



## **Section 42A Report to the District Plan Review Hearing Panel**

---

### **Proposed Horowhenua District Plan Historic Heritage**

---

**March 2013**



Hearing Date: 8-9 April 2013  
Report Prepared by: Lynette Baish  
Report Number: 04.01

## **NOTE TO SUBMITTERS**

Submitters should note that the hearings on the Proposed District Plan have been organised according to topic. A total of 14 hearings are scheduled to hear submissions on each of the 14 topics. The topic which is the subject of this report is Historic Heritage.

It is very likely that submitters who have made submissions in relation to Historic Heritage may have also made submissions on other parts of the Proposed Plan. This report only addresses those submissions points that are relevant to the subject of this report.

The hearings of submissions to the Proposed District Plan are being collectively heard by a Panel of eight commissioners. The appointed commissioners include a mix of local Councillors and independent commissioners. In most cases each hearing will be heard by a panel of three commissioners selected from the eight panel members. This does mean that different commissioners will be sitting on different hearings. It therefore will require submitters to ensure that when speaking at a hearing that they keep to their submission points that have been covered by the Planning Report for that hearing.

To assist submitters in finding where and how their submissions have been addressed in this report, a submitter index has been prepared and can be found at the very end of the report. The index identifies the page number(s) of where the submitter's submission points have been addressed in the report.

Submitters may also find the table contained in Section 6.2 of this report helpful as it identifies the Reporting Officer's recommendation to the Hearing Panel on every submission point and further submission point addressed in this report.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Horowhenua District Plan has been operative for over 13 years (since 13<sup>th</sup> September 1999). During this time Council has undertaken a number of plan changes the majority have been of a minor technical nature. In 2009 Council publicly notified three substantive plan changes that sought to address Rural Subdivision, Urban Growth and Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. A significant portion of the Operative District Plan has not be reviewed or modified since becoming operative in 1999. The Council in fulfilling its statutory duties has undertaken a review of those parts of the District Plan that have not been subject of a plan change after 2008. In this time, the District has experienced a variety in the types and quality of subdivision and development, while at the same time the economic climate has impacted on the resources available to landowners to invest in the maintenance and conservation of heritage resources, not to mention the impact of the Christchurch earthquakes on requirements to strengthen heritage buildings and structures.

The Proposed District Plan was publicly notified for submissions on 14 September 2012. The period for further submissions closed 20 December 2012. Through the public notification process a number of submissions were received supporting and opposing the Proposed Plan provisions. These submissions have supported some provisions requesting they be adopted as proposed, while others have requested changes to the wording or deletion of specific changes.

The purpose of this report is to summarise the key issues raised in submissions in respect of Chapter 13 (Historic Heritage) and associated provisions in respect of historic heritage throughout the Plan, and to provide advice to the District Plan Review Hearings Panel on the issues raised. All submission points have been evaluated in this report, with specific recommendations for each point raised within each submission. These recommendations include amendments to the Proposed Plan, including refinements to the wording of some provisions. Whilst recommendations are provided, it is the role of the District Plan Review Hearings Panel to consider the issues, the submissions received, the evidence present at the hearing, and the advice of the reporting planner for Council before making a decision.

The District Plan Review Hearings Panel in making its decisions will determine whether to accept, reject or accept in part, the submissions received, and as a consequence, any amendments to be made to the Proposed Plan.

# CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Qualifications	6
1.2 Purpose	6
1.3 Outline	6
<b>2. PROPOSED HOROWHENUA DISTRICT PLAN</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Background	7
2.2 Consultation & Process	7
<b>3. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Resource Management Act 1991	8
3.2 Proposed Amendments to Resource Management Act	9
3.3 Local Government Act 2002	10
3.4 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010	10
3.5 National Environmental Standards	10
3.6 National Policy Statements	10
3.7 Operative Regional Policy Statement & Proposed One Plan	11
3.8 Operative Horowhenua District Plan	12
3.9 Historic Places Act 1993	12
3.10 Conservation Act	12
3.11 Reserves Act 1977	12
3.12 Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993	13
3.13 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010	13
<b>4. ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Issue 13.3 Balancing Private Rights/Public Good	14
4.2 Policy 13.1.2	16
4.3 Policy 13.2.3	17
4.4 Policy 13.3.2	19
4.5 Policy 13.3.3	20
4.6 Methods for Issue 13.1 & Objective 13.1.1	21
4.7 Methods for Issue 13.3 & Objective 13.3.1	24
4.8 Chapter 13 General Matters	28
4.9 Rules 16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6	29
4.10 Rules 17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8	30
4.11 Rule 19.1(n)	31
4.12 Rules 19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8	32
4.13 Rule 19.4.10	33
4.14 Rule 19.4.11(a)	35
4.15 Rules 20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5	37
4.16 Schedule 2: Historic Heritage – Buildings, Structures & Sites	38
<b>5. CONCLUSION AND MAIN RECOMMENDED CHANGES FROM PROPOSED HOROWHENUA DISTRICT PLAN (AS NOTIFIED)</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>6. APPENDICES</b>	<b>46</b>
6.1 Legislative Extracts	46
6.2 Proposed District Plan as amended per officer’s recommendations	50

6.3 Schedule of Officer’s Recommendations on Submission Points ..... 56

**SUBMITTER INDEX ..... 58**

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 Qualifications

I have been employed at Horowhenua District Council as a resource management planner since January 2008. I hold a Bachelor of Arts Degree majoring in history and politics from Victoria University of Wellington. I am currently working towards my thesis, the subject of which is heritage, as the final part of my Masters in Resource and Environmental Planning degree programme with Massey University. I am a student member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

## 1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to assess the Proposed District Plan in terms of the relevant statutory considerations and obligations, taking into account those issues raised in submissions, and an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the proposed Historic Heritage provisions. I provide my findings and recommendations to the Hearings Panel in accordance with Section 42A of the Resource Management Act.

## 1.3 Outline

This report considers submissions and further submissions which were received on “Chapter 13 Historic Heritage” of the Proposed Horowhenua District Plan (referred to in this report as “the Proposed Plan”). This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 42(a) of the Resource Management Act (“the RMA”) to assist the Hearings Panel with its consideration of submissions received in respect of the provisions in these parts of the Proposed Plan.

This report is structured according to the following format:

- An overview of the Proposed Plan and associated heritage rules throughout the Proposed Plan
- Statutory Requirements
- Analysis of Submissions
- Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan

The report discusses each submission or groups of similar submissions and includes a recommendation from the report writer on each submission that has been received, **but the recommendation is not the decision of the Horowhenua District Council** (“the Council”).

Following consideration of all the submissions and supporting evidence, if any, presented by the submitters and further submitters at the hearing, the Hearings Panel will make a decision on the submissions. The decision report prepared by the Hearing Panel will include the Hearing Panel’s decision to accept, accept in part, or reject individual submission points, and any amendments to the Proposed Plan. All recommendations in this report are subject to consideration of any further evidence provided by submitters at the hearing.

The amendments to the Proposed Plan arising from the staff recommendations discussed throughout this report are listed in full in Section 6.2. The suggested amendments are set out in the same style as the Proposed Plan.

The Analysis of Submissions section has been structured by grouping submission points according to individual provisions in the Proposed Plan. As far as possible, the individual submission points

are listed in order to match the contents of each Plan provision. The submission points relating to text or maps are listed first. Each submission and further submission has been given a unique number (e.g. 58). Further submissions follow the same number format although they start at the number 500, therefore any submitter number below 500 relates to an original submission and any submitter number of 500 or higher relates to a further submission. In addition to the submission number, each submission point (relief sought) has been given a unique number (e.g. 01). When combined with the submitter number, the submission reference number reads 58.01, meaning submitter number 58 and submission point number 01. A similar numbering system has been used for further submissions.

This report contains selected text from the Proposed Plan itself, either when changes have been requested by a submitter or where a change is recommended by Council officers or advisers. Where changes to the text are recommended in this report the following protocols have been followed:

- New additional text is recommended is shown as underlined (i.e. abcdefghijkl)
- Existing text is recommended to be deleted is shown as struck-out (i.e. ~~abcdefghijkl~~)

## **2. Proposed Horowhenua District Plan**

---

### **2.1 Background**

In November 2009, Council resolved to undertake a full review of its Operative District Plan. Under Section 79 of the RMA, the Council is required to commence a review of its District Plan provisions which have not been reviewed in the previous 10 years. The Council has undertaken a number (23) of District Plan changes since the current Plan was made operative in September 1999. These Plan Changes addressed a wide range of issues, with the most recent Plan Changes including rural subdivision, urban growth, outstanding natural features and landscapes, and financial contributions. Whilst these Plan Changes covered a number of the provisions in the District Plan, many other provisions had not been changed or reviewed. Accordingly, the Council decided to do a full review of the rest of the District Plan, including the earlier Plan Changes. This review did not cover the most recent Plan Changes 20 – 22 which were not operative at the time the Proposed Plan was notified.

Chapter 13 of the Proposed Plan, Historic Heritage, contains information about the historic heritage of the Horowhenua District, the statutory context for the protection of such places and the main issues for achieving the statutory requirements for heritage protection. This Chapter of the Proposed Plan is an updated version of Section 7 in the Operative Plan.

### **2.2 Consultation & Process**

As outlined in the Section 32 Report associated with the Proposed Plan, general and targeted consultation has been undertaken for the District Plan Review from 2009. The general consultation was undertaken in two phases: 1. Survey and 2. Discussion Document (refer to the Section 32 Report for further details on the consultation approach and process).

The consultation undertaken above in relation to the Plan provisions contained in Chapter 13 Historic Heritage, forms an initial stage of what will be a complex long term consultative process beyond the District Plan hearings. As part of the work under the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, a specialised survey will be undertaken of the prospective historic heritage buildings, structures, sites and places that could be protected through inclusion in the District Plan, in addition to a comprehensive research process to identify the values and significance of those

heritage places. The survey and research will be a major collaborative exercise between Council, NZHPT, Iwi, Horizons, DoC, QEII Trust, local historical societies and Historic Places Horowhenua Manawatu, with the survey to commence within one year from the date of notification of the Proposed Plan.

### **2.2.1 Late Submissions**

No late submissions were received which raised matters relating to Chapter 13 or the associated heritage rules.

## **3. Statutory Requirements**

---

### **3.1 Resource Management Act 1991**

In preparing a District Plan, HDC must fulfil a number of statutory requirements set down in the Resource Management Act (RMA), including:

- Part II, comprising Section 5, Purpose and Principles of the Act; Section 6, Matters of National Importance; Section 7, Other Matters; and Section 8, Treaty of Waitangi;
- Section 31, Functions of Territorial Authorities;
- Section 32, Duty to consider alternatives, assess benefits and costs;
- Section 72, Purpose of district plans;
- Section 73, Preparation and change of district plans;
- Section 74, Matters to be considered by territorial authorities;
- Section 75, Contents of district plans.

Below I have summarised the key matters from the above requirements which are particularly relevant to this report. Historic Heritage is defined in section 2 of the RMA to mean those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, deriving from archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, or technological qualities. Historic heritage includes historic sites, structures, places and areas, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori, including waahi tapu, and surroundings associated with natural and physical resources.

Section 5 of the RMA outlines the purpose of the Act, including the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in a way, and at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety. Section 5 defines the purpose of the Act - the sustainable management of natural and physical resources for current and future generations. Natural and physical resources include natural and historic landscapes and sites, while physical resources include heritage buildings, structures and places.

Section 6 states that in achieving the stated purpose of the Act, all persons exercising any function or power under the RMA shall recognise and provide for matters of national importance including the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga. A further matter of national importance is the protection of historic heritage from any subdivision, use and development that would be inappropriate or compromise/diminish heritage resources in any way. Furthermore, Section 7 compels all persons exercising functions under the Act to have a particular regard to kaitiakitanga, the ethic of stewardship and the maintenance and enhancement both of amenity values and of the quality of the environment.



