

# **Wellington City Proposed District Plan**

## **REPORT 3A - Historic Heritage, Notable Trees and Sites, Areas of Significance to Māori and Heritage Design Guide**

### **Appendix 2 Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions**

## General Points Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
James Coyle	307.3	Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values	Support	Supports Heritage and Culture as they give a sense of place. Projects that retain elements of heritage should be supported and encouraged.	Retain the Historical and Cultural Values chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.60	Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values	Support in part	Generally supportive.	Not specified.	Accept	No

## Definitions Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the current 'ongoing use' definition describes a continuing original use.	Add a new definition for 'Original Use' as follows:  <u>means keeping a building or object in the same use it was originally constructed for.</u>	Accept	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES	Amend	The definition of archaeological site should not be limited to the pre-1900 definition in the HNZPTA because this is an arbitrary date that does not reflect archaeological or historic heritage value.	Amend the Defintion of Archaeological Site as follows:  <del>Has the same meaning as given in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPT Act) (as set out below):</del>  <del>means, subject to section 42(3) of the HNZPT Act,</del>  a. any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that— i. was associated with human activity <del>that occurred before 1900 or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900;</del> and ii. provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and b. includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43(1) of the HNZPT Act.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES	Oppose	The definition as notified is aligned with the HNZPTA 2014 definition, and for consistency should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.34	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Demolition' and seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Demolition'.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	The definition of demolition provides clarity in administration of the rules related to the character precincts.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.18	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP.  TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.60	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECONSTRUCTION	Support	Supports the use of the ICOMOS NZ charter definition.	Retain the definition of 'Reconstruction' as notified.	Reject	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.46	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORATION	Amend	Considers that the definition is inconsistent with the regional plan definition. It is also unclear why restoration and restored have been separated out, such that 'restoration' relates only to cultural heritage.	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Reconstruction' to align with regional plan definition.	Reject	Yes

## Appendix B – Definitions Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.21	Interpretation Subpart /Definitions / RESTORATION	Support	Supports the use of the ICOMOS NZ charter definition.	Retain the definition of 'Restoration' as notified.	Reject	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition is very different to the one in the current District Plan and must ensure that heritage items are not able to be adversely affected using this definition.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and repair' as follows:  Means:  .....  (For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter)  In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following:  <u>a. Demolition of a structural element</u>  <u>a. b.</u> Changes to the existing surface treatment of fabric;  .....	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition should be made clearer e.g. what is meant by surface treatment?	Clarify the definition, particularly the meaning of surface treatment.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that double glazing should not be permitted as maintenance and repair and should instead be subject to the considerations of a resource consent process. Identifies the approach of English Heritage.	Seeks that the definition of 'maintenance and repair' is amended as follows: .. (For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter) In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following: ..... h. The modification, removal or replacement of windows (all joinery, including frames, sashes, sills, casements, mullions, glazing bars), <u>except</u> ; <u>i. modifications as necessary to replace an existing clear single glazed window pane with a clear double glazed pane.</u>	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andrew Haddleton	23.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Considers that in other cities, such as Auckland and Christchurch, councillors have pushed back to protect their heritage. WCC should do the same. Wellington is famous for its heritage housing and appearance. Allowing more concrete and glass buildings will ruin the tourist appeal of the city.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	[No reasons given other than decision]	Supports Historic Heritage Introduction with amendment.	Accept	No
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that as Appendix 1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes) contains reference to the NZ Archaeological Association data base and the role of HNZPT with regards to archaeological sites, it would also be beneficial for plan users reading the Historic Heritage chapter to be reminded of the provisions which apply to both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.	Amend the introduction section of the Historic Heritage Chapter where it refers to APP1 - Historic Heritage Advice Notes as follows:  ... APP1 - Historic Heritage Advice Notes contains useful information on assessing effects on heritage values and the different ways in which historic heritage is addressed by regulation and advocacy. <u>APP1 also contains reference to the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 which protect all archaeological sites.</u>  ...	Accept	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of 134 Brougham Street within the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas).</p> <p>134 Brougham Street (The property) is not a heritage example of Edwardian or character housing.</p> <p>Relevance to the Moir family home has been lost because of significant alterations to the property.</p> <p>Structure and weather proofing of the property is deteriorating and heritage area status makes repairs and development difficult.</p> <p>John Moir only lived in the property for &lt;5 years.</p> <p>Most of the Heritage Assessment Criteria do not specifically or reasonably apply to the property.</p> <p>Heritage Area status will reduce ability to densify Mt Victoria and maximise the development potential of this particular site.</p> <p>[See original submission for further detail]</p>	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is excluded from the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas).	Accept	Yes
Turi & Jane Park	73.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that there was insufficient correspondence from the Council on the proposed inclusion of 134 Brougham Street within the Moir Street Heritage Area and that they have been let down by the Council	[Not specified]	No decision sought	
Oliver Sangster	112.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Opposed to the inclusion of the Gordon Wilson Flats on SCHED1-Heritage buildings (# 299).</p> <p>Considers that the flats are an embarrassing and sorry sight in a time when there is a growing problem of homelessness and high rents in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that the flats need to be demolished to make way for more housing near our city centre and Victoria University.</p> <p>Considers that because they already have Heritage New Zealand protection, further protection under the district plan is unnecessary.</p>	Seeks that the demolition or alteration of any kind of Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats) on SCHED1-Heritage Buildings be a permitted activity.	Reject	No
Sophie Kahn	161.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	[Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that only public owned structures should listed as heritage in the Proposed District Plan, unless privately owned property has the agreement of an owner.	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Privately-owned, independent suburban homes should not be included in the Plan unless within a recognised precinct or with the agreement of the owner.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The further submitter supports the view in relation to private and isolated homes. Notes that it is unfair to burden private homeowners so significantly and discount and dismiss the impact of their economic wellbeing and property rights.	Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.  The Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owners consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.	Reject	No
Sophie Kahn	161.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage/General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council should offer to purchase those homes it proposed to list when owners are not supportive of listing.	[None specified].	No decision sought	
Ian Attwood	FS16.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	If Council wishes to preserve architectural heritage to the benefit of citizens and community and without owners incurring losses, then it should be required to acquire the properties and/or financially support the retention and maintenance.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The further submitter supports council offering to purchase homes proposed for listing. Notes that the point the original submitter makes is aligned with the section titles "No nonregulatory incentive options for protection have been considered" on page 47 of our submission and "The Council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage" on page 21.  Notes that requiring the Council to compensate owners for the heritage services they mandate, or for them to purchase properties where owners are opposed, would provide important balance and restraint to their incentives to over procure heritage as they bear no cost of doing so.	Allow / Seeks that the Council offer to purchase homes proposed for listing when the owners are opposed.  Seeks that the Council investigate other non- regulatory incentive schemes (as expected under the RMA) including enduring rates remissions for private owners providing heritage services to the city.	No decision sought in primary submission	
Historic Places Wellington	182.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the HH - Historic Heritage chapter with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Supports continuing to promote seismic strengthening of heritage places.	Not specified.	No decision sought	
Historic Places Wellington	182.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose in part	Considers the chapter has become too permissive in its drafting and opposes it to this degree.	Seeks that the chapter takes a more mandatory, conservation and preservation focus.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	FS48.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not recognise that in some circumstances, a mandatory focus on conservation and preservation is not appropriate and cannot enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow	Accept	
