

**Before the Hearings Panel  
Appointed by Porirua City Council**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management  
Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Porirua Proposed District Plan

---

**TABLED STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DEAN RAYMOND ON BEHALF OF  
HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND POUHERE TAONGA**

**PORIRUA PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**Planning Statement – Subdivision**

---

**21 April 2022**

1. My name is Dean Raymond, and I am employed as a Planner for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) based in the Central Region Office. I have provided my qualifications and experience in the evidence presented at hearing stream 3 in relation to historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori.
2. HNZPT made submissions and further submissions on the Porirua Proposed District Plan (PDP). I was involved in preparing both the original submission and the further submission. I have been asked by HNZPT to assist by providing planning evidence on the PDP.
3. In preparing this evidence I have read the relevant submissions, further submissions, and the Section 42A report prepared by Council staff and/or consultants.
4. HNZPT made both submissions and further submission on the subdivision chapter. The relevant submission points relate to SUB-R10 – subdivision within the heritage setting of a heritage item, and further submissions on the Kāinga Ora submissions that non-notification clauses be added to rules SUB-R10 and SUB-R11.
5. HNZPT submission point number 65.52 related to the fact that a number of scheduled heritage places (eight in total) have not been provided with a heritage setting, and that subdivision rule SUB-R10 relies on the existence of a setting. The submission was that, if the submission point requesting that all scheduled heritage places be given a setting was not accepted, that SUB-R10 be amended to refer to subdivision of a site containing heritage.
6. I note that the 42A author for the Historic Heritage chapter has recommended that the HNZPT submission point to include settings for all scheduled places be rejected.
7. The 42A author for the subdivision chapter has in paragraph 288 made the following recommended changes to SUB-R10:

*Any subdivision of land within a the heritage setting of or which contains 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.*
8. This recommended change is clear and it captures the intent of the HNZPT submission. I concur in general with the 42A author's recommendation, if the hearing panel also accepts

the recommendation of the Historic Heritage 42A author that no additional heritage settings be provided.

9. The proposed change however does raise a potential ambiguity in implementation of the rule, in the case where a heritage setting exists on a site which is larger than its setting, and a subdivision of the site is proposed which does not directly impact the heritage item or the heritage setting. An example of a site where this is a possible scenario is 850A Paekākāriki Hill Road, a seven hectare (more or less) property which contains Blackey's Woolshed, HHA008. This heritage item has a defined setting which is considerably smaller than the land parcel.
10. The rule should be drafted to clarify that it applies to a defined heritage setting where one exists, and the land containing a heritage item where a setting does not exist. I have drafted an amendment to SUB-R10 which attempts to rectify this ambiguity. I have highlighted my suggested changes in [blue text](#).

*Any subdivision [of land](#) within ~~a the~~ heritage setting ~~of or~~, [where no heritage setting is defined](#), [any subdivision of land within which contains](#) 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.*

11. The amendments I have recommended will improve the efficiency of the District Plan in that it removes potential ambiguity from the provision.
12. Regarding the Kāinga Ora submissions that non-notification clauses be added to Rules SUB-R10 and SUB-R11, the 42A author recommends that the submission be rejected.
13. I concur with the author's reasoning and recommendations on these submission points.



**Dean Raymond**

**21 April 2022**