Finally, Section 74(2)(b)(iia) of the Act requires Councils to have regard to relevant entries on the Historic Places Register when preparing or changing a district plan.

### **3.2 Proposed Amendments to Resource Management Act**

Central government has initiated reforms to the Resource Management Act (RMA) which focus on reducing delays and compliance costs. These reforms comprise two phases: Phase 1 focused on streamlining and simplifying the RMA, including changes to the preparation of district plans, while Phase 2 focuses on more substantive issues concerning freshwater, aquaculture, urban design, infrastructure and the Public Works Act. Work on Phase 1 commenced late in 2008, while work on Phase 2 commenced in mid-2009.

The Phase 1 work culminated in the Resource Management (Simplifying and Streamlining) Amendment Act 2009, which came into force in October 2009. In respect of the Horowhenua District Plan and the Proposed Plan, the main effects of these amendments relate to the further submission process, ability to simplify decision reports and notices, and changes to the point at which rules have effect. In respect of heritage, a much earlier significant amendment was the change from the section 7(e) requirement to have particular regard for historic heritage, to a new requirement under section 6(f) which made historic heritage a matter of national importance.

In terms of Phase 2, in December 2012 the Resource Management Reform Bill was introduced to Parliament for its first reading and was referred to the Local Government and Environment Committee for consideration. In terms of District Plan Reviews and Proposed District Plans, this Bill proposes changes in relation to the analysis that underpins District Plans, including greater emphasis on the need for quantitative assessment of costs and benefits, the need to consider regional economic impact and opportunity costs, ensuring decision-making is based on adequate, relevant, and robust evidence and analysis, and increasing the level of transparency in the decision-making process. It is noted the Bill includes transitional provisions which state that these new assessment and decision-making requirements do not apply to proposed plans after the further submission period has closed (refer Schedule 2, Clause 2 of the Bill).

Central government is also considering further changes to the RMA. In late February 2012 the government released a discussion document on proposals it is considering to change the RMA. The proposed reform package identifies six proposals:

Proposal 1: Greater national consistency and guidance

Proposal 2: Fewer resource management plans

Proposal 3: More efficient and effective consenting

Proposal 4: Better natural hazard management

Proposal 5: Effective and meaningful iwi/Maori participation

Proposal 6: Working with councils to improve practice

At the time of writing this report, there have been no other announcements or research relating to the subject of this report.

### **3.3 Local Government Act 2002**

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) is designed to provide democratic and effective local government that recognises the diversity of New Zealand communities. It aims to accomplish this by establishing an administrative framework to guide what local authorities do and how. To balance this, the legislation promotes local accountability, with local authorities accountable to their communities for decisions taken.

The LGA also enables local authorities to play a broad role in meeting the current and future needs of their communities through the provision of good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions. Section 14 of the LGA sets out the principles that underpin the functions of local government, one of which states:

*(h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority should take into account—*

*(i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and*

*(ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and*

*(iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations*

This principle generally aligns with the overall purpose of the Resource Management Act and, in terms of historic heritage, complements the requirements of s.6(f) in that it implicitly recognises the role that historic buildings, structures and sites assume in providing communities with a sense of place, a cultural identity and a tangible link to people and events of the past.

### **3.4 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010**

Under Section 75(3)(b) of the Resource Management Act, a District Plan must give effect to any New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) provides a policy regime for achieving the purpose of the RMA in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand. Objective 6 of the NZCPS recognises that historic heritage in the coastal environment is extensive but not fully known, and vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Policies 2 and 17 assist in serving the interests of this objective and are identified as having relevance to the provisions of Chapter 13 and associated heritage rules. These provisions are summarised more fully in Section 6 of this report.

### **3.5 National Environmental Standards**

No National Environmental Standards (NES) are specifically relevant to the subject matter of this report.

### **3.6 National Policy Statements**

Under Section 75(3)(a) of the Resource Management Act, a District Plan must give effect to any National Policy Statement (NPS). No NPS's are specifically relevant to the subject matter of this report.

### 3.7 Operative Regional Policy Statement & Proposed One Plan

Under Section 74(2) of the Resource Management Act, the Council shall have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, in this case, the Horizons Regional Council Proposed One Plan. In addition, under Section 75(3)(c) of the Resource Management Act, a District Plan must give effect to any Regional Policy Statement.

The Operative Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Policy Statement became operative on 18 August 1998. The Proposed One Plan (incorporating the Proposed Regional Policy Statement) was publicly notified in May 2007 and decisions on submissions notified in August 2010. In total 22 appeals were received, with some resolved through mediation while others were heard by the Environment Court. Interim decisions were issued by the Environment Court in August 2012 with final decisions expected in early 2013. However, appeals have been lodged with the High Court by Federated Farmers of NZ Inc and Horticulture NZ in relation to non-point source discharges and run-off (nutrient management).

Given the very advanced nature of the Proposed One Plan in the plan preparation process and that all matters relevant to the District Plan Review are beyond challenge, the Proposed One Plan is considered the primary instrument to be given effect to by the Proposed District Plan.

Chapter 7 outlines the regionally significant issues for the management of living heritage within the Manawatu-Wanganui region, including indigenous biological diversity, landscape and historic heritage (NB: Chapter 4 *Te Ao Maori*, contributes to the management of sites of significance to Maori, including waahi tapu). The chapter identifies that halting the decline of indigenous biological diversity is one of the main issues addressed by the Proposed One Plan, and proposes that the Regional Council take a more active role around coordinating biodiversity management. To this end, although natural biodiversity is arguably a part of historic heritage, it is not an issue that will be dealt with at district level in the Manawatu-Wanganui region, with Council jurisdiction limited to the identification and protection of notable and amenity trees.

Chapter 4 recognises that the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes is a matter of national importance, and seeks to aid territorial authorities through the provision of guidance for managing the effects of subdivision, use and development that may affect such features and landscapes.

The approach of the Proposed One Plan is to maintain and enhance, where appropriate, the current degree of natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, rivers, lakes and their margins through the implementation of policies, management interventions and restoration programmes. In assessing outstanding natural features and landscapes the Regional Council and territorial authorities have to take into consideration the criteria in Table 7.2 *Natural Feature and Landscape Assessment Factors* (See Section 7.1 of this report), particularly when identifying/establishing the values of outstanding features and landscapes and providing for their protection. The criteria include shared and recognised values that contribute to local identity, cultural and spiritual values, and historical associations.

Finally, the Proposed One Plan acknowledges the impacts that regional decision making (including consents decisions) can have on historic heritage and the need for historic heritage to be identified and managed in conjunction with district councils, New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) and New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), particularly in the coastal marine area where district councils hold no jurisdiction. In response, the Regional Council is to develop and

maintain a schedule of known historic heritage in the coastal marine area, including a statement of qualities that contribute to each site.

### **3.8 Operative Horowhenua District Plan**

As noted above, the Horowhenua District Plan has been operative for over 13 years (since 13<sup>th</sup> September 1999) and a number of plan changes made. None of these plan changes directly impact the subject matter of this report. However, Plan Change 7 included amendments in respect of the protection of notable trees, while Plan Change 16, inter alia, deleted some heritage features from Schedule 2. Apart from these changes, no other changes have been made to the Heritage provisions since the District Plan became operative.

### **3.9 Historic Places Act 1993**

The Historic Places Act 1993 promotes the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand's historic heritage and is administered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Under the 1993 Act the Trust is the consenting agency for archaeological sites, for which it has regulatory responsibilities, and is also required to administer a national register of historic resources, including archaeological sites. A regard for the resources included on the Register must be held by local authorities in the preparation and implementation of policies and plans under the RMA. Radical changes are proposed to the 1993 Act with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Bill currently before parliament.

### **3.10 Conservation Act**

The Conservation Act 1987 promotes the conservation and protection of New Zealand's natural and historic resources, particularly within the Conservation Estate. The Conservation Act sets up a hierarchy of consideration of activities occurring on public conservation land under section 6(e) *"to the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism."*

Conservation Management Strategies are prepared by DoC under the Conservation Act and explain how the purposes and aims of the legislation will be undertaken within each conservancy. The strategy provides an integrative platform for the management of public conservation land in order to afford the best opportunities for a wide range of conservation outcomes, provision of recreation opportunities and appreciation of historic heritage. Regard must be had to a relevant Conservation Management Strategy in preparing a plan (NB: National parks are governed by the National Parks Act; reserves are managed under the Reserves Act 1977, see below).

### **3.11 Reserves Act 1977**

Under the Reserves Act areas containing historic heritage resources may either be specifically classified as historic reserves or more generally as another type of reserve (e.g. local purpose reserve). Historic reserves may be either vested in, or controlled and managed by, local authorities or the Historic Places Trust. District plans should be informed by the overall management direction of reserve management plans prepared by local authorities in accordance with the Reserves Act.

### **3.12 Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993**

The Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993 promotes the retention of land by Maori and is administered by Te Puna Kokiri. It provides for land to be set aside as Maori reserve and may include places of cultural and historic interest.

### **3.13 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010**

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) is an organisation of professionals who provide advice to UNESCO in respect of World Heritage Listings for historic places. ICOMOS has introduced a number of international conventions on heritage since its establishment in 1964.

The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, *Te Pumanawa o ICOMOS o Aotearoa Hei Tiaki I Nga Taonga Whenua Heke Iho o Nehe*, contains a set of guidelines and principles, and forms a recognised benchmark for conservation standards and practice in respect of historic heritage in New Zealand. The intent of the Charter is to either inform or be used to form part of policies and plans prepared under the RMA, and to date it has been applied in this way by a number of city, district and regional councils. It is also intended to act as a guide to persons involved in the conservation and management of heritage places and resources.

The Charter's purpose is to promote the care of places of cultural heritage value, and to support the ongoing meanings and functions of places of cultural heritage value for both current and future generations. To achieve this, the charter sets out how cultural heritage values, including indigenous cultural heritage values, should be recognised, stipulates the importance of recording and documenting, and identifies appropriate methods and degrees of intervention.

## 4. Analysis of Submissions

### 4.1 Issue 13.3 Balancing Private Rights/Public Good

#### 4.1.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
17.00	Penelope Brown	Support	Support the initiative that Council may commit resources such as rates relief to owners of heritage buildings as owners are hindered in some areas of renovation due to restrictions put on buildings and difficulties with insuring heritage buildings.	Retain the method for Issue 13.3 so that Council commit resources such as rates relief to encourage the management and protection of historic heritage buildings.	509.02 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) - Support
96.22	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	<p>Support Issue 13.3. Many of our members are impacted by heritage provisions as they own land where historic and archaeological sites are located, and often use their own resources to manage these sites. Our members value heritage, but often the unknown costs or implications of heritage can create a perception that heritage is a burden.</p> <p>When developing policy around heritage, the impacts on resource users must be addressed. Resource users for value heritage resources and Council's mechanisms to protect them should include encouragement for resource users. If the effects on landowners are ignore it could be perceived that recognised heritage resources are a hindrance and a liability, resulting in negative consequences all around. Policies that provide for recognition of the private efforts that go into protecting a public resource, and non-regulatory methods that assist landowners is a great initiative from this Council.</p>	Retain Issue 13.3 as notified.	<p>506.11 Ernslaw One Ltd - Support</p> <p>509.04 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) - Support</p>

Brown (17.00) and Federated Farmers (96.22) support Council's recognition of the tensions between the private cost and public benefit of protecting and managing the District's historic heritage as per Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1, and request that Council retain this issue. Additionally, Ms Brown supports the methods within Chapter 13.3 proposed to resolve this issue.

Submitter Brown (17.00) is further supported by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) (509.02), while Federated Farmers (96.22) submission points are further supported by Ernslaw One Ltd (506.11) and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (509.04).

