1. Kia ora, my name is Julia Masters. I am a home owner and resident of Hamilton East and I made a submission on Plan Change 9 on behalf of myself and my husband Dean Masters. I have submitted a statement which hopefully you have had a chance to read. My summary focuses on the two key points outlined in my statement, the proposed Information Requirements and Assessment Criteria.

2. I consider it unreasonable to require a Heritage Impact Assessment for all activities requiring a resource consent in a HHA. Council should have discretion over the provision of such an assessment, dependant on the nature and scale of the activity. For example, a small addition to the rear of an existing building will likely have little effect to the heritage value of an HHA when considered as a whole. In this scenario, the assessment can be adequately undertaken within an Assessment of Environmental Effects without a full Heritage Impact Assessment also being provided.

3. I support the proposed changes to clause d of section 1.2.2.8 (Volume 2, Appendix 1) where the Heritage Impact Assessment is required to provide an "assessment of how a proposal will be sympathetic to, and not detract from the heritage values, representativeness and consistency of the HHA". I also support the Planner's recommendation to delete the proposed consistency criteria (the bullet points under 1.2.2.8 d iii).

4. With regard to the Assessment Criteria, I consider that the new recommended assessment criteria (E9 to E13 in section in section 1.3.3 in Volume 2, Appendix 1) are appropriate for consideration of resource consents for activities with an HHA and that section 19.6 should be updated to limit assessment to these matters only. I have outlined how this would appear in my statement.

5. Reference to the other matters outlined in E in section 1.3.3 is unnecessarily duplicative for the assessment of activities within an HHA requiring a resource consent, especially when the matters outlined in the recommended E9 to E13 are taken into consideration.