

OFFICER'S REPORT FOR:

**Independent Hearing Commissioners:
Trevor Robinson (Chair)
Miria Pomare
Mark St Clair
Julia Williams**

SUBJECT:

**Proposed Porirua District Plan: Historic
Heritage**

PREPARED BY:

Caroline Rachlin

REPORT DATED:

5 November 2021

DATE OF HEARING:

3 – 10 December 2021

Executive Summary

1. This report considers submissions received by Porirua City Council (the Council) in relation to the relevant objectives, policies, rules, definitions, schedules and maps of the Proposed Porirua District Plan (PDP) as they apply to the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter. The report outlines recommendations in response to the issues that have emerged from these submissions.
2. There were a number of submissions and further submissions received on HH- Historic Heritage Chapter and the associated schedules for Historic Heritage Items (Group A), Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and Historic Heritage Sites. The following are considered to be the key issues in contention in the chapter:
 - The overall approach to scheduling historic heritage;
 - Whether the set of values in the definition of heritage values and in the identification and assessment policy is too narrow;
 - The approach to repositioning and relocation of historic heritage items;
 - Amendments to provisions for certain activities including animal grazing on historic heritage sites and provisions for earthworks;
 - The approach to the protection of non-scheduled buildings within heritage settings;
 - Including new heritage places (items and areas), heritage settings and the approach to interiors of heritage items; and
 - The need for a definition of 'demolition'.
3. This report addresses each of these key issues, as well as any other issues raised by submissions.
4. I have recommended some changes to the PDP provisions to address matters raised in submissions and these are summarised below:
 - Adding to the introduction that historic heritage includes sites of significance to tangata whenua, including wāhi tapu and wāhi tupuna, and including a reference to the SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter;
 - Relocating content on the Archaeological Authority Process from the chapter introduction to a new Appendix;
 - Amending HH-P11 to ensure the loss of physical fabric is minimised, and to consider the potential for cumulative effects';
 - Amending HH-P12 to ensure that it for the repositioning a heritage item within a heritage setting, that consideration is given to both the location as close to practicable to a heritage item as well as the effects on heritage values;
 - Amending HH-P14 to include gaining access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency;
 - Adding a new permitted rule for a range of activities undertaken to non-scheduled buildings and structures in heritage settings;
 - With respect to definitions:

- Adding to the definition of 'Adaptive re-use' to state that adaptive reuse processes include alteration and addition;
 - Amending the definition of 'Heritage values' so that it is clear that any one of the listed values applies;
 - Amending the definition of 'Historic heritage site' to reference 'area or place' instead of site or place';
 - Adding a definition of 'Demolition', which includes demolition in part;
 - With respect to the heritage schedules:
 - Including two new heritage items;
 - Re-categorising one heritage item (from Group B to Group A); and
 - Amendments to details in the descriptions of and Statements of Significance for some heritage items and historic heritage sites.
5. Having considered all the submissions and reviewed all relevant statutory and non-statutory documents, I recommend that PDP should be amended as set out in section 0 of this report.
6. For the reasons set out in the Section 32AA evaluation and included throughout this report, I consider that the proposed objectives and provisions, with the recommended amendments, will be the most appropriate means to:
- achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) where it is necessary to revert to Part 2 and otherwise give effect to higher order planning documents, in respect to the proposed objectives, and
 - achieve the relevant objectives of the PDP, in respect to the proposed provisions.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Contents.....	iii
Interpretation	vi
Table 1: Abbreviations	vii
Table 2: Abbreviations of Submitters' Names	viii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Author	1
1.3 Supporting Evidence	2
1.4 Key Issues in Contention.....	2
1.5 Procedural Matters	3
2 Statutory Considerations.....	4
2.1 Resource Management Act 1991.....	4
2.2 Section 32AA.....	4
2.3 Trade Competition	5
3 Consideration of Submissions and Further Submissions.....	6
3.1 Overview	6
3.2 General Submissions.....	7
3.3 Introduction to Chapter - Archaeological Authority Process.....	8
3.4 Overall approach to scheduling historic heritage places.....	10
3.5 Titles for Categories of Historic Heritage Places.....	12
3.6 Animal grazing on historic heritage sites	15
3.7 Repositioning and relocation of historic heritage items.....	16
3.8 Demolition of historic heritage items	20
3.9 Including further heritage settings	25
3.10 Interiors of historic heritage items	27
3.11 Definitions.....	30
3.12 Policies	35
3.13 Rules.....	38
3.14 Historic Heritage Schedules	41
Table 3: Recommendations on Submissions: Schedules: SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A),	43
3.15 Minor Errors.....	49
4 Conclusions.....	50

Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Definitions, HH – Historic Heritage Chapter, and
Historic Heritage Schedules - SCHED 2 – 4 51

Appendix B Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions 103

Table B 1: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions 104

Appendix C Report Author’s Qualifications and Experience 126

Appendices

- Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Definitions, HH – Historic Heritage Chapter, and Historic Heritage Schedules - SCHED 2 – 4
- Appendix B Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions
- Appendix C Report Author’s Qualifications and Experience

List of Tables

Table 1: Abbreviations vii

Table 2: Abbreviations of Submitters’ Names viii

Table 3: Recommended on Submissions: SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A),
SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

List of Tables in Appendices

Table B 1: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions

Interpretation

7. Parts A and B of the Officer's reports utilise a number of abbreviations for brevity as set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Means
the Act / the RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
the Council	Porirua City Council
the Operative Plan/ODP	Operative Porirua District Plan 1999
the Proposed Plan/PDP	Proposed Porirua District Plan 2020
GWRC	Greater Wellington Regional Council
NES	National Environmental Standard
NES-AQ	National Environmental Standards for Air Quality 2004
NES-CS	National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
NES-ETA	National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009
NES-FW	National Environmental Standards for Freshwater 2020
NES-MA	National Environmental Standards for Marine Aquaculture 2020
NES-PF	National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry 2017
NES-SDW	National Environmental Standards for Sources of Drinking Water 2007
NES-TF	National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities 2016
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS-ET	National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008
NPS-FM	National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020
NPS-REG	National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
NZCPS	New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
PNRP	Proposed Wellington Natural Resources Plan (Decisions Version) 2019
RPS	Wellington Regional Policy Statement 2013

Table 2: Abbreviations of Submitters' Names

Abbreviation	Means
Dept of Corrections	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections
DOC	Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai
FENZ	Fire and Emergency New Zealand
Forest and Bird	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society
GWRC	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Harvey Norman	Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited
Heritage NZ	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
House Movers Association	House Movers section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc
Kāinga Ora	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities
KiwiRail	KiwiRail Holdings Limited
NZDF	New Zealand Defence Force
Oil companies	Z Energy, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Limited
PCC	Porirua City Council
QEII	Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust
RNZ	Radio New Zealand
Survey+Spatial	Survey+Spatial New Zealand (Wellington Branch)
Telco	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Chorus New Zealand Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited
Transpower	Transpower New Zealand Ltd
TROTR	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira
Waka Kotahi	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
WE	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited
Woolworths	Woolworths New Zealand Limited

In addition, references to submissions includes further submissions, unless otherwise stated.

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

8. The purpose of this report is to provide the Hearing Panel with a summary and analysis of the submissions received on the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter and to recommend possible amendments to the PDP in response to those submissions.
9. This report is prepared under section 42A of the RMA. It considers submissions received by the Council in relation to the relevant objectives, policies, rules, definitions, schedules and maps as they apply to the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter in the PDP. The report outlines recommendations in response to the key issues that have emerged from these submissions.
10. This report discusses general issues, the original and further submissions received following notification of the PDP, makes recommendations as to whether or not those submissions should be accepted or rejected, and concludes with a recommendation for changes to the PDP provisions or maps based on the preceding discussion in the report.
11. The recommendations are informed by both the technical evidence provided by Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman, which is available on the hearings portal¹, and the evaluation undertaken by the author. In preparing this report the author has had regard to recommendations made in other related s42A reports.
12. This report is provided to assist the Hearings Panel in their role as Independent Commissioners. The Hearings Panel may choose to accept or reject the conclusions and recommendations of this report and may come to different conclusions and make different recommendations, based on the information and evidence provided to them by submitters.
13. This report is intended to be read in conjunction with Officers' Report: Part A – Overarching which contains factual background information, statutory context and administrative matters pertaining to the district plan review and PDP.

1.2 Author

14. My name is Caroline Elizabeth Rachlin. My qualifications and experience are set out in Appendix C of this report.
15. My role in preparing this report is that of an expert planner.
16. I was involved in the preparation of the PDP and contributed to authoring the Section 32 Evaluation Reports for Historic Heritage, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, Notable Trees, Natural Character and Public Access.
17. In my previous role as a Planner at Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZ) I led the feedback provided to the Porirua City Council on the draft Plan.
18. Although this is a Council Hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Practice Note issued by the Environment Court December 2014. I have

¹ pdpportal.porirua.govt.nz

complied with that Code when preparing my written statement of evidence and I agree to comply with it when I give any oral evidence.

19. The scope of my evidence relates to the HH - Historic Heritage Chapter. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise as an expert policy planner.
20. Any data, information, facts, and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in the part of the evidence in which I express my opinions. Where I have set out opinions in my evidence, I have given reasons for those opinions.
21. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

1.3 Supporting Evidence

22. The expert evidence, literature, legal cases or other material which I have used or relied upon in support of the opinions expressed in this report includes the following:
 - Evidence of Greg Vossler - Planner/Heritage Advisor, Boffa Miskell Ltd, and Ian Bowman – Architect and Conservator.

1.4 Key Issues in Contention

23. A number of submissions and further submissions were received on the provisions relating to the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter. The submissions received were diverse and sought a range of outcomes including for example amendments to the provisions for repositioning and relocation, and the addition of new sites and areas to the historic heritage schedules.
24. I consider the following to be the key issues in contention in the chapter:
 - The overall approach to scheduling historic heritage;
 - Whether the set of values in definition of heritage values and the identification and assessment policy is too narrow;
 - The approach to repositioning and relocation of historic heritage items;
 - Amendments to provisions for certain activities including animal grazing on historic heritage sites and provisions for earthworks;
 - The approach to the protection of non-scheduled buildings within heritage settings;
 - Including new heritage places (items and areas), heritage settings and the approach to interiors of heritage items; and
 - The need for a definition of 'demolition'.
25. I address each of these key issues in this report, as well as any other issues raised by submissions.

1.5 Procedural Matters

26. At the time of writing this report there has not been any pre-hearing conferences, clause 8AA meetings or expert witness conferencing in relation to submissions on this chapter.

2 Statutory Considerations

2.1 Resource Management Act 1991

27. The PDP has been prepared in accordance with the RMA and in particular, the requirements of:
- section 74 Matters to be considered by territorial authorities, and
 - section 75 Contents of district plans.
28. As set out in Section 32 Evaluation Report Part 1 - Overview to s32 Evaluation, there are a number of higher order planning documents and strategic plans that provide direction and guidance for the preparation and content of the PDP. These documents are discussed in detail within the Section 32 Evaluation Report Part 2: Historic Heritage and Sites of Significance to Māori. There is further discussion in the Section 32 Evaluation Report Part 1 – Overview to the s32 Evaluation on the approach the Council has taken to giving effect to the NPS-UD and NPS-FM. This is also discussed in the Officer's Report: Part A.

2.2 Section 32AA

29. I have undertaken an evaluation of the recommended amendments to provisions since the initial section 32 evaluation was undertaken in accordance with heritag. Section 32AA states:

32AA Requirements for undertaking and publishing further evaluations

(1) A further evaluation required under this Act—

(a) is required only for any changes that have been made to, or are proposed for, the proposal since the evaluation report for the proposal was completed (the changes); and

(b) must be undertaken in accordance with section 32(1) to (4); and

(c) must, despite paragraph (b) and section 32(1)(c), be undertaken at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the changes; and

(d) must—

(i) be published in an evaluation report that is made available for public inspection at the same time as the approved proposal (in the case of a national policy statement or a New Zealand coastal policy statement or a national planning standard), or the decision on the proposal, is notified; or

(ii) be referred to in the decision-making record in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the further evaluation was undertaken in accordance with this section.

(2) To avoid doubt, an evaluation report does not have to be prepared if a further evaluation is undertaken in accordance with subsection (1)(d)(ii).

30. The required section 32AA evaluation for changes proposed as a result of consideration of submissions with respect to the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter is contained within the assessment of the relief sought in submissions in section 3 of this report.

2.3 Trade Competition

31. Trade competition is not considered relevant to the HH – Historic Heritage provisions of the PDP.
32. There are no known trade competition issues raised within the submissions.

3 Consideration of Submissions and Further Submissions

3.1 Overview

33. A total of 83 original submissions and 23 further submissions are addressed within the report.

3.1.1 Report Structure

34. Submissions on the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter raised a number of issues which have been grouped into sub-topics within this report. Some of the submissions are addressed under a number of topic headings based on the topics contained in the submission. I have considered substantive commentary on primary submissions contained in further submissions as part of my consideration of the primary submission(s) to which they relate.
35. In accordance with Clause 10(3) of the First Schedule of the RMA, I have undertaken the following evaluation on both an issues and provisions-based approach, as opposed to a submission by submission approach. I have organised the evaluation in accordance with the layout of chapters of the PDP as notified.
36. Due to the number of submission points, this evaluation is generic only and may not contain specific recommendations on each submission point, but instead discusses the issues generally. This approach is consistent with Clause 10(2)(a) of Schedule 1 to the RMA. Specific recommendations on each submission / further submission point are contained in 0.
37. The following evaluation should be read in conjunction with the summaries of submissions and the submissions themselves. Where I agree with the relief sought and the rationale for that relief, I have noted my agreement, and my recommendation is provided in the summary of submission table in 0. Where I have undertaken further evaluation of the relief sought in a submission(s), the evaluation and recommendations are set out in the body of this report. I have provided a marked-up version of the Chapter with recommended amendments in response to submissions as Appendix A.
38. This report only addresses definitions that are specific to this topic. Definitions that relate to more than one topic have been addressed in Hearing Stream 1.

3.1.2 Format for Consideration of Submissions

39. For each identified topic, I have considered the submissions that are seeking changes to the PDP in the following format:
- Matters raised by submitters;
 - Assessment;
 - Summary of recommendations; and
 - Section 32AA evaluation.
40. The recommended amendments to the relevant chapter/s are set out in in 0 of this report where all text changes are shown in a consolidated manner.

41. I have undertaken a s32AA evaluation in respect to the recommended amendments in my assessment.

3.2 General Submissions

3.2.1 Matters raised by submitters

42. Transpower [60.68] seek to retain the chapter but if it applies to the National Grid that the provisions are amended to reflect the relief sought in their submission. Transpower are neutral on the provisions in the chapter on the basis that they do not apply to infrastructure, specifically the National Grid.
43. Waka Kotahi [82.296] seek to replace the word 'minimise' throughout the Plan with the word 'mitigate' for the reasons of ensuring that Waka Kotahi can carry out its statutory obligations, reducing interpretation and processing complications for decision makers, and providing clarity for plan users.
44. Kainga Ora [81.433] request amendments to provisions with direct 'avoid' statements. This issue has been addressed at a high level in the Officers' Report: Part A – Overview, and it is for the topic based chapters in Part B reports to address whether the use of this term is appropriate in relation to any particular provision.²

3.2.2 Assessment

45. The provisions in the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter do not apply to infrastructure. The Infrastructure chapter manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 - General Approach of the PDP. In addition, the introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states "... *This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions...*". Accordingly, I agree with Transpower to retain this approach and I consider there is no need to address their alternative relief.
46. With regard to Waka's Kotahi's submission, HH-P12 contains the word 'minimise' as follows:

HH-P12 Repositioning and relocation of heritage items

Only allow repositioning or relocation of heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where the identified heritage values are protected and maintained taking into account:

(...)

2. Any measures to minimise the risk of damage to the heritage item;

(...)

² Section 9.1, pages 30 – 31.

47. In my view the purpose of the use of minimise within this part of the policy is to provide direction on how effects on the identified heritage values are protected or maintained. One means of achieving this is to minimise (or reduce) risk to the heritage item to the smallest or least amount possible. This is within the context of the overall policy direction and the other factors by which developments are to be assessed. As such, I disagree with the request from Waka Kotahi.
48. HH-P13 and HH-P14 have an avoid policy direction in relation to the demolition and destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites. In my opinion, this continues to be the appropriate approach. The use of 'avoid' has been carefully considered in the context of higher order policy direction. I note the submitter has not provided any specific assessment of the issues as regards to the subject chapter and the Panel may request the submitter to do so at the hearing.

3.2.3 Summary of recommendations

49. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Transpower [60.68], be **accepted in part**.
50. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission Waka Kotahi [82.296] and Kāinga Ora [81.433] **be rejected**.

3.3 Introduction to Chapter - Archaeological Authority Process

3.3.1 Matters raised by submitters

51. TROTR [264.107] request amending this section to include that Te Rūnanga be informed if any unknown archaeological site is discovered and prior to being removed. The reason provided is:

Historic Heritage including sites of significance to Māori are an integral part to ensuring that our sense of place and identity is appropriately protected from further degradation.

Te Runanga seeks to ensure that when discussing Historic Heritage this clearly and appropriately reflects Māori Historic Heritage. The chapter does not appropriately reflect this relationship.

52. Heritage NZ [FS14.20] support TROTR's request, while noting the submitter's own relief sought to move the content into an Appendix.
53. Kāinga Ora [81.424] requests the content on Archaeological Authority Process is removed. The submitter generally supports the introductory text but seeks that explanations about other non-RMA processes are removed.
54. Heritage NZ [65.18] requests the paragraphs on Archaeological Authority Process are put into a new Appendix 16 and to provide cross references to it from relevant sections (HH, SASM and earthworks chapters).
55. TROTR [FS70.13] and Heritage NZ [FS14.22] oppose Kāinga Ora's request. TROTR is concerned that such processes can otherwise be ignored if not included in the PDP. Heritage NZ considers that these paragraphs best fit within an appendix to the PDP.

3.3.2 Assessment

56. I agree with moving the information to a new appendix (Appendix 16) as requested by Heritage NZ. This provides for it to be cross-referenced by other chapters and avoids unnecessary duplication. I recommended however retaining some wording in this Chapter to provide an alert to this Appendix, and to also make a change to the General Approach section within Part 1 of the PDP to recognise this Appendix.
57. I disagree with the submission of TROTR to include the additional wording. This relates to an issue or process regarding who must be informed, and is a matter relating to Archaeological Authority Process requirements managed by Heritage NZ under the Heritage New Zealand Act 2014. I do not consider it is appropriate to include this wording in the Appendix.
58. I disagree with the request by Kāinga Ora to remove this section from the Plan. In my opinion it is important to consider the need for any content on non-RMA process content on a case by case basis. On this matter, I think it is especially important to alert readers to the requirements under the HNZPT Act, which may necessitate an archaeological authority (a requirement over and above those of the district plan); that there are 'stop work' requirements; and information on who to contact in certain circumstances.

3.3.3 Summary of recommendations

59. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the Hearings Panel:
- a. **Amend** the Introduction - Archaeological Authority Process as set out below;
 - b. Include a new Appendix 16 as shown in Appendix A; and
 - c. Make a consequential amendment to the General Approach section of Part 1 of the PDP.

Archaeological Authority Process
<p>Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 it is unlawful to destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site (regardless of whether the site is identified in the District Plan or not) without obtaining an archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) before you start work. An archaeological authority is required in addition to any resource consents required by the Council.</p> <p><u>Appendix 16 contains detail on Archaeological Authority Process.</u></p>
<p>An archaeological site is defined in this act as any place in New Zealand (including buildings, structures or shipwrecks) that was associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there is evidence relating to the history of New Zealand that can be investigated using archaeological methods.</p>
<p>If you discover a previously unknown archaeological site (for example, when you are conducting Earthworks) you must stop any work that could affect it and contact HNZPT for advice on how to proceed.</p>
<p>The Police will also need to be notified if human remains are revealed. If any artefacts are found, they must be handed over to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.</p>

Part 4	Appendices and Schedules
-------------------	---------------------------------

The appendices and schedules contain technical information and data, such as schedules of specific areas (Overlays managed under the District-Wide Matters chapters) and design guides. For example, SCHED9 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes lists those areas of the City that have been identified as being outstanding natural features and landscapes and includes a description of each area's characteristics and values. The objectives, policies, rules and standards that apply to the areas contained in SCHED9 are contained in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter in Part 2.

[Appendix 16 contains detail on Archaeological Authority Process.](#)

60. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.18] be **accepted in part**.
61. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from TROTR [264.107] and Kāinga Ora [81.424] be **rejected**.
62. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.4 Overall approach to scheduling historic heritage places

3.4.1 Matters raised by submitters

63. Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.8] seek to 'add and amend' the PDP as it relates to Historical Sites. While the submitter's relief is attributed to 'General' in relation to the Historic Heritage Chapter, I am satisfied that this relief relates to Historic Heritage including the historic heritage schedules (SCHED2 – SCHED4).
64. The reason given by the submitter is that "no community meetings were undertaken with regards to historical heritage, and the process of information regarding historic sites is deficient". The submitter provides the following detailed points:
 - *2014 a minor update was published by PCC based on work undertaken in preceding years;*
 - *No community meetings were undertaken with regard to historical heritage;*
 - *Consultants were employed to look at a limited selection of heritage sites;*
 - *PCC's own historical experts do not appear to have been consulted on additional sites of interest;*
 - *The submission to the September 2019 Draft PCC District Plan identified sites of interest which were categorised in the Section 32 Heritage Report as "insufficient information" and "no changes made";*
 - *There are many more sites that should be included about Porirua's diverse heritage which requires further community involvement. An example of a missed heritage site*

identified - Historic Public Burial Ground at Pauatahanui. The supporting information given was a booklet written by Porirua City's own Pataka Museum, yet this was still labelled "insufficient information".

3.4.2 Assessment

65. The submitter's request is of a broad nature concerning to add and amend the historic heritage schedule. This is on the basis of concerns about how nature and process of the work undertaken to date. To assist my assessment of this submission I have considered in particular the approach outlined in the Section 32 Evaluation Report Part 2 - Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (HH and SASM - s32 report). I have also considered the evidence of Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman regarding the heritage assessment work which was undertaken, under the heading 'Approach to Scheduling Heritage Items', paragraphs 27-30.
66. Section 5.2 of the HH and SASM – s32 report³, outlines how the Council commissioned a Heritage Schedule Review report, titled 'Proposed Porirua District Plan, Heritage Schedule Review, prepared for Porirua City Council 13 August 2019'⁴. This report was made available when the PDP was notified and is available on the Council's website.
67. This 2019 Review report built on Plan Change 15 – Historic Heritage (PC15) which was made operative in March 2014⁵. PC15 was prepared in response to the elevation of the protection of historic heritage in the RMA in 2003. It included reviewing the list of heritage features and how they are protected. The HH and SASM – s32 report, at page 18, sets out how the 2019 review focused on the existing heritage schedules, for example ensuring they are up-to-date, align with national/regional policy and the national planning standards; and that three nominated places were assessed for inclusion in the PDP. The sites assessed were included in the PDP.
68. Section 5.2.4 of the HH and SASM - s32 report sets out consultation that was undertaken on the PDP including consultation in September 2019 on the full draft District Plan. Appendix 1 of the s32 report, at page 58 outlines how no new sites were added in response to feedback requesting further sites be added to the Plan as for many of these places there was insufficient information, with such information being "locational information or supporting documentation, or alternatively that further detailed assessment would be required to determine significance for scheduling."
69. Although no new sites were included in the latest consultation the preparatory work in developing the PDP, including assessment work undertaken and consultation, demonstrates that there has been a thorough process of identification and scheduling new sites and confirming existing scheduling based on thorough assessment and consultation.
70. Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman were engaged to both assess new sites and re-assess existing sites to inform the PDP review. In Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's opinion, new sites and re-assessing existing sites to inform the PDP review. In Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's opinion this was:

"...reflective of contemporary best practice and underpinned by a level of rigour sufficient to justify inclusion of the heritage items contained in SCHED2, (Group A)

³ Section 5.2 Evidence Base – Research, Consultation, Information and Analysis.

⁴ Prepared by Greg Vossler, Boffa Miskell Limited for the Council. This report was peer reviewed by Ian Bowman.

⁵ The plan change was notified in June 2012.

*and SCHED 3 (Group B), along with a number of sites in SCHED4 of Chapter HH-
Historic Heritage of the PDP.”⁶*

71. Their evidence⁷ also sets out what was comprised in the four stages of the approach to their work and the scope of that work.
72. I acknowledge the concerns of the submitter that more places have not been included. In my opinion the heritage schedule is not static, and over-time more places can be added provided that they meet the test for being scheduled as historic heritage. This is important as new places in the heritage schedules are then subject to the provisions for historic heritage, where for example resource consent is required for alteration to a heritage item or new buildings in a heritage setting (under PDP provisions).
73. In terms of the criteria or process for assessing significance, there is well established criteria for this ‘test’ in Policy 21 of the RPS. The PDP must give effect to this criteria and the policy direction in HH-P1 of the PDP integrates these criteria.
74. Overall, I agree with the general principle or intent of the submission to add more places to the schedule, however I consider that the submitter has not provided sufficient analysis and supporting information which would support adding new places based on this general relief.
75. Further, in my view the process undertaken as outlined in the s32 report demonstrates a significant degree of assessment and consultation to help inform the provisions and the historic heritage schedules. I would note that HH-P1 provides the policy framework for considering new places to be identified, assessed and scheduled in the future. Further, I note that the submitter’s relief [79.10] specific to adding the NZ Wars Memorial at Battle Hill and on HHS005 Belmont Coach Road [79.9] is addressed in Section 3.15 of this report.

3.4.3 Assessment

76. For the reasons given in the assessment above I recommend that the submission of Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.8] be **rejected**.

3.5 Titles for Categories of Historic Heritage Places

3.5.1 Matters raised by submitters

77. A number of submission points address the title of the heritage category ‘Historic Heritage Site’ Submissions received seek changes to three different parts of the PDP as follows:
 - HH-P2, specifically HH-P2-3
 - Definition of Historic heritage site
 - SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites.

⁶ Paragraph 29

⁷ Paragraphs 29-30

78. Heritage NZ [65.20, 65.70, 65.3] seek that in respect of HH-P2, the reference to Historic Heritage Sites (at HH-P2-3) is amended to Historic Heritage Areas. Similar relief is sought in relation to the historic heritage sites schedule - SCHED4 to amend to Historic Heritage Areas. The submitter refers to examples of other councils with historic heritage areas (Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch).
79. Heritage NZ [65.3] seek a similar type of relief on the definition of Historic heritage site, and include an alternative relief:

Amend:

Historic heritage ~~site~~area

means ~~an site~~area or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage ~~Sites~~Areas.

Alternatively:

Historic heritage site

means ~~an area~~site or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.