#### **4.1.2 Discussion & Evaluation**

1. Federated Farmers (96.22) draw attention to farmers who manage heritage resources on private land at their own cost, and suggest that the plan provisions that provide for recognition of private efforts to protect and manage heritage would place historic heritage resources in a more positive light for landowner and resource users alike.
2. Federated Famers (96.22) also support the methods to increase public awareness through education and promotional material relating to scheduled historic heritage buildings and sites, including their associated value and the community benefit that is derived from their ongoing protection.
3. Brown (17.00) and Federated Farmers (96.22) support the inclusion of non-regulatory methods and the commitment of Council resources as these initiatives will provide beneficial assistance to landowners. The provision of rates relief through the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan, access to grants, and to technical advice, and the possibility of fee waivers and development flexibility through resource and building consent processes, are amongst the methods supported by the submitters.
4. Council identifies that a balance needs to be struck between the rights of private landowners and the costs brought to bear on property owners to protect and manage heritage, with the public benefits that are gained from the same. Added to this, it is acknowledged that the absence of public awareness of our historic heritage resources, as well as a lack of shared responsibility/resources, gives rise to risks to those resources of degradation and demolition through neglect and deferred repair. The support by submitters to retain Issue 13.3 is noted. I therefore recommend that submission points (96.22) and (17.00) be accepted and, as no amendments are necessary, that Issue 13.3 be retained as proposed. Additionally, I consider that further submission points 509.02, 506.11 and 509.04 are recommended to be accepted.

#### **4.1.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation**

<b>Sub. No</b>	<b>Further Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>	<b>Further Position</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>
17.00	509.02	Brown New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Accept Accept
96.22	506.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Ernslaw One Ltd	Support		Accept Accept
	509.04	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Accept

#### **4.1.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions**

No changes are recommended to Issue 13.1.

## 4.2 Policy 13.1.2

### 4.2.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
67.18	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	In-Part	Place Māori cultural values as number one bullet point as they are the longest term human values in region, followed by archaeological values, then rest of values as follows.	Amend Policy 13.1.2 to re-order the bullet points to place 'Māori cultural values' first, followed by 'Archaeological values' second, and then rest of values as currently listed.	

Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit (67.18) supports Policy 13.1.2 but suggests an amendment to enrich the provision with a chronological context which would be more representative of the history of occupation and settlement as it occurred.

### 4.2.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Policy 13.1.2 assists with achieving Objective 13.1.1 Identification of historic heritage. The policy requires the identification of historic heritage that is significant in terms of seven stated values. It is appropriate to order the values in a manner which responds to the chronological implication of the objective, as suggested in (67.18), however it must be noted that there is no intention to suggest or imply any order of priority. I recommend submission point 67.18 is accepted and that Policy 13.1 be amended by reordering the values.

### 4.2.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
67.18		Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit			Accept

### 4.2.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

Amend Policy 13.1.2 to read as follows:

Identify historic heritage that contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the culture and history of the District, the region and/or New Zealand that is significant in terms of one or more of the following values:

- Maori cultural values
- Archaeological values
- Historic values
- Social values
- Setting and group values
- Architectural values
- Scientific and technological values
- ~~Maori cultural values~~



## 4.3 Policy 13.2.3

### 4.3.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.11	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Include a policy which is in line with the ICOMOS Charter (attached to the submission) that would assist in the identification of Historic Heritage Values.	Include a new Policy in Chapter 13 as follows: <u>The assessment of heritage values in the district for listing will be guided by the ICOMOS Charter for Assessing Historic Heritage Values in the District.</u>	503.00 NZWEA – In-Part
101.65	Director-General of Conservation (DoC)	In-Part	General support for Policy 13.2.3 Reference to the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) NZ Charter principles would assist.	Amend Policy 13.2.3 by inserting “ <u>adhering to ICOMOS principles</u> ” to the policy in order to provide assistance to the reader when any maintenance, redecoration, repair etc. type work is required.	509.07 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)- In Part

The NZHPT (117.11) submit that a further policy be introduced to assist with the identification of historic heritage and historic heritage values in the District. In particular, it considers that work undertaken to identify historic resources should be guided by the conservation principles outlined in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (2010). The submission (117.11) is supported in-part by the NZWEA (503.00). The Director-General of Conservation (DoC) (101.65) supports in-part, Policy 13.2.3 in respect of the maintenance, redecoration, repair and adaptive re-use of buildings and sites listed in the Plan, but suggests that Policy 13.2.3 include a further reference to the ICOMOS NZ Charter to provide both Council, landowners/heritage managers and consent applicants with appropriate guidance to assist with these undertakings and to ensure a quality heritage outcome. This submission (101.65) is supported in-part by the NZHPT (509.07).

### 4.3.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. The ICOMOS NZ Charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand and is intended for use by all those involved in heritage planning, development and management, as well as those with a statutory role for the same. The Charter states that its principles “*should be made an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.*” (p.1, ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010). Among the conservation principles included in the Charter are those which provide a fundamental and defining definition of cultural heritage values, indigenous cultural heritage and planning for conservation. Other key principles identify the need to respect surviving evidence and

knowledge, use minimum intervention and outline definitive understandings around investigations, documenting, archiving and recording of heritage.

2. These guiding principles are relevant to Issue 13.1, Objective 13.1.1 and Policies 13.1.2 and 13.1.3, all of which respond to the need to accurately identify historic heritage resources, as well as the heritage values and significance of those resources, in a manner which preserves their integrity, and respects and protects the values and value-holders in relation to the resources.
3. Further to this, the NZ Charter identifies the elements that are crucial to conservation processes and practice, and defines principles in respect of identifying the appropriate degree of intervention including preservation, restoration, reconstruction, and adaptation. This also responds to Issue 13.2 *Protection of Historic Heritage*. The Charter is hence of particular relevance to informing the appropriateness of proposed physical interventions at the time that an application is lodged.
4. The loss or degradation of historic heritage is directly attributable to inappropriate use, development and subdivision of land containing historic heritage resources. The proposed policies seek to prevent historic heritage resources from harm caused by inappropriate development, however the methods to achieve the stated policy outcomes are non-specific and provide little guidance as to what could be interpreted as appropriate for different heritage resources and their associated values, unique to each and every resource.
5. It is apparent that the ICOMOS NZ Charter can provide a valuable benchmark for assessing consent applications impacting on historic heritage resources and for appraising the appropriate methods for achieving the stated policy outcomes, as well as guiding the interpretation and application of the proposed heritage rules in each of the zones. It is hence considered to be appropriate to incorporate, in a modified form, the intent of the changes suggested in submission points 117.11 and 101.65. It is further determined, that Issue 13.2 and Objective 13.2.1 would benefit from a new assessment matter requiring that due regard be given to the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter rather than to simply amend Policy 13.2.3 as per DoC's submission (101.65). Further, I recommend that a new assessment matter be included in Assessment Criteria 25.7.16 in line with the intent expressed in the NZHPT submission (117.01). Further submissions (503.00) and (509.07) are also accepted in-part.

#### **4.3.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation**

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.11	503.00	NZ Historic Places Trust NZWEA	In-Part		Accept In-Part Accept In-Part
101.65	509.07	Director General of Conservation (DoC) New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part		Accept In-Part Accept In-Part

#### **4.3.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions**

Include a new assessment criteria to Rule 25.7.16(a) to read as follows:

(xv) The extent to which the conservation principles contained within the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (2010) apply and, where applicable, have been substantially adhered to.

Include a new assessment criteria to Rule 25.7.16(b) to read as follows:

(vii) The extent to which the conservation principles contained within the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (2010) apply and, where applicable, have been substantially adhered to.

## 4.4 Policy 13.3.2

### 4.4.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
96.23	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Support is given for Policy 13.3.2 which seeks to increase public awareness of the responsibility that private landowners assume over heritage that is located on private property.	Retain Policy 13.3.2 as notified.	506.12 Ernslaw One Ltd - Support  509.05 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)- Support

Federated Farmers (96.23) support Policy 13.3.2, acknowledging the benefits to farmers of methods proposed to increase public awareness of heritage management through education and promotional material, including values of heritage resources and the community benefit that is derived from their ongoing protection. This in turn reflects positively on the landowners who bear the responsibility for their private land, their livery, and for the protection of historic heritage resources on their land. The submission (96.23) is in favour of retaining the Policy 13.3.2 and is further supported by Ernslaw One Ltd (506.12) and NZHPT (509.05).

### 4.4.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. In Section 4.1 of this report, Federated Farmers (96.22) drew attention to the risk that when a private landowner's responsibility for protecting and managing heritage is viewed as a burden, that this may in turn mean that heritage itself is a burden, thus limiting the extent to which resource users appreciate historic heritage.
2. Policy 13.3.2 aims to increase public recognition and understanding of historic heritage resources and values in the Horowhenua, and of the respective responsibility for managing those resources. The policy outcomes would be realised through the development of information and promotional material which would acknowledge the community benefit that can be derived from the ongoing protection of historic heritage, as well as through the actions identified in the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012.
3. Federated Farmers (96.23), suggest that provisions that provide for recognition of private efforts to protect and manage heritage would place historic heritage resources in a more positive light for landowners and resource users alike. The retention of heritage is a

community good and furthermore increasing public awareness of heritage, and of those who are the guardians of heritage resources, increases community respect for heritage and for land managers alike.

- As Policy 13.3.2 is instrumental to achieving such an outcome I therefore recommend that submission point (96.23) is accepted. I also recommend that the further submissions by Ernslaw One Ltd (506.12) and NZHPT (509.05) are accepted. Additionally it is noted that as no changes are proposed to Policy 13.3.2 it will therefore be retained as proposed.

#### 4.4.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
96.23		Federated Farmers			Accept
	506.12	Ernslaw One Ltd	Support		Accept
	509.05	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Accept

#### 4.4.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to 13.3.2.

## 4.5 Policy 13.3.3

### 4.5.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
96.24	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Federated Farmer strongly supports Policy 13.3.3 which provides for the development of non-regulatory mechanisms as tools for managing heritage.  The corresponding methods include a great range of non-regulatory methods that will go a long way toward achieving this policy.	Retain Policy 13.3.3 as notified.	506.13 Ernslaw One Ltd - Support  509.06 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)- Support

Federated Farmers (96.24) supports Policy 13.3.3 which proposes a range of non-regulatory mechanisms and methods to assist and facilitate private land owners and heritage managers in the conservation, protection and management of historic heritage resources. The submission (96.24) is therefore in favour of retaining proposed Policy 13.3.3, and is further supported by Ernslaw One Ltd (506.13) and NZHPT (509.06).

### 4.5.2 Discussion & Evaluation

- In Section 4.1 of this report, Federated Farmers (96.22) identified that non-regulatory methods and the commitment of resources are initiatives that would be of beneficial

assistance to landowners. The provision of rates relief, grants, fee waivers, access to technical advice, and development flexibility through resource and building consent processes are amongst the methods supported by submitters Federated Farmers (96.22) and Brown (17.00) to be retained as it is considered that they will directly assist landowners and heritage managers in achieving this policy. Consequently, I recommend that submission points (96.24), (506.13) (509.06) be accepted and that the methods to achieve Objective 13.3 and related policies be retained as proposed (subject to due process).

#### 4.5.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
96.24		Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Accept
	506.13	Ernslaw One Ltd	Support		Accept
	509.06	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Accept

#### 4.5.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Policy 13.3.3.

## 4.6 Methods for Issue 13.1 & Objective 13.1.1

### 4.6.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
11.31	Philip Taueki	In-Part	The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings and sites to be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and affected landowners.	No specific relief requested.	
60.24	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings and sites to be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners.	No specific relief requested.	
67.19	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of 13.1 Methods District Plan.	Amend 13.1 Method to include the following in bullet two:  ...including sites <u>and interrelated areas</u> of	

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
				significance to Māori including wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and archaeological, within 12 months...	
117.29	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part	<p>The submitter seeks a collaborative approach to the cultural heritage survey that includes Council, Iwi, a historian and NZHPT to identify new listings that could also inform possibilities for registration under the Historic Places Act. It is recommended that conducting the survey that the New Zealand Archaeological Association Archsite be used as a tool for capturing sites. The submitter seeks that as part of the survey Council has strategies in place to record and list archaeological sites and to adopt layers around archaeologically sensitive areas.</p> <p>As part of the cultural heritage survey, the submitter recommends that best practice rules for significant archaeological sites are developed in close consultation with tangata whenua and the NZHPT. Consultation should also occur with landowners.</p>	Include as part of Method 13.1 the Council has strategies in place to record and list archaeological sites and to adopt layers around archaeologically sensitive areas. The cultural heritage survey should also develop new objectives, policies and rules for significant archaeological sites in the district.	

