

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Jane Mary O’Dea. I am the Heritage Advisor Planning for the Otago and Southland Area Office of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT). I have been working for HNZPT since November 2010.
- 1.2 I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Arts and Master of Regional and Resource Planning from the University of Otago.
- 1.3 I have 11 years’ experience as a planner in various roles including for a multi-disciplinary consulting company, Crown entity and local authorities in New Zealand and the United Kingdom, prior to my current role with HNZPT. In my current position I provide statutory planning advice and submissions to Regional Policy Statements, Regional Plans, District Plans, and resource consent applications affecting heritage items. I have provided this advice primarily for local authorities in Otago and Southland.
- 1.4 With input from other HNZPT staff I prepared HNZPT’s submission and further submission on the Proposed District Plan (PDP).

2. CODE OF CONDUCT

- 2.1 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. I am authorised to give this evidence on HNZPT’s behalf.

3. SCOPE OF THIS STATEMENT

- 3.1 My statement addresses the following matters:
- The statutory framework for the management of historic heritage;
 - Heritage New Zealand Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series;
 - I will then discuss a range of matters pertaining to HNZPT’s submission and the notified and Section 42A Report Recommended Revised Chapter version of the provisions. In some cases I recommend amendments to the provisions;

- I will then cover HNZPT's approach to notifying landowners affected by HNZPT's submissions on the PDP.

3.2 Where I refer to the proposed PDP provisions in this statement I am usually referring to the provisions as set out in the Recommended Revised Chapter of the Section 42A Report. This will be referred to as the 'RRC.' Where I discuss the provisions as notified I will refer to the 'notified' PDP.

4. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

4.1. The RMA regulates district plans to recognise and provide for matters of national importance (s6). The matters relevant to heritage are:

- *6 (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga*
- *6 (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development*

4.2. Historic heritage is defined in s 2 as:

(a) means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:

(i) archaeological:

(ii) architectural:

(iii) cultural:

(iv) historic:

(v) scientific:

(vi) technological; and

(b) includes

(i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and

(ii) archaeological sites; and

(iii) sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; and

(iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources

- 4.3. The RMA definition of historic heritage is an inclusive definition and is not limited to places or areas that have been “scheduled”¹ by the Council or entered on the New Zealand Heritage List.
- 4.4. Heritage New Zealand’s responsibilities are set out in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA 2014), which has as its purpose:

the promotion of the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand.

- 4.5. The responsibilities of HNZPT include the preparation and maintenance of the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero (the List). As discussed in Heather Bauchop’s statement, the List contains historic places (Category 1 and Category 2), historic areas, wāhi tapu, wāhi tapu areas and wāhi tupuna.
- 4.6. As noted in Heather Bauchop’s statement, the List in itself is primarily an identification measure rather than a planning tool. Practical protection of places and areas is provided through regional and district plans. This typically includes a schedule of significant historic heritage places, in conjunction with appropriate objectives, policies and rules. The PDP contains the Inventory of Protected Features (Tables 26.8-26.13) which identify significant precincts; buildings, structures and features; archaeological sites; sites of significance to Maori (currently unpopulated); heritage landscapes; and heritage orders.
- 4.7. The section of the RMA that specifically addresses the relationship between the List and plans prepared under the RMA is Section 74(2)(b)(iia). This in effect states that when preparing a district plan, the territorial authority:

shall have particular regard to any relevant entry on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero required by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

- 4.8. In contrast to the statutory provisions for the List entries, the HNZPTA 2014 provides the regulatory framework for the management of activities that have the potential to affect archaeological sites, whether or not those sites are entered on the Council schedule or recorded,² provided those sites:
- (a) pre-date 1900 or

¹ Scheduled by the Council means entered on a schedule of significant historic heritage places or areas, and thereby subject to the provisions that regulate activities in terms of their potential to affect heritage values.

² Known archaeological sites are recorded on the New Zealand Archaeological Association database (Archsite).

(b) have been 'declared' in terms of section 43 HNZPTA.³

4.9. Archaeological values (whether recorded or not, scheduled or otherwise identified) also fall within the RMA definition of historic heritage, and therefore should be subject to the PDP provisions. The implications of this, and the ways that the two processes can complement each other and not create conflict and overlap, is a key factor to consider with respect to PDP provisions. I further consider this matter later in my statement. The statement of Matthew Schmidt also discusses the management of archaeological sites under the HNZPTA in further detail.

5. HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND POUHERE TAONGA SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC HERITAGE GUIDE SERIES

5.1. The overarching aim of the Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guide Series (SMHHG) is to achieve the sustainable management of New Zealand's finite heritage resource. A central aspect of the SMHHG is to provide assistance on the protection of historic heritage under the RMA. The guidance was published by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust in August 2007 in accordance with the Historic Places Act 1993 and includes three sections:

- SMHHG Guidelines
- SMHHG Discussion papers
- SMHHG Information sheets.

5.2. The SMHHG Guidelines provide non-statutory guidance on historic heritage issues and legislation, particularly the RMA and Building Act 2004. I understand they intend to represent a 'best practice' or 'model heritage provisions' for RMA plans. They seek to highlight the important role that planning documents play in the management of historic heritage. Of relevance in the context of the PDP, there is a SMHH guideline which covers District Plans. This document is attached as Appendix C.

5.3 It is important to recognise that the current edition of the SMHHG was produced in August 2007. Since that time a number of factors have emerged which have had an impact on heritage management. These include increased awareness of seismic risk following the Canterbury

³ A site that originates from 1900 or later may be "declared", and made subject to the provisions of the HNZPTA, in accordance with s43 of that Act.

earthquakes, changes relating to insurance and heritage properties and repeal of the Historic Places Act 1993 now replaced by the HNZPTA 2014.

- 5.4 Section 6(f) of the RMA remains unchanged in its requirement for Local Authorities to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage as a matter of national importance. In my opinion the nature and content of the SMHHG is still relevant in supporting the protection of historic heritage under the RMA. Accordingly, in the context of the factors set out above I regard the SMHHG as being useful to assist local authorities in the development of planning documents but not determinative.

7. PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN – GENERAL COMMENTS

- 7.1 I consider that the PDP heritage framework provides for the range of heritage encompassed by the definition of historic heritage. This framework consists of identification and provisions relating to:

- Built Heritage;
- Archaeological sites;
- Māori heritage;
- Surroundings associated with historic heritage which are provided for through provisions relating to setting or extent of place, heritage precincts and heritage landscapes.

- 7.2 Like the ODP, the PDP provides for hierarchical management of heritage items, by providing different management frameworks for Category 1, 2 and 3 items, representing relative heritage significance.

- 7.3 Unlike the ODP, scheduled archaeological sites are provided for through a specific framework of provisions rather than these being subject to the same rules as buildings and structures. I consider this to be an appropriate approach and in line with SMHH best practice.

- 7.4 A specific rule framework is also provided for Heritage Landscapes as identified in Table 26.12 whereas previously effects on these areas were more indirectly addressed through assessment matters spread through the ODP. The Section 32 Evaluation Report (undated) explains that the existing provisions have been poorly used which has limited their effectiveness.

- 7.5 The PDP controls a range of activities in such a way as to recognise the continuum from those activities that are likely to have no, or minor effects to those that are likely to have more significant effects on heritage. This is recognised through applying a scale of activity status' to the activities from permitted to prohibited. Again, I consider that this is an appropriate approach.
- 7.6 I consider the overall PDP framework to be generally aligned with HNZPT best practice as set out in the SMHH guidance.
- 7.7 I note the numerous changes to the proposed chapter recommended in the RRC contained in the Section 42A Report. I generally consider these to provide greater clarity and certainty than the notified version of the PDP. Furthermore, the proposed amendments streamline provisions that have the potential to duplicate provisions in other chapters of the Plan.

8.0 IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION (SECTION 26.2)

- 8.1 I support the proposed amendments to section 26.2 as outlined in the RRC which relate to the provision of owner consent for nominations. This matter was raised in HNZPT's submission on the PDP. I consider the inclusion of owner consent to be unnecessary because the plan change process provides for consultation, with scope to consider the views of owners regardless of whether their prior consent has been obtained. Requiring nominations to be accompanied by owner consent could constrain the Council's ability to consider new nominations for which owners' consent has not been obtained. Such a situation would not promote the sustainable management of historic heritage.
- 8.2 Furthermore, in relation to the provision of conservation plans to support nominations, I support the amendment proposed in the RRC wherein this will be 'encouraged' rather than required as per the notified version. Conservation plans should not be mandatory where a person or group is nominating a place for inclusion in the Inventory. Conservation plans take a long time to write and to be adequately reviewed, can be expensive and are reliant on owner co-operation. Conservation plans do have their place to guide a project and the care of a place. They are an important tool that should be written to inform appropriate change to places of high significance. In this respect they can be of use to an owner in guiding works to their property and could be used to inform resource consent decision making if provided as part of a resource consent application. However in my opinion a conservation plan is not necessary to

establish heritage significance for the purpose of considering whether a place meets the criteria for inclusion in the Inventory.

