are covered by objectives and policies, cultural and heritage values should also be part of the land management processes considered under any Resource Management Act process for these important sites and meet the considerations required under section 6 of the Act.

Point Number 559.282

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Objective 9.3.4 Heritage.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is supportive of the continued retention of the existing objective related to the development of the Rangitahi Peninsula.

Point Number 559.283

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 9.3.4.1 Cultural and historic sites of significance.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is supportive of the continued retention of the existing policies related to the development of the Rangitahi Peninsula.

Point Number 559.284

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Policy 9.3.4.2 Heritage protection.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is supportive of the continued retention of the existing policies related to the development of the Rangitahi Peninsula.

Point Number 559.285

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** Chapter 12.1 How to use and interpret the rules, except for the amendments sought below.

AND

Add a new section (k) to Chapter 12.1 How to use and interpret the rules as follows:

(k) The New Zealand Archaeological Association archaeological sites are included on the planning maps for District Plan information purposes only. However these sites are subject to the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must be contacted regarding development on or in proximity to these sites and the need to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter is concerned that the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) sites are shown on the Plan planning maps for information only, yet the purpose is not discussed in the parts of the Chapter 12 that refer to the planning maps.
- The submitter considers that it needs to be highlighted in Chapter 12, through an advice note that the NZAA sites are included for information as they have the potential to impact on the natural of the proposed development and property owners and developers need to be aware of their obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Point Number 559.286

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** the definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions, subject to below.

AND

Amend rules to ensure Ancillary rural earthworks are being assessed as a restricted discretionary activity should they occur in a Maaori site or area of significance, or waahi tapu site or waahi tapu area, or the setting of a heritage item.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the definition of Ancillary rural earthworks in so far as they should be assessed at the time of works in a cultural site or area of significance, wahi tapu or wahi tapu area, or the setting of a heritage item or as recognised in the schedules of the plan, as the scale of some of the works within this definition have the potential for adverse effects.

Point Number 559.287

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** the definition of "Rural Ancillary Earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter considers that the definition of "Rural Ancillary Earthworks" replicates the definition for "ancillary rural earthworks".

Point Number 559.288

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** the definition of "earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions, subject to below.

AND

Amend rules to ensure earthworks are being assessed as a restricted discretionary activity should they occur in sites and areas of significance to Maaori.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the definition of "earthworks" as all earthworks within sites and areas of significance to Maaori are subject to resource consent.

Point Number 559.289

Summary of Decision Requested: **Amend** the heading of the definition of "addition or alteration" in Chapter 13: Definitions to be "addition" as follows:

~~Alteration or Addition~~

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the actual definition for "addition or alteration", however considers that this definition should be a definition for additions only, rather than a definition for "addition or alteration", as there is already a separate definition for alterations.

Point Number 559.290

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** the definition of "Alteration" in Chapter 13: Definitions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the definition of “alteration” as the breadth of works defined as an alteration will ensure the range of works that could impact on heritage values are captured for assessment as an alteration.

Point Number 559.291

Summary of Decision Requested: **Retain** the definition of “Historic heritage” in Chapter 13: Definitions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter supports the definition of “historic heritage as it uses the same definition as section 2 of the Resource Management Act.
- This ensures consistency of consideration at the time of assessing works in relation to Appendix 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items).

Point Number 559.292

Summary of Decision Requested: **Add** the definition of “Historic heritage values” to Chapter 13: Definitions to have the same meaning as Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.

AND

Provide for any consequential amendments as required throughout the Proposed District Plan.

Decision Reasons:

- This undefined term is used within the Maaori sites and areas of significance – Matters of discretion earthworks rules.
- Heritage New Zealand considers that this term could be ambiguous and seeks that the term is amended to historic heritage values and has the same meaning as Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.
- This ensures consistency of consideration at the time of assessing works in relation to Maaori sites and areas of significance – Matters of discretion earthworks rules.

Point Number 559.293

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 16.3.11.3 PI All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.294

Summary of Decision Requested: **Delete** Rule 17.3.8.3 PI All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.295

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 18.3.10.3 PI All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.296

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 20.3.5.3 PI All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
- Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
- Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
- Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
- In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
- Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.

Point Number 559.297

Summary of Decision Requested: Delete Rule 22.3.8.3 PI All heritage items – Alterations or additions.

Decision Reasons:

- The submitter has concerns regarding the permitted activity rule related to alterations or additions.
 - Concerned that that only protecting the significant physical features or specified facades of buildings has the potential for adverse effects on the heritage values of the entire building
 - Works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features could have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
 - The rule ignores the intrinsic heritage values of the whole of the heritage items.
 - Alterations and additions under this rule as a permitted activity could cumulatively impact on the overall building, not just the significant features or specified facades.
 - In addition it is incorrect to assume that works that are located out of public view or that do not involve significant features are unimportant and do not have the potential to adversely affect or undermine heritage values.
 - Any alterations or additions should be assessed through a resource consent process to consider the holistic impact of the proposed works on the historic heritage item, ensuring minimal loss of heritage fabric, and that the design, form, scale, workmanship, location of works and the curtilage and setting are respected.
-