The submitters Taueki (11.31) and Muaupoko Co-operative Society (60.24) support in part the methods for achieving Objective 13.1, in particular in relation to the nature of any survey and the breadth of consultation, but suggest no amendments to the proposed provision.

Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit (67.19) also support in part the proposed methods for Objective 13.1.1 and suggest amending the text to more clearly denote the different types of sites related to indigenous heritage.

Finally, the NZHPT (117.29) support the methods in part and submit that the approach taken in any undertaking to survey historic heritage in the District must be fundamentally collaborative, and utilise the New Zealand Archaeological Association Archsite as a tool for capturing sites. Furthermore, a range of best practice rules should be developed for any significant archaeological sites identified, in addition to a suite of rules, policies and objectives for such sites, as part of the actions identified in the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012.

#### **4.6.2 Discussion & Evaluation**

1. Taueki (11.31) and the Muaupoko Co-operative Society (60.24) acknowledge their support for a thematic survey involving consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners. The survey is a proposed method for Objective 13.1.1 *Identification of Historic Heritage* and will form a significant output derived from the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012. Under the Strategy, the key partners in the

survey and associated research/processes are identified as HDC, Iwi, NZHPT, DoC, Historical Societies, Historic Places Manawatu Horowhenua, QEII Trust. The stated goal in relation to the survey is to identify heritage resources that are representative of the District's history of occupation and settlement. The identified groups are 'key partners' in this undertaking.

2. The implication of this is that the relationship between these groups will be a collaborative undertaking, a point made in the NZHPT submission (117.29). This implies that any consultation between Council and the key partners would be meaningful and designed to meet the goal of identifying heritage resources that are 'representative' of the District. It is acknowledged that in order for historic heritage protection at district, regional and national levels to be truly representative, protection should apply equally to indigenous cultural heritage as well as European historic heritage resources. It is important to recognise however, that some indigenous sites are tapu and therefore must be treated sensitively and with confidentiality. Consequently, I recommend that submission points 11.31, 60.24 and 117.29 be accepted and note that no further changes to the methods for Objective 13.1.1 are necessary.
3. The collaborative involvement of the key partners in the "coordinated management of information" is likely to result in outcomes which will ensure that sensitive information about the location etc of cultural heritage sites is carefully managed. There is willingness from some Iwi groups to be involved in the survey and to ensure that indigenous cultural heritage sites, including wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna, as well as interrelated areas of significance to Māori, are identified and protected in line with the submission by the Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit (67.19). The submitter (67.19) proposes an amendment to the wording of the Methods for Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1 to ensure that in addition to the specific location of buildings, sites and structures, that the inter-related areas, settings and surroundings of these buildings, sites and structures are also identified, assessed and subject to the protective mechanisms provided under Chapter 13. It can be seen that areas surrounding historic heritage sites and structures form the wider context, and hence a part of the value systems attached to those sites and structures, without which an appreciation of those values may be impaired. I recommend therefore that the submission point 67.19 be accepted, and the proposed amendment be incorporated.
4. Finally, in response to NZHPT (117.29), the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012 includes a proposed action to subscribe to Archsite and transfer relevant information from Archsite to Council's GIS system. Furthermore, following implementation of the proposed cultural heritage survey identified in the Strategy, I would anticipate a corresponding outcome being a review of the proposed historic heritage provisions to determine their efficiency and effectiveness relative to the archaeological and indigenous cultural heritage resources identified and recorded. I therefore recommend that submission point 117.29 be accepted in-part, given that the undertakings in respect of the identification of archaeological sites will be deferred as part of the work to be undertaken within the scope of the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012. I further recommend that an additional method be added to indicate the future work to take place in this area under the Strategy.

### 4.6.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Position	Officer's Recommendation
11.31		Philip Taueki		Accept
60.24		Muaupoko Co-operative Society		Accept
67.19		Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit		Accept
117.29		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept In-Part

### 4.6.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

Amend the Methods for Issue 13.1 & Objective 13.1.1 (under District Plan) to read:

- Commence, in line with the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, a comprehensive survey of historic heritage in the District including sites of significance to Māori, wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and archaeological sites, within 12 months of the date of the notification of the Proposed District Plan. The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings, sites and interrelated areas and be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners.

## 4.7 Methods for Issue 13.3 & Objective 13.3.1

### 4.7.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
67.04	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of 13.3 Methods District Plan to give a better coverage of ancestral landscape significance to Māori, rather than a 'dots on map perspective'.	Amend 13.3 Method to include the following in the final bullet:  ...heritage buildings, <u>areas of interrelated significance</u> and sites...	503.01 NZWEA – In-Part
96.25	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	In-Part	Federated Farmers supports these methods provided for the heritage Chapter.  Currently the wording of the first bullet point only indicated that Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes may occur, but further assurance that these methods will be implemented will provide assurance to landowners that they	Amend Methods 13.3 as follows:  Through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes, Council <del>may</del> <u>will</u> commit resources such as rates relief, grants, waive administration fees, low interest loans or offer access to professional	



Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
			<p>will occur.</p> <p>Further financial assistance should be provided by a fund, or a cost-share agreement system.</p> <p>Landowners may intend to fence off archaeological sites or carry out maintenance and repairs on historic buildings.</p> <p>We note however that presently the Schedule 2 of the Plan only contains one archaeological site of a midden on private land, but more sites could be added in the future.</p>	<p>technical advice to encourage the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings and sites.</p> <p>That a new bullet point be added the Council will have a cost-share system or a fund to provide landowners with financial assistance regarding their heritage sites.</p>	
103.02	Colin Easton	In-Part	<p>There needs to be a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good and also rates relief.</p> <p>This will make general public realise that there will be a cost attached to these areas.</p>	<p>Amend Chapter 13 through allowing for the setting up of a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good and also rates relief.</p>	
106.00	Rosalie Huzziff	In-Part	<p>It seems completely unfair that property rights are taken away from individuals without compensation for the extra cost involved. Compensation is a well-established principle overseas. If public opinion is used to justify restrictions on private property then surely the duly elected or appointed representatives of the public are duty-bound to assist those that they restrict for the public good. For that reason I believe there is a need for the Council to set up a fund of \$1 million for recompense purposes.</p> <p>This would help those with historic buildings which are difficult to utilise and costly to maintain. In most cases the cheapest option would be to demolish and rebuild but due to historic restriction this is not an option. Similarly, where</p>	<p>Amend Chapter 13 by allowing the establishment of a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good.</p>	

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
			<p>restrictions are placed on farmland, farmers should be compensated.</p> <p>This fund would establish two important principles: the first being that all restrictions have costs involved. The second is that there is a need to be sure of justifications before restrictions are applied.</p>		

Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit (67.04) seek an amendment of several of the Methods in 13.3 to emphasise that historic heritage is not always site specific and may relate to broader inter-related areas or to several areas. The submission is supported in-part by the New Zealand Wind Energy Association (NZWEA) (503.01). Submitters (96.25), (103.02) and (106.00) seek more certainty around the proposed methods in respect of financial and other support for the maintenance and management of historic heritage resources by private landowners.

#### **4.7.2 Discussion & Evaluation**

1. Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit (67.04) submit that three of the five proposed methods identified under Objective 13.3 be amended – to recognise that historic heritage resources are not necessarily site specific, but may be located within an interrelated area of land that holds significance for an Iwi or hapu.
2. The methods are currently worded to relate to “historic heritage buildings and sites”. In identifying historic heritage resources it is important to recognise that historic heritage is not simply comprised of buildings and monuments, but can extend to include places, sites and areas of cultural and historic significance. There is not always a visible or tangible indication of the historic heritage values of a place – heritage does not necessarily manifest as a physical survival of the past, but instead can exist as a wide and varied mixture of collective memories/shared experiences retold through generations, or as an ascribed association to a place, site, village, town or landscape. This is an important consideration in terms of the cultural significance of many of the landscapes and geographical areas of the Horowhenua District which hold fundamental cultural historical associations for many people. I recommend therefore to accept submission point 67.04 and to incorporate the proposed wording “and areas of interrelated significance” within the 13.3 methods as per the submission.
3. Several submitters (96.25) (103.02) (106.00) have identified the need for a fund to be set up to provide compensation and/or financial assistance to private landowners with responsibility for heritage resources on their land.
4. Given the changes in land tenure over the periods of settlement within the Horowhenua region, much land is now in the hands of individuals who have a limited direct association with the property in their ownership. However, responsibility for protecting historic heritage resources that may exist on these properties largely rests with landowners, even if that resource does not form a part of their own individual sense or concept of heritage.
5. It can be seen that in assuming this responsibility the right to use private property as suggested by Huzzif (106.00) is diminished to an extent – for instance where certain uses of

land are restricted in order to prevent the degradation of a heritage resource, or where additional cost may be imposed to maintain or upgrade a heritage building.

6. It can be also argued that in order for the public to benefit from historic heritage, there must be a contribution from the public to support those responsible for the management and protection of heritage resources as per all three submission points. This is recognised by Council through the range of mechanisms it has identified to assist land owners and heritage managers to meet their responsibilities. These include the provision of technical advice, the possibility of grant funding and/or low interest loans, as well as rates relief and the waiving of consent application fees. The latter two are directly apportioned from ratepayer contributions and hence represent a public contribution to the heritage resource.
7. Federated Farmers (96.25) also request an amendment to the proposed method in respect of the resources Council is prepared to commit to support heritage property owners, suggesting that instead of allowing the exercise of a discretion regarding the allocation of resources through the Long Term and Annual Plan processes that Council clearly specify that such resources will be allocated. In respect of this request it needs to be acknowledged that the allocation of budget funding through the Annual Plan and the Long Term Plan are political processes outside of the District Plan and cannot be fettered by it. Consequently, it is considered that the relief sought is outside the scope of what can be progressed through these proceedings.
8. I consider that the submitters (96.25), (103.02) and (106.00) concept of a fund or cost-sharing system be further investigated as part of the work under the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, specifically through the establishment of a heritage focus group to explore the use of non-regulatory methods and other voluntary mechanisms to incentivise the maintenance and protection of heritage resources. I therefore recommend that the submission points 96.25, 103.02, 106.00 and further submission point 503.01 be accepted in-part, but that the method remain as it is proposed as.

#### **4.7.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation**

<b>Sub. No</b>	<b>Further Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>	<b>Further Position</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>
67.04	503.01	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit New Zealand Wind Energy Association (NZWEA)	Support In-part		Accept Accept In-Part
96.25		Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Accept In-Part
103.02		Colin Easton			Accept In-Part
106.00		Rosalie Huzziff			Accept In-Part

#### **4.7.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions**

Amend the methods for Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1 (under Other Council Initiatives) to read:

- Through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes, Council may commit resources such as rates relief, grants, waive administration fees, low interest loans or offer access to

professional technical advice to encourage the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites, and areas of interrelated significance ~~and sites~~.

- Provide guidance and advice to assist landowners to sensitively manage scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites and areas of interrelated significance ~~and sites~~.
- Liaise and collaborate with landowners, Iwi and other groups and agencies with interests in the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites and areas of interrelated significance ~~and sites~~.

## 4.8 Chapter 13 General Matters

### 4.8.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.05	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Support the objectives, policies and methods contained within Chapter 13.	No specific relief requested.  Inferred: Retain all objectives, policies and methods in Chapter 13.	
117.12	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part	The submitter recommends cross referencing the Chapter 13 to the Horowhenua Heritage Strategy, especially in light of its action plans. It is suggested that the Heritage Strategy action plans are listed as methods for this Chapter.	Include cross referencing in Chapter 13 to the Heritage Strategy and include the Strategy action plans as methods.	