9. HERITAGE SETTINGS

9.1. In my view it is appropriate to provide a level of protection and control to heritage settings and surrounds insofar as they contribute towards the significance of a place. This is consistent with what is considered to be encompassed under the term 'historic heritage' in the RMA which includes:

Surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources

9.2. In response to submissions that the term 'curtilage or setting,' as used in the notified version, is too broad and subjective, the RRC puts forward two solutions, both of which I support. These are as follows:

1. The introduction of defined 'extents of place' where this information is available from the New Zealand Heritage List or technical assessments prepared by experienced heritage specialists. Extents of place are particularly valuable where a heritage item is located within a large land parcel. There is scope in the future for further 'extents of place' to be identified and I consider that such work would be worthwhile.
 2. An amended explanation of the term 'setting' (point 5. of the section entitled 'Terms used in this Chapter.')
- The definition is supported by proposed policy 26.5.1.4 which provides useful guidance in relation to the types of effects on setting that the PDP is seeking to manage. The new definition for 'setting' clarifies that the setting does not extend beyond the legal boundary of a site. In my opinion it also provides scope for the Council to determine that even where works are within the same legal title, they may not necessarily be within the 'setting' of the heritage feature.

9.3. In my view the extent of the heritage settings must be balanced with the practicalities of reasonable use of property. In this regard control on any new development must be focused on effects on the principle heritage item. I believe it would be of benefit to undertake further work to identify additional 'extents of place' in the future, and that this would provide even greater certainty. However at this time I consider that the proposed provisions as put forward in the RRC strike an appropriate balance between protecting the surroundings of significant historic

heritage, with ensuring reasonable limitations on how far 'settings' might extend; and strong policy guidance through 26.5.1.4 which will also aid interpretation.

10. PARTIAL AND TOTAL DEMOLITION

- 10.1 My main concern with determining what constitutes an alteration, partial demolition, or total demolition through calculating the percentage of fabric demolished, as proposed in the RRC, is that it does not take into account the relative heritage significance of the affected fabric. For example, demolition of less than 30% of a building could be proposed which would make the works an 'alteration.' However the 30% to be demolished could be the most significant section of the building, which in terms of effects could be more akin to full demolition than an alteration. This is where it is important for applicants and decision-makers to have a good understanding of the relative significance of heritage fabric.
- 10.2 Notwithstanding the above I recognise the complexity of devising definitions that are not subjective, but which will also cover all necessary possible scenarios. I also recognise that in general there is a continuum of effects arising from demolition activities which is often related to the amount of demolition proposed. I am also aware that the proposed approach of calculating the percentage of demolition has been used by the Auckland Council in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.
- 10.3 In my view the critical aspect of these provisions relates less to the definitions of partial and total demolition but rather to the strength of the underlying rule framework and assessment matters. In this regard I am comfortable that in the main, the rule structure for alterations, partial demolition and total demolition is robust enough to ensure that regardless of which of these activity rules is triggered, that the effects on the heritage significance of the item would be able to be appropriately considered, and also that the Council would have the ability to decline consent if necessary.

11. MĀORI HERITAGE

- 11.1 From a planning perspective one of the most direct methods to assist in the protection and conservation of wāhi tapu, wāhi tapu areas and wāhi tupuna is to provide appropriate provisions through the district plan. Nationally as at 2011, 42 District Plans provide a schedule of sites of significance to Māori.

11.2 I note the PDP provides for Sites of Significance to Māori (SOSM), via Schedule 26.11 and that the Council has signalled a commitment to progress further work in this area as part of stage 2 of the PDP. I accept that this is an appropriate course of action and support the proposed provisions which relate to this ie. 26.5.3, 26.5.3.1, 26.5.3.2, 26.6.16; as well as those of the Tangata Whenua chapter (5.45, 5.4.5.1-5.4.5.4).