Historic Places Wellington	182.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Opposes facadism as an outcome for heritage buildings.	Add a new policy or rule to the HH - Historic Heritage Chapter to make it clear that only in exceptional instances will facadism be appropriate, and only if consistent with ICOMOS guidelines.	Reject	No
Mike Camden	226.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that HH rules are very "Enabling".	Seeks that the Historic Heritage chapter is amended to support more reuse, refurbishment and conservation.	Reject	No
Mike Camden	226.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendments to the Historic Heritage chapter for protection for stained and decorative heritage glass windows in Heritage Buildings.	Accept in part	Yes
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that historic elements in the Wellington Botanic Gardens (e.g. Talavera Cable Car Station) should be given heritage protection. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that heritage protection is extended in the Botanic Gardens.	Reject	No
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that Hay Street has heritage values, as evidenced in the report titled 'Hay Street Heritage Area - Heritage Assessment' included with the submission.	Seeks that development in Hay Street is restricted due to the heritage values (as a qualifying matter).	Reject	No
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.86	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	The submitter oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s771 of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow	Reject	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Cherie Jacobson	251.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that heritage is given inadequate weight in the PDP.</p> <p>The heritage policies have a focus on enabling works as opposed to enabling conservation.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>Heritage and character can make a significant contribution to Wellington's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use.</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was listed as a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness.</p> <p>The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas) is exempt from all Heritage Zone Controls except HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) and HH-R1 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures).	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers minor amendment necessary for consistency. In addition it is considered that this section makes no mention of the recognised heritage values of buildings.</p>	<p>Amend Historic Heritage Introduction as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Sustainable long-term use One of the best ways to protect <u>the recognised heritage values of</u> built heritage is to ensure that it remains in a sustainable <u>long term long-term use</u>.</p>	Accept	Yes
Property Council New Zealand	338.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	<p>Supports heritage as a qualifying matter. Retaining genuine heritage in Wellington is critical in maintaining a high quality, desirable and liveable building environment. It is however important that the Council ensures Wellington has sufficient development capacity when engaging with property owners on proposed new heritage listings.</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	
Parliamentary Service	375.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage/General HH	Support in part	<p>The Historical Heritage chapter introduction is generally supported, but wording in the Sustainable long-term use objective should be amended. The objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.</p>	Retain the Historic Heritage Introduction with amendments.	Accept in part	yes
Parliamentary Service	375.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Sustainable long-term use objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.</p>	Amend the Historic Heritage Chapter Introduction to acknowledge that it is important to ensure that built heritage can continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	accept in part	yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>Supports the Introduction to the extent that it recognises that ‘reuse’ (defined as “changing the use of a building or object from that which it was originally constructed for”) of a heritage building can be appropriate and facilitated by additions or alterations. This is important to balance the importance of retaining heritage values while enabling appropriate use of heritage buildings</p>	Retain HH - Introduction as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	FS48.1	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission because "reuse" and "appropriate use" may facilitate works which enable the continued practicable and functional use of heritage buildings.	Allow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that within the 'Cross references to other relevant District Plan provisions' that it is amended to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.	Reject	no
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that chapter includes appropriate rules to ensure protection of SASMs in or near identified Historic Heritage sites.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.123	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.163	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose in part	The Historic Heritage chapter is partially opposed as it is unclear which rules apply to a scheduled heritage building, a non-scheduled contributing building, and a non-scheduled non-contributing buildings.	Opposes the Historic Heritage chapter and seeks amendments.	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.164	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the Historic Heritage chapter should be amended to provide further clarification and should define contributing and non-contributing buildings, scheduled and non-scheduled building. It is not clear which rules apply to a scheduled heritage building, a non-scheduled contributing building, and a non-scheduled non-contributing buildings. Amendments are required throughout the chapter to provide clarity to when rules apply to respective buildings in Historic Heritage chapter.	Seeks amendments to the Historic Heritage chapter to provide clarity in provisions applying to: - Scheduled heritage buildings, - Non-scheduled heritage buildings considered to be contributing buildings; and - Non-scheduled heritage buildings that are non-contributing.	Accept in part	Yes
Murray Pillar	393.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	Supports the heritage rules but notes that they are very "enabling" i.e. permissive.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Murray Pillar	393.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Supports the heritage rules but notes that they are very "enabling" i.e. permissive.	Seeks that the heritage rules are drafted to support more conservation.	Reject	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not recognise that in some circumstances, a focus on conservation is not appropriate and cannot enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Considers that there is a lack of evidence to support the heritage content of the PDP, including for the following reasons:  - The provisions lack a reliable evidence base and a qualitative report on the effectiveness of the operative plan provisions in necessary. - There is little evidence to support claims that the provisions are working as intended - There is little evidence that the heritage and character provisions are affecting the housing market in wellington.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that Wellington has struggled to retain its historic heritage and continues to lose listed and unlisted heritage of national significance.  Considers that the city centre only retains a small pool of representative heritage from its past, and this is dominated by public buildings and clusters of commercial buildings. Many of Wellington's surviving historic buildings have been significantly altered, partially demolished or incorporated into larger buildings.	Not specified	No decision sought	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers that some of the heritage and plan content does not reflect best practice.</p> <p>Considers that the heritage policies have a focus on enabling works as opposed to enabling conservation, based on an assumption that heritage protection has prevented necessary development.</p> <p>Opposes more permissive rules for historic heritage and considers that finite environmental values like historic heritage need discretion through consent processes</p> <p>Considers that this is a fundamental misunderstanding of ICOMOS New Zealand charter and the principles of heritage conservation.</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not provide for appropriate activities or recognise that a focus on conservation may prevent works that enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow	No decision sought in primary submissions	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers concern that if the plan as proposed is implemented, historic heritage and character which is of significance to current and future Wellingtonians, will be lost or altered.</p> <p>Considers concern that the proposed plan's more permissive rules for historic heritage, the inadequacy of the schedule in reflecting Wellington's heritage, and the reductive approach to character areas.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is little reliable evidence that the current district plan has been effective at preventing or mitigating the loss of Wellington's historic heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the move in the PDP towards making more activities permitted is likely to result in adverse effects on historic heritage.</p> <p>Considers that finite environmental values like historic heritage need discretion through consent processes. As such, we are concerned that the more permissive rules in the proposed district plan for historic heritage will not adequately provide for the protection of historic heritage as a matter of national importance under section 6f of the RMA and will not achieve objective HH-02 Protecting Historic Heritage.</p>	Seeks that more historic heritage related activities need the activity status of discretionary. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that it is not necessary to refer to partial demolition as a way of facilitating sustainable long term use as it is captured by 'alterations' and suggests partial demolition applications would be welcome, whereas they should be discouraged.	<p>Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage chapter as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Both ongoing use and reuse can be a sustainable long term use for built heritage and can be facilitated by compatible additions and alterations. <u>and/or carefully done partial demolition.</u></p>	Reject	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the reference to 'continuity of buildings and structures' as it relates to heritage areas is not clear. Some significant heritage areas are not 'continuous' and contain gaps where non-contributing buildings are located.	[inferred decision requested] clarify the meaning of 'continuity of buildings and structures' under the description of heritage areas.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the 'sustainable long term use' section should explicitly allow for stabilisation and mothballing. This section is very focussed on 'use' as the be all and end all. However, if there isn't a reasonable use right now that doesn't mean the only other option is demolition.	Amend the section on sustainable long term use to explicitly allow for stabilisation and mothballing.	Reject	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not provide for appropriate activities or recognise that a focus on conservation may prevent works that enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the description of Heritage areas should be explicit (like the current District Plan) that it is 'because of their contribution to the value of the heritage area the contributor buildings warrant the same treatment and control as listed heritage items'.  Considers that the values of contributing buildings in heritage areas should be protected to the same degree as individual heritage buildings in heritage areas to ensure that the heritage values of the area as a whole are maintained.  Considers that there is not reliable evidence in the s32 report to support this change.	Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage chapter description of heritage areas to be explicit that it is 'because of their contribution to the value of the heritage area the contributor buildings warrant the same treatment and control as listed heritage items'.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that In line with submission point on EW-S10reference to the application of the earthworks chapter should be removed for scheduled archaeological sites, as HH-P20, HH-R18 provide a more nuanced approach to assessing the effects of earthworks on scheduled archaeological sites	Amend the 'Cross references to other relevant district plan provisions' note so that scheduled archaeological sites are not referenced and accordingly not managed by the earthworks provisions.	Accept	yes