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (117.05) supports Chapter 13 (Historic Heritage) of the Proposed Plan and submits that all objectives, policies and methods proposed as part of this section be retained. Further to this however, the NZHPT (117.05) submits that Chapter 13 would benefit from a more explicit correlation between the proposed plan provisions and the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012.

### 4.8.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. The NZHPT is the lead agency for the identification, protection and promotion of heritage in New Zealand and its support for the proposed provisions in Chapter 13 is noted. In light of this it is recommended that the submission (117.05) be accepted, noting that no further amendments are required.
2. The Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012 sets out a range of strategic goals in respect of historic heritage identification, protection/management, and public awareness-raising and details a comprehensive range of actions in order to achieve those goals. To a degree these goals mirror Objectives 13.1.1, 13.2.1 and 13.3.1.

3. The addition of a cross reference as well as the inclusion of the Heritage Strategy as a method would be appropriate in light of the goals and actions specified in the Strategy. It is therefore recommended that submission point 117.12 be accepted and the proposed amendment incorporated within the Methods for Objectives 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3.

#### 4.8.3 Reporting Officers Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.05		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept
117.12		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

#### 4.8.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

Include new Method for Issue 13.1 and Objective 13.1.1 (under Other Council Initiatives) as follows:

- Implement the action plan outlined in the Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012 in order to identify the heritage resources that are representative of the District's history of occupation and settlement.

Include new Method for Issue 13.2 and Objective 13.2.1 (under Other Council Initiatives) as follows:

- Implement the action plan outlined in the Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012 in order to appropriately protect and manage heritage resources that have been identified as requiring protection or management.

Include new Method for Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1 (under Other Council Initiatives) as follows:

- Implement the actions identified in the Council's Heritage Strategy Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012.

### 4.9 Rules 16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6

#### 4.9.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.07	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested.  Inferred: Retain Rules 16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6	

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (117.07) supports the inclusion in (Chapter 16 Industrial Zone) of the Proposed Plan, of provisions in respect of the earthquake strengthening of listed built heritage resources.

#### 4.9.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 2 listed building is proposed to be a controlled activity (16.2(d)), with matters of control (16.7.4) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values associated with the building.
2. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 1 listed building is proposed to be a restricted discretionary activity (16.3(e)), with matters of discretion (16.8.6) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values of the building.
3. The provisions are designed to facilitate strengthening work on buildings identified as earthquake prone while ensuring that the historic, architectural, cultural and other values for which is has been identified are respected, and key features of significance are not unnecessarily transformed. It is considered appropriate to accept the submission point 117.07 and to retain the provisions as proposed.

#### 4.9.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.07		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

#### 4.9.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Rules 16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6.

### 4.10 Rules 17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8

#### 4.10.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.08	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested.  Inferred: Retain Rules 17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8.5	

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (117.08) supports the inclusion in Chapter 17 (Commercial Zone) of the Proposed Plan, of provisions in respect of the earthquake strengthening of listed built heritage resources.

#### 4.10.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 2 listed building is proposed to be a controlled activity (17.2(d)), with matters of control (17.7.4) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values associated with the building.
2. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 1 listed building is proposed to be a restricted discretionary activity (17.3(e)), with matters of discretion (17.8.6) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values of the building.
3. The provisions are designed to facilitate strengthening work on buildings identified as earthquake prone while ensuring that the historic, architectural, cultural and other values for which is has been identified are respected, and key features of significance are not unnecessarily transformed. It is considered appropriate to accept the submission point 117.08 and to retain the provisions as proposed.

#### 4.10.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.08		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

#### 4.10.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Rules 17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8.5.

### 4.11 Rule 19.1(n)

#### 4.11.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
101.68	Director-General of Conservation (DoC)	In-Part	The addition of a paragraph (iii) referring to the ICOMOS NZ Charter would assist implementation. This charter should be made an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.	Amend Rule 19.1(n) by adding the following sentence;  “(iii) Consider ICOMOS NZ Charter to guide conservation work”, or to that effect.	509.01 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)-  In-Part

The Director-General of Conservation (DoC) (101.68) suggests that the inclusion of a requirement to adhere to the ICOMOS NZ Charter would assist undertakings carried out in relation to this rule, and that furthermore, the charter should be relied on to inform both Council decisions and heritage management plan and policies. DoC has made a similar submission (101.65) in respect of a policy under Issue 13.2 to assist landowners and heritage managers through the provision of informed

guidance when carrying out any maintenance, redecoration, repair work or the like on heritage resources protected in the District Plan Schedule.

#### 4.11.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. DoC (101.68) submits that the ICOMOS NZ Charter would provide necessary guidance for landowners in relation to any work carried out on a heritage resource and that furthermore, the Charter should be relied on to inform both Council decisions and heritage management plan and policies. However, I consider that given Rule 19.1 of the Proposed Plan details those activities which are permitted, there is no ability for Council to require adherence to the Charter via such an amendment.
2. The appropriate place for such a specification would be under another rule within Chapter 19 where Council has the ability or the discretion to require it. I am not of the view that this is the appropriate place to incorporate the amendment, as proposed – it is therefore recommended that the submission point 101.68 be rejected and the provision be retained as proposed.

#### 4.11.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
101.68		Director-General of Conservation (DoC)			Reject
	509.01	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support in-part		Reject

#### 4.11.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Rule 19.1(n).

## 4.12 Rules 19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8

### 4.12.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.09	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested.  Inferred: Retain Rules 19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8.5	117.09

The NZHPT (117.09) supports the inclusion in Chapter 19 (Rural Zone) of the Proposed Plan, of provisions in respect of the earthquake strengthening of listed built heritage resources.



#### 4.12.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 2 listed building is proposed to be a controlled activity (19.2(f)), with matters of control (19.7.8) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values associated with the building.
2. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 1 listed building is proposed to be a restricted discretionary activity (19.3.4(a)), with matters of discretion (19.8.5) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values of the building.
3. The provisions are designed to facilitate strengthening work on buildings identified as earthquake prone while ensuring that the historic, architectural, cultural and other values for which is has been identified are respected, and key features of significance are not unnecessarily transformed. It is considered appropriate to accept the submission point 117.09 and to retain the provisions as proposed.

#### 4.12.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.09		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

#### 4.12.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Rules 19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8.5.

### 4.13 Rule 19.4.10

#### 4.13.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
101.69	Director-General of Conservation (DoC)	In-Part	It could be helpful to provide a clear, direct, link from the provisions of Chapter 13 Historic Heritage in considering an application under this rule.	Amend Rule 19.4.10 by adding references so that in considering an application for resource consent under Rule 19.4.10 will have regard to the matters of assessment set out in Policies 3.4.2 -3.4.5.	

DoC (101.69) submits that clearer linkages made between Chapter 13 Historic Heritage and the provision 19.4.10 would assist applicants to have a regard for the relevant matters of assessment.

### 4.13.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Rule 19.4.10 sits within Chapter 19.4 *Discretionary Activities* and identifies the types of activities in respect of heritage that have discretionary status. Any application for consent pursuant to a discretionary status must be of a high quality, and incorporate an assessment of environmental effects corresponding in scale and significance to the nature of the proposal, and the degree of any adverse effects.
2. The inclusion in a plan of explicit criteria to inform the assessment of an application against specific rules and associated policies provides applicants with necessary guidance to ensure their application to Council addresses relevant considerations and is of a standard that enables a comprehensive assessment to be undertaken. In respect of heritage resources, this could include identification of the type and extent of protection/conservation that would be appropriate to the circumstances. I therefore consider that the inclusion of a linkage to Chapter 13 within Rule 19.4.10, as per submission (101.69), is appropriate as it would ensure that applicants are aware that there is guidance that they should have a regard to in undertaking any works on an historic heritage site or structure.
3. This could be provided by way of the inclusion of an additional note that reads “Any application made under 19.4.10 must demonstrate a regard for guidance detailed under Chapter 13 of this Plan, including the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010 referenced in this Plan by association, in undertaking maintenance, conservation and other works on any heritage building, structure or site identified in Schedule 2 Historic Heritage.”
4. Further changes may be introduced to the Plan once guidance is produced as part of the work identified in the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012. Consequently, it is my recommendation that submission point 101.69 be accepted in-part and that an amendment be added to Rule 19.4.10 as shown below.

### 4.13.3 Reporting Officer’s Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer’s Recommendation
101.69		Director-General of Conservation (DoC)			Accept In-Part

### 4.13.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

Amend Rule 19.4.10 to read:

- (a) Where a building or structure is listed in Schedule 2 – Historic Heritage, the following are discretionary activities:
  - i. Alteration to, or relocation of, a Group 1 or 2 building or structure.
  - ii. Demolition of a Group 2 building or structure.
  - iii. Subdivision within the heritage setting of a Group 1 or 2 building or structure.
  - iv. New building or additions to an unlisted building located within the heritage setting of a Group 1 or 2 building or structure.
  - v. Earthworks within the heritage setting of a Group 1 building or structure.

Notes:

- Rule 19.4.10 has immediate legal effect from 14 September 2012.
- Any application made under 19.4.10 must demonstrate a regard for guidance detailed under Chapter 13 of this Plan, including the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010 referenced in this Plan by association, in undertaking maintenance, conservation and other works on any heritage building, structure or site identified in Schedule 2 Historic Heritage.”

## 4.14 Rule 19.4.11(a)

### 4.14.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
96.31	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	In-Part	Federated Farmers is concerned that the use of the word site in this Rule will bring confusion when it interacts with the definition of Site in Chapter 26. The definition of Site refers to an entire property or certificate of title, whereas this Rule appears to refer to the discrete area that has the historic significance. Seeking to restrict buildings, earthworks and subdivision on the entire property even when not located near the historic area is impractical. While it is noted that there is only one historic site that is listed in Schedule 2 of the Plan that appears to be on private land, more sites may be added in the future.	Amend Rule 19.4.11(a) as follows:  (a) Where a site is listed in Schedule 2 – Historic Heritage, the following are discretionary activities:  (i) New building or the extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure on <del>a site</del> <u>the historic site</u> .  (ii) Earthworks <u>on the historic site</u> .  (iii) Subdivision of land <u>where the boundary is on the historic site</u> .	506.17 Ernslaw One Ltd - Support

Federated Farmers (96.31) request an amendment to Rule 19.4.11 *Historic Heritage – Sites*, to make a clearer distinction between an historic site as opposed to the conventional meaning of site, defined under Chapter 26 of the Proposed Plan.

### 4.14.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. The submitter (96.31) proposes that a clearer distinction is made between historical sites and the more conventional definition of site under Chapter 26 of the Proposed Plan *General Provisions*.
2. This definition of site in Chapter 26 reads as follows:  
  
“**Site** means an area of land comprised wholly of one (1) certificate of title; or the area of land contained within the allotment of an approved plan of subdivision; or the area of land which is intended for the exclusive occupation by one (1) residential unit; or an area of land held in one (1) computer register.”
3. While Rule 19.4.10 relates to buildings and structures, Rule 19.4.11 relates to any site listed in Schedule 2 *Historic Heritage*. Rule 19.4.11 is framed to capture historic heritage resources that occupy a broad spatial area as opposed to being concentrated in the form of

an object or physical structure. This area may or may not have easily identifiable boundaries – it could be contained in one or more defined areas of a titled allotment or it could be located over several titled allotments. A site or spatial area identified as significant in terms of historic, cultural or archaeological values may not exhibit any physical traces, or any tangible or visible indication of heritage. A site may be significant for intangible associations ascribed to it, for instance by spiritual values held by tangata whenua.