13. PROVISIONS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEDULED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

13.1 Matthew Schmidt's statement outlines the role of the HNZPTA 2014 in managing the modification and destruction of archaeological sites. The RMA has a slightly different emphasis which requires protection of historic heritage from inappropriate, subdivision use and development, but also includes effects on historic heritage with the range of other effects when assessing proposals. Archaeological values fall within the definition of historic heritage. District Plans must therefore provide for the sustainable management of archaeological resources.

13.2 It is my opinion that under the RMA, consideration of the effects on a site may take a broader perspective than under the HNZPTA 2014. For example matters such as the visual intrusion of a new structure on a site, or the impaired view of a site by due to a development. Crucially, and as elaborated on in Matthew Schmidt's statement, the partial demolition of pre-1900 structures does not require an Archaeological authority pursuant to the HNZPTA 2014, whereas this is a matter that can be controlled by a district plan. Furthermore, management of archaeological heritage values under the RMA beings with it public consultation processes in the areas of plan-making and resource consents. Public consultation is not available under the HNZPTA.

13.3 I support the PDP approach wherein significant archaeological sites are included in the Inventory as a sub-category of historic heritage (26.10 Archaeological Sites). Effects on non-scheduled archaeological sites are appropriately managed through a combination of non-regulatory methods such as advice notes referring to the requirements of the HNZPTA 2014, and the proposed archaeology and cultural alert layer, which will sit outside the District Plan but will be available through the Councils online GIS system.

13.3 The HNZPT submission sought amendments to the rule framework for scheduled archaeological sites (see Appendix B of HNZPT's submission). The Section 42A Report largely recommends that the proposed framework should be accepted.

PDP ‘Development’ activity in relation to Archaeological Sites scheduled in section 26.10 of the Inventory of Protected Features

- 13.4 Paragraph 12.7 d. of the Section 42A Report suggests that HNZPT clarify the status of its submission in relation to the ‘development’ rule proposed in Appendix B of its submission. I confirm that this submission point is only intended to apply to archaeological sites listed in Schedule 26.10.
- 13.5 I would also like to it to be noted that the inclusion of the proposed ‘development’ rule in Appendix B of Heritage New Zealand’s submission as part of the overall proposed framework for scheduled archaeological sites was an attempt to use terminology consistent with elsewhere in the notified heritage chapter. Where this term is used elsewhere in the chapter ie. Rule 26.6.7, I note that the RRC recommends amendments to the explanation of what the term includes. I understand that the amendments are recommended in order to avoid potential duplication with other district wide chapters associated such as Chapter 22 - Earthworks and Chapter 18 - Signs.
- 13.6 Chapter 22 – Earthworks includes a range of provisions aimed at managing the effects of earthworks on historic heritage values, including archaeological sites. I do not intend to elaborate on those provisions in this forum except to note that I accept that the effects of earthworks on items listed in the Inventory of Protected Features (including archaeological sites) can be adequately managed under these provisions. As such the ‘development’ activity referred to in Chapter 26 – Historic Heritage need not refer to earthworks as it does in the notified version.
- 13.7 Nevertheless I do consider that without the ‘development’ rule as suggested in HNZPT’s submission, or suitable alternative, the PDP does not address some activities that can adversely impact on archaeological sites, and which are able to be more effectively managed through the PDP rather than through the HNZPTA.
- 13.8 I therefore recommend the following additional rule be included in section 26.6 - Table 5:

Rule	Activity - Archaeological sites listed in Section 26.10	All sites
26.6.20	<p><u>Development within the setting or Extent of Place</u></p> <p><u>Development within the ‘Extent of Place’ where this is specifically defined in the Inventory (26.10) or, where no Extent of Place is defined, this rule shall apply to development within the setting.</u></p>	<u>D</u>

	<p><u>For the purpose of this rule:</u></p> <p><u>Development means new buildings and structures, earthworks that otherwise requires consent under the earthworks rules, carpark areas over 15m² within view of a public road, and carpark areas over 40m² elsewhere. 'Development' does not include any land use activity occurring in the setting (such as residential, retail, or industrial activity), which is managed instead through the relevant zone provisions.</u></p> <p><u>'Setting' is as defined in Section 26.6 - Terms Used in this Chapter.</u></p>	
--	---	--

Rule 26.6.20

13.9 I agree with the Planner's recommendation that PDP rule 26.6.20, as notified, should be deleted due to interpretation issues. Furthermore, due to the different considerations relevant under the HNZPTA and RMA, there may be occasions where it would be appropriate to grant resource consent for an activity even where there is a 'breach' of the HNZPTA (noting the lack of clarity about what would constitute a 'breach.')