80. In its reason for this relief Heritage NZ considers that the word 'area' better reflects the types of places in Schedule 4 and for reasons of consistency with HH-P2 "... which states that HH sites are places and areas that are of national, regional or local significance".
81. Kāinga Ora [FS65.37] opposes the request by Heritage NZ to amend the definition to the extent that it is inconsistent with its primary submission⁸.
82. Kāinga Ora [81.891, 81.892] request that the title and introductory information to SCHED2 and SCHED3 is amended as follows:

SCHED2 – Outstanding Historic Heritage Items (Group A)

SCHED2 contains ~~Group A~~ Heritage Items and associated heritage settings that have outstanding national or regional significance.

SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B)

SCHED3 contains ~~Group B~~ Heritage Items and associated heritage settings that have national, regional or local significance.

83. In respect of SCHED2 Kāinga Ora supports the use of a schedule for historic heritage items of outstanding national or regional significance but considers the additional wording of outstanding or regional significance (as shown above) should be included. The submitter considers, "... the reference to "Group A" is arbitrary and should be deleted." The same type of concern is also identified in relation to SCHED3.
84. Heritage NZ [FS14.26] supports this request from Kāinga Ora in part; to retain Group A, and include the words 'that have outstanding national or regional significance'. The submitter in its

⁸ The decision requested in the primary submission of Kāinga Ora [81.80] is to retain the definition as notified.

reason sets out support to the two heritage schedules and that Group A and Group B is "...a convenient shorthand, although it may also be beneficial to include the words 'that have outstanding national or regional significance' in the introduction to SCHED2".

3.5.2 Assessment

85. In my view, it is unnecessary to amend the title of the definition or the title in HH-P2 and the title of SCHED4 as requested by Heritage NZ. However, I agree with the alternative relief requested by Heritage NZ to amend the definition of historic heritage site. The amendment would provide for consistency with HH-P2-3 which includes reference to 'Places and areas' in relation to Historic Heritage Sites. The use of the words 'area or place' instead of 'site or place' provides greater clarity of the variation in scale of these places. The ODP definition of Historic Heritage Sites is "Places and areas that are of national, regional and/or local significance". As such the continued use of both 'place' and 'area' retains terms that are familiar to Plan users.
86. In regards to Kāinga Ora's request to amend the title of SCHED2 to Outstanding Historic Heritage Items and SCHED2 to Historic Heritage Items, and to remove the references to Group A and Group B, in my opinion the use of Group A and Group B help to articulate the relative significance between the two heritage categories. Further, HH-P2 sets that items in these categories have either significance (in the case of Group B) or outstanding significance (in the case of Group A) and how this is at a level of local, national, or regional significance. As such I disagree with the requested changes.

3.5.3 Summary of recommendations

87. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment, that the Hearings Panel:
- a. Amend the definition of Historic heritage site as shown below and as set out in 0;

Historic heritage site	means a site area or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.
-------------------------------	---

88. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.3] be **accepted in part**.
89. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.20, 65.70] and Kāinga Ora [81.891, 81.892] be **rejected**.
90. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.5.4 Section 32AA evaluation

91. In my opinion, the amended definition of 'Historic heritage site' to refer to places and 'areas' is more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular I consider that the recommended amendment:
- Provides increased clarity of what is comprised in a historic heritage site in SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites, in terms of scale, and will more appropriately align with HH-P2 which specifically refers to 'Places and areas'. Further, the use of 'area' instead of 'site'

is within the Historic heritage site definition in the ODP so is a term familiar to users of the Plan.

- The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

3.6 Animal grazing on historic heritage sites

3.6.1 Matters raised by submitters

92. Heritage NZ [65.22, 65.32, 65.45] request changes to the policies and rules for animal grazing on historic heritage sites. The addition sought to HH-P7 is:

“Recognising that grazing large animals such as cattle has the potential for damaging some historic heritage sites.”

93. The submitter refers to how the policy allows for grazing where heritage values are maintained and outlines that cattle can have a substantially different impact on archaeological and other sites compared to smaller animals. The submitter considers that the development of a Conservation Management Plan (or equivalent) for each site would assist in providing guidance for which activities (including grazing) are appropriate in each site.
94. Heritage NZ seeks that HH-R3 is amended so that the activity is permitted where compliance is achieved with a new standard (HH-S2) as follows:

HH-S2

1. *The grazing animals are sheep, goats, llamas, alpacas, or poultry.*
2. *Grazing of any other animals is consistent with management guidance contained within a management plan for the historic heritage area*

95. The submitter considers how HH-P7 refers to allowing grazing where heritage values are maintained, and that grazing of small animals (listed in the Auckland Unitary Plan as sheep, goats, alpacas and llamas) should be a permitted activity but grazing of large, heavy animals which can potentially damage a heritage sites needs to be managed and controlled. Further, that this control could be best achieved by adding a permitted activity standard.

3.6.2 Assessment

96. Section 5 of the HH and SASM - s32 report identifies how small-scale activities take place in heritage places that help maintain heritage values and this includes animal grazing as a form of vegetation management.
97. The direction in HH-P7 of the PDP is: *“Allow animal grazing as a means of vegetation maintenance on historic heritage sites listed in SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites, where identified heritage values are maintained.”*
98. In the Auckland Unitary Plan there are activities subject to additional archaeological rules. This includes farming (except grazing of sheep, goats, llamas and alpacas) is a discretionary activity status, and grazing of sheep, goats, llamas and alpacas is permitted.

99. For comparison I have also considered other district plans to compare any similar controls. The Christchurch District Plan and Kapiti Coast District Plan do not contain any such provisions in regards to historic heritage.
100. Heritage NZ has not set out any issues to date in the Porirua City context for all or any of the sites in SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites. As such it is not clear the extent to which this is a resource management issue that needs to be managed. I note that there are seven historic heritage sites listed in this schedule, which range in nature and size. No analysis has been provided regarding the issue relative to any site or part thereof.
101. I note the new policy direction and associated provisions have a reliance on a document sitting outside of the district plan. The requested new HS-S2-2 is that grazing of any other animals is consistent with management guidance contained within a management plan for the historic heritage area.
102. I recognise the concerns raised and the overall intent or concern is to protect these sites from damage from grazing of heavy animals. Moreover, as highlighted in the submission on HH-P7 the potential role of heritage conservation management plans in this respect. However, the submitter provides no district or historic heritage site specific analysis of the extent to which this is an issue for Porirua or consideration of other options, including non-regulatory methods.
103. The submitter seeks a significant change in approach for which no specific S32AA analysis has been provided. As such I disagree with the relief sought.

3.6.3 Summary of recommendations

104. For the reasons given in the assessment above that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.22, 65.32, 65.45] be **rejected**.

3.7 Repositioning and relocation of historic heritage items

3.7.1 Matters raised by submitters

105. Heritage NZ [65.2] request amendments to the HH-P12 as follows:

HH-P12 Repositioning and relocation of heritage items

Only allow repositioning or relocation of heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where:

(a). The relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter, and

(b) All other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted.

Where the matters (a) and (b) above are satisfied the following matters should be taken into account:

- 1. Whether the identified heritage values are protected and maintained ~~taking into account~~;*

2. *Whether there are opportunities to enhance the physical condition of the heritage item and its heritage values and the public's appreciation of those values, including being more publicly accessible and/or within public view;*
 3. *Any measures to minimise the risk of damage to the heritage item;*
 4. *For repositioning within a heritage setting, whether the new location of the heritage item is as close to the original location as practicable, and whether ~~or, where this is not possible~~ if the new location maintains the heritage values and significance of the heritage item;*
 5. *For relocation beyond a heritage setting:*
 - a. *Whether the new location is related to the heritage values of the heritage item and/or provides a heritage setting compatible with the heritage values of the heritage item; and*
 - b. *Any other alternatives to relocation that have been explored including repairs, earthquake strengthening, heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive re-use, and relocation is the only reasonable option; ~~and~~*
- ~~1. *Whether the relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter.*~~

106. Heritage NZ's reason is that relocation should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances if its current site is in imminent danger, and if all other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. The submitter identifies how this aspect is reflected in the fifth point of this policy but that it needs to be given more weight than the other factors mentioned in the policy. The submitter requests the changes to reflect this position and prioritise the most important matters to consider.
107. In addition, Heritage NZ considers that point 3 of the policy should not be a choice between repositioning as close as possible to the original location and maintaining the heritage values as both aspects (repositioning as close as possible, and maintaining the heritage values and significance) should be considered.
108. Heritage NZ [65.40] also seek that HH-R11 be amended so that the relocation of Historic Heritage items (Group A) beyond the setting of the heritage items is a non-complying activity. The submitter's reason is that a differentiated approach is justified, in a similar way as the demolition rules for Group A and B, and that relocation for Group A should be a non-complying activity.

3.7.2 Assessment

109. The HH and SASM – s32 report at Section 5 Resource Management Issues Analysis⁹ addresses issues of relocation beyond a setting and heritage and natural hazard risk. With respect to relocation beyond an original heritage setting, the s32 report states that this should be a last

⁹ HH and SASM – s32 Report, pages 16-17

resort where there is no feasible alternative but it also states that in some instances repositioning or relocation does provide for the opportunity to relocate to an original context, or to an otherwise appropriate context.

110. In relation to heritage and natural hazard risk the s32 recognises recent RMA changes which elevated the management of significant risks from natural hazards to a s6 matter, and further that there will be "... an increasing tension between heritage and natural hazard risk, particularly for heritage buildings."
111. Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence, at paragraphs 31-32, is that: "there are a range of factors that could necessitate consideration of relocation of a heritage item beyond its original setting or repositioning as close as possible to its original location", with four factors listed. I agree with and adopt their evidence.
112. I agree with that part of the relief requested by Heritage NZ to HH-P12-4 to replace 'where this is not possible' with 'and whether'. This would ensure that for repositioning within a heritage setting matters of proximity to the original location and whether the new location maintains the heritage values and significance of the heritage item are considered. It still enables consideration of how close any repositioning proposed is to an original location but also ensures consideration of the effect on heritage values regardless of the proposed point of repositioning.
113. I disagree with the change sought by Heritage NZ which would mean that the five factors are only considered if parts (a) and (b) are satisfied. This would mean that applicants must demonstrate that relocation is necessary because of a threat from natural hazards, and secondly all other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted.
114. The requested change provides no other 'pathway' to test relocation which may be necessary or proposed for other reasons. I am of the opinion, that this is an important factor in considering relocation, however it should not be elevated over the other matters to the extent that it is the only pathway.
115. With regards to the request to amend the activity status for Historic Heritage Items (Group A) to non-complying activity status where relocation is beyond a heritage setting, I disagree with their relief. In my opinion a discretionary activity status is the correct setting, particularly when considering the policy direction in HH-P12, which has a strong direction; any such proposals will be subject to a thorough and robust assessment.
116. The discretionary activity status provides for a case-by case test and it does not mean that relocation beyond a setting triggered under this rule is either anticipated or likely to be granted. At discretionary the test or 'threshold' is still high, and a broad assessment is provided for. In my opinion this is important given the range of reasons why relocation beyond a setting may need to be considered.
117. Heritage NZ has not provided any S32AA analysis or evidence to justify the proposed change in activity status. The submitter's reason focuses on a differentiated approach being justified (i.e. between Group A and Group B historic heritage items), similar to the approach for demolition rules for Group A and B.
118. In my opinion the overall policy direction (with the exception to make changes to HH-P12-4) and the same activity status for Group A and Group B as set out in the notified provisions is the most appropriate option.

3.7.3 Summary of recommendations

119. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment, that the Hearings Panel:

- a. Amend HH-P14 as shown below and as set out in 0;

HH-P12	Repositioning and relocation of heritage items
<p>Only allow repositioning or relocation of heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where the identified heritage values are protected and maintained taking into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether there are opportunities to enhance the physical condition of the heritage item and its heritage values and the public's appreciation of those values, including being more publicly accessible and/or within public view; 2. Any measures to minimise the risk of damage to the heritage item; 3. For repositioning within a heritage setting, whether the new location of the heritage item is as close to the original location as practicable, or, where this is not possible if and whether the new location maintains the heritage values and significance of the heritage item; 4. For relocation beyond a heritage setting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the new location is related to the heritage values of the heritage item and/or provides a heritage setting compatible with the heritage values of the heritage item; and b. Any other alternatives to relocation that have been explored including repairs, earthquake strengthening, heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive re-use, and relocation is the only reasonable option; and 5. Whether the relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter. 	

120. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.26] be **accepted in part**.

121. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ be [65.40] be **rejected**.

3.7.4 Section 32AA evaluation

122. In my opinion, amendment to HH-P12 is more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular I consider that the recommended amendments:

- Provides for a more thorough assessment of, and a pathway to 'test' the appropriateness of any proposals which include repositioning further away from the original location as well as to test that the proposed location maintains heritage values.
- Will better achieve the objectives for historic heritage, especially HH-02 – which has the outcome that the City's historic heritage is protected from, and not lost as a result of, inappropriate modification, subdivision, use and development; and HCH-O1, and appropriately recognises and provide for s6(f) of the RMA.

- The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

3.8 Demolition of historic heritage items

3.8.1 Matters raised by submitters

123. FENZ [119.39] request a change to Policy HH-P14 as follows:

HH-P14 Demolition, partial demolition and destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

Avoid the demolition, partial demolition or destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, unless:

1. The heritage item or historic heritage site is a serious risk to safety or property or is in a serious state of disrepair and interim protection measures would not remove that threat; and

2. The cost of remedying the risk or disrepair is prohibitive; and

3. To gain access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency; and

4. Other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored including:

a. Repairs;

b. Earthquake strengthening;

c. Heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive reuse;

d. Repositioning or relocation;

e. Whether demolition or destruction could occur in part without adverse effects on the identified heritage values for which the heritage item was scheduled; and

f. Whether the costs of the alternatives would be prohibitive.

124. The reason given from FENZ is that firefighters may be required to partially demolish buildings in order to gain access to properties in the event of an emergency.

125. Heritage NZ [FS14.23] supports this request except for adding the words 'partial demolition', if the Heritage NZ submission on the definition of 'demolition' is accepted. Heritage NZ considers that it is reasonable for the policy to provide for this sort of emergency situation.

126. Heritage NZ [65.4] request a definition of 'demolition' be added to the PDP, as follows:

Demolition: means the destruction or damage, in whole or in part, of any building or structure.

127. The submitter considers the definition would assist in interpretation of rules and policies and suggests the adoption of the Auckland Council Unitary Plan definition of demolition.

3.8.2 Assessment

128. In assessing the request to introduce a definition of 'demolition' I have considered the following:

- Any issues arising with the ODP and what is understood as demolition;
- Relevant provisions within the ODP and PDP;
- Approaches taken in the Auckland Unitary Plan and Christchurch District Plan; and
- Heritage NZ Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guide 3 No. 3 District Plans¹⁰.

129. The HH and SASM – s32 report, at Appendix 2 contains a review of recent resource consents for historic heritage under the ODP¹¹. There were no resource consents for demolition of historic heritage during the approximately ten-year period of the review, and therefore no interpretation issues have arisen.

130. I note that there is a definition for demolition in the ODP which includes the words 'total destruction'. Further, the ODP definition for 'alteration', includes 'partial destruction' connected with specific alterations. I have outlined these definitions below:

Demolition Means the total destruction of a historic heritage building identified in Appendices 10.1 and 10.2. This definition only applies to Part HH

Alteration (also refer to separate definition of internal alteration)

Means any change to the physical fabric of a historic heritage building or structure that varies its size, style or composition. This includes the partial destruction of a historic heritage building or structure required to realise any such change, and includes the removal and replacement of external walls, windows, roofs, verandahs, parapets and balustrades. Alteration does not include maintenance, redecoration, repair or restoration. This Definition only applies to Part HH

131. A recent resource consent was granted in 2021 to demolish the Former US Marines Hall building (a Group B historic heritage item, HHB - 017).
132. I have reviewed the resource decision and no interpretation issues arose regarding what is total or partial demolition.¹²
133. Turning to the PDP, there is no definition for either 'demolition' or 'partial demolition' but there is an 'alteration' definition as follows:

¹¹ Dated 3 August 2007

¹² The 2019 resource consent was an application to demolish the Former US Marines Hall at 20 Whitehouse Road, Titahi Bay (Reference: RC8033 - LU0160/19). It was granted in February 2021.

Any work to existing buildings or structures which involves the change, removal or replacement of walls, windows or features which results in an external appearance different to its existing appearance.

134. The HH and SASM – s32 report at page 70, responds to feedback from Heritage NZ on the draft Plan that it is: *“Unnecessary to include definitions of demolition or partial demolition as the Plan does not differentiate within the rules between partial and substantial or whole demolition, therefore no clear need to define”*.
135. While the rules for demolition in the PDP do not differentiate between partial or full demolition, I consider it is key to note that HH-P13 and HH-P14 contain policy direction which includes for demolition or destruction in part. As such, assessing partial demolition under these policies is clearly anticipated. In my opinion, it is key that the rules and definitions are clear on what forms demolition and is therefore assessed against these policies.
136. As such I agree with Heritage NZ that there is a need for a definition of demolition and in considering the specifics of any such definition, I have reviewed the provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan and Christchurch District Plan.
137. The Auckland Unitary Plan defines demolition as: *“The destruction or damage, in whole or in part, of any building or structure”*. The activity status for demolition (for A, A* and B schedules places) is different per heritage category and is relative to the percentage of demolition proposed (i.e. 70% or more (by volume or footprint), or 30% or more but less than 70%. Demolition under 30% is addressed under the activity of ‘Modification and Restoration’ activity. The Unitary Plan does not define ‘alteration’.
138. The Christchurch District Plan separately defines both ‘demolition’ and ‘partial demolition’ and the definition of ‘alteration’ addresses ‘partial demolition’.

Demolition

in relation to a heritage item, means permanent destruction, in whole or of a substantial part, which results in the complete or significant loss of the heritage fabric and form.”¹³

Partial demolition

in relation to a heritage item, means the permanent destruction of part of the heritage item which does not result in the complete or significant loss of the heritage fabric and form which makes the heritage item significant.

Alteration

In relation to Sub chapter 9.3 Historic Heritage of Chapter 9 Natural and Cultural Heritage, means any modification or addition to a heritage item, which impacts on heritage fabric.

Alteration of a heritage item includes:

¹³ Heritage item and heritage fabric are also defined terms.

1. permanent modification of, addition to, or permanent removal of, exterior or interior heritage fabric which is not decayed or damaged and includes partial demolition of a heritage item;

139. I have also considered guidance in the Heritage NZ guide 'Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guide No. 3 District Plans. The includes guidance that district plans include definitions for 'demolition' and 'partial demolition', with recommended wording as follows:

Demolition means to damage and demolish a building or structure

Partial demolition means to demolish a substantial part of any building or structure. Partial demolition includes façade retention which normally involves the demolition of the rear or a substantial part of a building or structure and the retention of the front or main façade and the construction of a new building or structure behind the preserved façade.

140. In my view the definition needs to include the use of 'permanent' to improve clarity and to recognise that demolition is irreversible. Further, including this word would have the benefit of further differentiating demolition activity from 'alterations'.
141. I do not consider it is necessary to further identify what comprises 'in part' such as through a volume or other method, primarily because the policy framework anticipates assessing demolition in part under HH-P13 and HH-P14. It does not narrow or further refine a degree or extent of demolition in part.
142. I agree with the request by FENZ to add to HH-P14 the words, 'To gain access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency', for the reason that that there are requirements under s330A of the RMA relating to resource consents for emergency works. The requested change makes it clear that such extraordinary circumstances may occur in relation to why demolition may occur, i.e. for emergency purposes. I recommend the additional wording forms a new HH-P14-1, so that this is clearly stated within the policy framework but is not subject to the other parts, or tests, of the policy which in my view would be unnecessary if the demolition or part demolition was to address such an emergency situation.
143. I do not consider it is necessary to add the words 'partial demolition' into HH-P14, given that the definition which I recommend be included covers demolition in whole or in part.

3.8.3 Summary of recommendations

144. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment, that the Hearings Panel:

b. Include a new definition of 'Demolition' as shown below and as set out in 0;

Demolition	<u>means the permanent destruction or damage in whole or in part of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.</u>
-------------------	--

c. Amend HH-P14 as shown below and as set out in Appendix A

HH-P14	Demolition and destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites
---------------	---

Avoid the demolition or destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, unless:

1. To gain access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency; or

~~1.2.~~ The heritage item or historic heritage site is a serious risk to safety or property or is in a serious state of disrepair and interim protection measures would not remove that threat; and

~~2.3.~~ The cost of remedying the risk or disrepair is prohibitive; and

~~3.4.~~ Other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored including:

- a. Repairs;
- b. Earthquake strengthening;
- c. Heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive reuse;
- d. Repositioning or relocation;
- e. Whether demolition or destruction could occur in part without adverse effects on the identified heritage values for which the heritage item was scheduled; and
- f. Whether the costs of the alternatives would be prohibitive.

145. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.4] be **accepted in part**.

146. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from FENZ [119.39] be **accepted in part**.

147. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.8.4 Section 32AA evaluation

148. In my opinion, the new definition of 'Demolition' and the amendments to HH-P14 are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular I consider that:

- The definition provides greater certainty of what is understood as demolition, which includes both demolition in part or whole and that it is permanent.
- The introduction of the recommended definition is a more appropriate option than the status quo or including a definition which only covers full or complete definition. It means the irreversible loss of historic heritage (whether in part or in whole) is appropriately assessed as demolition and not as another activity, such as an alteration. In particular, it gives effect to the direction in HH-P13 and HH-P14 to assess partial demolition. Consequently, including the definition is also more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the PDP.
- The amendment will better achieve the objectives for historic heritage, especially HH-02 – which has the outcome that the City's historic heritage is protected from, and not lost as a result of, inappropriate modification, subdivision, use and development; and HCH-O1, and appropriately recognise and provide for s6(f) of the RMA.

- The addition to HH-P14 recognises demolition for the purpose of emergency works may need to occur, and this provides certainty for any retrospective resource consent process that the demolition will not be the subject of the other parts of the policy, which include matters such as considering reasonable alternatives.
- The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

3.9 Including further heritage settings

3.9.1 Matters raised by submitters

149. Heritage NZ [65.65] request a setting is defined for all scheduled heritage items. Those historic heritage items which the submitter request a setting is defined for includes:

- HHB014 Pukerua Bay Gun posts
- HHB016 Motuhara tunnel
- HHB018 Titahi Bay boat sheds
- HHB019 Transmission station & shed
- HHB022 Mana machine gun posts
- HHB023 Plimmerton Railway station
- HHB026 Titahi Bay machine gun post

150. Heritage NZ's reasons is that eight places in SCHED3 have n/a* instead of a defined setting and that settings should be defined and included in the District Plan, otherwise there will be gaps in policies and rules. The submitter identifies policies and rules which rely on the term 'setting' as follows and how some of these provisions refer to overlay, which is defined as spatially identified sites, items, features, settings or areas. The submitter considers that any reference to overlay in the Plan also relies on the setting on a historic heritage item.

- *HH Rules 4, 7, 10, and 11*
- *Subdivision R10*
- *Signs R10*
- *INF-P17, R5, 6, 9, and 45*
- *REG-P5 and 7, R2, 3, 4, and 6*

3.9.2 Assessment

151. The PDP takes the approach that all historic heritage items and their heritage settings are identified in the heritage schedules and identified on the planning maps. This is outlined in the HH and SASM – s32 report at page 47.
152. The approach to heritage settings is further explained in the HH- SASM - s32 report in response to feedback on the draft Plan and Appendix 4 contains a summary of the approach to scheduling and mapping – historic heritage (SCHED 2 – 4). I note in particular a part of Appendix 4 relating

to heritage settings which confirms the approach taken and anticipated future further work on heritage settings because there is not a heritage setting in the PDP for all historic heritage items.

(...)

- *The heritage settings largely follow the heritage settings in the ODP which are either to the 'Site' or to different extent than the 'Site'. These settings only apply to Group A and Group B heritage items and do not apply to historic heritage sites.*
- *A small number of places on the schedules do not have a corresponding heritage setting. As for interiors, this could be addressed through future work.*

(...)

153. The future work recognition is specifically set out in SCHED2 where at the start of the schedule it is stated: "Not all heritage items have a heritage setting and some are marked as n/a* to indicate heritage settings may be considered for inclusion at a future date, through a future plan change."
154. In my opinion the assessment and scheduling of any heritage settings is most appropriately undertaken through a plan change process as previously anticipated. Through this process, the need for a heritage setting per historic heritage item, and specifics of that heritage settings could be carefully assessed. This process would provide for engagement with landowners and other stakeholders. Key to this assessment would be the extent to which the heritage setting should be to the 'site' or otherwise. I would note in particular that the definition of 'Heritage setting' in the PDP includes how: "Heritage settings are integral to the function, meaning and relationships of these heritage items and they also contribute to the heritage value of the heritage items." As such it is clear that detailed consideration of the spatial extent per historic heritage place to determine the heritage setting is necessary. This is important as the rules in the PDP do limit certain works that can occur in heritage settings.¹⁴
155. Overall, for the reasons set out above I disagree with the request to include additional heritage settings. I recognises that there may be a gap in protection of the settings for some items the submitter has not provided any supporting analysis or evidence to identify the spatial extent of any new heritage setting and the reasons for the mapped extent.
156. I consider that it is remains the most appropriate option to address any further heritage settings through a plan change process, because of the nature and scale of the work involved, including the need for site by site analysis and providing for engagement with landowners. I have also considered the analysis provided by the submitter which does not recommend any certain setting dimensions, or spatial extent per individual heritage item.

3.9.3 Summary of recommendations

157. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.65] be **rejected**.

¹⁴ For example, it is a restricted discretionary activity for new buildings in heritage settings.

3.10 Interiors of historic heritage items

3.10.1 Matters raised by submitters

158. Heritage NZ [65.59] requests amendments to SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A) to specify that the interiors of a number of scheduled heritage items in SCHED2 are included. The submitter considers that the interior of all items in SCHED2 have heritage values, with the exception of HHA010 and HH011.

159. The submitter seeks the interiors of four historic heritage items, which they consider have heritage significance, be specifically identified in the schedule. That part of Heritage NZ's reason relating to each of these four heritage places is outlined below:

HHA002 Papakowhai Homestead. The HNZPT list for this building includes the comment that 'The interior of Papakowhai retains some of the original joinery'

HHA004 F-Ward Porirua Hospital. The statement of significance refers to 'original isolation cells as well as relics of treatment' although the PDP could be more explicit that these interior elements are included.

HHA005 Mana Island Woolshed. The statement of significance includes reference to some interior elements, such as the kanuka/manuka rafters and 'early internal fittings', although the PDP could be more explicit that these interior elements are included.