VicLabour	414.22	Historical and Cultural Values/ Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Supportive of more flexible heritage building protections to allow for more sustainable changes to be made.	Not specified	No decision sought	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that Council has misinterpreted their obligations to provide for the protection of heritage under the purpose of the RMA. Incentives for the Council to protect heritage are unbalanced and without proper diligence to the Section 32 evaluation may not actually be delivering a net benefit to society that is simply assumed. Council has interpreted Section 6(f) to mean that heritage is a fait accompli and trumps other societal value. However, a High Court ruling stated that "the consent authority must ensure its consideration is founded upon an assessment of whether or not destruction of historic heritage is a balanced response, and a fair, appropriate and reasonable outcome".</p> <p>Council has focused on regulatory solutions alone and has dismissed any consequences or costs of their regime as inconsequential. There is no confidence that there are net benefits to society from the heritage listing at 28 Robieson St, because Council did not fully identify the effects of their proposal or take quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significance of the regulatory intervention. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The veracity of Council claims about heritage value and societal benefits are questioned.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that Heritage listings would have a direct impact of \$319 million. This indicates the order of magnitude of the scale and significance of the proposal and should not be diminished or dismissed. It requires that the Council apply a level detail and rigour that is proportional. It requires them to invest more effort. Council will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to owners to meet quotas that have little merit of basis. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that heritage and building evaluation and classification from Council is weak. The evidence base for historic heritage section of the Section 32 evaluation is lacking in transparency and accountability.</p> <p>Furthermore, many modern buildings are not recorded as modern by the Council due to a lack of any robust classification system or process. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that Council use a more robust and transparent heritage assessment and classification system. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Process of identification seems arbitrary and inequitable impacting some and not others. Regrettable precedence where to be consistent any home designed by an award-winning architect should be considered heritage and scheduled.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers modern movement architects have a long history of contributing to public debate around affordable housing design, social housing, urban planning, and heritage. Many, including Bill Toomath and the Architecture Centre wrote or contributed to sustainable housing manifestos for architectural interest groups. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council does not know how many of the existing scheduled heritage listings are private homes. The existing heritage inventory was analysed, and it is estimated that 224 private homes have individual heritage protection. In the District Plan, the Council has proposed the inclusion of 52 new heritage listings, of which half are homes (26 homes), and 11 new heritage areas which affects 350 homes. This is on top of the existing 224 individual homes listed and the 100 homes within the existing heritage areas. Character areas impact another 5000 homes in Wellington. Considers it is notable that Wellington has nearly three times the number of houses protected relative to the total housing stock in Auckland. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the council is proposing to expand homes with heritage protection from about 324 homes to about 700. This increase is an additional 376 homes and means under the proposal, almost 1% of all the homes in Wellington will be protected and have their development restricted, in the suburbs and within walking distance of the city centre and transport hubs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage protection, and interest groups have similar incentives to Council. Considers no non-regulatory mechanisms or options were considered in the Proposed District Plan which misses an opportunity to rethink and rebalance how incentives work to better deliver on the requirement in the RMA to treat the protection of heritage with importance. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council is failing its responsibilities under the RMA . Their level of rigour, policies, approach to identification, evaluation frameworks, consideration of options, and level of performance assessment against heritage objectives are all lacking in the context of national importance prescribed within the Act. For instance, Section 6(f) of the RMA has been misinterpreted by Council.  Furthermore, it is considered that there is an implicit expectation of access when closely interpreting the definition of historic heritage in the RMA. This would reasonably remove or reduce the heritage value of isolated private suburban homes compared to publicly accessible heritage buildings and landmarks. Considers that it seems likely that when the RMA was drafted in 1991 and heritage was defined, policy makers had not envisioned isolated homes from the 1960's, with no real stand out qualities form others on the street, no public access, and limited visibility, would be targeted for heritage protection. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the Council better identify, evaluate, consider and assess heritage objectives in the context of national importance prescribed within the Act, particularly in regard to heritage listing specific properties. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Not specified.	Allow / Seeks that all privately-owned, independent suburban homes not in an identified heritage precinct removed from the District Plan.	reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sophie Kahn	FS76.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>The Submitter (415) points to the implicit expectation of public access to Historic Heritage when the RMA was drafted. This calls for an independent evaluation of the WCC's justification for the inclusion of private homes that will never be accessible to the public (and in many cases are not at all or barely visible to the public) onto the Plan.</p> <p>The submission (415) points out that is highly probable originators of the RMA would not have imagined that Councils of the future would interpret their document to mean homes like 28 Robieson St and Kahn House which are inaccessible and barely visible should be targeted for protection.</p> <p>The Submitters (415) query what the Council is trying to achieve by placing private homes that are visually unremarkable in their surrounds and that are outside any recognised heritage precinct on the Plan and submit that this achieves none of the objectives of the NPS-UD and DP regarding efficient use of land and housing supply.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings</p> <p>Seeks that Council: -seek and make publicly available an independent legal evaluation of the the RMA's expectation of access, and if the proposed WCC's inclusion of inaccessible private homes are aligned with the independent evaluation</p>	reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that there is a significant power imbalance between the Council and isolated homeowners in regard to heritage listings. Considers the powers granted to consent authorities under the RMA to regulate are significant. Considers individuals and isolated homeowners have less voice, weight, time, or energy, to stand up for themselves. Considers the Council has both direct authority to regulate property owners, access to better information, and greater resources. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sophie Kahn	FS76.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>The Submitters express their concern regarding the significant imbalance of power that exists in this process. Refer to submission for their detailed illustrations of this point.</p> <p>The further submitter agrees with their concern and has taken all reasonable steps to attempt to minimise the devastating effects of this power imbalance during my opposition to the listing of the Kahn House, including many attempts to engage with Council staff. The Submitters imply that an independent review needs to be carried out to ensure WCC acts fairly and reasonably with the extreme power they possess over Wellington's homeowners. The further submitter concurs.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>- Appoint an independent body to assess that Council are acting fairly and reasonably with owners of private homes</p>	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council needs to be cognisant of the selection biases they have imbedded in their identification processes for historic heritage. by selecting 10 streets at random and checking every building on them for any historic significance. Such an approach might generate a fairer and more representative list of buildings for historic consideration, the same way randomisation is embedded in medical trials to prevent biases. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the Council amend its heritage identification process to include more randomisation, so as to prevent bias. [Inferred decision requested]</p>	reject	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers the evaluation of the effectiveness and performance of the current regulatory settings is extremely limited in regard to heritage protection. Considers that the heritage protection regime needs to find a balance heritage protection required by the RMA, the desire to identify historic heritage, the value of heritage to the wider community, the performance of an operative plan, and the cohesive integration with other policies.</p> <p>It is considered that the Council has dismissed the burden imposed on private property owners of proposed heritage listings, which is not aligned with the intent of the RMA.