4. A precautionary approach is appropriate in respect of historic heritage resources, particularly where there may be uncertainty as to the location or the exact extent of the resource within a spatial area, for instance where unidentified archaeological remains could be located in the vicinity of any identified site. Consequently an historic heritage site should be assessed in relation to its wider surroundings or setting. This would enable, for example, earthworks on rural land identified as containing archaeological remains to be monitored, or would ensure that any subdivision and subsequent redevelopment of land containing historic heritage sites would not adversely impact on those sites, or alter the relationship between a heritage resource and its surroundings. Any reduction or alteration to the contextual setting of an historic site or structure could also diminish or adversely impact its integrity and values as a heritage resource.
5. It is necessary that every application for resource consent be assessed on its own merits. Even if an historic heritage 'site' occupying a titled landholding has an obvious physical boundary within the title boundaries, and there is no obvious threat to its fabric from a proposed activity, it cannot be ruled out that any associated values held by the community would not be impacted on by changed land use or substantial alterations to the landscape through subdivision and earthworks.
6. For the reasons stated above, it is recommended that submission point 96.31 be rejected. It should be noted however, that in undertaking a district wide survey of historic heritage buildings, structures, sites and interrelated areas as part of the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, an identification of heritage settings and curtilage areas particular to each item would assist landowners and applicants in identifying potential impacts of subdivision, land use and development on historic heritage resources and will be investigated.

#### **4.14.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation**

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
96.31		Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Reject
	506.17	Ernslaw One Ltd	Support		Reject

#### **4.14.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions**

No change is recommended to Rule 19.4.11(a).

## 4.15 Rules 20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5

### 4.15.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
117.10	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested.  Inferred: Retain Rules 20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5.	

The NZHPT (117.10) supports the inclusion in Chapter 20 (Open Space Zone) of the Proposed Plan, of provisions in respect of the earthquake strengthening of listed built heritage resources.

### 4.15.2 Discussion & Evaluation

1. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 2 listed building is proposed to be a controlled activity (20.2(d)), with matters of control (20.7.4) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values associated with the building.
2. Earthquake strengthening of any Group 1 listed building is proposed to be a restricted discretionary activity (20.3 (e)), with matters of discretion (20.8.5) being the potential effects of earthquake strengthening work on the heritage values of the building.
3. The provisions are designed to facilitate strengthening work on buildings identified as earthquake prone while ensuring that the historic, architectural, cultural and other values for which is has been identified are respected, and key features of significance are not unnecessarily transformed. I consider it appropriate to recommend that submission point 117.10 be accepted and that the provisions be retained as proposed.

### 4.15.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
117.10		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

### 4.15.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

No change is recommended to Rules 20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5.

## 4.16 Schedule 2: Historic Heritage – Buildings, Structures & Sites

### 4.16.1 Submissions Received

Sub No.	Submitter Name	Support/ In-Part/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Further Submission
34.00	Foxton Historical Society	In-Part	Schedule 2 is incomplete and does not recognise Policies 13.3.3 and 13.3.4 with regards Foxton area. A list of properties/locations in Foxton has been provided to Council to be added to the Schedule.	Include the Foxton properties/locations from the list provided by the Historical Society within Schedule 2.	509.03 New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) - Support
117.01	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part	The submitter seek that the nomenclature of Category I and II items is amended to Category 1 and 2 for consistency with NZHPT and relevant legislation.	Amend Schedule 2 to update terms Category I and II to read as Category 1 and 2.	
117.02	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part	A number of sites proposed on the schedule are currently being revisited through NZHPT's registration process. NZHPT requests that the following scheduled sites be updated to reflect the current status of these sites.  Duncan House, All Saints Church, Nye Homestead Sunnyside, Dwelling, Opiki Suspension Bridge, Tane Flaxmill remains.	Amend Schedule 2 to include a column titled 'New NZHPT Category' and the following sites will be identified using this column with the text ' Under consideration and will confirm at hearing'  Duncan House, All Saints Church, Nye Homestead Sunnyside, Dwelling, Opiki Suspension Bridge, Tane Flaxmill remains.	
117.00	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	In-Part	The submitter seeks inclusion of the house located at 947 Koputaroa Road, Levin, formerly located at 41 Bath Street, Levin. This house is registered with NZHPT as a Category 2 registered historic place. NZHPT seeks that Council carry out more research in partnership with NZHPT to determine an addition to Schedule 2.	Include the house located at 947 Koputaroa Road, Levin as a Category 2 registered historic place in Schedule 2.	

Foxton Historical Society (34.00), further supported by NZHPT, submit that there are a number of properties worthy of protection in the Foxton area, and that these should be included in Schedule 2 of the Proposed Plan. NZHPT (117.01) (117.02) (117.00) seek to amend Schedule 2 in three respects – firstly to alter the number of the NZHPT categories from 'I' and 'II' to '1' and '2'; secondly to add a new column to the Schedule to indicate that a number of the existing items in the schedule are currently under consideration with the outcome yet to be determined; and finally to add a Category 2 registered dwelling/site to the Schedule.

#### **4.16.2 Discussion & Evaluation**

1. Schedule 2 contains details and property information in relation to those historic buildings, structures and sites that are determined to be worthy of protection under the Plan. The structure of the schedule has been modified to differentiate between historic heritage that is of local, regional and national significance. The adjustment of the NZHPT category nomenclature from roman numerals to conventional numbers, as per submission (117.01) would further bring the schedule into line with current policy and practice. It is therefore recommended that submission point 117.01 be accepted and that the Schedule be amended to bring the Schedule in line with references to the categorisation under the Historic Places Act 1993 referenced in Policy 13.1.3.
2. The NZHPT (117.02) is currently revisiting a range of places in the District as part of its registration process and request that a notation to this effect be attached to these items in Schedule 2. Any changes arising from this process however, could be implemented within the future plan change to amend Schedule 2 following the District wide heritage survey. Consequently, I recommend that submission point 117.02 be rejected.
3. The NZHPT (117.00) also requests that an additional site be incorporated into the schedule - a Category 2 listed dwelling located at 947 Koputaroa Road that is currently not identified in Schedule 2. Given that the NZHPT has assessed the property at 947 Koputaroa Road and determined the site to be worthy of a Category 2 listing. I note that the dwelling on this site was previously listed in the Operative Plan as a Heritage Feature on 41 Bath Street, Levin. In 2005 the building was relocated to its current location in Koputaroa Road. On the basis that NZHPT are satisfied that despite the building being relocated that it is worthy of its heritage listing, I recommend that this be incorporated into Schedule 2 as per submission point 117.00. I note no further submission was received regarding the inclusion of this dwelling in Schedule 2.
4. Further, the Foxton Historical Society (34.00) proposes the inclusion of 23 new heritage sites within the schedule. The implication of listing a property in the Schedule for property owners, occupiers or land managers is that it is likely to impose additional commitments on them in terms of finances and resources, as well as the responsibilities complicit with the maintenance, conservation and protection of historic heritage buildings, sites and structures. Given that to date there has been little or no engagement with these property owners in respect of such an undertaking, it would be inappropriate at this juncture to place such impositions on them.
5. As identified in the Proposed Plan and the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, Council is willing to invest resources into the development of a range of non-regulatory mechanisms to assist and facilitate the conservation and protection of buildings and sites identified in the schedule, to explore and provide for opportunities affording greater development flexibility, as well as to provide those responsible for historic heritage resources with information and technical guidance.
6. Council acknowledges the submission by the Foxton Historical Society, and the willingness to come forward with these listings. However, it is considered to be more appropriate given the implications outlined above to delay the listing of the proposed sites until such time as Council has progressed the stated actions of the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, in particular the District wide historic heritage survey. The aim of the survey would be to develop a more extensive heritage inventory, including a more representative range of

heritage places. The survey process would entail an assessment of the significance of the places nominated, their categorisation under key themes, and the research and co-ordination of information about those places. Schedule 2 would then be updated accordingly. Consequently, I recommend that submission point 34.00 be rejected, while noting that this is really a matter of timing and that the proposed additions to Schedule 2 should instead be considered as part of the upcoming District wide heritage survey.

#### 4.16.3 Reporting Officer's Recommendation

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
34.00	509.03	Foxton Historical Society New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Reject Reject
117.01		NZ Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept
117.02		NZ Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Reject
117.00		NZ Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept

#### 4.16.4 Recommended Amendments to the Plan Provisions

Amend Schedule 2 Historic Heritage – Buildings, Structures & Sites to read as follows:

##### Historic Heritage Group 1: Buildings and Structures (outstanding national and/or regional significance)

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHPT Category
21A	H45	Shannon Railway Station	Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Railway Station	Lot 1 DP 71514	† <u>1</u>
4	H55	Weraroa State Farm	Hokio Beach Road, Levin	Former Boys' Training Centre, State Farm, Experimental Farm	Section 1 SO 36420	† <u>1</u>

##### Historic Heritage Group 2: Buildings and Structures (regional and/or local significance)

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHPT Category
14,15	H1	Duncan House	11A Ladys Mile Foxton	Restaurant	Lot 3 DP 9245	
14,15	H2	All Saints Church	53 Main Street, Foxton	Church	Pt Blk VIII Te Awahou	
4	H3	Nye Homestead Sunnyside	64 Newth Road, Foxton	Dwelling	Pt Rural Section 428 Foxton Township	



14,15	H4	Dwelling	31 Robinson Street, Foxton	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 32194	
27B	H6	Dwelling	51 Bath Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 65398	# <u>2</u>
28B	H7	St Johns Methodist Church	90 Cambridge Street, Levin	Church	Lot 2 DP 85699	# <u>2</u>
29	H8	Dwelling	29 Keepa Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 18 DP 2115	# <u>2</u>
27	H9	Dwelling	31 Keepa Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 20 DP 2115	# <u>2</u>
28B	H10	Thompson House	4 Kent Street, Levin	Cultural Centre	Lots 1 & 2 DP 45727 Sections 3, 5 Blk XVIII Town of Levin	# <u>2</u>
27A	H11	Former Bank of Australia	24 Queen Street, Levin	Commercial Building	Pt Section 12 Blk IX Township of Levin	# <u>2</u>
25	H13	Dwelling	8 Roslyn Road, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 66276	# <u>2</u>
27	H14	Dwelling	1 Victoria Street, Levin	Dwelling	Pt Lots 1 & 2 DP 2142	# <u>2</u>
27A	H15	Horowhenua College Main Building	Weraroa Road, Levin	Secondary School	Section 87 Pt Sections 6 & 7 DP 1656	# <u>2</u>
27A	H17	Walkerley Homestead	120A Weraroa Road, Levin	Dwelling	Pt Lot 1 DP 16531 & Pt Section 20 Town of Levin SO 12912	# <u>2</u>
28B	H18	Dwelling	94 Winchester Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 67353	# <u>2</u>
28	H19	Dwelling (Naumai)	1 Winslow Place, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 67637	# <u>2</u>
37	H20	War Memorial Sarcophagus	Honi Taipua Street, Manakau	Memorial	Rly I.D. 56166 Land Plan 2982	# <u>2</u>
37	H21	Former Manakau Post Office	Honi Taipua Street, Manakau	Part Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 81871	# <u>2</u>
37	H22	Manakau School	Mokena Kohere Street, Manakau	Primary School	Lots 32-37 DP 420 Manakau Township	# <u>2</u>
37	H23	St Andrews Church	Mokena Kohere Street, Manakau	Church	Section 38 Town of Manakau	# <u>2</u>
37	H25	Former Methodist Church	State Highway 1, Manakau	Dwelling/Craft shop	Pt Lot 15 DP 415	# <u>2</u>
22	H26	Mangahao Hydro Electric Power Station	Mangahao Road, Mangahao	Power Generation Station and Museum	Sections 11, 12 & 17 Pt Sections 1, 6, 8, 10 & 11 DP 457	# <u>2</u>