HHA006 St Alban's Church. The HNZPT list for this building includes the comment that 'In the interior, scissor trusses with knee braces. The apse is semi-circular in plan. ... and tongue and groove lining in the interior'. Overall the interior of this church is largely unmodified and has a high degree of authenticity and integrity.

160. Heritage NZ makes a similar submission with regards to SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B), to "Consider specifically including more interiors in the scheduled items of SCHED3." The reason provided outlines how within SCHED3 there may be a number of items where the interior has significant heritage values and should be specifically included with an example provided of HH-29 Porirua Hospital Chapel, for which the submitter states "where the schedule entry includes reference to 'striking interior' and 'authenticity of form and interior'. However, the PDP could be more explicit that these interior elements are included."

3.10.2 Assessment

161. In assessing this issue I have considered the following:

- The approach to the matter of interiors as set out in the HH and SASM – s32 report;
- The approach taken in other district plans; and
- Initial consideration regarding a set of work needed to identify, assess and protect interiors.

HH and SASM – s32 report

162. The issue of interiors was considered in the HH and SASM - s32 report.¹⁵ In summary, it recognises that the interiors of heritage buildings and items can contribute to the significance of a heritage item but including interiors in the Plan would need to be progressed through specific work to review which places contain interiors (and interior features) that have particular heritage significance to merit recognition and protection. Further, for this work to be undertaken through a relevant process, such as a variation or a proposed plan change.
163. I consider that it is the most appropriate option to address the scheduling of interiors is through a plan change process, as opposed to in response to submission. This is primarily due to the nature and scale of the work involved, which in my view would be extensive to firstly develop an overall approach and to, then carry out the necessary work to identify, assess and list interiors, as well as providing for engagement with landowners. I expand on this matter in the following paragraphs including being informed by approaches taken elsewhere, the nature of analysis that would be required, , as well as considering the level of analysis provided for by the submitter.

3.10.2.1 Approaches taken in other district plans

164. I outline three approaches below and note a common theme is that each approach contains a degree of specificity regarding which interiors are scheduled and protected through the plan, and it is clear which part of a building or in some cases any specific feature within the interior is scheduled.

Auckland Unitary Plan

165. The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) takes an 'exclusions' based approach to interiors. Interiors are included in the historic heritage schedule and protected under the rules unless specifically excluded. Features listed as exclusions either do not contribute to, or may detract from the values for which the historic heritage place has been scheduled.¹⁶ Examples of exclusions in Schedule 14.1 – Schedule of Historic Heritage are: Interior of building(s); and buildings and structures that are not the primary feature; and, an extension including covered deck.

Christchurch City District Plan

166. In the Christchurch City District Plan those heritage items with scheduled interiors are specifically identified in the historic heritage schedule.¹⁷ Where a heritage item has a scheduled interior there is a corresponding link to a supporting Register of Interior Heritage Fabric. This Register is located within the Plan. An example is the Christchurch Town Hall, which has a scheduled interior. The supporting register of Interior Heritage Fabric for the Town Hall includes a table which identifies the space, e.g. room or foyer and the feature within it which is scheduled, e.g. 'marble flooring', 'timber wall panelling.'

Proposed Dunedin City Plan (appeals version)

¹⁵ Page 69-70, and page 82 (within Appendix 4 of the s32 report - Summary of approach to scheduling and mapping – historic heritage (SCHED 2 – 4)

¹⁶ As detailed in The Historic Heritage Overlay Chapter of the AUP

¹⁷ Appendix 9.3.7.2 Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage

167. In the Schedule of Protected Heritage Items and Sites in the proposed Dunedin City Plan (appeals version) those parts of the scheduled heritage building for which there is 'Protection Required' is identified. This extends to, if this applies to interiors, that there are degrees of specificity. For example, for the Dunedin Railway Station, the protection required is for the: "Entire external building envelope and foyer, stained glass windows featuring locomotives, Royal Doulton facings at the ticket offices, Royal Doulton frieze of cherubs and foliage, wrought iron balustrades, and mosaic floor". Other examples are St Andrews Church (former): "Entire external building envelope and interior", and a scheduled residential building: Entire external building envelope.
168. *Initial consideration regarding a set of work needed to identify, assess and protect interiors.*
169. In my opinion a carefully considered approach or methodology is necessary to schedule interiors. This needs to address a number of factors such as what level of specificity is appropriate to schedule to and how would this information be presented in the schedule. Further, what would form the policy direction and rules to protect interiors. In my opinion, a more specific approach has benefits in providing greater certainty about the parts of interiors which are protected and therefore are subject to any particular resource consent requirements. This approach also reduces unnecessary consents for parts of interiors that do not contribute to heritage values.
170. Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman address the matter of scheduling heritage interiors at paragraphs 34-35 of their evidence. As part of their consideration, they set out the nature and scope of technical inputs that would be required to inform an assessment of extending the feature descriptions. An example of an input is at paragraph 35.1 where they explain that more extensive research into Group A heritage items would be required than is currently available for the purposes of determining, "...the extent to which the interior of these items significantly contribute to their associated heritage value/s."
171. In seeking this amendment Heritage NZ identifies information about the interiors of the Group A heritage items either in the PDP statement of significances for that heritage item and/or on the New Zealand Heritage List. In my view this forms a useful starting basis for further consideration of interior scheduling, but it is insufficient basis to proceed to schedule interiors through this process. However, the work to schedule interiors would be most appropriately and effectively achieved through a plan change process where the necessary comprehensive set of work can be undertaken to develop and confirm an overall approach. This would also allow for landowner and other key stakeholder engagement to occur.
172. I overall agree with the principle of the submission to recognise and protect interiors, however I disagree with including these specific interiors as requested by the submitter for the reasons given above.

3.10.3 Summary of recommendations

173. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.59, 65.64] is **rejected**.

3.11 Definitions

3.11.1 Definition of Heritage alteration

3.11.1.1 Matters raised by submitters

174. Powerco [83.4] seeks that the definition of 'Heritage alteration' also excludes maintenance and repair or upgrading of infrastructure for the reason that the definition does not address maintenance or upgrades of infrastructure located on heritage items or historic heritage sites. In its further submission Heritage NZ [FS14.6] set out that maintenance and repair of infrastructure could be included in the items excluded from the definition but upgrading should not be part of this exclusion.

3.11.1.2 Assessment

175. The provisions in the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter do not apply to Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Chapter manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 – General Approach of the PDP. Further, the introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states, "... This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions...". As such historic heritage as regards to infrastructure is clearly managed in that chapter. I consider that the definition of heritage alteration is clear that it only applies to heritage items and historic heritage sites, managed through the three schedules. In addition, the term is only used in the HH – Historic Heritage Chapter. Based on that approach, in my opinion a change to the definition of Heritage alteration is not required.

3.11.1.3 Summary of recommendations

176. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment above that the submission of Powerco [83.4] be **rejected**.

177. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.11.2 Definition of Heritage values and HH-P1 - Identifying Historic heritage

3.11.2.1 Matters raised by submitters

178. Kāinga Ora [81.79] seek a change to the end of clause f. of the definition to replace the word 'and' with 'or' as shown below:

Heritage values

means the following values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites:

- a. *historic values;*
- b. *physical values;*

- c. *social values;*
- d. *tangata whenua values ;*
- e. *surroundings;*
- f. *rarity; ~~and~~or*
- g. *representativeness.*

179. Kāinga Ora's reason given to change from 'and to 'or' is to align with Policy HH-P1 Identifying historic heritage. The submitter provides general support to the definition but also requests more clarity is provided within the definition regarding what is meant by 'e. surroundings' and g. 'representativeness'. I note, the request in relation to 'e' and 'g' is summarised in the Summary of Decisions Requested Reports within the reason for the submission. I am satisfied that this request forms part of the decisions request.
180. Heritage NZ [FS14.7] supports Kāinga Ora request to change to 'or' because all of the values listed need to be considered, but not all of them need to apply to every place. The submitter also addresses the relief of Kāinga Ora's in relation to 'representativeness'; responding that it is a term understood by heritage professionals, and an explanation is not necessary. As part of its further submission Heritage NZ also requests changing 'Surroundings' to 'settings', because 'settings' is a defined term in the PDP. I note that this is out of scope, as a further submission can only be on an original submission and cannot seek other changes.
181. GWRC [FS40.50] supports Kāinga Ora's request to use 'or' instead of 'and' between the final two clauses for the reason that "*Policy 21 of the RPS "refers to 'one or more' of these criteria/values."* GWRC does not support providing additional information regarding what is meant by surroundings and representativeness, as this information is available in Policy 21 of the RPS.
182. Heritage NZ [65.2] seeks to add four new values to the definition as follows:

means the following values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites:

- a. *historic values;*
- b. *physical values;*
- c. *architectural values;*
- d. *scientific values;*
- e. *technological values;*
- f. *social values;*
- g. *tangata whenua values ;*

h. surroundings;

i. rarity;

j. Authenticity; and

k. representativeness.

183. The submitter considers that authenticity should be included as it is an important component of heritage value. Further, that architectural, scientific, and technological values are part of the general topic of 'physical' and should also be added.
184. GWRC [FS40.30] opposes the Heritage NZ request to add more values into the list for the reason that the heritage values listed in the notified definition reflect the criteria in Policy 21 of the RPS.
185. Heritage NZ [65.19] seek to amend HH-P1 to add 'authenticity' to the list of heritage values. The submitter supports the list of heritage values in HH-P1 but considers that authenticity is an important component of heritage values and should be included. "Architectural, scientific and technological values are also important and these qualities are contained in the definition of Historic heritage in the RMA, and that these qualities are contained in the physical values category."

3.11.2.2 Assessment

186. In relation to changing 'and' to 'or in the definition of Heritage values, I agree with this amendment for the reasons stated by Kāinga Ora. However, as a consequential amendment I also recommend a change to the start of this definition to include the words 'one or more' before the word 'values'. In my opinion this would provide increased certainty that one or more of the values can contribute to the significance of a scheduled heritage item or site.
187. With respect to adding new heritage values within the definition, I refer to the HH and SASM s32 report, which addresses Policy 21 of the RPS and the criteria within the policy. In summary, the report outlines (including in response to earlier feedback on the draft PDP):
- How Policy 21 of the RPS sets the direction for the identification and assessment of historic heritage;
 - How Policy 21 contains seven criteria to be considered in the identification and assessment process;
 - That there is further detail under each criteria¹⁸; and
 - How HH-P1 of the PDP aligns with this RPS policy.
188. I agree with the GWRC further submission to not include more values as those listed reflect the criteria in Policy 21 of the RPS.
189. For these same reasons I disagree with the Heritage NZ request to add 'authenticity' to the list of heritage values in the HH-P1.

¹⁸ For example, how 'technological' forms part of 'physical values'.

3.11.2.3 Summary of recommendations

190. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment, that the Hearings Panel:

- d. Amend the definition of Heritage values as shown below and as set out in 0;

Heritage values	<p>means the following <u>one or more</u> values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. historic values; b. physical values; c. social values; d. tangata whenua values ; e. surroundings; f. rarity; <u>and/or</u> g. representativeness.
------------------------	--

- b. Make a consequential amendment to the start of the definition to make it clear that one or more values can apply, consistent with the submitter requested relief.

191. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Kāinga Ora [81.70] be **accepted**.

192. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.2] be **rejected**.

193. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.11.2.4 S32AA Evaluation

194. In my opinion the amendment to the definition is more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular, I consider that:

- They will provide clarity that not all heritage values in the definition need apply. It provides for consistency with HH-P1. It also provides for consistency with the approach taken within SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items Group B), and SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites, which specifies for each heritage item or site in the schedules what are the relevant HH-P1 Values per heritage item or site. Consequently, the changes are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the PDP.
- The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

3.11.3 Definitions of Maintenance and Repairs

3.11.3.1 Matters raised by submitters

195. Kāinga Ora [81.100] request that the definition of Maintenance is amended to 'Heritage Maintenance' to better reflect what is being defined and because the term "maintenance" is used throughout the PDP. As part of this request the submitter requests adding the words 'Maintenance of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' before 'means in relation to a site or areas listed in SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori ...'. I address the first part of this relief in this report. The relief as it relates to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori is addressed in the Officer Report: Part B - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.
196. Heritage NZ [FS14.8] oppose this relief and seek the definition is retained as notified as it applies to both heritage items and places in SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The submitter is concerned that the requested change would not necessarily cover the term as it relates to SCHED6.
197. Kāinga Ora [81.139] seek that the definition of 'Repair' is amended to 'Heritage Repair' for the reason that it is a heritage specific definition and that "'Repair' is a term used throughout the PDP for its plain English meaning."
198. Heritage NZ [FS14.11] support amending to 'Heritage Repair' noting how it may be better to amend the definition so that it is similar to the way 'heritage alteration' and 'heritage restoration' are defined. They note that this could mean the need for consequential amendments to the wording of some historic heritage policies and rules.

3.11.3.2 Assessment

199. I have considered the possible benefits for plan interpretation of making both of these definitions specific to heritage. I recognise the point raised by the submitter that these terms are used throughout the PDP. However, in an e-plan format the PDP takes the approach of marking any words (with purple text) which have a specific meaning. Those words are separately defined in the definitions section of the PDP.
200. It is clear in the definitions of 'maintenance', and 'repair' that the focus of these definitions is historic heritage specific, and in the case of maintenance both historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. In my opinion this avoids any confusion about the focus or application of these terms in the historic heritage chapter or throughout the PDP, and that it is unnecessary to further amend these terms. As such I disagree with the requested changes to these definitions from Kāinga Ora.
201. I also refer to a similar issue being raised in relation to 'Maintenance and Repair' as it relates to Infrastructure, and that the corresponding submission is being addressed in the Officers' Report: Part B – Infrastructure.

3.11.4 Summary of recommendations

202. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submissions from Kāinga Ora [81.100, 81.139] be **rejected**.
203. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submissions.

3.12 Policies

3.12.1 HH-P4 and HH-P11

3.12.1.1 Matters raised by submitters

204. Heritage NZ request additions to HH-P4 and HH-P11 [65.21, 65.25]. These are considered collectively given a similar request is made within part of each relief in relation to 'minimise'.
205. The submitter seeks to add the following to HH-P4 and the additions to HH-P11 as shown below:

'Any works undertaken need to be kept to the minimum necessary and keep the heritage fabric as intact as possible'

HH-P11 Use and development of heritage items, heritage settings, and historic heritage sites

Only allow other use and development of and within heritage items and heritage settings in SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED 4 – Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values are protected and maintained, having regard to:

1. *The particular heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting, or the historic heritage site and its significance;*
2. *The heritage item, heritage setting, or the historic heritage site's sensitivity to change or capacity to accommodate changes without compromising the heritage values of the heritage item, heritage setting or historic heritage site;*
3. *Any heritage alterations and additions to heritage items, including for an ongoing use or any adaptive re-use, are compatible with the form, proportions, materials and patina of the heritage item and maintain its heritage values;*
4. *Architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the heritage item or the historic heritage site are not lost or obscured by new materials or changes;*
5. *Whether any new building or structure, including its location, form, design and materials, is compatible with the original architectural style, character and scale of the heritage item, and the impact of the new building or structure on the heritage setting;*
6. *The extent to which any adverse impacts on heritage values are necessary to enable the long term, practical, or feasible use of the heritage item or historic heritage site;*
7. *The reduction or loss of any heritage values, including the ability to interpret the place and its relationship with other features/items;*
8. *The extent or degree to which any changes are reversible;*
9. *Any opportunities to enhance the heritage values of the heritage item and its heritage setting or the historic heritage site;*
10. *The extent to which any alterations to heritage fabric is kept to the minimum necessary;*
11. *the potential for cumulative adverse effects on heritage values;*
12. *Any assessments or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert; and*
13. *The extent to which any changes are consistent with a relevant conservation plan.*

206. The reason given for the requested change to HH-P4 is that the works undertaken to enable the adaptation of a heritage item may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place, and any change should be to the minimum necessary, be substantially reversible, and have little or no adverse effect on the heritage value of the place.
207. In relation to HH-P11 general support is provided but the submitter considers that a few other aspects should be included and that "Any changes should be kept to the minimum necessary, the potential for adverse cumulative effects should be acknowledged."

3.12.1.2 Assessment

208. I agree with the relief to add additional policy direction into HH-P11 however I do consider it is necessary to introduce further policy direction into HH-P4 as this have the effect of duplicating direction in HH-P11. In my view HH-P11 already incorporates the ability to address new uses including adaptive re-use.
209. I agree with including new policy direction into HH-P11 to ensure works are to the minimum necessary. The addition would ensure this is one of the matters that is considered in assessing proposals against HH-P11 under the strong direction of 'Only allow ... where it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values are protected and maintained'
210. I have considered whether to include the word 'heritage fabric', as this is not defined in the PDP and its use may raises issues of interpretation. I do not consider it is necessary to include a definition for 'heritage fabric'. Instead of the exact relief sought by the submitter, I recommend the use of the words 'heritage alterations' as well as including wording about modifying physical fabric which contributes to identified heritage values as shown in the Summary of recommendations section below, which I consider would have a largely similar meaning or intent as the submission.
211. I note this would have the effect of only applying to heritage items and historic heritage sites. It is not clear from the submission whether this was intended to also apply to heritage settings. The submitter may wish to clarify this in any appearance in front of the Hearings Panel.
212. I also agree with including content on the potential for cumulative effects because any new works or change to heritage places in the short or longer term have the potential to detract from heritage values or potentially to effect the heritage status of the scheduled heritage place.

3.12.1.3 Summary of recommendations

213. I recommend for the reasons given I the assessment that the Hearings Panel:
- a. Amend HH-P11 as set out below and in 0;

HH-P11	Use and development of heritage items, heritage settings, and historic heritage sites
	<p>Only allow other use and development of and within heritage items and heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values are protected and maintained, having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The particular heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting, or the historic heritage site and its significance;

2. The heritage item, heritage setting, or the historic heritage site's sensitivity to change or capacity to accommodate changes without compromising the heritage values of the heritage item, heritage setting or historic heritage site;
3. Any heritage alterations and additions to heritage items, including for an ongoing use or any adaptive re-use, are compatible with the form, proportions, materials and patina of the heritage item and maintain its heritage values;
4. Architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the heritage item or the historic heritage site are not lost or obscured by new materials or changes;
5. Whether any new building or structure, including its location, form, design and materials, is compatible with the original architectural style, character and scale of the heritage item, and the impact of the new building or structure on the heritage setting;
6. The extent to which any adverse impacts on heritage values are necessary to enable the long term, practical, or feasible use of the heritage item or historic heritage site;
7. The reduction or loss of any heritage values, including the ability to interpret the place and its relationship with other features/items;
8. The extent or degree to which any changes are reversible;
9. Any opportunities to enhance the heritage values of the heritage item and its heritage setting or the historic heritage site;
10. The extent to which any heritage alterations to heritage items and historic heritage sites are kept to the minimum necessary, in particular where it involves modifying the physical fabric of a heritage item or parts of a historic heritage site which contribute to identified heritage values;
11. The potential for cumulative adverse effects on heritage values;
- ~~10~~12. Any assessments or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert; and
- ~~11~~13. The extent to which any changes are consistent with a relevant conservation plan.

214. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submissions from Heritage NZ [65.25] be **accepted in part**.

215. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.21] be **rejected**.

3.12.1.4 Section 32AA evaluation

216. In my opinion the changes to HH-P11 are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular I consider that:

- Including the 'minimum' direction provides necessary direction that that there are parts of heritage items and historic heritage sites that are sensitive to modification and that any alteration to physical fabric that contributes to heritage values will be carefully assessed to ensure that it is not unnecessarily altered. This contributes to ensuring the protection of heritage values. A pathway to 'test' removing contributing physical fabric is still provided for within the policy framework given this addition does not mean no such alterations can occur.

- The addition of cumulative effects ensures that consideration can be given to how any changes over time, incremental or more extensive, could result in a loss of heritage values or potentially impact on heritage status.
- The proposed changes will better achieve HH-02 and HCH-01 and more appropriately recognise and provide for s6(f) of the RMA.
- The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social and cultural effect than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits for improved plan interpretation and more efficient administration.

3.12.2 HH-P15 – Subdivision

3.12.2.1 Matters raised by submitters

217. An addition to HH-P15-2 is sought by Heritage NZ [65.29] as follows:

2. Sufficient land is provided around the heritage item or historic heritage site to protect associated heritage values and the integrity of the heritage item or site;

218. The reason given is that the matter would strengthen the policy.

3.12.2.2 Assessment

219. It is not clear from the submission why the additional words are required, and the integrity of a heritage item or site is not already covered under associated heritage values. I consider that there may be merit in the relief sought however it needs to be clearer why this is required in addition to the inclusion of heritage values. The submitter may wish to clarify this in any appearance in front of the Hearings Panel.

3.12.2.3 Summary of recommendations

220. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.29] be **rejected**.

3.13 Rules

3.13.1 HH-R4 - Earthworks

3.13.1.1 Matters raised by submitters

221. Heritage NZ [65.33] request a new point is added to HH-R4 so that minor earthworks associated with the maintenance, installation and construction of service connections, rainwater tanks or effluent systems is permitted, for the reasons that there may be merit in considering other, very limited earthworks activities.

3.13.1.2 Assessment

222. In my opinion, minor earthworks if not appropriately located or limited in extent have the potential to modify parts of the heritage item historic heritage site or heritage setting which contribute to heritage values. In my view there needs to be an assessment of such proposed earthworks to ensure they are appropriately located and designed to ensure heritage values are protected.

223. The submitter has not recommended any associated standards with the requested change to HH-R4 or a corresponding change in policy direction. Further, no section 32AA evaluation or evidence to support this change has been provided.
224. I note that there is a submission on the PDP definition of minor earthworks, which is being addressed in the Officer's Report Part B: Infrastructure.
225. For the reasons stated above I disagree with the relief sought.

3.13.1.3 Summary of recommendations

226. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [[65.33] be **rejected**.

3.13.2 HH-R7 and HH-R9

3.13.2.1 Matters raised by submitters

227. Heritage NZ [65.36, 65.38] request a note clarifying HH-R7 and HH-R9 in terms of additions/extensions to building footprints, as the rules appear to potentially double up. The submitter supports the activity status and notification clause for HH-R7 but that it may be beneficial to clarify that HH-R9 applies to additions to a heritage building, while HH-R7 applies to additions to extensions to the foot-print of a non-heritage building within a heritage setting.
228. PCC [11.38] seek a new permitted activity rule HH-R5 as follows, for the reason that alterations to non-listed buildings and structures within heritage settings are unintentionally caught by "catch-all rule" HH-R13, and the intention was for extensions only:

Repair, maintenance, redecoration, heritage restoration, earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility upgrades, alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)

1. Activity status: Permitted

Where:

a. The structure or building is not identified as a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B).

Note:

- *This rule does not apply to extensions to the footprint of buildings and structures located within the heritage setting of a heritage item, which is covered by Rule HH-R7*

229. Heritage NZ [FS14.24] oppose the PCC requested amendment and seek a new restricted discretionary rule of: "*Alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 or SCHED3*", with matters of discretion those within HH-P11. In the reason provided the submitter acknowledges this relates to addressing a gap in the notified provisions but that it could result in unexpected adverse effects on historic heritage values:

There may be cases where there is an accessory building which is not identified as a heritage item in the schedule, but which nonetheless contributes to the heritage values

of the site and setting. Major alterations, additions, or demolition of such a building would adversely affect the heritage values of the site.

230. I note that that this is out of scope, as a further submission can only be on an original submission and cannot seek other changes.

3.13.2.2 Assessment

231. I agree with the submissions from Heritage NZ [65.36, 65.38] and PCC. In my opinion there is a gap that needs to be addressed (as identified by PCC), and there is benefit in being clearer on the specifics of HH-R7 and HH-R9 (Heritage NZ).

232. I agree with the permitted activity status sought for the activities set out in the relief from PCC as I do not consider it is appropriate for certain use and development in relation to non-scheduled buildings in heritage settings to be caught by the ‘catch-all’ rule HH-R13, which means a discretionary activity status for works other than extensions to the footprint of a non-scheduled building in heritage settings. That approach would mean a number of activities, such as alterations, or earthquake strengthening for those non-scheduled heritage items would be subject to the same or a more onerous activity status than for the specifically identified heritage item.

233. Although I agree with the general intent of the Heritage NZ submission I do not consider it is necessary to include the note as requested by Heritage NZ as I consider that including the new rule as sought by PCC would sufficiently address the issue being raised.

3.13.2.3 Summary of Recommendations

234. I recommend for the reasons given I the assessment that the Hearings Panel:

- a. **Amend** the HH- Historic Heritage Chapter by including a new rule HH-R5 as shown below, and as set out in O, and make consequential numbering changes to rules HH-R6 to HH-R13-HH-R15 as shown in Appendix A; and

<u>HH-R5</u>	<u>Repair, maintenance, redecoration, heritage restoration, earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility upgrades, alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B)</u>
<u>All zones</u>	<p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The structure or building is not identified as a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B).</u></p> <p><u>Note</u></p> <p><u>This rule does not apply to extensions to the footprint of buildings and structures located within the heritage setting of a heritage item, which is covered by Rule HH-R8.</u></p>

235. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submissions from Heritage NZ [65.36, 65.38] be **accepted in part**.
236. I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from PCC [11.38] be **accepted**.
237. My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.

3.13.2.4 Section 32AA evaluation

238. In my opinion introducing a new rule HH-R5 is more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the PDP than the notified provisions. In particular I consider that:
- It provides for increased clarity and certainty regarding the approach to consenting for non-scheduled buildings or structures within heritage settings.
 - The note included in the rule makes it clear that the only resource consent requirement for non-scheduled heritage items in heritage settings is where there is an increase in footprint of non-scheduled buildings in heritage settings. This ensures there is a degree of protection for non-scheduled buildings commensurate with their location within a heritage setting but not being specifically scheduled.
 - The proposed change will better achieve HH-02.
 - The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social and cultural effect than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits for improved plan interpretation and more efficient administration.

3.14 Historic Heritage Schedules

3.14.1 Matters raised by submitters

239. Submissions were received seeking changes and additions to the set of historic heritage schedules. This includes to SCHED 2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED 3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Items. The changes can be summarised as follows¹⁹:
- Requests to include new historic heritage places;
 - Requests to include historic heritage areas;
 - Requests to re-categorise a SCHED 3 – Historic Heritage Item (Group B) to SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Item (Group A);
 - Amendments to the statement of significance for heritage items or historic heritage sites in SCHED2 – 4;
 - Adding new introductory information to SCHED4; and

¹⁹ Heritage settings and interiors are addressed in earlier sections of this 42a report.