</p> <p>The heritage protection regime does not incentivise documentation, identification, nomination or preservation of historic heritage. It does not educate owners of heritage properties, and instead incentivises owners of unlisted properties to remove, destroy or significantly alter unknown heritage value to preserve monetary value, and even accelerate destruction prior to any proposed listing. Financial incentives are also considered inadequate. It is considered that there are significant issues with the current heritage protection regime. Considers that no evaluation of the effectiveness of the current regime against objectives and principles has taken place.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that the current regime's effectiveness be evaluated against objectives and principles and this be used to inform a future regime, which should find a balance between the importance of heritage protection in the Resource Management Act, the desire to identify historic heritage, the value of heritage to the wider community and other factors such as the burden imposed of private property owners of heritage listings. [Inferred decision requested, refer to original submission]	reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that the council has only considered a narrow set of high-level options to protect heritage in their section 32 report. Considers that there is a singular focus on a regulatory approach, and costs relating to owners on newly listed properties has been dismissed. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers there are issues with the Heritage Issues and Options report including that it contains unsubstantiated claims, disputes findings within the paper e.g. that categorisation of buildings is not appropriate, and considers the state of some of the report content is very poor. Considers a heritage database of unlisted items as referred to in the report should be made public. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that no non-regulatory incentive options for heritage protection have been considered. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the council considers non-regulatory incentive options for heritage protection [Inferred decision requested]	reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that no options for a collaborative or regional approach to heritage protection have been considered [Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the council considers options for a collaborative or regional approach to heritage protection [Inferred decision requested]	reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that digital heritage protection should be considered by Council. Having historic heritage digitally preserved provides many benefits over physical protection and may increase collective heritage value to society. Knowing a physical structure is already digitally preserved also changes the interpretation of what is an appropriate or inappropriate physical modification.</p> <p>A digital approach is less costly to society and would offer real value and convenience in the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, so people can interact, and experience natural and physical resources virtually, without any impact on the resources themselves. Good examples of digital heritage protection are provided by Google Street View Time Machine and CityViewAR.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Council considers digital heritage protection techniques. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the digital innovation team at Wellington City Council should get in touch with the Heritage Team at the Council to collaborate on options regarding digital preservation and integration of heritage into the Wellington digital twin programme. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that digital heritage preservation be integrated into the Wellington digital twin programme.	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council has failed to effectively consider cost and benefits of protection of heritage, which is required under Section 32 of the RMA. The responsibility in 'providing for' the protection of heritage does not require scheduling of buildings, it does not preclude incentive regimes, and it does not rule out the Council establishing a voluntary regime. Considers that section 32 evaluations must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	No evidence presented by WCC of the costs and benefits of heritage protection for 28 Robieson Street.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sophie Kahn	FS76.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>The Submitters contend that an accurate and professional-level cost:benefit analysis be required in the case of Heritage. The Submitters point out that no such analysis has been done by the WCC and that given the scale and significance of the economic, social and cultural outcomes this is unjustifiable.</p> <p>The further submitter fully support this position and echo this point for the Kahn House. A detailed cost:benefit analysis is required under Section 32 of the RMA. As this has not be carried out and provided to homeowners, all private homes without owner support should be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Seeks to remove all privately-owned homes from the list where the owner is opposed to listing as no analysis on the costs owners will face has been performed.</p> <p>Seeks the decision that private homes cannot be listed without appropriate considerations of the cost and benefits, as required in the RMA.</p>	No decision sought in primary submission	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the Council has failed to identify the full range of effects and describe their scale and significance in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Council has not adequately assessed and accounted for the impact of loss of capital value (financial loss to owners), the increased compliance costs, the constraints on development and alterations, and impact on marketability because of scheduling.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the council has failed to quantify costs and benefits of their proposal (heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street), including largely ignoring the way society responds to their incentives, the cost to society of having more restrictive use of land and the costs that fall on owners. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the Council has failed to include a level of information and certainty or properly identify risks in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	The Section 32 evaluation is considered to be inadequate in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. A detailed list of objections is provided. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the heritage assessment of the Toomath House (28 Robieson Street) is weak and overstates the heritage value of the building, while ignoring costs. The Council's report makes un-substantiated claims, or errors. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Heritage assessment is not balanced by alternative views on architectural merit and heritage value.  There is no provision at the outset for the architectural merit or significance/influence to be debated or challenged, or an opposing view to be recorded.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that while the heritage assessment provided by the Council attempts to assess the significance of heritage in the submitter's home (28 Robieson Street), it makes no attempt to consider or assess the heritage value. Considers that a framework that assesses "Use" and "non-use" values is appropriate. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	Support Historic Heritage protection in part.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain Historic Heritage provisions, with amendments [inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Submitter seeking further certainty regarding Historic Heritage provisions. Submitter recognises the importance of Wellington's historic heritage. It is an important aspect of the City and must be protected.</p> <p>In the submitter's experience, however, the lines can become blurred at the boundaries between heritage areas and other areas of the City. Submitter considers that they need greater certainty in proximity controls so that all plan users understand where heritage protections do and do not apply.</p>	<p>Seeks greater certainty in the Historic Heritage proximity controls so that all plan users understand where heritage protections do and do not apply.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept in part	No
Penny Griffith	418.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Wellington City Council formally recognises Historic Places Wellington as an organisation with specialist knowledge, who get consulted with on heritage policy issues.	Reject	No
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a new objective that reflects the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Reject	No
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.	Seeks that I submit that the draft District Plan needs to better recognise and provide for the protection of heritage from inappropriate development and better take into account the need to maintain and enhance amenity values.	Reject	No
Peter Fordyce	431.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas should be expanded. Wellington's built heritage comprises a vital part of the city, featuring a cityscape that is not only unique within New Zealand, but the world. This contributes to not only tourism, but fosters a sense of "place" for residents. While the rules as they currently exist provide some protection, this does not go far enough, and irreplaceable buildings and streetscapes are at risk of being lost.	Seeks that Heritage Areas be expanded.	Reject	No
Kay Larsen	447.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the history and character of the southern end of the terrace is protected.	Reject	no
David Lee	454.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers there is the Climate change issue to consider. Demolishing wooden heritage housing (which the Plan will allow of right) will release carbon into the atmosphere. Considers that more carbon will be used in building replacements made of concrete, steel and glass. 'Old is greener than new'.	No specified.	No decision sought	No
Marilyn Head	457.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Opposed to how the Proposed Plan protects Heritage Areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Rachel Underwood	458.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	While supporting the heritage rules, considers they should be drafted to enable more conservation rather than permissive development. Considers there are many details that should be included such as stained and decorative heritage glass window in heritage listed buildings.	Seeks that the historic heritage provisions are amended to enable more conservation.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Christina Mackay	478.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage/ General HH	Not specified	Considers that Neighbourhood clusters of houses set against the backdrop of the green town belt present Wellington's historical character and in the aggregate is of national significance under RMA s.6.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Christina Mackay	478.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the maintenance, conservation and upgrading of 19th Century timber houses is not easy and VUW research found a shortage of heritage design and building craft skills and knowledge.	Seeks that WCC adopts policies to promote and encourage sustainable re-use and restoration and provide evidence-based design and technical based resources.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Paul Burnaby	44.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that a provision should be made for 'transferable development rights' from sites containing listed heritage buildings to adjoining sites that do not fall within an identified heritage area.	Seeks that 'transferable development rights' be created for sites adjoining Heritage areas.	Reject	No