The prohibited activity status would therefore not be appropriate were this rule to remain.

26.6.17 Demolition of any built archaeological feature

13.10 With reference to the RRC, I note that unlike the rules in section 26.6 for 'Buildings, structures and features,' and 'Heritage precincts' the activity of demolition is not split into 'partial' and 'total' demolition. For the sake of PDP consistency I would recommend that this should be addressed.

13.11 Archaeological sites listed in Table 5 of the Inventory of Protected Features are not assigned a Category 1, 2 or 3 status. The activity status framework applied to these sites is therefore broader than for 'Buildings structures and features.' Accordingly I consider discretionary activity status to be appropriate for both partial and total demolition of built archaeological features, noting that modification or alterations of such sites is proposed to be a restricted discretionary activity. Based on this my recommended approach would be to simply clarify that the rule applies to both partial and total demolition as follows:

Rule	Activity - Archaeological sites listed in Section 26.10	All sites
-------------	--	------------------

26.6.17	Destruction or demolition of an archaeological site listed in section 26.10 Destruction of any archaeological feature or <u>partial or total</u> demolition of any built archaeological feature associated with an archaeological site listed in Section 26.10.	D
---------	--	---

Relocation to another the site - Archaeological Sites Scheduled in section 26.10

13.12 I also note what appears to be an oversight in HNZPT’s submission, which has been carried over into the RRC version of section 26.6 Table 5 Archaeological Sites. The oversight relates to the activity of ‘relocation to another site.’ Whilst HNZPTA, in Appendix B of its submission, recommended a rule for relocation of an archaeological site within the same site, no rule was recommended to control relocation to another site.

13.13 Whilst recognising that this may be outside the scope of what can be considered at this stage, I recommend an amendment to section 26.6.18 in order to address the issue of relocation to another site. Putting in place controls over this activity would be consistent with the proposed PDP rules for ‘Buildings, structures and features’ and ‘Heritage precincts’ and could be addressed as follows:

Rule	Activity - Archaeological sites listed in Section 26.10	All sites
26.6.18	Relocation affecting an archaeological site Any activity that results in an archaeological feature associated with an archaeological site listed in Section 26.10 being relocated within the same site <u>or to another site.</u>	D

13.14 For ease of reference I have appended a proposed set of rules for archaeological sites scheduled in Section 26.10 of the Inventory of Protected Features as Appendix A.

14. SIGNAGE

14.1 The concept of protecting the setting of scheduled heritage features as introduced into the PDP provides an opportunity to manage the effects of signage within important heritage settings. I am aware that District Plan Chapter 18 - Signs was recently reviewed (Plan Change 48). To my knowledge the issue of signage within the setting of scheduled heritage features was not

considered as part of that process, although signs directly attached to scheduled heritage items was considered and this is provided for in the decision version of the chapter.

- 14.2 Signage within the setting or curtilage of scheduled heritage items has the potential to cause adverse effects and in my opinion should be subject to resource consent. In its submission, Heritage New Zealand supported notified Rule 26.6.7 which requires consent for ‘development within the curtilage or setting’ this section explains that ‘development’ includes *earthworks, signage, lighting, street furniture, new buildings and structures*.
- 14.3 An outcome of the RRC proposed amendment to the explanation of the ‘development’ activity is that signage is no longer specifically included as an aspect of ‘development’ requiring consent. I consider that signage is one of the more common forms of development that has the potential to compromise the surroundings of historic heritage, and accordingly I believe this is an activity that should be specifically controlled through the PDP provisions.
- 14.4 There are numerous possible methods for addressing this issue which could involve amendments to the Signage chapter, Historic Heritage chapter, or both. My recommended approach would be to make the following amendment to the Signage chapter:

Chapter 18 Signs Activity Table 4 – District Wide

21.	Signs on any Category 1, 2 or 3 item, <u>within the setting or extent of place of any Category 1, 2 or 3 item, within any heritage precinct, archaeological site or heritage landscape included in the Inventory of Protected Features.</u>	DIS
-----	---	-----

- 14.5 I do have a concern that users of the Plan will expect to find all provisions relating to historic heritage within Chapter 26 (this concern also relates to subdivision activity, discussed in section 15 of this statement). Accordingly for clarity I also recommend an advice note be included beneath Table 6 of section 26.6 to read as follows:

For provisions concerning signage in relation to Category 1, 2 or 3 items, within the setting or extent of place of Category 1, 2 or 3 items, within heritage precincts, archaeological sites and heritage landscapes included in the Inventory of Protected Features, please refer to Chapter 18 - Signage.