- Requests to update information and amend the way it is displayed within the schedules including:
 - Separating information provided for places listed in the schedules as relates to New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) site number references and information on the New Zealand Heritage List /Rārangi Kōrero (the List).
 - Including further NZAA site number references

Table 3: Recommendations on Submissions: Schedules: SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
Submissions seeking new listings			
Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10] Heritage NZ [FS14.29] TROTR [FS70.53]	<p>Heather Philips and Donald Love seeks to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add the New Zealand Wars Memorial the heritage schedules. <p>The reason provided by the submitter is that the NZ Wars Memorial at Battle Hill site is a war memorial that was erected by the NZ government and is on the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage website. While the site is mentioned in SASM003, it needs its own entry.</p> <p>Heritage NZ opposes this request but consider including reference to the feature within the statement of significance for SASM003.</p> <p><i>"The statement of significance for SASM003 includes reference to both Māori and British forces. It may be appropriate to include a comment in entry SASM003 that 'within the site there is a war memorial erected in 1922 to commemorate British soldiers who died in the August 1846 battle'."</i></p> <p>TROTR supports the requested addition. TROTR agrees that it holds great significance to not only Ngāti Toa but to Aotearoa history.</p>	<p>The assessment and recommendation are set out in paragraphs 10 - 14 of Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence.</p> <p>Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Memorial is included in SCHED3 along with a recommended Statements of Significance and associated setting to be denoted on the planning maps. 	<p>Accept submitter's request (consistent with Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's recommendation).</p> <p>In my opinion the recommendation of Heritage NZ to amend SASM003 is out of scope as a further submission can only be on an original submission and cannot seek other changes.</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend that the Hearings Panel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Include a new heritage item in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) as shown in Appendix A; and Include a new heritage item and a heritage setting on the planning maps consistent with the map Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence. <p>I recommend that the submission from Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10] be accepted.</p> <p>My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.</p>
He Ara He Ara Pukerua [6.1] Heritage NZ [FS14.28]	<p>Seeks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include Pukerua Bay WW2 Block in SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and identify it on the planning maps and include a Statement of Significance as follows: <p><i>"The Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block, officially known as Type E Concrete Block Rail carrier number 801, and commonly referred to as a tank trap, was constructed in 1942 as part of Wellington Fortress during the Japanese invasion threat. The Road Block was part of the defences against an expected invasion force heading south to Wellington. The Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block was very unusual as it had three pedestals, one either side of the road and one in the centre of the road. Grooves on the inner sides were to have heavy iron rails locked in place when invasion was imminent. The one remaining pedestal of the Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block is the only one in the region in its original position, the only one in New Zealand beside a main highway and one of the few still existing in New Zealand. Its size, white colour and position beside State Highway 1 make this WW2 relic a prominent landmark"</i></p> <p>The reason provided by the submitter is that the Pukerua Bay Machine Gun Posts</p>	<p>The assessment and recommendation are set out in paragraphs 11 - 14 of Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence.</p> <p>Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman recommend that:</p> <p>The World War Two 'Road Block' is included in SCHED3 along with a recommended Statements of Significance and associated setting to be denoted on the planning maps.</p>	<p>Accept submitter's request (consistent with Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's recommendation).</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend that the Hearings Panel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Include a new heritage item in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) as shown in Appendix A; and Include a new heritage item and a heritage setting on the planning maps consistent with the map Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence. <p>I recommend that the submission from He Ara Pukerua [6.1] be accepted.</p> <p>My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.</p>

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
	<p>are already included yet the road block is of greater significant and much rarer.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the original intended defence purpose of the road block constructed in 1942, that it is commonly known as a "tank trap", and provides further details about the feature.</p> <p>Heritage NZ supports the addition of this place to SCHED3, subject to the place meeting the values listed in HH-P1.</p>		
<p>TROTR [264.79]</p> <p>Heritage NZ [FS14.40]</p>	<p>Seek to add to the Historic Heritage Sites schedule the following, as per per "Me Huri Whakamuri Ka Titiro Whakamua".</p> <p><u>4. Specific site information (Sites not included in Heritage Register)</u></p> <p>D.1 Titahi Bay Sandunes</p> <p>D.2 Tamanga a Kohu</p> <p>D.3 Papakowhai</p> <p>D.4 Aotea</p> <p>D.5 Horopaki</p> <p>D.6 Whitianga</p> <p>D.7 Te Rapa a Wahi</p> <p>D.8 Waiohata</p> <p>D.9 Kakaho</p> <p>D.10 Turi Kawera</p> <p>D.11 Kahotea</p> <p>D.12 Horokiri</p> <p>D.13 Purehurehu</p> <p>D.14 Porirua Track</p> <p>Heritage NZ supports request to the add places to SCHED 4, subject to each place meeting the values listed in HH-P1. Work with Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira to assess these places and where appropriate add to Schedule 4.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Reject submitter's request.</p> <p>In the Officers Report Part B: Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, I assess a similar request to add sites to be added to SCHED6 from "Me Huri Whakamuri Ka Titiro Whakamua".</p> <p>I note that that the sites requested to be included in the Heritage schedule are some of those which are also sought to be added to SCHED6.</p> <p>For the same reasons as in that report I recommended that this work should be considered through a future plan changes process or any Variation to the PDP that the Council may promulgate. I have not however recommended a corresponding amendment to the introduction to the Historic Heritage Chapter as is recommended in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Officers' Report.</p> <p>A plan change process, or any variation to the PDP would enable further preparatory work to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner as set out in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Officer's Report. This would provide for consideration of which of the sites requested to be added to SCHED6 should also be considered for including in SCHED 4, noting that for a site to be included in SCHED4 it would need to be considered under HH-P1.</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from TROTR [264.79] be rejected.</p> <p>My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.</p>
<p>Heritage NZ [65.69]</p>	<p>Seeks to include Sir Maui Pomare's, Hongoeka Bay Cottage in SCHED 3.</p> <p>The reason given for the request is: <i>"This building has been nominated for inclusion in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero. It was built in about 1914 for Sir Maui Pomare as a place of</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Reject submitter's request.</p> <p>In my opinion further detailed assessment of the values of this place would need to be undertaken and this would be best undertaken through a plan change process. This</p>

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
	<i>retreat, and has great historical significance. We acknowledge that, while this place is worthy of being included in the schedule, further discussion and consultation with the property owners would be necessary."</i>		<p>process would also provide for engagement to be undertaken with property owners. I recognise the submitter specifically refers to the need for further discussion and consultation with the property owners.</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.79] be rejected.</p>
Heritage NZ [65.79]	<p>Seeks to include NIMT Railway line Paekakariki to Muri in SCHED 4 as a Historic Heritage Area/Site.</p> <p>The reason provided is that this section of NIMT has been nominated for inclusion in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero.</p> <p>This rare and unique section of track has significant historic heritage values.</p>	N/A	<p>Reject submitter's request.</p> <p>In my opinion further detailed assessment of the values of this place would need to be undertaken and this would be best undertaken through a plan change process. This process would also help to determine the precise extent of any potential listing.</p> <p>This process would also provide for engagement to be undertaken with property owners.</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.79] be rejected.</p>
Heritage NZ [65.80]	<p>Seeks to:</p> <p><i>Consider inclusion of additional historic heritage areas in the District Plan, which may include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>State housing areas in Titahi Bay and Porirua East</i> - <i>The Austrian Housing area in Titahi Bay</i> - <i>The suburban shopping centres of Cannons Creek and Titahi Bay</i> 	N/A	<p>Reject submitter's relief.</p> <p>The submitter request consideration of new heritage areas. This is a substantial change and I note that no detailed analysis for any of these areas has been provided to justify such an approach. I also note that it is unclear what the spatial extent of the areas requested would comprise.</p> <p>The addition of such areas would require significant work to understand the heritage values, including undertaking necessary research and assessment, and undertake engagement with landowners.</p> <p>More broadly, I consider the addition of heritage areas needs to be thoroughly 'tested' to see if the areas meet the test for including in the Plan. Accordingly, any such consideration would be more appropriately addressed through a plan change process.</p> <p>I recommend that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.80] be rejected.</p>
Heritage NZ [65.78]	<p>Seeks to include Pāuatahanui Historic Area in SCHED 4.</p> <p>The submitter's reason is shown below:</p>	N/A	<p>Reject submitter's relief.</p> <p>The HH and SASM s32 report, recognises that there is the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangi "Pāuatahanui Historic Area", and</p>

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
	<p><i>The Pāuatahanui Historic Area has been included in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero since 1985 (List number 7029). The area contains a pa site, other archaeological sites, WWI memorial, historic cottages, and a church.</i></p> <p><i>Although all of these items and buildings are scheduled individually in SCHED2 there is merit in acknowledging the area as a whole. It comprises a group of inter-related places which collectively reinforce the value of the whole area.</i></p> <p><i>The statements within the individual scheduled items confirm that a significant aspect of the heritage value of the individual places is their contribution to an identifiable historic area. For example, the Pāuatahanui War Memorial (HHA010) 'can be visually and historically linked with other historic structures in the Pāuatahanui Village and has high group value accordingly'.</i></p>		<p>also the number of separately listed (on the NZ Heritage List) places in the area.</p> <p>I note that the Settlement Zone of the PDP also recognises heritage values in the area.</p> <p>In my opinion, the consideration of including this Historic Area in the PDP is best undertaken through a plan change process. This would also provide for comprehensive review of heritage values and the consideration of any tailored provisions to be developed, instead of those for historic heritage sites, and further consideration of the extent to which an area overlay is necessary when considering the extent of individual schedule entries within the wider area.</p> <p>Although I recognise the concerns of the submitter and the significance of the area, given it is on the List, I note the date of the List entry is 1985. I consider any plan change process would need to carefully consider the heritage values through current, up to date assessment. The submitter may wish to provide further information on the extent to which the date of the List entry affects the particular Historic Area entry in any way.</p> <p>I have considered the alternative of a non-regulatory layer which would mean the heritage area could be considered in resource consents are otherwise required, i.e. for any discretionary or non-complying resource consents. This provides a further option to recognising the heritage area should the Council decide to undertake further work, including landowner and key stakeholder engagement and decide to promulgate a plan change in due course.</p> <p>Overall, for the various reasons outlined above I do not consider it would be appropriate to add such a heritage area at this time, including when considering the and lack of community engagement undertaken.</p> <p>For the reasons given in the assessment above I recommend that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.78] be rejected.</p>
HHB018 Titahi Bay Boat Sheds – Request to re-categorisation from a Group B to Group A Heritage Item			
Heritage NZ [65.66]	<p>Seeks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move the HHB018 – Titahi Bay Boat Sheds from SCHED 3 - to SCHED 2; and Amend the listing so that the fabric of the buildings is protected. <p>The reason provided is:</p>	<p>The assessment and recommendation are set out in paragraphs 15 – 24 Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence</p> <p>Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman recommend that:</p>	<p>Accept in part submitter's request (consistent with Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's recommendation).</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend that the Hearings Panel:</p>

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The values of this place (including the values identified in the statement of significance) may be sufficient to justify inclusion in Group A. (SCHED 2); and The fabric of the boatsheds is an important part of their heritage and aesthetic value. If the fabric of the boatsheds is completely altered, for example replaced with aluminium sheds, the authenticity of the boat sheds as a group would be ruined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elevation of the Titahi Bay Boat Sheds (HHB018) from a SCHED 3 (Group B) historic heritage item to a SCHED 2 (Group A) historic heritage item; Retention of the reference in the associated feature description to the fabric of the boat sheds being excluded from protection. 	<p>a. Remove HHB018 from SCHED 3 Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and insert it into SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) as shown in Appendix A.</p> <p>I recommend that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.66] be accepted in part.</p>
Requests to change details in the heritage schedule – HHA005 - Mana Island woolshed			
Heritage NZ [65.61]	<p>Seeks an amendment to the Statement of Significance for HHA005 – Mana Island woolshed as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p><i>Statement of Significance</i></p> <p><i>Mana Island woolshed is located on flat land slightly elevated above the beach at Shingle Point.</i></p> <p><i>It is thought that Mana Island Woolshed was constructed prior to 1873 between 1890 and 1897 by Mariano Vella.</i></p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The reason given for the submission is the archaeological database for this site has been updated with new research in 2019 which indicates it was built prior to 1873.</p>	<p>The assessment and recommendation are set out in paragraphs 25-27 of Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's evidence.</p> <p>Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman recommend that:</p> <p>The reference to the construction date of 'between 1890 and 1897' is deleted and replaced with 'prior to 1873'.</p>	<p>Accept in part submitter's request (consistent with Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman's recommendation).</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend that the Hearings Panel:</p> <p>a. Amend the schedule entry for HHA005 as set out in Appendix A:</p> <p>I recommend that the submission from Heritage NZ [65.61] be accepted.</p>
Other requests to make amendments to SCHED2 - 4			
<p>Heather and Donald Phillips and Love [79.9]</p> <p>Heritage NZ [FS14.31]</p>	<p>Seek the relief of to 'Add and amend' to HHS005 Belmont Coach Road.</p> <p>The reasons for the relief is:</p> <p><i>A correction is required to the Boffa Miskell report which refers to Belmont Coach Road, as there is no evidence that this road was ever traversed by coaches. Historic Place Category 2 entry List Number 7711 names the road as "Old Belmont to Pauatahanui Road". This is an example of the Boffa Miskell report not being evidence based.</i></p> <p>Heritage NZ supports the feature name and description to be amended as requested, and states:</p> <p><i>"In the statement of significance it may be appropriate to include reference to 'Belmont Coach Road' as an alternative name. The submission is correct in that the Rārangī Kōrero / List entry is named 'Old Belmont to Pauatahanui Road', however 'Old Coach Road' is also recognised an alternative and commonly used name".</i></p>	<p>This matter is addressed in the evidence of Mr Vossler and Mr Bowman at paragraphs 27-31.</p> <p>No specific assessment is made on the details of the schedule entry, instead the focus of the assessment is on responding to the issue raised in relation to approach to the scheduling of heritage items.</p>	<p>Reject the submitter's relief.</p> <p>I consider that it is unclear whether a specific change is sought to HHS005 given that submitter's reason seeks a change to the Boffa Miskell report.</p> <p>I further note that the requested changes to the Statement of Significance by Heritage NZ, is out of scope, as a further submission can only be on an original submission and cannot seek other changes.</p> <p>Summary of recommendation</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heather and Donald Phillips and Love [79.9] be rejected.</p> <p>My recommendations in relation to further submissions reflect the recommendations on the relevant primary submission.</p>
In relation to SCHED2 – 4, and adding NZAA site reference numbers: Heritage NZ, [65.60, 65.67, 65.71, 65.72,	<p>Heritage NZ seek a number of changes to the schedules including the following:</p> <p>In relation to SCHED2 – 4 to include additional NZAA site reference numbers across a number of the schedule entries.</p>	N/A	<p>I agree with making additions to include further NZAA site reference numbers.</p> <p>I disagree with request by Heritage to write in full HNZPT and NZAA given that these are abbreviated</p>

Submitter Name and Number	Matters raised by Submitters	Greg Vossler and Ian Bowman Assessment and Recommendation	Caroline Rachlin's Assessment and Summary of Recommendations
<p>65.73, 65.74, 65.75, 65.76]</p> <p>In relation to SCHED2 and SCHED3</p> <p>Heritage NZ: [65.58, 65.63]</p> <p>In relation to SCHED2 - SCHED4:</p> <p>Heritage NZ [65.62, 65.68, 65.77]</p> <p>In relation to SCHED4:</p> <p>Heritage NZ [65.75, 65.76]</p> <p>PCC [11.72]</p>	<p>Amending, in relation to HNZPT numbers to change from 'Category ...' to 'Cat ...';</p> <p>In relation to SCHED2, SCHED3 to include full names as follows, for the reason that people may refer to the schedules without reading the whole district plan.</p> <p><i>Detail on <u>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) or New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) information...</u></i></p> <p>In relation to SCHED2 - 4 to have separate rows for the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) and New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) reference numbers</p> <p>Heritage setting is n/a for all sites be deleted from SCHED4.</p> <p>In relation to SCHED4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend 'site type' to feature description' <p>The reason given for this request is that most entries refer to 'feature description' rather than 'site type'. It is appropriate and more consistent to refer to 'feature description'</p> <p>In relation to SCHED4, PCC [11.72] request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New introductory text at the start of SCHED4 as follows: <p><i>Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED4 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.</i></p> <p>The reason is to include a note in the introduction (as per the introduction to SCHED2 and SCHED4) to make it clear that this detail is included for information purposes.</p>		<p>throughout the PDP and through the e-plan format a reader can go straight to the full title.</p> <p>I consider it is more appropriate to retain the word 'Category' instead of replacing with 'Cat ...'.</p> <p>I agree with the Heritage NZ requested additional NZAA references, and to have separate rows for site reference numbers as this would avoid any confusion for readers of the Plan regarding the applicable reference type.</p> <p>In addition, I agree with removing heritage setting n/a from SCHED4. This would avoid confusion that historic heritage sites may also have associated heritage settings, when it is only heritage items that have heritage settings.</p> <p>The relief to amend to 'Feature description' is also addressed in the Officer's Report Part B: Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori at Section 3.8. I disagree with this request for the same reasons as set out in that report.</p> <p>I agree with the request to include the introductory text at the start of SCHED4 as this provides increased clarity and certainty.</p> <p>Summary of recommendations</p> <p>I recommend the Hearings Panel a. a. Amend SCHED 2 -4 as shown in Appendix A.</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.67 [65.58], [65.68], 65.71, 65.72, 65.73, 65.74, and PCC [11.72] be accepted.</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.62, 65.68, 65.75,65.76, 65.77] be accepted in part.</p> <p>I recommend for the reasons given in the assessment that the submission of Heritage NZ [65.58, 65.63] be rejected</p>

3.15 Minor Errors

240. I recommend that an amendment is made to correct where SH58 was misspelt. This amendment could have been made after PDP was notified through the RMA clause 16 process to correct minor errors, but I recommend the amendment is made as part of the Hearing Panel's recommendations for completeness and clarity in Appendix A.

4 Conclusions


241. Submissions have been received in support of, and in opposition to the PDP.
242. Having considered all the submissions and reviewed all relevant statutory and non-statutory documents, I recommend that PDP should be amended as set out in 0 of this report.
243. For the reasons set out in the Section 32AA evaluation attached at **Error! Reference source not found.** OR included throughout this report, I consider that the proposed objectives and provisions, with the recommended amendments, will be the most appropriate means to:
244. achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) where it is necessary to revert to Part 2 and otherwise give effect to higher order planning documents, in respect to the proposed objectives, and
245. achieve the relevant objectives of the PDP, in respect to the proposed provisions.

Recommendations:

I recommend that:

1. The Hearing Commissioners accept, accept in part, or reject submissions (and associated further submissions) as outlined in 0 of this report; and
2. The PDP is amended in accordance with the changes recommended in 0 of this report.

Signed:

Name and Title		Signature
Report Author	Caroline Rachlin	

Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Definitions, HH – Historic Heritage Chapter, and Historic Heritage Schedules - SCHED 2 – 4

Where I recommend changes in response to submissions, these are shown as follows:

- Text recommended to be added to the PDP is underlined.
- Text recommended to be deleted from the PDP is ~~struckthrough~~.

General Approach

Part 4 Appendices and Schedules

The appendices and schedules contain technical information and data, such as schedules of specific areas (Overlays managed under the District-Wide Matters chapters) and design guides. For example, SCHED9 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes lists those areas of the City that have been identified as being outstanding natural features and landscapes and includes a description of each area's characteristics and values. The objectives, policies, rules and standards that apply to the areas contained in SCHED9 are contained in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter in Part 2.

[Appendix 16 contains detail on Archaeological Authority Process.](#)

Definitions

Adaptive reuse

means changing the use of a heritage item and/or its heritage setting to a compatible use while retaining its heritage value. [Adaptive reuse processes include alteration and addition.](#)²⁰

Heritage values

means the following [one or more](#) values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites:

- h. historic values;
- i. physical values;
- j. social values;
- k. tangata whenua values ;
- l. surroundings;
- m. rarity; [and/or](#)²¹
- n. representativeness.


²⁰ Heritage NZ [65.1]

²¹ Kāinga Ora [81.79]

<u>Demolition</u>	<u>means the permanent destruction or damage in whole or in part of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.</u>
--------------------------	--

Historic heritage site	means a <u>site area</u> ²² or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.
-------------------------------	---

HH - Historic Heritage

This chapter contains provisions that have legal effect. They are identified with a  to the right hand side of the provision. To see more about what legal effect means please click here.

Buildings, items and sites with historic heritage values, sites of significance to tangata whenua including wāhi tapu and wāhi tupuna²³ provide a context for community identity. They can also provide valuable information about the past and the cultures of those who came before us, for example, the tools, technology and materials available at specific points in time.

Historic heritage values can be directly threatened through modification, damage or destruction associated with the subdivision, use or development of a site. Damage can also occur from natural hazards, including earthquakes, fire and flooding. Inappropriate subdivision, use or development can result in the loss of this knowledge and the links to the past that heritage items, heritage settings and historic heritage sites provide. It is therefore important that Porirua City's historic heritage values are identified and protected.

Historic heritage includes sites of significance to Māori. Refer also to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori Chapter.²⁴

Archaeological Authority Process

Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 it is unlawful to destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site (regardless of whether the site is identified in the District Plan or not) without obtaining an archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) before you start work. An archaeological authority is required in addition to any resource consents required by the Council.

²² Heritage NZ [65.3]

²³ TROTR [264.106]

²⁴ GWRC [137.42]

<u>Appendix 16 contains detail on Archaeological Authority Process.</u>	
An archaeological site is defined in this act as any place in New Zealand (including buildings, structures or shipwrecks) that was associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there is evidence relating to the history of New Zealand that can be investigated using archaeological methods.	
If you discover a previously unknown archaeological site (for example, when you are conducting Earthworks) you must stop any work that could affect it and contact HNZPT for advice on how to proceed.	
The Police will also need to be notified if human remains are revealed. If any artefacts are found, they must be handed over to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.	
Objectives	
HH-O1	Recognising historic heritage
Historic heritage that reflects the City's diverse history is recognised.	
HH-O2	Subdivision, use and development
The City's historic heritage is protected from, and not lost as a result of, inappropriate modification, subdivision, use and development.	
Policies	
HH-P1	Identifying historic heritage
Identify historic heritage that contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the history and cultures of Porirua City, the Wellington Region or New Zealand and is significant in terms of one or more of the following values: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic values; 2. Physical values; 3. Social values; 4. Tangata whenua values; 5. Surroundings; 6. Rarity; or 7. Representativeness. 	
HH-P2	Historic Heritage categories
Classify the buildings, items and sites identified using the values of HH-P1 according to their relative significance and schedule and map them as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Heritage (Group A): Buildings or Items and any associated features and heritage settings that have outstanding national or regional significance (SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A)); 2. Historic Heritage (Group B): Buildings or Items and any associated features and heritage settings that have national, regional or local significance (SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)); or 3. Historic Heritage Sites: Places and areas that are of national, regional or local significance (SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites). 	

HH-P3	Repair, maintenance and redecoration of heritage items
Enable the repair, maintenance and redecoration of heritage items included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where the identified heritage values are maintained.	
HH-P4	New use of heritage items, and heritage settings
Provide for new uses, including adaptive reuse of heritage items and their heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where any works undertaken to adapt the heritage item or heritage setting for the new use are undertaken in a manner that is sensitive to and protects the identified heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting.	
HH-P5	Small-scale earthworks on historic heritage sites, and within heritage items and heritage settings
Enable small-scale earthworks for burials within an existing cemetery on historic heritage sites and within heritage items and heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.	
HH-P6	Other earthworks on historic heritage sites, and within heritage items and heritage settings
Only allow for other earthworks on historic heritage sites and within heritage items and heritage settings listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values will be protected, having regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extent of the earthworks; 2. The manner in which the earthworks are undertaken; 3. The monitoring of earthworks; and 4. The avoidance of archaeological sites. 	
HH-P7	Animal grazing on historic heritage sites
Allow animal grazing as a means of vegetation maintenance on historic heritage sites listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, where identified heritage values are maintained.	
HH-P8	Maintenance and heritage restoration of historic heritage sites
Enable the maintenance and heritage restoration of historic heritage sites included in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, where identified heritage values are maintained.	
HH-P9	Heritage restoration of heritage items
Control the heritage restoration of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), to ensure that the materials used and the design reflects the heritage form, fabric and heritage values of the heritage item, having regard to:	

1. The manner in which the works are undertaken, including the materials used and design; and
2. The impact of the works on the identified heritage values in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B); and
3. Whether the works will be subject to the oversight of and/or undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert.

HH- P10 Earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility

Control earthquake strengthening, fire protection, and accessibility upgrades to heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), to ensure that the materials and design reflect the heritage values of the heritage item and avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on identified heritage values, by:

1. Protecting, as far as possible, architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the heritage item;
2. Retaining or reinstating original façade appearance;
3. Minimising the visual impact of additions on the heritage item, and in the case of any replacement of an elevated feature on a façade or roof, the new feature is visually indistinguishable from the feature being replaced; and
4. Having regard to:
 - a. The manner in which the works will be undertaken; and
 - b. Whether the works will be subject to the oversight of and/or undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert.

HH- P11 Use and development of heritage items, heritage settings, and historic heritage sites

Only allow other use and development of and within heritage items and heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values are protected and maintained, having regard to:

1. The particular heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting, or the historic heritage site and its significance;
2. The heritage item, heritage setting, or the historic heritage site's sensitivity to change or capacity to accommodate changes without compromising the heritage values of the heritage item, heritage setting or historic heritage site;
3. Any heritage alterations and additions to heritage items, including for an ongoing use or any adaptive re-use, are compatible with the form, proportions, materials and patina of the heritage item and maintain its heritage values;
4. Architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the heritage item or the historic heritage site are not lost or obscured by new materials or changes;
5. Whether any new building or structure, including its location, form, design and materials, is compatible with the original architectural style, character and scale of the heritage item, and the impact of the new building or structure on the heritage setting;
6. The extent to which any adverse impacts on heritage values are necessary to enable the long term, practical, or feasible use of the heritage item or historic heritage site;
7. The reduction or loss of any heritage values, including the ability to interpret the place and its relationship with other features/items;

8. The extent or degree to which any changes are reversible;
9. Any opportunities to enhance the heritage values of the heritage item and its heritage setting or the historic heritage site;
10. The extent to which any heritage alterations to heritage items and historic heritage sites are kept to the minimum necessary, in particular where it involves modifying the physical fabric of a heritage item or parts of a historic heritage site which contribute to identified heritage values;²⁵
11. The potential for cumulative adverse effects on heritage values;²⁶
- 4012²⁷. Any assessments or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert; and
- 4413²⁸. The extent to which any changes are consistent with a relevant conservation plan.