Tim Bright	75.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that a setback of more than 1m should be required to allow for more of a transition zone between Heritage Areas or Character Precincts.	Seeks that a setback of more than 1m is required from boundaries in or adjoining Heritage Areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Reports 2A and 4B	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that replacement of decorative and coloured glass be disallowed and discouraged.	Seeks that a new rule be added to the Historic Heritage Chapter that requires resource consent for the removal of heritage decorative or stained glass as a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington	182.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that there is a gap in the current regulatory framework whereby property owners of heritage listed buildings can neglect to maintain or repair buildings so they are effectively "demolished by neglect".  Demolition by neglect is addressed in the English National Planning Framework.  Considers that adding a provision addressing demolition by neglect would address situations where an owner argues that the benefits of a newbuilding (which substantially demolishes a listed heritage building) outweighs its value as an intact or restored heritage building.  Considers that such arguments should not be available to owners who have not undertaken maintenance or repair.	Add a new policy to the Historic Heritage Chapter along the lines of:  <u>"Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision".</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	HNZPT supports the addition of a new policy to the Historic Heritage Chapter as mentioned in the submission.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.70	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is considered particularly onerous and is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.70	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is considered particularly onerous and is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington	182.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that HPW specific bulk and shading controls should apply at and near to boundaries of sites which are near heritage listed sites to address the principles set out in various High Court decisions such as: Sydney Substation Ltd v WCC [2017] NZHC 2489.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to include bulk and shading controls at, and near to, the boundaries of sites which are near to each heritage listed site where special height and design controls apply to protect context and curtilage setting of heritage listed buildings.	Reject	No
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.30	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	It is important for heritage buildings to be viewed by the public and not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent buildings.	Allow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.77	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.	Disallow	Accept	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.71	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.71	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington	182.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precincts together with the new “heritage areas” do not sufficiently protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development under RMA s.6. In particular, buildings with heritage value which are outside concentrations of buildings with similar values, or those in poor condition, will be at risk of inappropriate development.</p> <p>Considers that while “heritage is not the same as character”, it has been through character protections in the ODP that heritage has been acknowledged and protected in the existing planning regime (despite not being listed).</p> <p>Considers that Wellington’s unique heritage and character is represented in its native timber oldest inner city suburbs. The heritage values of those buildings are irreplaceable and unable to replicate.</p> <p>Considers that the proposal is consistent with the overlay proposed in the Councils Draft Spatial Plan. Considers that the proposal would protect the heritage of specific buildings where there is not a sufficient cluster of higher quality character streetscape sites, which would otherwise make available a level of protection under RMA s.7.</p> <p>Considers that without such a procedural overlay, the effects on the environment (specifically on heritage) of any ‘level of development’ would be incompatible and inappropriate, by not being considered at all.</p> <p>Considers that the demolition control overlay would see a negligible reduction in additional housing capacity. It would also provide an accumulative benefit from not demolishing NZ’s oldest native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that a 'heritage demolition control' be added for all areas identified by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Pre-1930s character area review as 'Primary' 'Contributory' or 'omitted'; and</li> <li>- The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's submission on the Draft Spatial Plan.</li> </ul>	Reject	no
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.78	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	<p>Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on intensification opportunities of applying the proposed changes.</p>	Disallow	Accept	no

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington	182.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precincts together with the new "heritage areas" do not sufficiently protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development under RMA s.6. In particular, buildings with heritage value which are outside concentrations of buildings with similar values, or those in poor condition, will be at risk of inappropriate development.</p> <p>Considers that while "heritage is not the same as character", it has been through character protections in the ODP that heritage has been acknowledged and protected in the existing planning regime (despite not being listed).</p> <p>Considers that Wellington's unique heritage and character is represented in its native timber oldest inner city suburbs. The heritage values of those buildings are irreplaceable and unable to replicate.</p> <p>Considers that the proposal is consistent with the overlay proposed in the Councils Draft Spatial Plan. Considers that the proposal would protect the heritage of specific buildings where there is not a sufficient cluster of higher quality character streetscape sites, which would otherwise make available a level of protection under RMA s.7.</p> <p>Considers that without such a procedural overlay, the effects on the environment (specifically on heritage) of any 'level of development' would be incompatible and inappropriate, by not being considered at all.</p> <p>Considers that the demolition control overlay would see a negligible reduction in additional housing capacity. It would also provide an accumulative benefit from not demolishing NZ's oldest native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that within the 'heritage demolition control' the following provisions apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The demolition of any building or structure, excluding ancillary structures, built before 1930 be a restricted discretionary activity.</li> <li>- Intensification provisions would apply (being the level of development enabled under the MDRS and NPSUD policy 3).</li> </ul>	Reject	no
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.79	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on intensification opportunities of applying the proposed changes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that there should be a specific process of heritage identification and assessment of all existing buildings in the inner city suburbs (noting that the Boffa Miskell 2019 report was not commissioned for the purpose of making a process to identify heritage and assessment of values, but rather identifying concentrations of "Character").	Seeks that a provision is added to make a process of specific heritage identification and assessment of heritage values for all building in the inner city suburbs.	Reject	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.90	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshafts</p>	Allow	Reject	no
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Supports evidence submitted by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks a new rule so that the removal of decorative/coloured glass from heritage buildings requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional rule clarifying that additions, alterations and demolition of non-listed heritage features of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures be permitted. This is consistent with the purpose of identifying features of heritage buildings that are not scheduled as not having heritage values, and is currently a gap in the Proposed Plan. For completeness, we note that it we do not consider it necessary for any of the existing standards in the Proposed Plan to apply to this rule.	<p>Add a new rule HH-RX to the Historic Heritage chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Additions, alterations and demolition of features that are excluded from the listing of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Provides greater clarity to the Plan.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Provides greater clarity to the Plan.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Murray Pillar	393.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that protection for stained and decorative heritage glass windows is provided for heritage listed buildings.	Accept in part	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH. Considers that it must be clear where heritage protections apply to provide certainty for development.</p> <p>The submitter considers that Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.</p>	<p>Add a new objective (or similar) within the HH chapter after HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as follows:</p> <p><u>Clearly identify historic heritage and provide certainty on the extent of heritage protection.</u></p>	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH. Considers that it must be clear where heritage protections apply to provide certainty for development.</p> <p>The submitter considers that Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.</p>	<p>Add a new objective (or similar) within the HH chapter after HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as follows:</p> <p><u>Recognise the importance of achieving a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.</u></p>	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	FS48.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission on the basis that ensuring certainty for new development and enabling new development may facilitate the continued.	Allow	Reject	No
Peter Fordyce	431.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that the Heritage chapter should have a provision to protect original windows with stained and decorative glass on buildings within the character precincts, and heritage structures. As the chapter stands, provisions have little protection for the windows of heritage buildings, particularly stained and decorative glass, and there is a significant risk that this will be lost with the push for double glazing. Where possible, original window frames should be retained, and new or modified windows must contain the original decorative glass.	Add a new rule in the Historic Heritage chapter providing protection of original windows and stained and decorative window glass on heritage buildings and structures.  [Inferred decision requested - note: relief sought refers to heritage structures and character precincts]	Accept in part	Yes