15. SUBDIVISION

- 15.1 Similar to my comment regarding the issue of signage, I do have a concern about Plan clarity in terms of provisions that closely relate to heritage management being located in other sections of the PDP. In this regard I note the proposed deletion of rule 26.6.2 (subdivision) in the RRC and that the issue of the subdivision of sites containing all or part of a protected feature will be addressed in hearing stream 4.
- 15.2 Whilst I understand and accept the reasoning for this as provided in the Section 42A Report (paragraphs 14.1-14.3) I do nevertheless consider that it would be appropriate to provide a clear cross-reference under 'Table 1 General' to the subdivision chapter. Such a note could read as follows or similar:

For provisions concerning the subdivision of any site containing all or part of a protected feature users of the Plan are referred to Chapter 27 Subdivision.

16. PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO INVENTORY OF PROTECTED FEATURES AND/OR PROPOSED CHANGES TO HERITAGE ITEM CATEGORIES

- 16.1 I note that the Section 42A Report, at paragraph 21.6 mentions that the landowners' views on inclusion of certain heritage items are not known. In this regard I believe it is useful to note that Heritage New Zealand wrote to all owners or leaseholders of land containing the heritage items which were the subject of Heritage New Zealand's PDP submission. With regard to proposed new additions to the Inventory of Protected Features, and proposed category changes the owners of the following places were written to:

- Gratuity Cottage, 9 Gorge Rd
- Sew Hoy's Big Beach Claim Historic Area (legal river)
- Wong Gong's Terrace Historic Area
- Reko's Point
- Kawarau Falls Dam
- Roaring Meg Bridge Abutment
- Skippers Bridge
- Hullert House
- Pleasant Terrace workings, including Sainsbury's House
- Kinross Farm Steading

- Bullendale
- Wakatipu Flourmill Complex (former) – noting that as per paragraph 8.6 of Heather Bauchop’s statement, Heritage New Zealand withdraws this submission as it relates to the Mill House (PDP heritage item 76.) The Mill House is not part of the New Zealand Heritage List entry for the Wakatipu Flourmill complex.
- Tomanovitch Cottage

16.2 The letters sent to these parties outlined the following matters:

- Explained how Heritage New Zealand’s submission on the PDP affects their property;
- Explain that there is an option to lodge a further submission;
- Where to find further information on the QLDC website regarding the PDP and how to lodge a further submission.
- Provided contact details of HNZPT staff if there were any queries.

16.3 Copies of the letters sent are included in Appendix B to this statement.

16.4 In terms of direct responses to the letters, HNZPT received the following responses:

9 Gorge Rd

HNZPT was contacted by the owner of 9 Gorge Rd. Verbal advice about the submission process was provided. Separate advice concerning the possible development of the site was also provided however I do not wish to detail this in my statement in order to respect the privacy of the owner.

Reko’s Point Archaeological Site

HNZPT was contacted in the last fortnight by the owner of part of the Reko’s Point site who had not lodged a further submission but wished to have an update on the current situation. I advised on the status at that time and undertook to keep them informed of any progress as I become aware of it.

16.5 A few parties lodged further submissions which were copied to HNZPT.

17. CONCLUSION

- 17.1 I support the overall direction and framework set out in Chapter 26 of the PDP, and consider that the proposed RRC version of the chapter generally serves to strengthen, streamline, and provide greater certainty in relation to matters of interpretation.
- 17.2 Having considered all of the relevant information and expert evidence available I have identified some areas (within the scope of HNZPT's submissions) where I consider that the PDP could better manage certain activities that have the potential to adversely affect historic heritage values. Where this is the case I have outlined the amendments that I would recommend in sections 13.8, 13.11, 13.3, 14.4, 14.5, 15.2 and Appendix B of this statement.

Jane Mary O'Dea

14 June 2016