HH-P12 Repositioning and relocation of heritage items

Only allow repositioning or relocation of heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where the identified heritage values are protected and maintained taking into account:

1. Whether there are opportunities to enhance the physical condition of the heritage item and its heritage values and the public's appreciation of those values, including being more publicly accessible and/or within public view;
2. Any measures to minimise the risk of damage to the heritage item;
3. For repositioning within a heritage setting, whether the new location of the heritage item is as close to the original location as practicable, or, where this is not possible if and whether²⁹ the new location maintains the heritage values and significance of the heritage item;
4. For relocation beyond a heritage setting:
 - a. Whether the new location is related to the heritage values of the heritage item and/or provides a heritage setting compatible with the heritage values of the heritage item; and
 - b. Any other alternatives to relocation that have been explored including repairs, earthquake strengthening, heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive re-use, and relocation is the only reasonable option; and
5. Whether the relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter.

HH-P13 Demolition or destruction of heritage items included in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)

Avoid the demolition or destruction of heritage items included in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), unless:

1. For demolition or destruction in part:
 - a. It is demonstrated that the part of the heritage item detracts from the identified heritage values of the heritage item; or
2. For complete demolition or for demolition or destruction in part that is not otherwise covered under HH-P13-1.a:

²⁵ Heritage NZ [65.25]

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ Ibid

²⁹ Heritage NZ [65.26]

- a. The heritage item is a serious risk to safety or property or is in a serious state of disrepair and interim protection measures would not remove that threat;
- b. The cost of remedying the risk or disrepair is unreasonable; and
- c. Other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored including:
 - i. Repairs;
 - ii. Earthquake strengthening;
 - iii. Heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive reuse;
 - iv. Repositioning or relocation;
 - v. Whether demolition or destruction could occur in part without adverse effects on the heritage values for which the heritage item was scheduled; and
 - vi. Whether the costs of the alternatives would be unreasonable.

HH- P14 Demolition and destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

Avoid the demolition or destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, unless:

1. To gain access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency; or³⁰
- ~~1.2.~~ The heritage item or historic heritage site is a serious risk to safety or property or is in a serious state of disrepair and interim protection measures would not remove that threat; and
- ~~2.~~ ~~3.~~ The cost of remedying the risk or disrepair is prohibitive; and
- ~~3.~~ ~~4.~~ Other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored including:
 - a. Repairs;
 - b. Earthquake strengthening;
 - c. Heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive reuse;
 - d. Repositioning or relocation;
 - e. Whether demolition or destruction could occur in part without adverse effects on the identified heritage values for which the heritage item was scheduled; and
 - f. Whether the costs of the alternatives would be prohibitive.

HH- P15 Subdivision

Only allow subdivision of sites that have heritage items, heritage settings or historic heritage sites listed SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that:

1. The heritage values for which the heritage item or historic heritage site is scheduled are maintained and protected;
2. Sufficient land is provided around the heritage item or historic heritage site to protect associated heritage values;

³⁰ FENZ [119.39]

3. There are measures to minimise obstruction of views of the heritage item from adjoining public spaces that may result from any future land use or development; and
4. The remainder of the site associated with the heritage item, heritage setting, or historic heritage site is of a size which continues to provide it with a suitable heritage setting to maintain the heritage values associated with the heritage item, or historic heritage site.

Rules

Note: There may be a number of provisions that apply to an activity, building, structure or site. Resource consent may therefore be required under rules in this chapter as well as other chapters. Unless specifically stated in a rule, resource consent is required under each relevant rule. The steps to determine the status of an activity are set out in the General Approach chapter.

Rules relating to subdivision, including minimum allotment sizes for each zone, are found in the Subdivision chapter.

HH-R1



Repair, maintenance and redecoration of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)

All zones

1. Activity status: **Permitted**

Where:

1. Compliance is achieved with HH-S1.

All zones

2. Activity status: **Restricted discretionary**

Where:

- a. Compliance is not achieved with HH-S1.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. The matters in HH-P11.

Note: An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.

HH-R2



Maintenance and heritage restoration of historic heritage sites listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

All zones

1. Activity status: **Permitted**

HH-R3



Animal grazing on historic heritage sites listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

All zones

1. Activity status: **Permitted**

HH-R4




Earthworks on heritage items and within³¹ heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

All zones

1. Activity status: **Permitted**

³¹ PCC [11.37]

	<p>Where:</p> <p>a. Earthworks are associated with burials within an existing cemetery.</p>
All zones	<p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with HH-R4-1.a.</p> <p>Matters of control are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters in HH-P6.</p> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To avoid doubt, the Earthworks provisions relating to the underlying zone still apply.
HH-R5³²	<p><u>Repair, maintenance, redecoration, heritage restoration, earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility upgrades, alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B)</u>³³</p>
<u>All zones</u> ³⁴	<p>1. Activity status: <u>Permitted</u>³⁵</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The structure or building is not identified as a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B).</u>³⁶</p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>This rule does not apply to extensions to the footprint of buildings and structures located within the heritage setting of a heritage item, which is covered by Rule HH-R8.</u>³⁷</p>
HH-R56³⁸ 	<p>Heritage restoration of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)</p>
All zones	<p>1. Activity status: Controlled</p> <p>Matters of control are restricted to:</p>

³² PCC [11.58]

³³ Ibid




³⁴ Ibid








³⁵ Ibid

³⁶ Ibid

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Ibid

	1. The matters in HH-P9.
HH-R67 	Earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility upgrades to a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)
All zones	1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P10.
HH-R78 	Any new building or structure, or extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)
All zones	1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P11. Notification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An application under this rule where it is for the extension of the footprint of a building or structure is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. • When deciding whether any person is affected in relation to this rule - where it is for the extension of the footprint of a building or structure, for the purposes of section 95E of the RMA, the Council will give specific consideration to any adverse effects on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
HH-R89 	Any new building or structure, or extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure on a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites
All zones	1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P11. Notification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An application under this rule where it is for the extension of the footprint of a building or structure is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. • When deciding whether any person is affected in relation to this rule - where it is for the extension of the footprint of a building or structure, for the purposes of section 95E of the RMA, the Council will give specific consideration to any adverse effects on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

 HH-R910	Additions and heritage alterations to any heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and heritage alterations to any historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites	
All zones	1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P11.	
 HH-R1011	Repositioning of any heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) within the heritage setting of that heritage item	
All zones	1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P12.	
 HH-R1112	The relocation of a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) beyond the heritage setting of the heritage item	
All zones	1. Activity status: Discretionary	
 HH-R1213	The demolition of a Group B heritage item listed in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)	
All zones	1. Activity status: Discretionary	
 HH-R1314	Any activity not provided for as a permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity	
All zones	1. Activity status: Discretionary	
 HH-R14-15	The demolition of a Group A heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A)	
All zones	1. Activity status: Non-complying	
 HH-R1516	The destruction of a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites	
All zones	1. Activity status: Non-complying	
Standards		
HH-S1	Repairs, maintenance and redecoration of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)	
All zones	1. There must be no damage to the heritage item when undertaking the repairs, maintenance or redecoration, and protective material must	Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P11.

be used where necessary to prevent damage.

2. For repairs, any materials removed to carry out the repairs must be limited to the amount necessary to carry out the works.

Appendix 16 - Archaeological Authority Process³⁹

Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 it is unlawful to destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site (regardless of whether the site is identified in the District Plan or not) without obtaining an archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) before you start work. An archaeological authority is required in addition to any resource consents required by the Council.

An archaeological site is defined in this act as any place in New Zealand (including buildings, structures or shipwrecks) that was associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there is evidence relating to the history of New Zealand that can be investigated using archaeological methods.

If you discover a previously unknown archaeological site (for example, when you are conducting Earthworks) you must stop any work that could affect it and contact HNZPT for advice on how to proceed.

The Police will also need to be notified if human remains are revealed. If any artefacts are found, they must be handed over to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

³⁹ Heritage NZ [65.18]

SCHEM2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A)

SCHEM2 contains Group A Heritage Items and associated heritage settings.

Information under Feature description identifies what is included in the schedule entry for each heritage item. The interiors of heritage items are excluded unless specifically identified. Where a heritage item has heritage setting this is stated. Not all heritage items have a heritage setting and some are marked as n/a* to indicate heritage settings may be considered for inclusion at a future date, through a future plan change. The Planning Maps show if a site contains a heritage item and heritage setting through the inclusion of a heritage item symbol within the site. Where relevant, the heritage setting is also shown. In some cases, the extent of a heritage item is outlined on the planning maps. Heritage settings do not always follow site boundaries.

Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHEM2 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.

HHA001 St Joseph's Church

Location & legal description	85 Paremata Haywards Road (Pt Sec 63 Pāuatahanui DIST)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	The church building	Constructed in 1878 St Joseph's is one of the oldest Catholic Church buildings still in use in the region and was the first Catholic church in Porirua. This well-composed and Gothic style church was designed by Thomas Turnbull, a well-recognised Wellington-based architect.
HNZPT or NZAA⁴⁰ listing	HNZPT ⁴¹ Category 1: List Number 205	These factors all give the place high historic value. Its location on a gentle rise above a small bluff gives the building some prominence and setting value when approached. The church is located away from the village core but can be read within the wider village landscape and this provides it with high value as part of this group of buildings that remain from the establishment of Pāuatahanui in the late 1800's. The long period of use of the site and associated use for burials gives it high archaeological value. The structure is authentic and little has been altered - the transfer windows are rare.
NZAA site number⁴²	R27/320 ⁴³	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

⁴⁰ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁴¹ Ibid

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

		Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA002 Papakōwhai Homestead		
Location & legal description	1 Bowlers Wharf Lane (Lot 1 DP 80738)	Statement of Significance The homestead's address at Bowlers Wharf Lane references William Bowler, the original owner of the farm and associated wharf, now extant. At least part of Bowler's modest farm cottage, built in 1848, is thought to have been subsumed within the more substantial Italianate styled homestead structure when it was added to after 1888 and following the farm's acquisition by Anthony Wall.
Feature description	Original house, excluding the 1990s rear addition	This association with a well-known family, the age, rarity and authenticity of the place give Papakōwhai Homestead high historic value. It also has high archaeological value given the age of the remnant structure. The building is of a well-composed design and this, together with its representativeness, gives it high architectural value.
HNZPT or NZAA⁴⁴ listing	HNZPT ⁴⁵ Category 1: List Number 2890	
<u>NZAA site number</u>⁴⁶	<u>R27/508</u> ⁴⁷	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity, Representativeness
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHA003 Taylor-Stace Cottage		
Location & legal description	470 Paremata Road, State Highway 58 (Lot 1 DP 50929)	Statement of Significance Taylor-Stace Cottage is located on the west side of the Pāuatahanui Stream, slightly apart from the rest of the village. It is still legible as a part of this original settlement group of buildings and this setting contributes to its high value. Named for William and Anne Taylor who arrived in New Zealand in 1840 and moved to Pāuatahanui in 1847 when they built the back portion of the cottage. In 1848 they moved to Tawa Flat and the house was sold to Alfred Stace, the other part of the cottage's name. The cottage as it stands today consists of the north wing at the street front of the
Feature description	The cottage building - north and south wings	

⁴⁴ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁴⁵ Ibid

⁴⁶ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁴⁷ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

HNZPT of NZAA⁴⁸ listing	HNZPT⁴⁹ Category 1: List Number 4108	building (possibly dating from 1860) and the south wing which dates from 1847. The Taylor-Stage Cottage has high historic value for its association with early European settler families. As the oldest existing residence in the Pāuatahanui area and possibly in the Wellington region, it has high archaeological value. As a rare example of a building from this time it has scientific and technical value from its construction and use of materials, although there have been considerable modifications. These include conversion to a craft gallery in the 1970s. However, it retains much of its original form, and its characteristic mid-19th century colonial cottage appearance gives it high architectural value.
<u>NZAA site number⁵⁰</u>	<u>R27/318⁵¹</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA004 F-Ward building, Porirua Hospital		
Location & legal description	Upper Main Drive - Lot 1 DP 428849	Statement of Significance
Feature description	The former F-ward buildings	Formal provision for mental health care in the Wellington region began in 1844. In 1884 work began on a new asylum at Porirua, based on the Farm Hospital concept, which opened three years later. F-Ward was designed by the Public Works Department under Government Architect, John Campbell and constructed in 1910 as part of a new initiative in care, the introduction of occupational health. In 1942 two large earthquakes severely damaged the main hospital building, and in the following year it was demolished, leaving F-Ward as the last surviving ward. F-Ward continued to provide accommodation for female patients until the 1970s when the ward closed. In 1987 F-Ward was reopened as a museum, at the time of the hospital's centenary celebration.
HNZPT of NZAA⁵² listing	HNZPT⁵³ Category 1: List Number 7444	
<u>NZAA site number⁵⁴</u>	N/A⁵⁵	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	The building has high value as a rare surviving and authentic example of an Edwardian psychiatric ward. It has retained original isolation cells as well

⁴⁸ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Ibid

⁵¹ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

⁵² Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁵³ Ibid

⁵⁴ Ibid

⁵⁵ Ibid

		<p>as relics of treatment, both of which contribute to scientific and technical value. It has high historic value for its long term provision of residential mental health care. Although the wider setting has changed considerably, the open recreation space and shade shelter used by patients has been retained.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHA005 Mana Island Woolshed		
Location & legal description	<p>Mana Island - Pt Mana Island Block XI Paekakariki Survey District</p>	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>Mana Island woolshed is located on flat land slightly elevated above the beach at Shingle Point.</p> <p>It is thought that Mana Island Woolshed was constructed between 1890 and 1897 <u>prior to 1873</u>⁵⁶ by Mariano Vella. The woolshed design is unusual in having very low side walls and a steeply pitched roof (36 degree slope). It appears that the woolshed has had two extensions (shearing area and machine room; and the wool room) although it is not known when the extensions were undertaken. The early part of the building is interesting for the use of kanuka/manuka rafters and posts, with some still having their bark on. To the east and north there are remains of holding pens, fences and a sheep dip.</p> <p>Mana Island woolshed has high historic values in its association with New Zealand farming, particularly because the farm produced the first wool to be exported from New Zealand. The woolshed has architectural and representative values as it demonstrates vernacular design and construction techniques particularly for the use of readily available materials. The woolshed has scientific and technical value given its high level of structural authenticity and early internal fittings. Repairs by Department of Lands and Survey in 1986 has reduced the authenticity of cladding.</p>
Feature description	Historic woolshed building	
HNZPT or NZAA listing ⁵⁷	N/A	
NZAA site number ⁵⁸	<u>R26/734</u> ⁵⁹	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	

⁵⁶ Heritage NZ [65.61]

⁵⁷ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁵⁸ Ibid

⁵⁹ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

		Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA006 St Alban's Church		
Location & legal description	4 Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 2 DP 311366)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	St Alban's Church building	<p>St Alban's Anglican church and associated cemetery are located on the site of an abandoned pā of which there is still evidence in trenches and land-works. Preceded by a smaller chapel the church was designed by highly regarded Wellington Anglican Diocesan architect Frederick de Jersey Clere. The foundation stone was laid in 1895 and Bishop Wallis consecrated the church in 1898 on St Alban the Martyrs Day. The Victorian Free Gothic styled timber building has a rectangular plan and an apsidal chapel and has a steeply sloped roof and tall bell tower which can be seen from the wider Pāuatahanui area. The cemetery extends around the church and is bounded by large trees, while holly hedge separates the church and its cemetery from the Pāuatahanui Public Cemetery.</p> <p>It is considered an excellent representative example of the architect's work and with accordingly high architectural value. Historic values are high given its associations with this community for over 120 years and it is a rare example of a country church with high authenticity. It also has scientific and technical value given its use of materials and structural design. Its group and setting value is high and it is perhaps the most central and prominent of the historic places that can still be seen together within the village landscape. It retains its high social and cultural value as a church venue for special occasions such as weddings, christenings and funerals within the Porirua area.</p> <p>St Albans church and cemetery is also at the historic site of Matai-taua Pā (reference SASM020 in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori)</p>
HNZPT or NZAA⁶⁰ listing	HNZPT⁶⁴ Category 2: List Number 1320	
<u>NZAA site number⁶²</u>	<u>R27/321⁶³</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

⁶⁰ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁶¹ Ibid

⁶² Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁶³ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

		Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA007 Gear Homestead 'Okowai'		
Location & legal description	Okowai Road (Lot 1 DP 54351)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Original house and ancillary buildings (including the woolshed)	The Gear Homestead (Okowai) is named after James Gear, an early and major player in Wellington's industry. He established the Gear Meat Preserving and Freezing Company in Petone in 1882 and the activity continued at this site for some 100 years. The house was completed on the site in 1887 and it is assumed to have been designed by Robert Edwards in the Italianate style, popular at that time for grand homes.
HNZPT or NZAA⁶⁴ listing	HNZPT ⁶⁵ Category 2: List Number 1328	The building has high architectural values because of its high level of stylistic representativeness and authenticity of fabric and form. The building and its remaining grounds (substantial areas were lost for housing and road works) are now (from 1975) in Porirua City Council ownership. It has retained a prominent setting which contributes to its value.
<u>NZAA site number</u>⁶⁶	<u>R27/322</u> ⁶⁷	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	It operates today as a cafe and function venue, and has high social amenity values accordingly. The association with Gear, an important industrialist of the time, gives the site and house high historic values as does its relative rarity as a country house of this period in Porirua. Due to the age of the site's occupation, it has high archaeological value and the building's intactness of structure gives it high scientific and technical value. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA008 Blackey's Woolshed		
Location & legal description	850A Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 2 DP 389851)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Historic Woolshed building	Blackey's woolshed is a vernacular building, mainly constructed with materials that were available in the area at the time. It is built into a gently sloping rise adjacent to a large modern farm building. The setting of this woolshed, although now compromised by the large modern farm shed,

⁶⁴ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁶⁵ Ibid

⁶⁶ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁶⁷ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

HNZPT of NZAA⁶⁸ listing	HNZPT⁶⁹ Category 2: List Number 2883	still makes an important contribution to the heritage values of the building. It is not known when Blackey's woolshed was constructed, however, it's exterior appearance, construction materials and condition would suggest a build date potentially in the 1850s or 1860s. Due to this the building is likely to be of archaeological value as an archaeological site under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
NZAA site number⁷⁰	R26/418⁷¹	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	Significant earthworks have occurred around the building in recent years to remove contaminated soil and to form a level building platform and access to the modern shed. The woolshed is interesting due to the use of native timbers and is distinctively constructed with split and adzed totara posts and native poles as rafters (with bark largely intact, possibly totara or wineberry). The majority of the exterior walls and the roof are clad in corrugated iron, some of which has been replaced by modern material. It has high historic, scientific and technical value given the authentic condition of the building and structure. The woolshed has high representativeness values as an example of early, rural vernacular carpentry. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA009 Thomas Hollis Stace Cottage		
Location & legal description	2 Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 1 DP 51888)	Statement of Significance This 2-storey cottage was built in 1860 by Thomas Hollis Stace, who was one of the earliest Pākehā to settle in Pāuatahanui. The cottage remains as one of the oldest buildings in Porirua.
Feature description	Cottage building	The age of the building and the use of the site from an early time in the district's colonial history contribute to high archaeological values. The building's composition and construction represents
HNZPT of NZAA⁷² listing	HNZPT⁷³ Category 2: List	

⁶⁸ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁶⁹ Ibid

⁷⁰ Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁷¹ Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

⁷² Heritage NZ [65.62]

⁷³ Ibid

	Number 4106	<p>a colonial style which is historically rare in the district. The back block extension has been appropriately designed and executed without detracting significantly from the original building although with other changes over time the authenticity of the building is reduced. Accordingly, the building has medium to high architectural value. The age and rarity of a structure suggests high scientific and technical value can be gained from studying its construction. The historic associations of the place with one of the initial settlers in Porirua, its setting being read as it is within the context of the village, and its community role as a post office and store, give it high historic values. The wider setting of the cottage has been considerably modified with the construction of the Transmission Gully highway.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
<u>NZAA site number</u> ⁷⁴	<u>N/A</u> ⁷⁵	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHA010 Pāuatahanui War Memorial		
Location & legal description	Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 1 DP 5672)	
Feature description	War memorial monument	Statement of Significance
HNZPT or NZAA ⁷⁶ listing	HNZPT ⁷⁷ Category 2: List Number 4107	Built as a memorial to WWI, the monument is an obelisk constructed of Kairuru marble and topped with an acanthus leaf finial. It is bounded by low walls and is chained off at the front. The memorial was unveiled by Governor-General Lord Jellicoe in January 1922, but the designer is not known.
<u>NZAA site number</u> ⁷⁸	<u>N/A</u> ⁷⁹	Memorials are by their nature of symbolic interest, and although often subsumed within our urban landscapes, they have high social and cultural value when considered in their own right. The Pāuatahanui memorial is no exception. It is elegantly proportioned and representative of a neo-Classical style which in combination with its rare use of this type of marble and authentic condition give it high architectural and some scientific and technical value. The memorial has important local associations within the community and high historic value for this. It can be visually
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

⁷⁴ Ibid

⁷⁵ Ibid

⁷⁶ Ibid

⁷⁷ Ibid

⁷⁸ Ibid

⁷⁹ Ibid

		and historically linked with other historic structures in the Pāuatahanui Village and has high group value accordingly. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHA011 Paremata Barracks		
Location & legal description	Southern end of Ngāti Toa Domain (Pt Sec 337 Porirua DIST)	Statement of Significance Constructed between 1846 and 1847 this brick, stone and timber barracks was originally an imposing two-storied structure with towers. Governor Grey considered this site strategically well placed to protect settlers from Te Rangihaeata's movements into Wellington and the Hutt Valley via Porirua Harbour. It was poorly constructed and earthquakes in 1848 and 1855 caused considerable damage causing it to be abandoned by the military. In the 1880s it was converted into a farm building and by the 1950s the barracks had become ruins.
Feature description	Military Barracks Ruins	
HNZPT or NZAA⁸⁰ listing	HNZPT ⁸⁴ Category 2: List Number 1329	
<u>NZAA site number</u>	<u>R26/254</u> ⁸²	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	The ruins are a regionally unique surviving example of stone barracks from the Imperial military period of the 1840s. The ruins have historic and archaeological values having a physical connection with the earliest period of organised European settlement and the resulting conflict between Māori and Pākehā. The remaining low walls of locally sourced stone and brick have architectural scientific and technical value. The barracks' relationship to other military sites in the region gives it a high group value. The site is somewhat neglected and compromised by the quality of the immediate surroundings, but the associations of the place with a challenging and turbulent time in New Zealand's history give it high social and cultural value. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings and Rarity
<u>HHB018</u>⁸³ <u>Titahi Bay Boat Sheds</u>⁸⁴		

⁸⁰ Ibid

⁸¹ Ibid

⁸² Heritage NZ [65.60, 65.62]

⁸³ Heritage NZ [65.66]

⁸⁴ Ibid

<u>Location & legal description</u> ⁸⁵	<u>All three groups located along Titahi Bay Beach (Accessed off Vella Street, Bay Drive and South Beach Access Road)</u> ⁸⁶	<u>Statement of Significance</u> - <u>A series of three groups of boat storage sheds sit at the back of the sweeping Titahi Bay beach. They include the oldest sheds at the north end (dating from 1916) on rocks through to the most recent other two groups of buildings that date from the 1950s – the exact dates are not known. The sheds' regular and repeating linear form along the beach give them high architectural value which is far in excess of any of their individual value. They are very typical of this type of structure and so have high representative value. Their historical significance is high - there are very few other groups of structures like this within New Zealand - they are both rare and distinctive. They have long been associated with the bay and as a group and in this setting are of significant value. The sheds at the north end are relatively original and will hold scientific and technical value, however there have been some changes to external fabric and complete shed replacements to the two other groups. The sheds tell a story of the settlement of Porirua's beach suburbs and they continue to provide the social amenity for which they were constructed, which keeps them in a place of high public esteem.</u>
<u>Feature description</u> ⁸⁸	<u>The form and scale of the boat shed buildings. The fabric of the buildings is not protected.</u> ⁸⁹	
<u>HNZPT listing</u> ⁹⁰	<u>N/A</u> ⁹¹	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ⁹²	<u>N/A</u> ⁹³	
<u>Heritage Setting</u> ⁹⁴	<u>n/a</u> ⁹⁵	<u>- Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</u> ⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Ibid⁸⁶ Ibid⁸⁷ Ibid⁸⁸ Ibid⁸⁹ Ibid⁹⁰ Heritage NZ [65.62]⁹¹ Ibid⁹² Ibid⁹³ Ibid⁹⁴ Heritage NZ [65.66]⁹⁵ Ibid

SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)

SCHED3 contains Group B Heritage Items and associated heritage settings.

Information under Feature description identifies what is included in the schedule entry for each heritage item. The interiors of heritage items are excluded unless specifically identified. Where a heritage item has heritage setting this is stated. Not all heritage items have a heritage setting and some are marked as n/a* to indicate heritage settings may be considered for inclusion at a future date, through a future plan change. The Planning Maps show if a site contains a heritage item and heritage setting through the inclusion of a heritage item symbol within the site. Where relevant, the heritage setting is also shown. In some cases, the extent of a heritage item is outlined on the planning maps. Heritage settings do not always follow site boundaries.

Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED3 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.