Peter Fordyce	431.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that the Heritage chapter should have a provision to protect original windows with stained and decorative glass on buildings within the character precincts, and heritage structures. As the chapter stands, provisions have little protection for the windows of heritage buildings, particularly stained and decorative glass, and there is a significant risk that this will be lost with the push for double glazing. Where possible, original window frames should be retained, and new or modified windows must contain the original decorative glass.	Add a new Rule in the Historic Heritage chapter providing protection of original windows and stained and decorative window glass on buildings in Heritage Areas.  [Inferred decision requested - note: relief sought refers to heritage structures and character precincts]	Accept in part	Yes
Christina Mackay	478.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that in order to combat intentional neglect the submitter support a new policy to the PDP's Historic Heritage Chapter on Maintenance and Repair.	Add a new policy as follows:  <u>"Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision."</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Cherie Jacobson	251.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Not specified	Considers that the schedule does not represent what is distinctive about Wellington, the region and New Zealand.  Objective HH-01 Recognising Historic Heritage will not be met if the schedule is not representative. This objective is that 'historic heritage [is] recognised for its contribution to an understanding and appreciation of the history, culture and sense of place of Wellington City, the Wellington region and New Zealand.'  WCC has not adequately sought the views of the community on historic heritage in the development of the PDP.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Support	The further submitters supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes the Council's engagement and understanding of what the community values.  The Council should spend the time and effort to understand how much value the community places on different types of heritage. This work would then inform Council resourcing and support quantitative net benefit assessments of listings as expected under s32 of the RMA.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the broader community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.	No decision sought in primary submission	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place.	Retain HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Support	Supports HH-01 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Amend	the objective is missing a word.	Amend HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage) as follows:  Historic heritage <u>is</u> recognised for its contribution to an understanding and appreciation of the history, culture and sense of place of Wellington City, the Wellington region and New Zealand.	Accept	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.57	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-01	Support in part	Supports HH-01 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage...) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-02	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place.	Retain HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-02	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-02	Support	Supports HH-02 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.58	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-02	Support in part	Supports HH-02 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage...), as notified.	Accept	No
Parliamentary Service	375.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Support in part	Supports but submits that the objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Retain HH-03 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) with amendments.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	375.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Amend	Supports but submits that the objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Amend HH-03 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as follows:  Sustainable long-term use  One of the best ways to protect built heritage is to ensure that it remains in a sustainable <u>and practicable</u> long term use. ...	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington’s identity and sense of place. It also recognises the importance of maintaining built heritage as part of sustainable use and waste reduction: construction waste is a major waste stream issue for Wellington - building re-use, as far as possible, needs to be incentivised.	Retain HH-03 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-03 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.	Accept	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHO3	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it recognises that works to built heritage should encompass maintenance, repair, reuse, and reasonable works; all of which are broadly aligned with the objective of facilitating and enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Support	Supports HH-03 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-03 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Amend	The objective of the chapter is best captured by HH-01 and HH-02.  Concerned that HH-03 could lead to unnecessary demolition of built heritage where current circumstances do not allow for sustainable use.  Considers that stabilisation and mothballing may also be an appropriate approach depending on the circumstances.	Amend HH-03 (Sustainable long term use) as follows:  Built heritage is well-maintained, resilient. <del>and kept in sustainable long term use.</del>	Reject	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHO3	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as the objective needs to recognise the importance of the sustainability of use of built heritage.	Disallow	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.59	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-03	Support in part	Supports HH-03 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-03 (Sustainable long-term use ...), as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Anna Kemble Welch	434.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Not specified	Not specified.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P1	Amend	Generally supportive but considers more emphasis to Māori heritage is needed, to be in line with Section 6 of the RMA.	Amend HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) as follows:  Identify buildings, structures, areas and archaeological sites with significant historic heritage values, or that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of Māori history, <u>relationship to their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, other taonga and culture.</u>	Reject	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage/ HH-P1	Amend	Considers appropriate to amend to include objectives, policies, rules and standards to minimise impact of earthworks or developments on cultural value to Taranaki Whānui. Requests focus on HH-P1.	Seeks that with the amendments to minimise impact of earthworks or developments on cultural value to Taranaki Whānui, that HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) is focused on.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P1	Support	Supports HH-P1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support	This policy is helpful in that it signals the need for adherence to conservation principles when maintaining or repairing built heritage.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support in part	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P2 to the extent that it encourages the maintenance and repair of built heritage where undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support	Supports HH-P2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.90	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	Supports the policy as it allows internal alterations to heritage buildings unless it involves interior features that are specifically scheduled.	Retain HH-P3 (Internal works) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	This policy is helpful in that it helps make renovations easier - fostering re-use of built heritage.	Retain HH-P3 (Internal works) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Oppose	Opposes heritage controls on new floor levels where only the exterior of a heritage building is scheduled. These are unnecessary because the internal additions to buildings are unlikely to detract from the heritage values of the exterior of a heritage building. Instead, this policy imposes an unreasonable burden on internal works. We understand that the purpose of this policy is to prevent additional or mezzanine floors being constructed which are visible through tall windows and would have a material impact on the heritage value of the building. The drafting of the policy is not sufficiently clear to restrict its application to these circumstances. It does not address the effect on the heritage values but applies to any floor structure that is visible.	Delete HH-P3 (Internal works) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	Supports HH-P4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance.  The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	Considers that the policy should be rewritten to focus on conservation as opposed to 'works' and reflect the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter approach to conservation.	Seeks that HH-P3 (Internal works) is rewritten with a focus on conservation as per the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	Considers that temporary works referred to in the Heritage Design Guide should be enabled as this is likely to prevent unnecessary demolition.	Amend HH-P3 (Internal works) so that temporary works are enabled as referred in the heritage design guide.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	As per the current District Plan, structural strengthening which is visible from the exterior of the building should not be a permitted activity as this is likely to have an adverse effect on heritage values. There is little reliable evidence in the s32 report to support this change. See our commentary below on HH-S1.	Amend HH-P3 (Internal works) as follows:  Enable works internal to built heritage, except where: 1. The works involve interiors or interior features which are specifically scheduled; or 2. New floor levels and structural strengthening that will be visible from the exterior of buildings.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because structural strengthening visible from the exterior of the building can have an adverse effect on heritage values.	Allow	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as it is enabling of works to built heritage and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington	182.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports the Council encouraging and supporting work on heritage places that increases their resilience and accessibility, contributes to sustainable long-term use and recovers or restores heritage values.	Retain HH-P4 as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Considers amendment necessary to enable works to built heritage that are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as follows:  Enable works to built heritage that: 1. Increase resilience through seismic strengthening, either in isolation or as part of additions and alterations; 2. Support providing a sustainable long-term use; 3. <u>Are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods;</u> 3. <u>4.