22	H27	House No 12	12 Blackwood Drive, Mangaore Village	Dwelling	Lot 12 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
22	H28	1 Hay Street Mangaore	1 Hay Street Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 71906	# <u>2</u>
22	H29	House	2 Hay Street, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 71906	# <u>2</u>
22	H30	Staff Hostel	3 Hay Street, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 3 DP 71906 Lots 19, 31, 34 & 44 DP 71908, Pt Lot 3 DP 178	# <u>2</u>
22	H31	Dwelling	17 Petticoat Lane, Mangaore Village	Dwelling	Lot 17 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
22	H32	Dwelling	18 Petticoat Lane, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 18 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
34,35	H33	St John the Baptist Church	Muhunoa East Road, Levin	Church	Pt Section 6 Town of Ohau (SO 12978)	# <u>2</u>
7	H34	Old Kuku Dairy Factory	State Highway 1, Kuku	Tui Trading Co Shop	Lot 4 DP 73189	# <u>2</u>
2	H35	Opiki Suspension Bridge	Rangitane Road near State Highway 56	Disused Bridge		# <u>2</u>
2	H36	Tane Flaxmill remains	Rangitane Road, Opiki	Mill remains	Pt Lot 1 DP 9314	
2	H37	Akers Homestead	State Highway 56, Opiki	Dwelling	Pt Lot 1 DP 10283	
2	H37	Akers Homestead	State Highway 56, Opiki	Woolshed	Pt Lot 1 DP 10283	
21A	H38	Club Hotel	2 Ballance Street, Shannon	Stables and Hotel	Sections 271, 272, 273 & 274, DP 368	# <u>2</u> (stables only)
21A	H39	Dwelling	55 Bryce Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 363 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H40	Dwelling	57 Bryce Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 364 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H41	Albion Hotel	2 Grey Street, Shannon	Hotel	Section 188A DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H42	Former Shannon Police Station	17 Nathan Terrace, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 325 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H43	Percy Nation Boer War Memorial	Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Memorial	Lot 1 DP 71514	# <u>2</u>

21A	H44	WW1/WW2 War Memorial	Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Memorial	Lot 1 DP 71514	# <u>2</u>
21A	H46	Former Bank of New Zealand	76 Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Disused Bank with first floor residential	Pt Section 194 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
5	H47	Miranui Flaxmill remains	State Highway 57, Shannon	Mill remains	Lot 1 DP 13248, Lot 1 DP 30532, Pt Lot 1 DP 40776	
21A	H48	Former Shannon Post Office	Stout Street/Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Commercial Building and dwelling	Lot 1 DP 66855	# <u>2</u>
21A	H49	Church of the Venerable Bede	34 Stout Street, Shannon	Church	Sections 217 & 218 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H50	Venerable Bede Church Hall	34 Stout Street, Shannon	Church Hall	Sections 217 & 218, DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21	H51	Dwelling	56 Stout Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 43058	# <u>2</u>
21	H52	Dwelling	64 Stout Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Pt Section 144, 145 DP 369	# <u>2</u>

**Historic Heritage Sites (sites and areas that are of national, regional and/or local significance)**

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHPT Category
19	H53	Hydrabad (1865 – 1878) Wreck Site	Waitarere/Hokio Beach (650 metres south of the beach access track at the end of Hydrabad Drive)	Ship Wreck	Grid Reference: NZTM E1785420 N5507343	# <u>2</u>
1	H54	Foxton Moa Hunter Midden	Wylie Road, Foxton	Midden/Oven	Pt Lot 4 DP 60293	# <u>2</u>

Include a new entry to Historic Heritage Group 2: Buildings and Structures (regional and/or local significance) to read:

<u>2</u>	<u>H55</u>	<u>Dwelling</u>	<u>947 Koputoroa Road</u>	<u>Dwelling</u>	<u>Lot 1 DP 57695</u>	<u>2</u>
----------	------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------

## 5. Conclusion and Main Recommended Changes from Proposed Horowhenua District Plan (as notified)

---

The provisions within Chapter 13 (Historic Heritage) are structured under a similar framework as those in the operative Plan, albeit that focus is now concentrated on three key issues - the identification of historic heritage resources, the protection of those resources, and the challenge to achieve a balance between private property rights and the rights of the public to access and appreciate historic heritage resources within the Horowhenua.

A total of 41 submission points from 12 submitters have been received in relation to provisions proposed under these three key issues, including:

- the importance of identifying historic heritage that is representative of the District through processes that are inclusive of the values held by the wider community;
- the inclusion of references to robust guidelines to assist in the assessment of consents concerning historic heritage; and finally
- support for Council initiatives to inform the public and support landowners in respect of the protection and management of our historic heritage.

Amongst the submitters are organisations including Federated Farmers, a number of Iwi representatives, interested members of the public, business representatives, a local historical society, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and the Department (Director General) of Conservation.

The submissions generally either support the proposed provisions, or support in part those provisions for which it is felt that amendments are appropriate. Overall, the amendments proposed by submitters are minor enhancements to the wording of some provisions in order to be more inclusive of values, to recognise the spatial implications of heritage and to ensure that the policies and their supporting methods are robust enough to ensure the outcomes of the stated objectives are achievable and measurable.

The officer's recommendations on the key issues raised in the submissions include:

- Enable a collaborative working relationship between all parties who will be involved in the work under the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, and meaningful consultation with extended stakeholders, through retaining methods and the refinement of policies to identify historic heritage that is representative of the District;
- Recognise that heritage is not necessarily restricted to cadastral or other visible boundaries through an amendment to include "areas of interrelated significance";
- Recognise the importance of education and information of the public and landowners in respect of historic heritage and additionally, the value to landowners of the provision of Council resources ranging from technical advice through to rates relief and the retention of these provisions as methods for achieving objectives 13.2 and 13.3;
- Make reference to the future work outlined in the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012 which will further build on the proposed provisions and may seek to introduce new and amend existing provisions as a result of a district wide survey and research exercise;
- Inclusion of references to the ICOMOS NZ Charter (2010) to better determine appropriate treatment and protection measures for registered historic heritage resources and to use the Charter as a guideline for assessment of development impacting heritage resources;

- Amendments to Schedule 2 Historic Heritage - Buildings, Structures and Sites, including the addition of information on a number of existing items on the schedule.

I recommend that Council proceed to adopt Chapter 13 (Historic Heritage) and associated heritage provisions within the Plan subject to the amendments recommended in this report.

## 6. Appendices

---

### 6.1 Legislative Extracts

#### 6.1.1 Resource Management Act 1991

##### 5 Purpose

(1) The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

(2) In this Act, **sustainable management** means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—

- (a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and
- (b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and
- (c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

##### 6 Matters of national importance

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

- (a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:
- (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:
- (c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:
- (d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:
- (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:
- (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:
- (g) the protection of protected customary rights.

##### 7 Other matters

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to—

- (a) kaitiakitanga:
  - (aa) the ethic of stewardship:
- (b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:
  - (ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy:
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:
- (d) intrinsic values of ecosystems:
- (e) *[Repealed]*
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:

- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:
- (h) the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon:
- (i) the effects of climate change:
- (j) the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy.

## **8 Treaty of Waitangi**

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

### **74 Matters to be considered by territorial authority**

(1) A territorial authority shall prepare and change its district plan in accordance with its functions under section 31, the provisions of Part 2, a direction given under section 25A(2), its duty under section 32, and any regulations.

(2) In addition to the requirements of section 75(3) and (4), when preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial authority shall have regard to—

- (a) any—
  - (i) proposed regional policy statement; or
  - (ii) proposed regional plan of its region in regard to any matter of regional significance or for which the regional council has primary responsibility under Part 4; and
- (b) any—
  - (i) management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts; and
  - (ii) *[Repealed]*
  - (iia) relevant entry in the Historic Places Register; and
  - (iii) regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management, or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing),—to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues of the district; and
- (c) the extent to which the district plan needs to be consistent with the plans or proposed plans of adjacent territorial authorities.

(2A) A territorial authority, when preparing or changing a district plan, must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

(3) In preparing or changing any district plan, a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

### **6.1.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010**

Under Section 75(3)(b) of the Resource Management Act, a District Plan must give effect to any New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) provides a policy regime for achieving the purpose of the RMA in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand. Objective 6 of the NZCPS recognises that historic heritage in the coastal environment is extensive but not fully known, and vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Policies 2 and 17 assist in serving the interests of this objective and are identified as having relevance to the provisions of Chapter 13 and associated heritage rules.

Policy 17, *Historic Heritage Identification and Protection*, aims to protect historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development in a number of ways including the identification, assessment and recording of heritage features, integrated/collaborative management, and requiring, where appropriate, the conservation of heritage features.

Customary uses and traditional relationships between tangata whenua and coastal places are recognised within Policy 2, *The Treaty of Waitangi, tangata whenua and Maori Heritage*. This policy requires consultation and collaboration with tangata whenua in relation to the identification of heritage places, and the recognition of Maori cultural and heritage values, recognising also that tangata whenua have the right to choose not to identify places of historic, cultural or special significance.

### 6.1.3 Operative Regional Policy Statement and Proposed One Plan

**Table 7.2 Natural Feature and Landscape Assessment Factors**

Assessment Factor	Scope
(a) Natural science factors	<p>These factors relate to the geological, ecological, topographical and natural process components of the natural feature or landscape:</p> <p>(i) Representative: the combination of natural components that form the feature or landscape strongly typifies the character of an area.</p> <p>(ii) Research and education: all or parts of the feature or landscape are important for natural science research and education.</p> <p>(iii) Rarity: the feature or landscape is unique or rare within the district or Region, and few comparable examples exist.</p> <p>(iv) Ecosystem functioning: the presence of healthy ecosystems is clearly evident in the feature or landscape.</p>
(b) Aesthetic values	<p>The aesthetic values of a feature or landscape may be associated with:</p> <p>(i) Coherence: the patterns of land<sup>^</sup> cover and land<sup>^</sup> use are largely in harmony with the underlying natural pattern of landform and there are no, or few, discordant elements of land<sup>^</sup> cover or land<sup>^</sup> use.</p> <p>(ii) Vividness: the feature or landscape is visually striking, widely recognised within the local and wider community, and may be regarded as iconic.</p> <p>(iii) Naturalness: the feature or landscape appears largely unmodified by human activity and the patterns of landform and land<sup>^</sup> cover are an expression of natural processes and intact healthy ecosystems.</p> <p>(iv) Memorability: the natural feature or landscape makes such an impact on the senses that it becomes unforgettable.</p>
(c) Expressiveness (legibility)	<p>The feature or landscape clearly shows the formative natural processes or historic influences that led to its existing character.</p>
(d) Transient values	<p>The consistent and noticeable occurrence of transient natural events, such as daily or seasonal changes in weather, vegetation or wildlife movement, contributes to the character of the feature or landscape.</p>
(e) Shared and recognized values	<p>The feature or landscape is widely known and is highly valued for its contribution to local identity within its immediate and wider community.</p>



(f) Cultural and spiritual values for tangata whenua^	Māori values inherent in the feature or landscape add to the feature or landscape being recognised as a special place.
(g) Historical associations	Knowledge of historic events that occurred in and around the feature or landscape is widely held and substantially influences and adds to the value the community attaches to the natural feature or landscape.

## 6.2 Proposed District Plan as amended per officer's recommendations

Amend Policy 13.1.2 to read:

Identify historic heritage that contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the culture and history of the District, the region and/or New Zealand that is significant in terms of one or more of the following values:

- Maori cultural values
- Archaeological values
- Historic values
- Social values
- Setting and group values
- Architectural values
- Scientific and technological values
- ~~Maori cultural values~~
- ~~Archaeological values~~

Include new Assessment Criteria to 25.7.16(a) to read:

(xv) The extent to which the conservation principles contained within the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (2010) apply and, where applicable, have been substantially adhered to.

Include new Assessment Criteria to 25.7.16(b) to read:

(vii) The extent to which the conservation principles contained within the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (2010) apply and, where applicable, have been substantially adhered to.

Amend Methods for Issue 13.1 & Objective 13.1.1 (under District Plan) to read:

- Commence, in line with the Horowhenua Historic Heritage Strategy 2012, a comprehensive survey of historic heritage in the District including sites of significance to Māori, wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and archaeological sites, within 12 months of the date of the notification of the Proposed District Plan. The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings, sites and interrelated areas and be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners.