HHB001 Bromley Homestead

Location & legal description	400A Paremata Road (Pt Lot 1 DP 72726)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Original house, (excluding the rear extension)	Built in 1913 for Reginald Stace Wall, the grandson of prominent early settler Thomas Hollis Stace, Bromley is a strong representative example of a substantial farm homestead built for a family of means on a prime site at the edge of the Pāuatahanui Inlet. It is part of a significant collection of old houses around the inlet associated with the Stace family, and of other houses and buildings in the wider area associated with the Stace and Wall families. In that context it illustrates the settlement and development of the area from the time the first Europeans started farming to the present day. The building has considerable historic and group value for those associations. Bromley has high architectural values for its careful design and use of materials and retains a high level of authenticity in its form and appearance – the building can be understood much as it was when first built.
HNZPT or NZAA⁹⁶ listing	HNZPT ⁹⁷ Category 2: List Number 4964	
NZAA site number⁹⁸	N/A ⁹⁹	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

⁹⁶ Heritage NZ [65.68]

⁹⁷ Ibid

⁹⁸ Ibid

⁹⁹ Ibid

		Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB002 Kerehoma Farm Homestead		
Location & legal description	28 Muri Road (Lot 3 DP 88556)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Original house	The Kerehoma Farm Homestead was completed in 1925 and is a large rectangular reinforced concrete house. The homestead is a good example of the Arts and Crafts style with boxed windows, exposed rafter ends and a characteristic arch. Original outbuildings included a small whare, a farm shed, a tool shed, wood shed, cow bales and a harness room and outdoor lavatory. A garage was added in 1936 to house the family's Austin. This house has important historic associations as does this location for the Wall family. The house is rare and distinctive in its construction and style and has historic value for this.
HNZPT or NZAA listing¹⁰⁰	<u>N/A¹⁰¹</u>	
NZAA site number¹⁰²	<u>N/A¹⁰³</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB003 Turville House		
Location & legal description	75 Motuhara Road (Lot 2 DP 59851)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	House and open space setting, including garage and gardens	Located on Motuhara Road on a ridge overlooking Plimmerton, the house, of masonry construction with a plastered finish and tiled roof, was built sometime between 1904 and 1908. It sits with a modern garage fronting Motuhara Road, built in a sympathetic design to the house around 1989 - 1990. The extensive grounds with mature trees give it high landmark value and the garden setting is an important part of its value. The origin of the name "Turville House" is believed to be attributed to the Rixon family who originated in Turville, Buckinghamshire, England. "Turville House" been acknowledged as such since 1917. The original designer and owner was NZ Railways architect George Troup, and who became Mayor of Wellington in 1927. The architectural value of the property is high due to the designer's association with well-regarded railway buildings (such as
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁰⁴ listing	<u>N/A¹⁰⁵</u>	
NZAA site number¹⁰⁶	<u>N/A¹⁰⁷</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

¹⁰⁰ Ibid¹⁰¹ Ibid¹⁰² Ibid¹⁰³ Ibid¹⁰⁴ Ibid¹⁰⁵ Ibid¹⁰⁶ Ibid¹⁰⁷ Ibid

		<p>Dunedin Railway Station) and the house's quality of construction and proportion. It has retained its authenticity despite changes and additions, is a rare building type in Porirua and with has qualities which give it high scientific and technical value. This association and Troup's later civic role also gives the place high historic value.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHB004 Clifton Homestead		
Location & legal description	450 Paremata Road, (Lot 1 DP 397438)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Original house	The homestead is located at the east end of the Pāuatahanui Inlet, on a prominent flat site above a bluff, which gives it a sunny and open aspect with expansive views across the inlet to Pāuatahanui and the hills beyond. The setting value is high. Clifton is one of several properties (Taylor Stace Cottage, Bromley and Riverdale) around the Inlet to be built for and occupied by descendants of the prominent Stace and Wall families, and the homestead has high historic values for these associations.
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁰⁸ listing	<u>N/A¹⁰⁹</u>	
NZAA site number¹¹⁰	<u>N/A¹¹¹</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB005 Riverdale		
Location & legal description	460 Paremata Road (Lot 4 DP 79271)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	House	Built in 1915 for William Nathaniel Stace, one of eight children of prominent early settler Thomas Hollis Stace, Riverdale is a large farm homestead of an interesting transitional villa design set on a prime site at the side of the inlet. Although much modified over time, the original form of the building remains apparent and the building retains architectural value. Riverdale has high historic value for its association with the Stace family as
HNZPT or NZAA¹¹² listing	<u>N/A¹¹³</u>	

¹⁰⁸ Ibid¹⁰⁹ Ibid¹¹⁰ Ibid¹¹¹ Ibid¹¹² Ibid¹¹³ Ibid

<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹¹⁴	<u>N/A</u> ¹¹⁵	well as high group value for its association with the important collection of Stace family houses located around the Pāuatahanui Inlet. In that context it helps illustrate the pattern of European settlement and development of the area, from its initial emphasis on farming to the present day.
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB006 Tireti Hall		
Location & legal description	29 Tireti Road (Lot 34 DP 19907)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Hall building	The Tireti Hall, also known as the Old Golf House (opened in 1929), sits on a small hill and is visible from the immediate public environment. Now subsumed by suburban development, the hall was part of the original Titahi Bay golf course. The course itself closed in 1939-40 and was taken over for a United States Marines camp. When troops withdrew the hall area was taken over by the Ministry of Education and the building served as part of Porirua Side School. The larger part of the golf course land was developed for State Housing in the 1950s (including the current shopping centre). In 1957 the hall was purchased by Council for use as a community library and recreation centre (in conjunction with the nearby Marines hall). It has high architectural value as representative of golf club building design as well as having high historic value for its association with the original Titahi Bay Golf Club, its occupation by US forces and its later school use. It has group values for its association with other buildings used by the US Marines. It remains in the ownership of Porirua City Council with a community use, and consequently has high social amenity and public esteem.
HNZPT or NZAA ¹¹⁶ listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹¹⁷	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹¹⁸	<u>N/A</u> ¹¹⁹	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB007 House at 4 Kenepuru Drive		
Location & legal description	4 Kenepuru Drive (Lot	Statement of Significance

¹¹⁴ Ibid¹¹⁵ Ibid¹¹⁶ Ibid¹¹⁷ Ibid¹¹⁸ Ibid¹¹⁹ Ibid

	1 DP 8266)	<p>These three houses (part of a former group of five) are situated on the face of a small rise overlooking Kenepuru Drive and, constructed in the 1890s, are one of few remnants of the old Porirua Village, contributing a rare glimpse of the area's original settlement pattern. Having been constructed prior to 1900 they are likely to have archaeological values.</p> <p>Although the straightening of the Kenepuru stream and construction of the motorway interrupted the connection between these houses and the city, the houses retain a setting value as a distinctive group of buildings in an elevated position in the townscape. The general arrangement, scale and form of the houses are essentially the same. While the houses are typical modest houses of the period, they have some representative architectural and technical values exhibiting characteristics of the villa style with associated details. However this particular house is missing a number of key elements of the style including the original veranda, balustrade, chimneys and front door, and the exterior is in poor condition.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
Feature description	House	
HNZPT or NZAA listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹²¹	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹²²	<u>N/A</u> ¹²³	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB008 House at 8 Kenepuru Drive		
Location & legal description	8 Kenepuru Drive (Lot 3 DP 8266)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	House	<p>These three houses (part of a former group of five) are situated on the face of a small rise overlooking Kenepuru Drive and, constructed in the 1890s, are one of few remnants of the old Porirua Village, contributing a rare glimpse of the area's original settlement pattern. Having been constructed prior to 1900 they are likely to have archaeological values.</p> <p>Although the straightening of the Kenepuru stream and construction of the motorway interrupted the</p>

¹²⁰ Ibid¹²¹ Ibid¹²² Ibid¹²³ Ibid

HNZPT of NZAA¹²⁴ listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹²⁵	<p>connection between these houses and the city, the houses retain a setting value as a distinctive group of buildings in an elevated position in the townscape. The general arrangement, scale and form of the houses are essentially the same. While the houses are typical modest houses of the period, they have some representative architectural and technical values exhibiting characteristics of the villa style with associated details.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
NZAA site number¹²⁶	<u>N/A</u> ¹²⁷	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB009 House at 10 Kenepuru Drive		
Location & legal description	10 Kenepuru Drive (Lot 4 DP 8266)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	House	<p>These three houses (part of a former group of five) are situated on the face of a small rise overlooking Kenepuru Drive and, constructed in the 1890s, are one of few remnants of the old Porirua Village, contributing a rare glimpse of the area's original settlement pattern. Having been constructed prior to 1900 they are likely to have archaeological values.</p> <p>Although the straightening of the Kenepuru stream and construction of the motorway interrupted the connection between these houses and the city, the houses retain a setting value as a distinctive group of buildings in an elevated position in the townscape. The general arrangement, scale and form of the houses are essentially the same. While the houses are typical modest houses of the period, they have some representative architectural and technical values exhibiting characteristics of the villa style with associated details. However, this particular house has been modified with an addition in the Californian Bungalow style and has little evidence of the typical villa style detailing remaining.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
NZHPT of NZAA¹²⁸ listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹²⁹	
NZAA site number¹³⁰	<u>N/A</u> ¹³¹	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB010 House at 31 Huanui Street		

¹²⁴ Ibid

¹²⁵ Ibid

¹²⁶ Ibid

¹²⁷ Ibid

¹²⁸ Ibid

¹²⁹ Ibid

¹³⁰ Ibid

¹³¹ Ibid

Location & legal description	31 Huanui Street (Lot 45 DP 1900)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>The house was once prominent in the landscape due to its elevated position and the wide spaces between houses in the area. However, the growth of trees over time now means the house is relatively well screened from the street. A classic single-storey timber villa with a prominent front veranda spanning between bay windows the house was thought to have been constructed circa 1907 as the parsonage for the Porirua Methodist Church (located nearby, across the Porirua Stream). This makes it one of the oldest surviving buildings in the city. The house is a good representative example of a single-storeyed bay villa, however, it has been extensively modified. With the other few remaining examples of houses from this time in Ranui Heights it has high setting value. It was constructed at a time when house sites were formed in quite a different way than today and makes an important contribution to the understanding of settlement patterns within the city.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
Feature description	House	
HNZPT or NZAA¹³² listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹³³	
<u>NZAA site number</u>¹³⁴	<u>N/A</u> ¹³⁵	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB011 Plimmerton Pavilion		
Location & legal description	9 Sunset Parade (Sec 2 SO 443344)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>The Pavilion is located on a corner of Sunset Parade in Plimmerton, just north of the point that was the centre of the former Taupo pā. The setting is open to the sea to the west, with sweeping views out to Mana Island. The front of the site is a car-park and the buildings are set back. The Pavilion was originally constructed in 1924 as an open side building, which has grown as a series of joined halls to what it is today. The modifications have retained a consistency of Arts and Crafts style and detailing. Its setting beside the sea is important to its value and it continues to have high value for its social amenity. A low bluff rises to the east of the site and an urupā is located on top. The</p>
Feature description	Historic pavilion building	
HNZPT or NZAA¹³⁶ listing	R26/356 <u>N/A</u> ¹³⁷	
<u>NZAA site number</u>¹³⁸	<u>R26/356</u> ¹³⁹	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

¹³² Ibid

¹³³ Ibid

¹³⁴ Ibid

¹³⁵ Ibid

¹³⁶ Ibid

¹³⁷ Ibid

¹³⁸ Ibid

¹³⁹ Ibid

		<p>significance of the site for Ngāti Toa as the former Taupo pā engenders significant archaeological and cultural value for tangata whenua.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHB012 House at 41 Huanui Street		
Location & legal description	41 Huanui Street (Lot 1 DP 23264)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	House	<p>The house was once prominent in the landscape due to its elevated position and the wide spaces between houses in the area. However, the growth of trees over time now means the house is relatively well screened from the street. For the area, the site is comparatively small and the house is a quirky and elaborate version of a basic small four room cottage with similarities to railway cottage designs. However it has high architectural interest given its interesting features and authenticity including an elaborate and carefully detailed front porch. This house appears to one of the earliest houses surviving in Ranui Heights, being constructed about 1910 by Alfred Charles Coles, a farmer of Porirua. It was constructed at a time when house sites were formed in quite a different way than today and makes an important contribution to the understanding of settlement patterns within the city.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HNZPT or NZAA listing¹⁴⁰	<u>N/A¹⁴¹</u>	
<u>NZAA site number¹⁴²</u>	<u>N/A¹⁴³</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB013 Somme House		
Location & legal description	34 Moana Road (Lot 79 DP 2242)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Front façade of house	<p>Located on the coastal Moana Road at Plimmerton, Somme House is an early example of a seaside cottage and is a distinctive local landmark in Plimmerton. One of the larger old houses in the area it is a substantial-looking building, two storeys high with a gable ended Marseille tile roof, roughcast stucco exterior (over mass concrete) and timber joinery. Somme House has elegant proportions and distinctive</p>

¹⁴⁰ Ibid¹⁴¹ Ibid¹⁴² Ibid¹⁴³ Ibid

HNZPT or NZAA¹⁴⁴ listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁴⁵	<p>features that set it apart from other houses of the era in the area. Given its design, relative rarity, and representativeness as a sea-side cottage it is of high architectural value. There is some possibility the house was designed by noted architect George Troup which would serve to reinforce its architectural value if this could be established. The masonry construction gives the building moderate technical and scientific value. The sea-side relationship and prominence of the cottage despite the intervening development of the suburb promote the setting value of the building.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
<u>NZAA site number</u>¹⁴⁶	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁴⁷	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB014 Pukerua Bay Machine Gun Posts		
Location & legal description	One on Ocean Parade, other on Brendan Beach	
Feature description	Machine gun post structures	Statement of Significance
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁴⁸ listing	R26/271 <u>N/A</u> ¹⁴⁹	<p>The 'pill boxes' [so named in WW1 by the British for a resemblance to the boxes chemists issued pills in] at Pukerua Bay, were built between 1942 and 43 and are two of 38 around Wellington's coastline which formed part of the wider coastal defence network. The two at Pukerua Bay are of the "arrow-head" type (referring to the basic plan shape) and with the firing slits ensured a good field of fire all-round the pillbox. They are constructed of heavy reinforced concrete with walls about 300 mm thick. The No.2 structure, in the south of the bay, is the best preserved and remains accessible. There is a commemorative plaque set on the roof. Although utilitarian structures the pill boxes have an uncompromising aesthetic, purpose of form and use of materials and have high architectural value for this. They are a good representative example of their type and position relative to each other. They have high historic values for their association with the place and an important period in New Zealand and the region's history. The better preserved box has high scientific value given its authenticity. Their setting is important and they have high value for the ability to see the connection between the structures' function and the coast.</p>
<u>NZAA site number</u>¹⁵⁰	<u>R26/271</u> ¹⁵¹	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	

¹⁴⁴ Ibid

¹⁴⁵ Ibid

¹⁴⁶ Ibid

¹⁴⁷ Ibid

¹⁴⁸ Ibid

¹⁴⁹ Ibid

¹⁵⁰ Ibid

¹⁵¹ Ibid

Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness		
HHB015 Charles Gray Homestead		
Location & legal description	7 State Highway 1, Pukerua Bay (Pt Pukerua 3C1A)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>Set on a large site above the sea and accessed directly from the highway at Pukerua Bay the homestead includes the main house (circa 1923), a separate cottage (date unknown but likely at a similar time as the homestead), other outbuildings, and a three-bay garage and workshop has been added recently. There are substantial trees and regenerating coastal vegetation of ecological value and this strong, treed landscape provides the homestead with a secluded feel. The combination of the site's expansiveness and landscape gives it high setting value. The main house was designed by King and Dawson Architects of Wellington. The cottage, the other principal building does not appear on still available plans for the main house. It is therefore unlikely to have been architecturally designed. The principal buildings were constructed in the transitional bungalow style with low-pitched roof, exposed rafters and wide eaves, but with joinery typical of the villas and townhouses of late 1910s and early 1920s. The house has a complex plan and is of a grand scale and provides high architectural interest comparable to other homesteads of the district built for notable developers and pastoralists (Kerehoma and Mungavin for example). Charles Gray's association with the development of Pukerua Bay give the site and buildings high historic values.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
Feature description	Original house and adjacent cottage	
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁵² listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁵³	
<u>NZAA site number</u>¹⁵⁴	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁵⁵	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	
HHB016 Motuhara Tunnel		
Location & legal description	Beneath Motuhara Road	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>This is a closed tunnel located beneath Motuhara Road. Created in 1898 and closed by 1900, the Motuhara Tunnel was a tramway tunnel constructed</p>
Feature description	Tunnel structure	

¹⁵² Ibid¹⁵³ Ibid¹⁵⁴ Ibid¹⁵⁵ Ibid

HNZPT of NZAA listing¹⁵⁶	<u>N/A¹⁵⁷</u>	primarily for horse drawn conveyance of stone boulders. The Motuhara Tunnel is associated with a relatively short period of Plimmerton's history, but illustrates natural resources sourced from the wider Wellington region to support the development of Wellington City. Although largely obscured, the tunnel is recognised by the local community for its contribution to the range and diversity of heritage located in and around Plimmerton.
NZAA site number¹⁵⁸	<u>N/A¹⁵⁹</u>	
Heritage Setting	n/a	
Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic and Social		
HHB017 The Former US Marines Hall		
Location & legal description	20 Whitehouse Road (Sec 254 Porirua DIST)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Marine hall structure	Contextually now somewhat at odds with its original setting (the old American marines camp on the old Titahi Bay golf course land) the building now sits within the urban context of the Titahi Bay shopping centre. The land uses around this simple structure have changed over the intervening time since its construction in 1942, but the building's setting in combination with the nearby old golf clubhouse (also part of camp facilities) show a connection to the camp that once accommodated 1500 marines. This association with such a significant time in New Zealand's history give it high historic value. The Titahi Bay camp was one of three in the area that collectively were home to 5000 American marines. All the camp structures were designed by the Government Architect, prefabricated in the south island and shipped to these sites. The Titahi Bay hall is a rare remaining and representative example of these structures in New Zealand and it has high architectural value for this. It also has cultural value reflecting a period of significant social change in New Zealand that saw new levels of interaction between the two cultures.
HNZPT of NZAA listing¹⁶⁰	<u>N/A¹⁶¹</u>	
NZAA site number¹⁶²	<u>N/A¹⁶³</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

¹⁵⁶ Ibid

¹⁵⁷ Ibid

¹⁵⁸ Ibid

¹⁵⁹ Ibid

¹⁶⁰ Ibid

¹⁶¹ Ibid

¹⁶² Ibid

¹⁶³ Ibid

HHB018 Titahi Bay Boat Sheds¹⁶⁴		
Location & legal description	All three groups located along Titahi Bay Beach (Accessed off Vella Street, Bay Drive and South Beach Access Road)	Statement of Significance - A series of three groups of boat storage sheds sit at the back of the sweeping Titahi Bay beach. They include the oldest sheds at the north end (dating from 1916) on rocks through to the most recent other two groups of buildings that date from the 1950s—the exact dates are not known. The sheds' regular and repeating linear form along the beach give them high architectural value which is far in excess of any of their individual value. They are very typical of this type of structure and so have high representative value. Their historical significance is high—there are very few other groups of structures like this within New Zealand—they are both rare and distinctive. They have long been associated with the bay and as a group and in this setting are of significant value. The sheds at the north end are relatively original and will hold scientific and technical value, however there have been some changes to external fabric and complete shed replacements to the two other groups. The sheds tell a story of the settlement of Porirua's beach suburbs and they continue to provide the social amenity for which they were constructed, which keeps them in a place of high public esteem. - Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
Feature description	The form and scale of the boat shed buildings. The fabric of the buildings is not protected.	
HNZPT or NZAA listing	-	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB019 Radio NZ Transmission Station		
Location & legal description	Transmitter Street (Pt Lot 1 DP 10900) (also known as 47 Thornley Street)	Statement of Significance Prominent on the Porirua skyline on the top of Whitirea peninsula the two transmitting masts and the main buildings were, in 1937 when opened by the Prime Minister Michael Joseph Savage, generating the largest medium frequency station output in the southern hemisphere. The site was established as part of the government of the day's commitment to a quality national broadcasting service. Prominent
Feature description	Transmission station and shed, not the aerials	

¹⁶⁴ Heritage NZ [65.66]

HNZPT of NZAA¹⁶⁵ listing	<u>N/A¹⁶⁶</u>	<p>Wellington architects Crichton, McKay & Haughton were appointed to design the buildings which they did in the Moderne style. The complex has important associations with the early history of radio broadcasting nationally, which give it high historic value. The significance of radio as a communication media in New Zealand gives the site high social value. Although the original masts have been replaced and quarters removed, the remaining buildings and other elements are authentic and representative of the function, and have high architectural value accordingly. The complex is rare and distinctive.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
<u>NZAA site number¹⁶⁷</u>	<u>N/A¹⁶⁸</u>	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB020 St. Timothy's Church and Hall		
Location & legal description	16 Te Pene Avenue (Lot 225 DP 19075 and Lot 226 DP 19075)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Church building including original hall	Sitting within the Titahi Bay shopping centre, the buildings (hall and church) are set back from the street. The hall has a simple rectangle plan, and the church is two buildings joined across. The hall is the original Titahi Bay Presbyterian Church building (1939) but was moved to this site from its initial location at Te Hiko Street (now Thornley Street) in 1959. In 1966 the new church and hall were built at the rear of the original hall. Extensive renovations were carried out by the people in the parish to restore the historical character of the original hall building. The church and hall are of moderate value architecturally and historically. They also continue to provide social amenity.
HNZPT of NZAA¹⁶⁹ listing	<u>N/A¹⁷⁰</u>	<p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Social and Surroundings</p>
<u>NZAA site number¹⁷¹</u>	<u>N/A¹⁷²</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

¹⁶⁵ Ibid

¹⁶⁶ Ibid

¹⁶⁷ Ibid

¹⁶⁸ Ibid

¹⁶⁹ Ibid

¹⁷⁰ Ibid

¹⁷¹ Ibid

¹⁷² Ibid

HHB021 St. Andrew's Anglican Church		
Location & legal description	13 Steyne Avenue (LOT 25 DP 729)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Church building	<p>This church on Plimmerton's main street, was designed by well-known architect Frederick de Jersey Clere. Fronted by a picket fence and a small lych-gate from the street, the church was dedicated as a "church room" rather than a church on Christmas Eve 1916. By the late 1950s there was a drive to improve and expand the church facilities to better serve the now large suburban area of Plimmerton and changes were completed in 1963 which provided sufficient facilities to finally elevate the building to "church" status. The church was formally consecrated as St. Andrew's, Plimmerton, in 1971. Although the church has undergone significant rebuilding as a result of a fire, its details, use of materials and style are nevertheless representative of de Clere's small parish church designs. It continues to play an important role in the community and has high social esteem and amenity value accordingly.</p> <p>The adjacent hall was converted from an adjoining shop in 1929 and then extended in 1951. A covered passage connecting the hall to church was completed in 1967. By the 1990s, the hall had ceased to fulfil the necessary functions and was replaced in 2004, along with significant modifications to the linking structure to the church.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁷³ listing	<u>N/A¹⁷⁴</u>	
<u>NZAA site number¹⁷⁵</u>	<u>N/A¹⁷⁶</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB022 Mana Machine Gun Post		
Location & legal description	Mana Esplanade	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Machine Gun Post structure	<p>The Mana Esplanade machine-gun pillbox was constructed in conjunction with other fixed defences which formed part of the wider coastal defence network, being one of 38 built around Wellington's coast. This pillbox can be found just off the side of Mana Esplanade, a short walk south along the beach from the railway crossing to Plimmerton. It has historic significance as it is</p>
HNZPT or NZAA¹⁷⁷ listing	<u>N/A¹⁷⁸</u>	

¹⁷³ Ibid¹⁷⁴ Ibid¹⁷⁵ Ibid¹⁷⁶ Ibid¹⁷⁷ Ibid¹⁷⁸ Ibid

<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹⁷⁹	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁸⁰	associated with an important period of the district's history while also being highly representative of WWII gun emplacement design, form, use of materials and location. It is authentic in its condition and form so has high scientific and technical value. The location and setting value is high as it is situated in a strategic coastal position which relates to its function. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB023 Plimmerton Railway Station		
Location & legal description	Steyne Avenue (Pt Lot 2 DP 88697)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Railway station building (does not include the platform nor the seats/structures outside the building footprint)	The Station is located at the entrance to this seaside area and was completed in 1940 to a design by railway architect George Troup. It has significant historic value for its association with the director of the Wellington and Manawatu Railway Company - John Plimmer - after whom Plimmerton was named. The building is authentic and representative of this design (the only other being at Tawa) so has architectural value. This rarity and original condition contributes to its high historic and technical and scientific value. The station has high social amenity value for its continued function in the transport network. Given its location and relative scale, the station is a prominent and highly visible local landmark while also having group value being one of several heritage places in close proximity to the Plimmerton Village. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HNZPT or NZAA ¹⁸¹	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁸²	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹⁸³	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁸⁴	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB024 Mungavin Homestead and grounds		
Location & legal description	1D Mungavin Avenue (Lot 2 DP 89503)	Statement of Significance
		The Mungavin Homestead – built in 1915 - originally had an extensive and open pastoral setting with expansive views across the Porirua basin. Now

¹⁷⁹ Ibid¹⁸⁰ Ibid¹⁸¹ Ibid¹⁸² Ibid¹⁸³ Ibid¹⁸⁴ Ibid

Feature description	Original house and gardens/ grounds	largely subsumed by urban Porirua the site's prominence remains, albeit now represented by the scale of the remnant large trees that were planted as part of the once grand garden when the homestead was originally developed. The gardens were originally designed by landscape designer Alfred Buxton. The grounds/garden included a large orchard and many exotic specimen trees including a significant Golden Macrocarpa, Blue Atlas, Cedar and Evergreen Oak which still stand today. The house and site and adjoining bush area to the south between the house and motel should be considered as a single heritage area.
HNZPT or NZAA 185 listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁸⁶	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ¹⁸⁷	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁸⁸	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	<p>The site has high setting value for this prominence. The Mungavin family lived in the house until compulsory acquisition of a large section of their farm for state housing development saw them eventually sell the house and grounds also. The house is significant for its longstanding association with this family. Porirua City Council purchased the house and in 1987 the homestead was moved to create space for a slip road to the Mungavin Interchange. The building was subsequently restored by Porirua City Council and then converted into a restaurant which opened in 1990. The house remains largely authentic to its original external appearance, but has been extensively rebuilt inside.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHB025 St. Luke's Church Pukerua Bay		
Location & legal description	4 Pukerua Beach Road (Lot 38 DP 6670)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Church building	Outwardly, the church is plain and unadorned except for a small cross on the western apex of the roof, and the interior is similarly straightforward. Although of moderate architectural value, the building is largely unchanged and exhibits a relatively high degree of authenticity. It was intended from the outset to be a multi-use building, and has had a variety of

¹⁸⁵ Ibid¹⁸⁶ Ibid¹⁸⁷ Ibid¹⁸⁸ Ibid

HNZPT of NZAA¹⁸⁹ listing	<u>N/A¹⁹⁰</u>	community uses over the years since its opening in 1952. It is the multiple roles the building has played within the Pukerua community that has ascribed social amenity as its strongest heritage value. It is also one of few remaining Methodist churches in the Porirua area.
<u>NZAA site number¹⁹¹</u>	<u>N/A¹⁹²</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB026 Titahi Bay Machine Gun Post		
Location & legal description	Beach Road (At the back of the beach, Titahi Bay)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Machine Gun Post structures	The Titahi Bay pill box is similar to those at Pukerua Bay and is one of at least three originally, which formed part of the wider coastal defence network. This one at the north end is the only existing example today. The Titahi Bay pillbox is embedded in an embankment to the side of the beach access road, is not particularly visible and is substantially filled with sand and debris. There is a cairn with a commemorative plaque fixed to the roof. Titahi Bay was a major defence area during World War II due in large part to the radio transmission station. Defence measures included barbed wire and at least three machine gun posts. A Mounted Home Guard patrolled the beach. Although a utilitarian structure the pill box has an uncompromising aesthetic, purpose of form, and use of materials. It has high architectural value for this. The box is a good representative example of its type. It has high historic values for its association with the place, and an important period in New Zealand and the region's history. The box has high scientific value given its authenticity. The setting is important and it has high value for the ability to see the connection between the structure's function and the coast.
HNZPT of NZAA¹⁹³ listing	<u>R27/197¹⁹⁴</u>	
<u>NZAA site number¹⁹⁵</u>	<u>R27/197¹⁹⁶</u>	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB027 Brick House		