</u> Increase accessibility and support means of escape from fire; or 4. <u>5.</u> Provide the opportunity to promote, enhance, recover or reveal heritage values.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	HNZPT supports the submission so that works are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.91	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports this policy as it enables works to heritage buildings for the purposes of seismic resilience and/or supporting a sustainable long-term use.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission to the extent that it emphasises the need for HH-P4 to provide for maintenance, repair, and reasonable works to built heritage with a view to practicable and functional sustainable long-term use.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Parliamentary Service	375.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support in part	HH-P4 is supported as it is important to acknowledge that works will be required on heritage buildings to ensure they continue to be useable, as with any building. However, it is submitted that the concept of “sustainable long-term use” does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Parliamentary Service	375.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Considers that the concept of “sustainable long-term use” does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as follows:  Enable works to built heritage that: 1. Increase resilience through seismic strengthening, either in isolation or as part of additions and alterations; 2. Support providing a sustainable <u>and practicable</u> long-term use; 3. Increase accessibility and support means of escape from fire; or 4. Provide the opportunity to promote, enhance, recover or reveal heritage values.	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	This policy is helpful in that it helps achieve seismic strengthening - very necessary to many heritage structures - and helping remove regulatory impediments to this work	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P4 as it recognises that works to built heritage will sometimes be required, and are appropriate where certain outcomes are achieved, including providing a sustainable long-term use.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works):  Enable works to built heritage that: ... 2. Support providing a sustainable long-term use (including reuse);	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.14	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because referring to adaptive re-use clarifies the provision.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Parliamentary Service	FS48.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it recognises that works to built heritage should encompass maintenance, repair, reuse, and reasonable works; all of which are broadly aligned with the objective of facilitating and enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports HH-P5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as notified.	Accept	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Amend	Considers that HH-P5 should be clarified as the proposed wording is misleading (too open and would be mis-interpreted) and will result in confusion.  The wording suggests even owners of properties of lesser significance will be required to provide a Conservation Plan. Conservation Plan costs are high and limited funding is much better directed towards building materials, which contribute positively to the ongoing viability of heritage buildings, rather than reports.	Amend HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as follows:  Encourage the preparation of conservation plans <u>for items of greatest significance</u> , and take them into account when considering the effects of development proposals on the identified heritage values of built heritage.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Oppose	It is appropriate that conservation plans are encouraged for all scheduled heritage places, and not limited to the 'most significant'. It is also noted that the policy does not make conservation plans compulsory, but only 'encourages' their development and use.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	The further submitter supports and expands on the benefits of categorisation in the section "Specific issues with the Heritage Issues and Options report" on page 45 of their submission.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current or adopted heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and meeting the requirements of the RMA  Seeks that the Council commission an independent evaluation of the costs and benefits of incorporating heritage categories into the heritage regime, and publish this, to the development or future development of the heritage protection regime.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	This policy is helpful in that conservation plans can provide ongoing certainty and continuity in respect of maintaining and sustaining built heritage over time	Retain HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	Supports HH-P6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Amend	Considers that this policy should come first in the Built heritage section as conservation planning comes after identification and before works are carried out.	Amend the numbering of HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) to HH-P1	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Support	This policy is helpful in that it provides for mitigation the seismic risk of unreinforced masonry chimneys in a manner sensitive to the built heritage.	Retain HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Support	Supports HH-P7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Oppose	<p>Considers that chimneys are often important parts of heritage buildings and that very few of Wellington's buildings have heritage protection meaning the plan should be encouraging their conservation, not enabling demolition.</p> <p>Considers that the plan would more usefully provide a set of considerations in the heritage design guide to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney</p> <p>Disagrees with the intent as stated in the s32 report that the approach to chimneys aligns more closely with the way that Council manages removal of chimneys under the Building Act. Considers this is not appropriate as the BA is focussed on safety whereas the RMA is focussed on effects on the environment.</p>	Delete policy HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys)	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	Supports HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) to the extent that it is enabling of additions and alterations.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) to the extent that it is enabling of additions ad alterations.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Parliamentary Service	FS48.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission to the extent that rule HH-P7 enables works that facilitate the practicable and functional use of heritage buildings	Allow	Accept in part	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that HH-P7 should be amended to reflect that a successful alteration or addition is not achieved by whether or not the main determinants of the architectural style have been maintained. The wording is very limiting and would have made previous award winning architecture projects impossible.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for award winning projects reference].</p>	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows (Delete HH-P7.1.c.):  ... 1.  ...  <u>c. Retains the main determinants of the architectural style or design of the heritage building or heritage structure;</u>  ...	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.16	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Having regard to the architectural style or design of a heritage building is an important factor to have regard to.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	FS48.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it emphasises the need for HH-P7 to enable appropriate works on heritage buildings and structures.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.73	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings...), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas).	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows: 1.  (...)  d. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, <u>design</u> and materials of the heritage building or heritage structure;	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.17	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because the addition of the word 'design' is appropriate in this policy.	Allow	Accept	yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.92	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it allows additions, alterations and the partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures subject to considerations which seek to retain the heritage values of listed buildings.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Parliamentary Service	375.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	HH-P4 is supported as it is important to acknowledge that works will be required on heritage buildings to ensure they continue to be useable, as with any building. However, it is submitted that the concept of "sustainable long-term use" does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) with amendment.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	375.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers that the concept of “sustainable long-term use” does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows:  ...  <u>2. The viability of the building or structure and the activities associated with it, with and/or without the work;</u> <u>3. For the Parliamentary Precinct, the extent to which the proposal supports the efficient, effective and safe functioning of Parliament and the Executive;</u> <del>2</del> <u>4.</u> The visibility of the work from street frontages; <del>3</del> <u>5.</u> Whether the works would lead to cumulative adverse effects on identified heritage values; <del>4</del> <u>6.</u> Whether there has been any change in circumstances since scheduling in the District Plan, including damage from natural disaster; <del>5</del> <u>7.</u> Any advice that has been obtained from a suitably qualified heritage professional including Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; and <del>6</del> <u>8.</u> The identified heritage values of the heritage area, where located within a heritage area.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.18	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Policy HH-P7 includes reference to sustainable longterm use and the additions requested in this submission are not necessary or desirable.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.70	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	This policy is helpful in that it enables use change whilst signalling the need for this to occur in a manner sensitive to heritage values.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P7 to the extent that it enables additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage buildings where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations, and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures):  Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to:  1. The extent to which the work: a. Supports the heritage building or heritage structure having a sustainable long term use ( <u>including reuse</u> );	Accept in part	Yes