Amend Methods for Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1 (under Other Council Initiatives) to read:

- Through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes, Council may commit resources such as rates relief, grants, waive administration fees, low interest loans or offer access to professional technical advice to encourage the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites, and areas of interrelated significance and sites.

- Provide guidance and advice to assist landowners to sensitively manage scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites and areas of interrelated significance ~~and sites~~.
- Liaise and collaborate with landowners, Iwi and other groups and agencies with interests in the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings, sites and areas of interrelated significance ~~and sites~~.

Include new Method for Issue 13.1 and Objective 13.1.1 (under Other Council Initiatives)

- Implement the action plan outlined in the Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012 in order to identify the heritage resources that are representative of the District's history of occupation and settlement.

Include new Method for Issue 13.2 and Objective 13.2.1 (under Other Council Initiatives)

- Implement the action plan outlined in the Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012 in order to appropriately protect and manage heritage resources that have been identified as requiring protection or management.

Include new Method for Issue 13.3 and Objective 13.3.1 (under Other Council Initiatives)

- Implement the actions identified in the Council's Heritage Strategy Horowhenua District Heritage Strategy 2012.

Amend Rule 19.4.10 to read:

Rule 19.4.10 is proposed to include an additional note as follows:

- Note: Any application made under 19.4.10 must demonstrate a regard for guidance detailed under Chapter 13 of this Plan, including the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010 referenced in this Plan by association, in undertaking maintenance, conservation and other works on any heritage building, structure or site identified in Schedule 2 Historic Heritage.

Amend Schedule 2 Historic Heritage – Buildings, Structures & Sites to read as follows:

**Historic Heritage Group 1: Buildings and Structures (outstanding national and/or regional significance)**

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHPT Category
21A	H45	Shannon Railway	Plimmer Terrace,	Railway	Lot 1 DP 71514	† <u>1</u>

		Station	Shannon	Station		
4	H55	Weraroa State Farm	Hokio Beach Road, Levin	Former Boys' Training Centre, State Farm, Experimental Farm	Section 1 SO 36420	# 1

### Historic Heritage Group 2: Buildings and Structures (regional and/or local significance)

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHT Category
14,15	H1	Duncan House	11A Ladys Mile Foxton	Restaurant	Lot 3 DP 9245	
14,15	H2	All Saints Church	53 Main Street, Foxton	Church	Pt Blk VIII Te Awahou	
4	H3	Nye Homestead Sunnyside	64 Newth Road, Foxton	Dwelling	Pt Rural Section 428 Foxton Township	
14,15	H4	Dwelling	31 Robinson Street, Foxton	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 32194	
27B	H6	Dwelling	51 Bath Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 65398	# 2
28B	H7	St Johns Methodist Church	90 Cambridge Street, Levin	Church	Lot 2 DP 85699	# 2
29	H8	Dwelling	29 Keepa Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 18 DP 2115	# 2
27	H9	Dwelling	31 Keepa Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 20 DP 2115	# 2
28B	H10	Thompson House	4 Kent Street, Levin	Cultural Centre	Lots 1 & 2 DP 45727 Sections 3, 5 Blk XVIII Town of Levin	# 2
27A	H11	Former Bank of Australia	24 Queen Street, Levin	Commercial Building	Pt Section 12 Blk IX Township of Levin	# 2
25	H13	Dwelling	8 Roslyn Road, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 66276	# 2
27	H14	Dwelling	1 Victoria Street, Levin	Dwelling	Pt Lots 1 & 2 DP 2142	# 2
27A	H15	Horowhenua College Main Building	Weraroa Road, Levin	Secondary School	Section 87 Pt Sections 6 & 7 DP 1656	# 2
27A	H17	Walkerley Homestead	120A Weraroa Road, Levin	Dwelling	Pt Lot 1 DP 16531 & Pt Section 20 Town of Levin SO 12912	# 2
28B	H18	Dwelling	94 Winchester Street, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 67353	# 2

28	H19	Dwelling (Naumai)	1 Winslow Place, Levin	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 67637	# <u>2</u>
37	H20	War Memorial Sarcophagus	Honi Taipua Street, Manakau	Memorial	Rly I.D. 56166 Land Plan 2982	# <u>2</u>
37	H21	Former Manakau Post Office	Honi Taipua Street, Manakau	Part Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 81871	# <u>2</u>
37	H22	Manakau School	Mokena Kohere Street, Manakau	Primary School	Lots 32-37 DP 420 Manakau Township	# <u>2</u>
37	H23	St Andrews Church	Mokena Kohere Street, Manakau	Church	Section 38 Town of Manakau	# <u>2</u>
37	H25	Former Methodist Church	State Highway 1, Manakau	Dwelling/Craft shop	Pt Lot 15 DP 415	# <u>2</u>
22	H26	Mangahao Hydro Electric Power Station	Mangahao Road, Mangahao	Power Generation Station and Museum	Sections 11, 12 & 17 Pt Sections 1, 6, 8, 10 & 11 DP 457	# <u>2</u>
22	H27	House No 12	12 Blackwood Drive, Mangaore Village	Dwelling	Lot 12 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
22	H28	1 Hay Street Mangaore	1 Hay Street Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 1 DP 71906	# <u>2</u>
22	H29	House	2 Hay Street, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 71906	# <u>2</u>
22	H30	Staff Hostel	3 Hay Street, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 3 DP 71906 Lots 19, 31, 34 & 44 DP 71908, Pt Lot 3 DP 178	# <u>2</u>
22	H31	Dwelling	17 Petticoat Lane, Mangaore Village	Dwelling	Lot 17 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
22	H32	Dwelling	18 Petticoat Lane, Mangaore	Dwelling	Lot 18 DP 71908	# <u>2</u>
34,35	H33	St John the Baptist Church	Muhunoa East Road, Levin	Church	Pt Section 6 Town of Ohau (SO 12978)	# <u>2</u>
7	H34	Old Kuku Dairy Factory	State Highway 1, Kuku	Tui Trading Co Shop	Lot 4 DP 73189	# <u>2</u>
2	H35	Opiki Suspension Bridge	Rangitane Road near State Highway 56	Disused Bridge		# <u>2</u>
2	H36	Tane Flaxmill remains	Rangitane Road, Opiki	Mill remains	Pt Lot 1 DP 9314	
2	H37	Akers Homestead	State Highway 56, Opiki	Dwelling	Pt Lot 1 DP 10283	
2	H37	Akers Homestead	State Highway 56, Opiki	Woolshed	Pt Lot 1 DP 10283	

21A	H38	Club Hotel	2 Ballance Street, Shannon	Stables and Hotel	Sections 271, 272, 273 & 274, DP 368	# <u>2</u> (stables only)
21A	H39	Dwelling	55 Bryce Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 363 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H40	Dwelling	57 Bryce Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 364 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H41	Albion Hotel	2 Grey Street, Shannon	Hotel	Section 188A DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H42	Former Shannon Police Station	17 Nathan Terrace, Shannon	Dwelling	Section 325 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H43	Percy Nation Boer War Memorial	Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Memorial	Lot 1 DP 71514	# <u>2</u>
21A	H44	WW1/WW2 War Memorial	Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Memorial	Lot 1 DP 71514	# <u>2</u>
21A	H46	Former Bank of New Zealand	76 Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Disused Bank with first floor residential	Pt Section 194 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
5	H47	Miranui Flaxmill remains	State Highway 57, Shannon	Mill remains	Lot 1 DP 13248, Lot 1 DP 30532, Pt Lot 1 DP 40776	
21A	H48	Former Shannon Post Office	Stout Street/Plimmer Terrace, Shannon	Commercial Building and dwelling	Lot 1 DP 66855	# <u>2</u>
21A	H49	Church of the Venerable Bede	34 Stout Street, Shannon	Church	Sections 217 & 218 DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21A	H50	Venerable Bede Church Hall	34 Stout Street, Shannon	Church Hall	Sections 217 & 218, DP 368	# <u>2</u>
21	H51	Dwelling	56 Stout Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Lot 2 DP 43058	# <u>2</u>
21	H52	Dwelling	64 Stout Street, Shannon	Dwelling	Pt Section 144, 145 DP 369	# <u>2</u>

Include a new entry to Historic Heritage Group 2: Buildings and Structures (regional and/or local significance) to read:

<u>2</u>	<u>H55</u>	<u>Dwelling</u>	<u>947 Koputoroa Road</u>	<u>Dwelling</u>	<u>Lot 1 DP 57695</u>	<u>2</u>
----------	------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------

**Historic Heritage Sites (sites and areas that are of national, regional and/or local significance)**

Map	Ref	Site Name	Location	Description	Legal Description	NZHPT Category
19	H53	Hydrabad (1865 – 1878) Wreck Site	Waitarere/Hokio Beach (650 metres south of the beach access track at the end of Hydrabad Drive)	Ship Wreck	Grid Reference: NZTM E1785420 N5507343	# <u>2</u>
1	H54	Foxton Moa Hunter Midden	Wylie Road, Foxton	Midden/Oven	Pt Lot 4 DP 60293	# <u>2</u>

### 6.3 Schedule of Officer's Recommendations on Submission Points

Sub. No	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Further Position	Submitter	Officer's Recommendation
17.00	509.02	Penelope Brown New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support		Accept Accept
96.22	506.11 509.04	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Ernslaw One Ltd New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support Support Support		Accept Accept Accept
67.18		Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit			Accept
117.11	503.00	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) NZWEA	Support In-part		Accept In-Part Accept In-Part
101.65	509.07	Director General of Conservation (DoC) New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support In-part		Accept In-Part Accept In-Part
96.23	506.12 509.05	Federated Farmers Ernslaw One Ltd New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support Support		Accept Accept Accept
96.24	506.13 509.06	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Ernslaw One Ltd New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support Support Support		Accept Accept Accept
11.31		Philip Taueki			Accept
60.24		Muaupoko Co-operative Society			Accept
67.19		Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit			Accept
117.29		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept In-Part
67.04	503.01	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit NZWEA	Support In-part		Accept Accept In-Part
96.25		Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Accept In-Part
103.02		Colin Easton			Accept In-Part
106.00		Rosalie Huzziff			Accept In-Part
117.05		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept
117.12		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept
117.07		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)			Accept



117.08		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept
101.68	509.01	Director-General of Conservation (DoC) New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support in-part	Reject Reject
117.09		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept
101.69		Director-General of Conservation (DoC)		Accept In-Part
96.31	506.17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Ernslaw One Ltd	Support	Reject Reject
117.10		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept
34.00	509.03	Foxton Historical Society New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Support	Reject Reject
117.01		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept
117.02		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Reject
117.00		New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)		Accept

# Submitter Index

---

The page numbers for where the submitter index has been referred to within the report are indexed below by the Surname or Organisation name of the submitter.

## B

**Brown (17)**, 14, 15, 21, 56

## D

**Director-General of Conservation (101 & 527)**,  
8, 12, 17, 18, 23, 31, 32, 33, 34, 56, 57

## E

**Easton (103)**, 25, 27, 56

**Ernslaw One Ltd (74 & 506)**, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21,  
35, 36, 56, 57

## F

**Federated Farmers of New Zealand (96 & 516)**,  
11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 35, 36, 44, 56, 57

**Foxton Historical Society (34)**, 38, 39, 40, 57

## H

**Horizons Regional Council (27 & 528)**, 8, 11

**Horticulture New Zealand (98 & 517)**, 11

**Huzziff, Rosalie (106 & 107)**, 25, 27, 56

## M

**Muaupoko Co-operative Society (60)**, 21, 22,  
24, 56

## N

**New Zealand Historic Places Trust (117 & 509)**,  
8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28,  
29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 50, 51, 52,  
55, 56, 57

**New Zealand Wind Energy Association  
(‘NZWEA’) (100 & 503)**, 17, 18, 24, 26, 27, 56

## P

**Percy (76)**, 42, 54

## T

**Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit  
(67)**, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 56

**Taueki (11)**, 21, 22, 24, 56