¹⁸⁹ Ibid¹⁹⁰ Ibid¹⁹¹ Ibid¹⁹² Ibid¹⁹³ Ibid¹⁹⁴ Ibid¹⁹⁵ Ibid¹⁹⁶ Ibid

Location & legal description	16 Arawhata Street (Lot 42 DP 1900)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>This house is set on the south side of the road, on a gentle slope that rolls down towards Porirua. In general form this house represents a conventional 1900s villa of modest size, but its proportions and veranda give it a surprisingly expressive external form and a high level of architectural interest. In 1908 Henry William Dear, a bricklayer of Porirua, purchased the land and it would appear the house was built shortly afterwards, probably by him given the construction material. The building is both rare and authentic, and for a building of this type there is scientific and technical value attributed. The house has high group and moderate setting value as one of the few remaining houses of the era in Ranui Heights, and where more of the original topography remains intact.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
Feature description	House	
HNZPT or NZAA 197 listing	<u>N/A</u> ¹⁹⁸	
NZAA site number ¹⁹⁹	<u>N/A</u> ²⁰⁰	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB028 Bradey's Grave, Duck Creek, Pāuatahanui/Whitby		
Location & legal description	Polestar Lane, off Navigation Drive (Lot 2 A 3324)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>The "Bradey Grave" is marked by a unique cast iron headstone in the shape of a cross with a two-dimensional urn mounted on the top and a bronze plaque engraved with the names of Francis Bradey and Keturah Ross. This cross is inset into a concrete slab, surrounded by four concrete corner posts, joined by a steel chain on its own half acre of land being part of the 100 acres purchased by Francis in London in 1839 from the N.Z. Company. The headstone is remarkably well preserved as Francis was buried here on 29th October 1864 and his wife Keturah on the 5th of November 1888. Francis Bradey was a pioneer arriving in Wellington on the "Adelaide" in 1840. The family has a long association with the area including having farmed where Whitby is now built. The site has high archaeological value given the age of the burial and important setting value as it was chosen</p>
Feature description	Headstone /plinth of grave	
HNZPT or NZAA 204 listing	<u>N/A</u> ²⁰²	
NZAA site number ²⁰³	<u>R27/446</u> ²⁰⁴	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	

¹⁹⁷ Ibid¹⁹⁸ Ibid¹⁹⁹ Ibid²⁰⁰ Ibid²⁰¹ Ibid²⁰² Ibid²⁰³ Ibid²⁰⁴ Heritage NZ [65.67, 65.68]

		<p>by Francis for its panoramic views. It also provides a visible link to our pioneering past and is a rare and authentic site in that it has been untouched despite the development of the Whitby residential area surrounding it.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHB029 Porirua Hospital Chapel		
Location & legal description	Upper Main Drive (SEC 1 SO 37151)	Statement of Significance Located in the former Porirua Hospital (opened in 1887) on Upper Main Drive, the chapel shares a large green space (also with F Ward – the hospital museum) bordered by mature trees. The building was moved to this site in 2007 from its original location in the middle of the hospital complex where it was officially dedicated in 1966. Despite the move it remains a characteristic and highly representative example of a 1960s church building. With its well considered form and striking interior, the chapel has high architectural value. The move was carefully undertaken to retain its original features, and it has high value for its authenticity of form and interior.
Feature description	Chapel building	Until the time when changes were made to the health care structure in New Zealand in the 1980s and facilities were downscaled and regionalised, Porirua Hospital was the biggest such institution in Australasia with 2000 patients. The chapel is rare as one of only two purpose-built separate chapels in mental health institutions in New Zealand and has high historic value for this, and continues to have social amenity value within the hospital.
HNZPT or NZAA²⁰⁵ listing	<u>N/A²⁰⁶</u>	
NZAA site number²⁰⁷	<u>N/A²⁰⁸</u>	
Heritage Setting	Refer Map	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness
HHB030 House at 14 Steyne Avenue		
Location & legal description	14 Steyne Avenue (Lot 32 DP 729)	Statement of Significance This large two-storied house stands near the water's edge in Plimmerton. The main part of the house dates from 1901 and is a simple two-storied villa, with a prominent bay window on the street front (ironically facing away from the coast). It has high architectural
Feature description	House	

²⁰⁵ Heritage NZ [65.68]

²⁰⁶ Ibid

²⁰⁷ Ibid

²⁰⁸ Ibid

HNZPT of NZAA²⁰⁹ listing	<u>N/A²¹⁰</u>	value for its representativeness of a style. In the wider setting, the house is part of an important group of old houses at this end of Plimmerton that back to the beach and form an historic core to the area. This gives the house high value in terms of how it reads as part of the historic settlement pattern. It has high setting and group value for this also. This house is significant as one of the largest early houses in Plimmerton and for its location and association with the Vella family, early farmers of Mana Island and prominent in the area - the historic value is high due to this. The building has scientific and technical value associated with the condition of the buildings and the use of kauri panelling within the building. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings and Representativeness
<u>NZAA site number²¹¹</u>	<u>N/A²¹²</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB031 Exnells		
Location & legal description	2 Bath Street (Lot 33 DP 729)	Statement of Significance Exnells is a house, probably built in 1896-97, associated with the early years of the Plimmerton settlement, on the corner of Steyne and Bath Street. This house is one of an important group of large older houses in Plimmerton built in the early years of the township when wealthy Wellingtonians were building larger summer houses there and so represents this early touristic and pleasure-seeking history of the town. The house is significant for its association with the Macdonald family, who had a crucial part of the development of Plimmerton, and the original development and settlement of the town. It also has a lengthy connection to the Coombs/Collins family, who still retained ownership of the house in 2019. It is also connected to the history of the home defence of the coastline during World War Two. The house is a good example of a somewhat austere domestic Victorian Italianate style. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings and Representativeness
Feature description	House	
HNZPT of NZAA²¹³ listing	<u>N/A²¹⁴</u>	
<u>NZAA site number²¹⁵</u>	<u>N/A²¹⁶</u>	
Heritage Setting	Entire Site	
HHB032 Stone Wall		

²⁰⁹ Ibid²¹⁰ Ibid²¹¹ Ibid²¹² Ibid²¹³ Ibid²¹⁴ Ibid²¹⁵ Ibid²¹⁶ Ibid

Location & legal description	16 Sunset Parade (Lot 18 DP2555)	<p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>A hand-built stone wall, built from large stones probably sourced from the nearby coastline, set into concrete, and topped with a concrete cap, outside the house at 16 Sunset Parade, Plimmerton. Etched into the concrete on the top of the wall near the letterbox is an inscription which reads '18719 Les 16/07/18'. This wall was built by Frank Thomson, and the inscription is in memory of his young son, Leslie, who died at only 19 after two years of service in France during the First World War. The marked wall is a tangible remnant of the efforts of two men, father and son from small town New Zealand to serve their country during the First World War, and the on-going process of grieving and memorialisation for those who were lost in the war.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Social, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
Feature description	Stone wall	
HNZPT or NZAA ²¹⁷ listing	<u>N/A</u> ²¹⁸	
NZAA site number ²¹⁹	<u>N/A</u> ²²⁰	
Heritage Setting	n/a*	
HHB033 NZ Wars Memorial ²²¹		
<u>Location & legal description</u> ²²²		<u>Statement of Significance</u>
<u>Feature description</u> ²²⁴	<u>Memorial</u> ²²⁵	<u>Although a simple, relatively plain sarcophagus-styled memorial erected to commemorate two British forces personnel who lost their lives during a battle with Te Rangihaeata's forces in August 1846, the memorial represents an important turning point in the relationship of Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand – a point marked by the extension of British sovereignty and associated claims over land and, in the Wellington regional context, the willingness of</u>
<u>HNZPT or listing</u> ²²⁶	<u>N/A</u> ²²⁷	
<u>NZAA site number</u> ²²⁸	<u>N/A</u> ²²⁹	
<u>Heritage Setting</u> ²³⁰	<u>Refer map</u> ²³¹	

²¹⁷ Ibid

²¹⁸ Ibid

²¹⁹ Ibid

²²⁰ Ibid

²²¹ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10]

²²² Ibid

²²⁴ Ibid

²²⁵ Ibid

²²⁶ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²²⁷ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²²⁸ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²²⁹ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²³⁰ Heather Phillips and Donald Love [79.10]

²³¹ Ibid

		<p><u>Wellington Māori to support British authorities against resistance to those claims.</u> <u>The memorial is unique in its association and proximity to this battle and its purposeful location on the site of the subsequent siege of Te Rangihaeata's forces. It is also one of two remaining memorials to battles of this period in the Wellington region and is an important contributor to a group of three graves located in Battle Hill Forest Park, two of which memorialise members of the Abbott family who settled in the area in 1860.</u></p> <p><u>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings and Rarity²²³</u></p>
HHB034 World War II Road Block²³²		
<u>Location & legal description²³³</u>	<u>Adjoining State Highway 1²³⁴</u>	<u>Statement of Significance</u>
<u>Feature description²³⁶</u>	<u>Road block²³⁷</u>	<p><u>The roadblock adjoining State Highway 1 north of Pukerua Bay was an important part of a system of road blocks constructed throughout the Wellington region to counter the threat of Japanese invasion during the Second World War. Although it was one numerous other defensive structures constructed along the coast between Porirua and Queen Elizabeth Park during the war it is the only remaining example of its type located on a main road in New Zealand and one of only two tank obstacles in the region that are still extant.</u></p> <p><u>Its association and physical connection with a small number of extant defensive structures in the immediate vicinity (i.e. the Pukerua Bay machine gun posts) provides an important</u></p>
<u>HNZPT listing²³⁸</u>	<u>N/A²³⁹</u>	
<u>NZAA site number²⁴⁰</u>	<u>N/A²⁴¹</u>	
<u>Heritage Setting²⁴²</u>	<u>Refer map²⁴³</u>	

²²³ Ibid

²³² He Ara He Ara Pukerua [6.1]

²³³ Ibid

²³⁴ Ibid

²³⁶ Ibid

²³⁷ Ibid

²³⁸ He Ara Pukerua [6.1], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²³⁹ He Ara Pukerua [6.1], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²⁴⁰ He Ara Pukerua [6.1], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²⁴¹ He Ara Pukerua [6.1], Heritage NZ [65.68]

²⁴² He Ara Pukerua [6.1]

²⁴³ He Ara Pukerua [6.1]

insight into the functional relationship between these structures, while the location and setting of the road block contributes to understanding and appreciating its intended functional role in the event of invasion.

Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Surroundings and Rarity²³⁵

SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites

Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED4 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Korero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.²⁴⁴

HHS001 Former WWII American Camp and Marker		
Location & legal description	328 Paremata Haywards Road, State Highway 58 (Pt Sec 95 Pāuatahanui AG RES)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Marker/plaque for former Judgeford Marines Camp	The Judgeford Golf Course was established in early 1930s. Up to 3,800 American soldiers were housed in the Judgeford Camp which was built in 1942. The original site spread across both sides of SH58. The golf course only occupies part of the total campsite. Following the war most of the camp was demolished. There are many abutments that remain. A three person toilet block is located in the course "bush". A Camp marker/plaque was placed on site at the main entrance to the golf club adjacent to the 16th green in 1993, commemorating the 50 th anniversary of the American presence in NZ. Although not protected as a pre-1900 archaeological site, the site will be of some archaeological interest for the remnants of the Marines camp. The
HNZPT or NZAA listing ²⁴⁵	<u>N/A</u> ²⁴⁶	
Heritage Setting ²⁴⁷	<u>n/a</u> ²⁴⁹ <u>N/A</u>	

²³⁵ Ibid

²⁴⁴ PCC [11.72]

²⁴⁵ Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁴⁶ Ibid

²⁴⁷ Ibid

²⁴⁹ Ibid

<u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁴⁸		<p>campsite has high historic place associations and importance of its historic location at a local and national level as a result of the role the site played in providing essential military training and a recreation base. The camp has high setting group values when considered with reference to the other 3 camps in Porirua and 11 camps in the Wellington Region. The golf course has high social amenity values for golfers in the Wellington region.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Social, Surroundings and Rarity</p>
HHS002 Bowlers Wharf		
Location & legal description	Papakowhai Road (Sec 1 SO 36736)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Wharf site	<p>Now located within a historic reserve which was created by the reclamation associated with the construction of the motorway, this was the site of a wharf associated with the Bowler family, who were involved with the New Zealand Company since its earliest days in London and whose Papakōwhai Homestead is nearby. What little remains of the wharf has historic values as it is indicative of the earliest colonial settlement in the Porirua area and is connected to farming, food production, the rural economy and coastal shipping. The wharf was damaged in the 1848 earthquake and then effectively destroyed by the 1855 earthquake. An earthwork ramp associated with the wharf remains within the reserve, giving the site some archaeological value.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic and Social</p>
HNZPT or NZAA listing ²⁵⁰	<u>N/A</u> ²⁵¹	
Heritage Setting ²⁵² <u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁵³	<u>n/a</u> ²⁵⁴ <u>R27/507</u> ²⁵⁵	
HHS003 Former Marine Camp & Motukaraka Point		
Location & legal description	1 Motukaraka Point (Lot 2 DP 52378)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Former Marine Camp &	<p>Motukaraka Point was occupied prior to 1820s by several Māori tribes including a Ngāti Ira Pā. In early 1820s Ngāti Toa expelled Ngāti</p>

²⁴⁸ Ibid²⁵⁰ Ibid²⁵¹ Ibid²⁵² Ibid²⁵³ Ibid²⁵⁴ Ibid²⁵⁵ Heritage NZ [65.71]

	Archaeological site	Ira. The New Zealand Company started acquiring land in the area in 1839 with the intention of establishing a village at Motukaraka. The company quickly became engaged in land disputes with Ngāti Toa. Te Rauparaha and his nephew Te Rangihaeata led the dispute. A fighting pā was set up beside Motukaraka Point. Motukaraka Point is an important historic location, has very high Māori cultural values, and archaeological values.
HNZPT or NZAA ²⁵⁶ listing	R26/261 ²⁵⁷	
Heritage Setting ²⁵⁸ <u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁵⁹	n/a ²⁶⁰ <u>R26/101-103</u> <u>R26/159</u> <u>R26/195</u> <u>R26/198</u> <u>R26/258</u> ²⁶¹ <u>R26/261</u> ²⁶²	The Pāuatahanui Campsite was built by public works department in 1942 for the United States Marine Corp. It accommodated 2000 marines. Grays Road now runs through the middle of the campsite. Before the Marines arrived the camp was occupied by three New Zealand Army Artillery Regiments before their departure for the Pacific. This place has high historic associations and is an important historic location. Camp buildings comprised timber buildings for cookhouses, messes, stores, and Recreation Halls with sleeping accommodation being tents on timber decks. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Social, Surroundings and Rarity
HHS004 Mount Welcome Gold Mine Remnant		
Location & legal description	Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 3 DP 77652)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Archaeological site	The remains of the Mount Welcome Gold Mine and a nearby shaft can be located by reference to a trig station east of Pukerua Bay. The mines are on a steep hillside with quartz outcrops. The Mount Welcome mine is described by investigations undertaken in the 1960s as being comprised of a 60 ft. shaft
HNZPT or NZAA ²⁶³ listing	<u>N/A</u>	

²⁵⁶ Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁵⁷ Ibid

²⁵⁸ Ibid

²⁵⁹ Ibid

²⁶⁰ Ibid

²⁶¹ Heritage NZ [65.72]

²⁶² Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁶³ Ibid

Heritage Setting ²⁶⁴ <u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁶⁵	<u>n/a</u> ²⁶⁶ <u>R26/245</u> ²⁶⁷	intersected by a drive at least 100 ft. long cut into the solid rock. The mine has only moderate values for its archaeological interest and potential to reveal scientific and technical knowledge of early mining techniques. It is also of moderate value for its place in the group of local heritage places which are representative of the early extractive industries in the district. Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings and Representativeness
HHS005 Belmont Coach Road		
Location & legal description	Belmont Road	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Old Road over Belmont Regional Park	The road (from south to north) runs from the end of the sealed section of the Normandale Road through Belmont Regional Park to the end of the sealed section of Belmont Road off the Paremata-Haywards Road (SH ²⁶⁸ 58). The Belmont Coach Road was built in 1871-72 and was the first road built between the Hutt Valley and the west coast, giving it historic value. The road was the main route until the opening of the Haywards Road in 1890, had some military use during World War II, and is now a part of the track network at Belmont Regional Park. The topography and original road alignment remain largely unaltered, however, no physical remains of construction techniques are evident. The road has rarity value being one of only two roads built in the Wellington region during the Wellington Provincial Council era that still remain largely intact – the other being the Johnsonville to Ohariu Old Coach Road. The road has public esteem, demonstrated by the Friends of Belmont Regional Park successfully advocating to register it with Heritage New Zealand as a Category II historic place.
HNZPT or NZAA ²⁶⁹ listing	HNZPT ²⁷⁰ Category 2: List Number 7711	
Heritage Setting ²⁷⁴ <u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁷²	<u>n/a</u> ²⁷³ <u>R27/252</u> ²⁷⁴	

²⁶⁴ Ibid

²⁶⁵ Ibid

²⁶⁶ Ibid

²⁶⁷ Heritage NZ [65.73]

²⁶⁸ Clause 16 RMA

²⁶⁹ Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁷⁰ Ibid

²⁷¹ Ibid

²⁷² Ibid

²⁷³ Ibid

²⁷⁴ Heritage NZ [65.74]

Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Social, Surroundings and Rarity		
HHS006 Gold Mine Remnant		
Location & legal description	771B Paekakariki Hill Road (Sec 31 Horokiri Valley DIST)	Statement of Significance
Feature description	Remnant Gold Mine	The site consists of both a vertical (drive) and horizontal (shaft) entrance into a remnant gold mine cut into an elevated quartz reef that forms a ridge-line through the property and adjoining properties. The mine shaft and drive have been hand hewn into solid rock and are still largely intact. The shaft is cut into a vertical face and has been described as being approximately 1.5m high, 1.0m wide and 18m long, while the drive is located south of an adjacent east-west running fence line and is approximately 18m in height. Both entrances are partially obscured by vegetation.
HNZPT or NZAA listing²⁷⁵	<u>R26/245</u>	
Heritage Setting²⁷⁶ NZAA site number²⁷⁷	n/a ²⁷⁸ <u>R26/245</u>	
		The mining remains have historical importance for their association with the short-lived gold rush in Pāuatahanui/Porirua area in 1869/70, and for their likely connection to a variety of people of importance in the local area. It also illustrates the varied colonial history of the District, and is associated with a time during the early colonial period when Pāuatahanui was a thriving settlement.
Relevant HH-P1 Values: Physical, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness		
HHS007 Ngāti Toa Domain		
Location & legal description	West of Mana Esplanade - Pt Sec 337 Porirua DIST	Statement of Significance
Site type	Archaeological site	Ngāti Toa Domain has many layers of history. It is linked to Kupe's movement. Moa bones have been excavated from the site. It was a pā site, the site of a whaling station, military barracks have been established there, and for the last fifty years, it has been a public recreational area. These layers of use give it high archaeological value, as there is significant potential to learn from the site
HNZPT or NZAA listing²⁷⁹	HNZPT Category 2: List number 1329	

²⁷⁵ Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁷⁶ Ibid

²⁷⁷ Ibid

²⁷⁸ Ibid

²⁷⁹ Ibid

Heritage Setting ²⁸⁰ <u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁸¹	n/a ²⁸² <u>R26/122</u> <u>R26/128</u> <u>R26/248</u> <u>R26/254</u> <u>R26/731</u> ²⁸³	<p>through investigations. There are accordingly scientific values accredited. The site's multiple uses have also generated strong historic associations with the place for Māori and Pākehā. The historic location is important particularly to tangata whenua for its long association with Ngāti Toa. The Domain is rare and distinctive for its place in the history of the district.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>
HHS008 Mana Island		
Location & legal description	Mana Island Scientific Reserve - Pt Mana Island Block XI Paekakariki Survey District	Statement of Significance Mana Island, or Te Mana o Kupe ki Aotearoa, has also been known as Table Island and Warspite Island. Māori occupation of the island began in the 14th century. Te Rangihaeata and Te Rauparaha signed the Treaty of Waitangi off Mana Island and important Ngāti Toa events occurred on the island. For many reasons Mana Island has high Māori cultural value. The island was later used by European settlers as a whaling station and a farm. One of New Zealand's first shipments of wool came from Mana Island and it played a role in the agricultural development of the area. Mana Island's long history gives it high historic value, and its position makes it a landmark. The remnants of human uses of the island, including building foundations, gardens and storage pits, gives the island high archaeological value.
Site type	Entire Island, including former lighthouse site and archaeological sites: R26/135-7, 139, 141, 142, 144, 169, 242-4 ²⁸⁴	
HNZPT or NZAA ²⁸⁵ listing	Listed as a Wāhi Tapu by HNZPT: List Number 7674	Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical and Social
Heritage Setting ²⁸⁶	n/a ²⁸⁸ <u>R26/134 – 144</u> <u>R26/169</u>	

²⁸⁰ Ibid

²⁸¹ Ibid

²⁸² Ibid

²⁸³ Heritage NZ [65.75]

²⁸⁴ Heritage NZ [65.76]

²⁸⁵ Heritage NZ [65.77]

²⁸⁶ Ibid

²⁸⁸ Ibid

<u>NZAA site number</u> ²⁸⁷	<u>R26/242 - 244</u> <u>R26/410</u> <u>R26/732 -</u> <u>741</u> ²⁸⁹
--	---

²⁸⁷ Ibid

²⁸⁹ Heritage NZ [65.76]

Appendix B Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

The recommended responses to the submissions made on this topic are presented in Table B 1 below.

Table B 1: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
137.42	GWRC	General	Retain chapter, but amend the explanation of the Historic Heritage chapter to provide a cross-reference to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	Yes
FS14.18	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports amendment. There is merit in including cross references between the HH and SASM chapters.</i>				
FS70.42	TROTR		<i>Supports amendment. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are also places of historic heritage and need to be recognized or at least referenced as such.</i>				
137.44	GWRC	General	Retain.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
79.8	Heather and Donald Phillips and Love	General	Add and amend.	Section 3.4	Reject	See body of the report	No
264.46	TROTR	General	Retain as notified subject to the amendments in other submission points.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
60.68	Transpower	General	Retain the Historic Heritage Chapter. If the chapter applies to the National Grid, amend provisions to reflect the relief sought in submission.	Section 3.2	Accept in part	Agree with submitter.	No
82.296	Waka Kotahi	General	Amending the use of the term minimise throughout the Proposed District Plan. Considers that the term is difficult to interpret and apply in practice. For clarity it is considered that the term be replaced with 'mitigate; which aligns with the effects hierarchy under the RMA.	Section 3.2	Reject	See body of the report	No
81.433	Kāinga Ora	Multiple provisions	Amend to be consistent with its overall submission on the Plan. Key areas of concern are (but not limited to): 1. Inclusion of earthworks rules within the earthworks chapter 2. Amend provisions with direct 'avoid' statements. This needs to be qualified in light of the King Salmon meaning of 'avoid'.	3.2	Reject	See body of the report	No
264.106	TROTR	Introduction	Amend the introduction: <u>Buildings, items and sites with historic heritage, sites of significance to tangata whenua including wāhi tapu and wāhi tupuna provide a context for community identity.</u>	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter ²⁹⁰	Yes

²⁹⁰ I note that the decision requested by TROTR and as shown the Summary of Decisions Requested shows the words 'provide a context for community identity' as new text to be added. I note that these words are already contained in the notified chapter, therefore the addition sought are the words 'sites of significance to tangata whenua including wāhi tapu and wāhi tupuna'. I am satisfied that it is clear what is sought in the requested addition.

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS14.19	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports amendment. Similar to GWRC submission point 137.42 Māori historic heritage should be explicitly recognised here.</i>				
264.107	TROTR	Archaeological Authority Process	Amend Archaeological Authority Process: This section must also include – Te Rūnanga to be informed if any unknown archaeological site is discovered and prior to being removed.	Section 3.3	Reject	See body of the report	Yes
FS14.20	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports amendment, while shifting the paragraphs to a plan appendix. Refers to Heritage NZ submission that the reference to the archaeological authority process be removed from this section and included in an appendix to the plan.</i>				
81.424	Kāinga Ora	Introduction	Amend: Buildings, items and sites with historic heritage values provide a context for community identity. They can also provide valuable information about the past and the cultures of those who came before us, for example, the tools, technology and materials available at specific points in time. Historic heritage values can be directly threatened through modification, damage or destruction associated with the subdivision, use or development of a site. Damage can also occur from natural hazards, including earthquakes, fire and flooding. Inappropriate subdivision, use or development can result in the loss of this knowledge and the links to the past that heritage items, heritage settings and historic heritage sites provides. It is therefore important that Porirua City's historic heritage values are identified and protected. Archaeological Authority Process Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 it is unlawful to destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site (regardless of whether the site is identified in the District Plan or not) without obtaining an archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) before you start work. An archaeological authority is required in addition to any resource consents required by the Council. An archaeological site is defined in this act as any place in New Zealand (including buildings, structures or shipwrecks) that was associated with pre 1900 human activity, where there is	Section 3.3	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>evidence relating to the history of New Zealand that can be investigated using archaeological methods.</p> <p>If you discover a previously unknown archaeological site (for example, when you are conducting Earthworks) you must stop any work that could affect it and contact HNZPT for advice on how to proceed.</p> <p>The Police will also need to be notified if human remains are revealed. If any artefacts are found, they must be handed over to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.</p>				
FS14.22	Heritage NZ		<i>Opposes amendment. These paragraphs best fit within an appendix to the PDP with appropriate cross-referencing.</i>				
FS70.13	TROTR		<i>Opposes Kāinga Ora's proposed removal of other non-RMA processes because too often are those processes otherwise ignored especially by developers if not included in the PDP.</i>				
65.18	Heritage NZ	Archaeological Authority Process	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Archaeological Authority Process under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is outlined in Appendix 16.</p>	Section 3.3	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes
65.19	Heritage NZ	HH-P1	Amend to add <u>authenticity</u> to the list of heritage values.	Section 3.11	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.20	Heritage NZ	HH-P2	<p>Amend:</p> <p>3. Historic Heritage Sites Areas: ... (SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites Areas)</p>	Section 3.5	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.21	Heritage NZ	HH-P4	<p>Add the following to policy P4:</p> <p><u>Any works undertaken need to be kept to the minimum necessary and keep the heritage fabric as intact as possible.</u></p>	Section 3.12	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.22	Heritage NZ	HH-P7	Add the following: <u>Recognising that grazing large animals such as cattle has the potential for damaging some historic heritage sites.</u>	Section 3.6	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.23	Heritage NZ	HH-P9	Retain policy.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.24	Heritage NZ	HH-P10	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.25	Heritage NZ	HH-P11	<p>Amend:</p> <p>HH-P11 Use and development of heritage items, heritage settings, and historic heritage sites</p> <p>Only allow other use and development of and within heritage items and heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where</p>	Section 3.12	Accept in part	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>it can be demonstrated that the identified heritage values are protected and maintained, having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The particular heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting, or the historic heritage site and its significance; 2. The heritage item, heritage setting, or the historic heritage site's sensitivity to change or capacity to accommodate changes without compromising the heritage values of the heritage item, heritage setting or historic heritage site; 3. Any heritage alterations and additions to heritage items, including for an ongoing use or any adaptive re-use, are compatible with the form, proportions, materials and patina of the heritage item and maintain its heritage values; 4. Architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the heritage item or the historic heritage site are not lost or obscured by new materials or changes; 5. Whether any new building or structure, including its location, form, design and materials, is compatible with the original architectural style, character and scale of the heritage item, and the impact of the new building or structure on the heritage setting; 6. The extent to which any adverse impacts on heritage values are necessary to enable the long term, practical, or feasible use of the heritage item or historic heritage site; 7. The reduction or loss of any heritage values, including the ability to interpret the place and its relationship with other features/items; 8. The extent or degree to which any changes are reversible; 9. Any opportunities to enhance the heritage values of the heritage item and its heritage setting or the historic heritage site; 				

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>10. <u>The extent to which any alterations to heritage fabric is kept to the minimum necessary;</u></p> <p>11. <u>the potential for cumulative adverse effects on heritage values;</u></p> <p>12. Any assessments or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert; and</p> <p>13. The extent to which any changes are consistent with a relevant conservation plan.</p>				
65.26	Heritage NZ	HH-P12	<p>Amend:</p> <p>HH-P12 Repositioning and relocation of heritage items</p> <p>Only allow repositioning or relocation of heritage items listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), where:</p> <p><u>(a). The relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter, and</u></p> <p><u>(b) All other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted.</u></p> <p><u>Where the matters (a) and (b) above are satisfied the following matters should be taken into account:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the identified heritage values are protected and maintained taking into account; 2. Whether there are opportunities to enhance the physical condition of the heritage item and its heritage values and the public's appreciation of those values, including being more publicly accessible and/or within public view; 3. Any measures to minimise the risk of damage to the heritage item; 4. For repositioning within a heritage setting, whether the new location of the heritage item is as close to the original location as practicable, <u>and whether, where this is not</u> 	Section 3.7	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>possible if the new location maintains the heritage values and significance of the heritage item;</p> <p>5. For relocation beyond a heritage setting:</p> <p>a. Whether the new location is related to the heritage values of the heritage item and/or provides a heritage setting compatible with the heritage values of the heritage item; and</p> <p>b. Any other alternatives to relocation that have been explored including repairs, earthquake strengthening, heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive re-use, and relocation is the only reasonable option; and.</p> <p>1. Whether the relocation is necessary due to threats to the heritage item from natural hazards identified in the Natural Hazards chapter.</p>				
65.27	Heritage NZ	HH-P13	Supports the policy approach regarding Group B items.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
119.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HH-P13	Retain as proposed	Section 3.8	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
119.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HH-P14	<p>Amend the policy as follows:</p> <p>HH-P14 Demolition, <u>partial demolition</u> and destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites</p> <p>Avoid the demolition, <u>partial demolition</u> or destruction of heritage items and historic heritage sites included in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites, unless:</p> <p>1. The heritage item or historic heritage site is a serious risk to safety or property or is in a serious state of disrepair and interim protection measures would not remove that threat; and</p> <p>2. The cost of remedying the risk or disrepair is prohibitive; and</p> <p><u>3. To gain access to a property or building for lifesaving purposes in the event of an emergency; and</u></p>	Section 3.8	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>4. Other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored including:</p> <p>a. Repairs;</p> <p>b. Earthquake strengthening;</p> <p>c. Heritage alterations and additions, including for adaptive reuse;</p> <p>d. Repositioning or relocation;</p> <p>e. Whether demolition or destruction could occur in part without adverse effects on the identified heritage values for which the heritage item was scheduled; and</p> <p>f. Whether the costs of the alternatives would be prohibitive.</p>				
FS14.23	Heritage NZ		Supports in part. Amend policy as suggested, except do not add the words 'partial demolition' if the HNZPT submission on the definition of 'demolition' is accepted (so that demolition is defined to include partial demolition) as this would have the same effect as the first part of this submission. The intention to allow for partial demolition in the case of an emergency is appreciated, and it is reasonable for the policy to provide this sort of emergency situation				
65.28	Heritage NZ	HH-P14	Retain provisions.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
65.29	Heritage NZ	HH-P15	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>HH-P15 Subdivision</p> <p>Only allow subdivision of sites that have heritage items, heritage settings or historic heritage sites listed SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>1. The heritage values for which the heritage item or historic heritage site is scheduled are maintained and protected;</p> <p>2. Sufficient land is provided around the heritage item or historic heritage site to protect associated heritage values <u>and the integrity of the heritage item or site;</u></p>	Section 3.12	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>3. There are measures to minimise obstruction of views of the heritage item from adjoining public spaces that may result from any future land use or development; and</p> <p>4. The remainder of the site associated with the heritage item, heritage setting, or historic heritage site is of a size which continues to provide it with a suitable heritage setting to maintain the heritage values associated with the heritage item, or historic heritage site.</p>				
65.30	Heritage NZ	HH-R1	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.31	Heritage NZ	HH-R2	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.32	Heritage NZ	HH-R3	<p>Amend:</p> <p>All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>where compliance is achieved with HH-S2</u></p>	Section 3.6	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.33	Heritage NZ	HH-R4	<p>Amend:</p> <p>All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Earthworks are associated with burials within an existing cemetery.</p> <p>b. <u>Minor earthworks associated with the maintenance, installation and construction of service connections, rainwater tanks or effluent disposal systems</u></p> <p>(...)</p>	Section 3.13	Reject	See body of the report	No
11.37	PCC	HH-R4	<p>Amend rules as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks on heritage items and <u>within</u> heritage settings in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), and historic heritage sites in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites ...</p>	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	Yes
65.34	Heritage NZ	HH-R5	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.35	Heritage NZ	HH-R6	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.36	Heritage NZ	HH-R7	Add a note clarifying R7 and R9 in terms of additions/extensions to building footprints, as the rules appear to potentially double up.	Section 3.13	Accept in part	See body of the report	No
11.38	PCC	HH-R7	Insert new permitted activity rule (as HH-R5) as follows:	Section 3.13	Accept	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p><i>Repair, maintenance, redecoration, heritage restoration, earthquake strengthening, fire protection and accessibility upgrades, alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B)</i></p> <p><i>1. Activity status: Permitted</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <p><i>a. The structure or building is not identified as a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B).</i></p> <p><i>Note:</i></p> <p><i>This rule does not apply to extensions to the footprint of buildings and structures located within the heritage setting of a heritage item, which is covered by Rule HH-R7</i></p>				
FS14.24	Heritage NZ		<p>Opposes amendment. Seeks new restricted discretionary activity rule:</p> <p>Alterations, additions, repositioning, relocation, and demolition of any structure or building located within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 or SCHED3</p> <p>Matters of discretion: HH-P11</p> <p>HNZPT acknowledges that this has been picked up as a gap in the notified provisions. However the new rule as submitted could result in unexpected adverse effects on historic heritage values. There may be cases where there is an accessory building which is not identified as a heritage item in the schedule, but which nonetheless contributes to the heritage values of the site and setting. Major alterations, additions, or demolition of such a building would adversely affect the heritage values of the site.</p>				
65.37	Heritage NZ	HH-R8	Retain this provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.38	Heritage NZ	HH-R9	Add a note clarifying the application of R7 and R9 in terms of additions/extensions to building footprints, as the rules appear to potentially double up.	Section 3.13	Accept in part	See body of the report	No
65.39	Heritage NZ	HH-R10	Retain this provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.40	Heritage NZ	HH-R11 - New provision	Amend:	Section 3.7	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>HH-R11 The relocation of a heritage item in SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B) relocation of a heritage item beyond the heritage setting of the heritage item</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>HH-NEW RULE relocation of a heritage item in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) beyond the heritage setting of the heritage item</u></p> <p>1. Activity status: Non-Complying</p>				
65.41	Heritage NZ	HH-R12	Retain rule.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.42	Heritage NZ	HH-R14	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.43	Heritage NZ	HH-R15	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
65.45	Heritage NZ	New provision	<p>Add:</p> <p><u>HH-S2</u></p> <p>1. <u>The grazing animals are sheep, goats, llamas, alpacas, or poultry.</u></p> <p><u>Grazing of any other animals is consistent with management guidance contained within a management plan for the historic heritage area</u></p>	Section 3.6	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.44	Heritage NZ	HH-S1	Retain provision.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
Definitions							
81.26	Kāinga Ora	Adaptive reuse	Retain definition as notified.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
65.1	Heritage NZ	Adaptive reuse	<p>Amend:</p> <p>means changing the use of a heritage item and/or its heritage setting to a compatible use while retaining its heritage value. <u>Adaptive reuse processes include alteration and addition.</u></p>	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	Yes
81.75	Kāinga Ora	Heritage alteration	Retain definition as notified	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter	No
83.4	Powerco Limited	Heritage alteration	<p>Amend the definition of Heritage alteration as follows:</p> <p>Heritage alteration of a heritage item or historic heritage site excludes:...</p>	Section 3.11	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<u>f. maintenance and repair or upgrading of infrastructure.</u>				
FS14.6	Heritage NZ		<i>Opposes amendment. Maintenance and repair of infrastructure could be included in the items excluded from the definition, however upgrading should not be part of this exclusion. It may be appropriate to amend the definition to allow for repair and maintenance of infrastructure within certain prescribed limits. However, upgrading has the potential for adverse effects on heritage and should not be included in the list of excluded activities.</i>				
81.79	Kāinga Ora	Heritage values	Amend definition Heritage values means the following values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites: a. historic values; b. physical values; c. social values; d. tangata whenua values ; e. surroundings; f. rarity; and g. representativeness.	Section 3.11	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
FS14.7	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports amendment. Surroundings would be better replaced with 'settings', which is defined in the PDP, and representativeness is "a term understood by heritage professionals, and a lengthy explanation or definition is in our view not necessary". Further, that 'And' can be changed to 'or' as all the values listed need to be considered, but not all need apply to every place.</i>				
FS40.50	GWRC		<i>Supports amendment that 'or' should be used instead of 'and'. Policy 21 of the RPS refers to 'one or more' of these criteria/values. Does not support providing additional information in relation to what is meant by surroundings and</i>				

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<i>representativeness. This information is available in Policy 21 of the RPS.</i>				
65.2	Heritage NZ	Heritage values	<p>Amend:</p> <p>means the following values which contribute to the significance of a heritage item and its heritage setting listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. historic values; b. physical values; c. <u>architectural values</u>; d. <u>scientific values</u>; e. <u>technological values</u>; f. social values; g. tangata whenua values ; h. surroundings; i. rarity; j. <u>Authenticity</u>; and k. representativeness. 	Section 3.11	Reject	See body of the report	No
FS40.30	GWRC		<i>Opposes amendment. The heritage values listed in the notified definition reflect the criteria in Policy 21 of the Regional Policy Statement.</i>				
81.100	Kāinga Ora	Maintenance	<p>Amend definition:</p> <p>Heritage Maintenance</p> <p>means in relation to a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or in SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED 4 - Historic Heritage Sites, the regular and ongoing protective care of the heritage item and/or historic heritage site to prevent deterioration and retain its heritage values.</p>	Section 3.11	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>Maintenance excludes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> heritage alterations; earthworks redecorating; repairs; and <p><u>Maintenance of Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori</u></p> <p>means in relation to a site or area listed in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori the regular and ongoing protective care of a site or area to prevent deterioration and retain its values.</p> <p>Maintenance excludes:</p> <p>earthworks.</p>				
FS14.8	Heritage NZ		<p><i>Opposes amendment. The definition of maintenance as notified specifically relates to both heritage items and SCHED6 places. Maintenance is used throughout the plan, however, the notified definition states, 'means in relation to a heritage item' and 'in relation to a site or area listed in SCHED6'. Changing it to heritage maintenance would not necessarily cover use of the term in relation to SCHED6.</i></p>				
81.139 ²⁹¹	Kāinga Ora		<p>Amend definition:</p> <p><u>Heritage Repair</u></p> <p>means in relation to a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), or SCHED 3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), to improve the long-term condition of the heritage item, by using identical or closely similar materials to fix any damaged or decayed fabric.</p> <p>Repair includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> refurbishing deteriorated brick and timberwork; and replacing corroded or deteriorated roofing material. 	Section 3.11	Reject	See body of the report	No

²⁹¹ Support – Heritage NZ [14.11]

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS14.11	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports amendment. While the definition as notified includes the words 'in relation to a heritage item' and therefore doesn't apply to every reference to 'repair' in the PDP, it may be better to amend the definition so that is similar to the way 'heritage alteration' and 'heritage restoration' are defined. There may be the need for consequential amendments to the wording of some HH policies and rules.</i>				
81.80	Kāinga Ora	Historic heritage site	Retain definition as notified	Section 3.5	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
65.3	Heritage NZ	Historic heritage site	Amend: Historic heritage site <u>area</u> means aansite <u>area</u> or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites <u>Areas</u> . Alternatively: Historic heritage site means aan areasite or place identified in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites.	Section 3.5	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes
65.4	Heritage NZ	General	Add: <u>Demolition: means the destruction or damage, in whole or in part, of any building or structure.</u>	Section 3.8	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes
SCHEDULES: SCHED2 – SCHED4:							
SCHED 2 – Historic Heritage Items (Group A)							
65.69	Heritage NZ	General	Include Sir Maui Pomare's Cottage in SCHED 3.	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.58	Heritage NZ	General	Amend: (...) Detail on <u>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)</u> or <u>New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA)</u> information...	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.60	Heritage NZ	General	Add the following NZAA site numbers: to SCHED 2: HHA001 - <u>R27/320</u> HHA002 - <u>R27/508</u> HHA003 - <u>R27/318</u>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>HHA005 - R26/734</p> <p>HHA006 - R27/321</p> <p>HHA007 - R27/322</p> <p>HHA008 - R26/418</p> <p>HHA011 - R26/254</p>				
65.62	Heritage NZ	General	<p>Amend all the HNZPT and NZAA to separate them out. The following is an example of the relief sought:</p> <p>HHA010 Pāuatahanui War Memorial</p> <p>Location & legal description Paekakariki Hill Road (Lot 1 DP 5672)</p> <p>Feature description Military Barracks Ruins</p> <p>HNZPT Listing Cat 2; 1329</p> <p>NZAA site number R26/254</p> <p>Heritage setting Refer map</p> <p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>Built as a memorial to WWI, the monument is an obelisk. ...</p>	Section 3.14	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes
81.891	Kāinga Ora	General	<p>Amend:</p> <p>SCHED2 – Outstanding Historic Heritage Items (Group A)</p> <p>SCHED2 contains Group A Heritage Items and associated heritage settings <u>that have outstanding national or regional significance.</u></p> <p>Information under Feature description identifies what is included in the schedule entry for each heritage item. The interiors of heritage items are excluded unless specifically identified. Where a heritage item has heritage setting this is stated. Not all heritage items have a heritage setting and some are marked as n/a* to indicate heritage settings may be considered for inclusion at a future date, through a future plan</p>	Section 3.5	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>change. The Planning Maps show if a site contains a heritage item and heritage setting through the inclusion of a heritage item symbol within the site. Where relevant, the heritage setting is also shown. In some cases, the extent of a heritage item is outlined on the planning maps. Heritage settings do not always follow site boundaries.</p> <p>Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED2 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.</p>				
FS14.26	Heritage NZ		<p><i>Supports in part. Retain reference to Group A, and include the words 'that have outstanding national or regional significance' in the introduction. Supports the use of two heritage schedules, and the related differentiation of district plan rules. Referring to Group A and Group B is a convenient shorthand, although it may also be beneficial to include the words 'that have outstanding national or regional significance' in the introduction to SCHED2.</i></p>				
65.59	Heritage NZ	Introduction	<p>Make specific that the interiors of a number of scheduled items on SCHED2 are included, including HHA002, HHA004, HHA005, HHA006.</p>	Section 3.10	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.61	Heritage NZ	HHA005 Mana Island Woolshed	<p>Amend:</p> <p>HHA005</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Statement of Significance</p> <p>Mana Island woolshed is located on flat land slightly elevated above the beach at Shingle Point.</p> <p>It is thought that Mana Island Woolshed was constructed <u>prior to 1873</u> between 1890 and 1897 by Mariano Vella. The woolshed design is unusual in having very low side walls and a steeply pitched roof(36 degree slope). It appears that the woolshed has had two extensions (shearing area and machine room; and the wool room) although it is not known when the extensions were undertaken. The early part of the building is interesting for the use of kanuka/manuka rafters and posts, with some still having their bark on. To the east and north there are remains of holding pens, fences and a sheep dip.</p> <p>Mana Island woolshed has high historic values in its association with New Zealand farming, particularly because the farm</p>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>produced the first wool to be exported from New Zealand. The woolshed has architectural and representative values as it demonstrates vernacular design and construction techniques particularly for the use of readily available materials. The woolshed has scientific and technical value given its high level of structural authenticity and early internal fittings. Repairs by Department of Lands and Survey in 1986 has reduced the authenticity of cladding.</p> <p>Relevant HH-P1 Values: Historic, Physical, Social, Surroundings, Rarity and Representativeness</p>				
SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B)							
General	Kāinga Ora	General	<p>Amend:</p> <p>SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B)</p> <p>SCHED3 contains Group B Heritage Items and associated heritage settings <u>that have national, regional or local significance.</u></p> <p>Information under Feature description identifies what is included in the schedule entry for each heritage item. The interiors of heritage items are excluded unless specifically identified. Where a heritage item has heritage setting this is stated. Not all heritage items have a heritage setting and some are marked as n/a* to indicate heritage settings may be considered for inclusion at a future date, through a future plan change. The Planning Maps show if a site contains a heritage item and heritage setting through the inclusion of a heritage item symbol within the site. Where relevant, the heritage setting is also shown. In some cases, the extent of a heritage item is outlined on the planning maps. Heritage settings do not always follow site boundaries.</p> <p>Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED3 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.</p>	Section 3.5	Reject	See body of the report	No
FS14.27	Heritage NZ		<p><i>Supports amendment. Retain reference to Group B, and the words 'that have outstanding national, regional or local significance' in the introduction. Supports the use of two heritage schedules, and the related differentiation of district plan rules. Referring to Group A and Group B is a convenient shorthand, although it may also be beneficial to include the words 'that have outstanding national, regional or local significance' in the introduction to SCHED3</i></p>				

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
6.1	He Ara Pukerua	General	<p>Include Pukerua Bay WW2 Block in SCHED3 – Historic Heritage Items (Group B) and identify it on the Council's District Plan Maps.</p> <p>Suggests a Statement of Significance:</p> <p>"The Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block, officially known as Type E Concrete Block Rail carrier number 801, and commonly referred to as a tank trap, was constructed in 1942 as part of Wellington Fortress during the Japanese invasion threat. The Road Block was part of the defences against an expected invasion force heading south to Wellington. The Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block was very unusual as it had three pedestals, one either side of the road and one in the centre of the road. Grooves on the inner sides were to have heavy iron rails locked in place when invasion was imminent. The one remaining pedestal of the Pukerua Bay WW2 Road Block is the only one in the region in its original position, the only one in New Zealand beside a main highway and one of the few still existing in New Zealand. Its size, white colour and position beside State Highway 1 make this WW2 relic a prominent landmark"</p>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
FS14.28	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports request. Undertake assessment of this place and if appropriate add item to schedule 3. Supports the addition of this place to SCHED3, subject to the place meeting the values listed in HH-P1.</i>				
65.68	Heritage NZ	General	<p>Add separate rows for HNZPT and NZAA <u>site numbers listings</u>. Example given in attachment.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
65.64	Heritage NZ	Introduction	Consider specifically including more interiors in the scheduled items of SCHED3.	Section 3.10	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.65	Heritage NZ	Introduction	<p>Amend to define a setting for all scheduled items including the following:</p> <p>HHB014 Pukerua Bay Gun posts</p> <p>HHB016 Motuhara tunnel</p> <p>HHB018 Titahi bay Boat sheds</p> <p>HHB019 Transmission station & shed</p> <p>HHB022 Mana machine gun posts</p>	Section 3.9	Reject	See body of the report	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			HHB023 Plimmerton Railway station HHB026 Titahi Bay machine gun post HHB032 Stone wall 16 Sunset Parade				
65.63	Heritage NZ	Introduction	Amend: Detail on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) or New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) information...	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
95.7	Titahi Bay Residents Association Incorporated	HHB017 The Former US Marines Hall	Retain the listing.	N/A	Accept	Agree with submitter ²⁹²	No
168.106	Robyn Smith	HHB018 Titahi Bay Boat Sheds	Supports the identification of the Titahi Bay Boat Sheds as heritage items (HHB018).	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
65.66	Heritage NZ	HHB018 Titahi Bay Boat Sheds	Move HHB018 from SCHED 3 to SCHED 2 The fabric of the buildings is not protected.	Section 3.14	Accept in part	See body of the report	No
65.67	Heritage NZ	HHB028 Bradey's Grave, Duck Creek, Pauatahanui/Whitby	Amend as follows: HHB028 – R27/446	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	No
SCHED4 – Historic Heritage Sites							
65.70	Heritage NZ	General	Amend: Heading: SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Areas <u>Sites</u> [Consequential amendments would be needed in other sections of the Plan].	Section 3.5	Reject	See body of the report	No
264.79	TROTR	General	Retain as notified subject to the following amendments – add to the schedule. <u>4. Specific site information (Sites not included in Heritage Register)</u> D.1 Titahi Bay Sandunes D.2 Tamanga a Kohu D.3 Papakowhai	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No

²⁹² I note that resource consent has recently been granted for demolition of this heritage item.

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			D.4 Aotea D.5 Horopaki D.6 Whitianga D.7 Te Rapa a Wahi D.8 Waiohata D.9 Kakaho D.10 Turi Kawera D.11 Kahotea D.12 Horokiri D.13 Purehurehu D.14 Porirua Track				
FS14.30	Heritage NZ		Supports request to the add places to SCHED 4, subject to each place meeting the values listed in HH-P1. Work with Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira to assess these places and where appropriate add to Schedule 4.				
65.77	Heritage NZ	General	Add separate rows for HNZPT and NZAA listings/site numbers. Delete Heritage setting row. Example: HHS005 Belmont Coach Road Location & legal description Belmont Road Feature description Old Road over Belmont Regional Park HNZPT Listing Cat 2; 7711 NZAA site number R27/252 Heritage setting n/a Statement of significance	Section 3.14	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			The road (from south to north) runs from the end of the sealed section...				
65.78	Heritage NZ	General	Include Pāuatahanui Historic Area in SCHED 4.	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.79	Heritage NZ	General	Include NIMT Railway line Paekakariki to Muri in SCHED 4 as a Historic Heritage Area/Site.	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
65.80 ²⁹³	Heritage NZ	General	Consider inclusion of additional historic heritage areas in the District Plan, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State housing areas in Titahi Bay and Porirua East - The Austrian Housing area in Titahi Bay - The suburban shopping centres of Cannons Creek and Titahi Bay 	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report	No
79.10	Heather and Donald Phillips and Love	General	Add the NZ Wars Memorial at Battle Hill to the Historic register	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
FS14.29	Heritage NZ		<i>Opposes requested addition. Do not add the memorial as a discreet item but consider including reference to it within the statement of significance for SASM003. The statement of significance for SASM003 includes reference to both Māori and British forces. It may be appropriate to include a comment in entry SASM003 that 'within the site there is a war memorial erected in 1922 to commemorate British soldiers who died in the August 1846 battle'.</i>				
FS70.53	TROTR		<i>Supports the requested addition. Agrees that it holds great significance to not only Ngāti Toa but to Aotearoa history.</i>				
11.72	PCC	Introduction	Insert the following under the schedule title and before the first schedule entry: <p><u>Detail on HNZPT or NZAA information is provided in SCHED4 for information purposes only. This includes places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero (The List) or in the NZAA site recording scheme.</u></p>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
81.893	Kāinga Ora	General	Retain as notified.	N/A	Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to the amendments made in response to other submissions	No
65.71	Heritage NZ	HHS002 Bowlers Wharf	Add the following NZAA site number to HHS002: <u>R27/507</u> .	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
65.72	Heritage NZ	HHS003 Former Marine Camp & Motukaraka Point	Add the following NZAA site numbers HHS003 – <u>R26/101-103, R26/159, R26/195, R26/198, R26/258</u>	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
65.73	Heritage NZ	HHS004 Mount Welcome Gold Mine Remnant	Add the following NZAA site number to HHS004: R26/245.	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes

²⁹³ Oppose – Kāinga Ora [FS65.420]

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
65.74	Heritage NZ	HHS005 Belmont Coach Road	Add the following NZAA site number to HHS005: R27/252.	Section 3.14	Accept	See body of the report	Yes
79.9	Heather and Donald Phillips and Love	HHS005 Belmont Coach Road	Add and amend	Section 3.14	Reject	See body of the report.	No
FS14.31	Heritage NZ		<i>Supports the feature name and description to be amended as requested, and states: "In the statement of significance it may be appropriate to include reference to 'Belmont Coach Road' as an alternative name. The submission is correct in that the Rārangi Kōrero / List entry is named 'Old Belmont to Pauatahanui Road', however 'Old Coach Road' is also recognised an alternative and commonly used name".</i>				
65.75	Heritage NZ	HHS007 Ngati Toa Domain	Amend: <u>Site type</u> <u>Feature description</u> Add the following NZAA site numbers to HHS007 - <u>R26/122, R26/128, R26/248, R26/254, R26/731</u>	Section 3.14	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes
65.76	Heritage NZ		Amend: <u>Site type</u> <u>Feature description</u> Add the following NZAA site numbers to HHS008: <u>R26/134 – 144, R26/169, R26/242 - 244, R26/410, R26/732 – 741</u> Include the NZAA site numbers in the correct field, not under 'site type'.	Section 3.14	Accept in part	See body of the report	Yes

Appendix C Report Author's Qualifications and Experience

I hold the following qualifications: Bachelor of Arts (in History and Geography) from the University of Canterbury, and a Master of Resources Studies (in Environmental Planning) from Lincoln University.

I have been employed by the Porirua City Council since March 2020 as a Senior Policy Planner within the Environment and City Planning Team.

I have 15 years' experience working as a planner in New Zealand, and five years' experience in planning in the United Kingdom.

Before being employed by Porirua City Council, I held a Planner role at Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for the Central Region Office. My role included providing planning advice in relation to proposals under the Resource Management (RMA). Prior to this I held senior planner positions at Upper Hutt City Council and Christchurch City Council, where my work was primarily focused on the preparation of Council led plan changes (under the RMA). During my work at Christchurch City Council I was involved in the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan, including assisting in drafting chapter proposals (including for Natural and Cultural Heritage) and providing evidence before the Independent Hearings Panel.

Before these positions, I was employed in planning positions in the United Kingdom in development control (similar to New Zealand resource consents planning), and by the Selwyn District Council in a policy planner role. I am an associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.