Parliamentary Service	FS48.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it emphasises the need for the heritage rules to support and provide for reuse; which may, in turn, allow for works enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.165	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	HH-P7 is generally supported as it provides for alterations and additions to heritage buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy (1(a) to (i) and 2-6) provides more than adequate guidance as to which specific matters need to be considered.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.120	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP7	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers that HH-P7 should be amended to focus on identified heritage values as outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory and balance the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. Blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy (1(a) to (i) and 2-6) provide more than adequate guidance as to which specific matters need to be considered. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value and should be utilised as a non-statutory document.	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) and its title as follows:  Additions, alterations and partial demolition of <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings and structures  Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings and heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: ... <del>j. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide;</del> 2. The visibility of the work from street frontages; ... 6. The identified heritage values of the heritage area, where located within a heritage area.  <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.19	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	It is appropriate to retain reference to the Heritage Design Guide in this policy.  [Inferred reference to submission 391.66]	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.121	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP7	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	The proposed change to refer to scheduled heritage buildings only is opposed. The intent of the section is to have wider application within heritage areas, and is explained in the section above in the DP referring to heritage areas	Disallow	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Roland Sapsford	FS117.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP8	Oppose	The proposed change to refer to scheduled heritage buildings only is opposed. The intent of the section is to have wider application within heritage areas, and is explained in the section above in the DP referring to heritage areas.	Disallow	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Supports HH-03 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-03 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers the content in the policy should be reordered.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend the order of order to: 1. The extent to which the work: <del>a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use;</del> a. <u>Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values;</u> <del>b. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values;</del> b. <u>Respects the valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design;</u> c. <u>Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area;</u> d. <u>Responds to the relationships between buildings and structures within the heritage area;</u> e. <u>Enables any adverse effects on heritage values to be reversed;</u> f. <u>Minimizes the loss of heritage fabric and craftsmanship;</u> g. <u>Is in accordance with any conservation plan that has been prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional;</u> h. <u>Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use;</u> i. <u>Increases structural stability, accessibility and means of escape from fire; and</u> j. <u>Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide;</u>	reject	no

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support in part	Supports HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) to the extent that it provides for new buildings and modifications to non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified to the extent that it provides for new buildings and modifications to non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.74	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas). Clarification is needed in HH-P8 to include reference to heritage values.	Amend HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as follows:  (...)  1. The extent to which the work:  a. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, <u>design, materials, and heritage values</u> of the heritage building or heritage structure;	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.20	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	HNZPT supports the submission for these minor changes to policy HH-P8.	Allow	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	This policy is helpful in that it enables activities adjacent to heritage buildings, whilst maintaining sensitivity to heritage values.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support in part	HH-P8 is generally supported as it provides for new buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.122	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP8	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Amend	Considers that HH-P8 should be amended to focus on the identified heritage values outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory balanced with the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value.	Amend HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as follows:  Provide for new buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings and structures on the same site as <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings or heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to:  1. The extent to which the work: a. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials of the <u>scheduled</u> heritage building or heritage structure; b. Respects the identified relationship of the heritage building or heritage structure with its setting; and c. <u>Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide.</u>  <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.21	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	It is appropriate to retain reference to the Heritage Design Guide in this policy.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.123	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP8	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP11	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow	Accept in part	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	Supports HH-P8 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P9.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options.  Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Opposes HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P9.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options.  Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows:  ... 3. In the case of relocation, alternatives have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option to avoid total demolition.	Accept in part	No
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.75	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Amend	Considers an additional point is required to only allow heritage buildings and heritage structures to be repositioned on the existing site or relocated to another site where it can be demonstrated that the repositioning or relocation work are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows:  (...)  <u>4. The work will be undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.</u>	Accept in part	yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.22	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HNZPT supports this submission so that works are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Allow /	Accept in part	yes
Waka Kotahi	370.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support in part	Supports direction of policy.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure), with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only be undertaken where other options are not available. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows: ... 3. In the case of relocation, <u>there are no practical alternatives.</u> <del>alternatives have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.</del>	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	This policy signals a preference for maintaining built heritage in situ.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	Supports HH-P9 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.73	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P10	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of built heritage to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-P10 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P10	Support	Supports HH-P10 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P10 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.76	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers amendment of HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) necessary for consistency within other policies in the chapter.	Amend title of HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows:  Height of development <u>within</u> heritage areas	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.74	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	This policy is helpful as there are unfortunate examples in Wellington where heritage has been put at risk by over-height adjacent structures.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it recognises that the height of development in heritage areas in the City Centre zone should be considered in the context of the objectives and policies of that zone	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support in part	HH-P11 is generally supported as it manages the heights of development within heritage zones to recognise the scale of the heritage areas.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.124	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP11	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 should be amended, as the form of development does not relate to the height of the building as this is covered by HH-P13 and HH-P14. In addition, the height of development should be cognisant of the heights that the Zone generally provides for and the existing height of buildings in the area.	Amend HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows:  Manage the height of development to recognise and respect the <u>unique setting of the form and scale of heritage areas in conjunction with the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and the Waterfront Zone in which the development occurs.</u>	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.125	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP11	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.14	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	We oppose this submission to allow heights in heritage areas in line with the surrounding suburbs. This would run counter to what the heritage areas are trying to achieve and would destroy the sense of heritage in the remaining area	Disallow	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP11	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes this submission to allow heights in heritage areas in line with the surrounding suburbs. This would run counter to what the heritage areas are trying to achieve and would destroy the sense of heritage in the remaining area.	Disallow	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	Supports HH-P11 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas ) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.60	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support in part	Supports HH-P11 in part. Supports HH-P11's direction to "manage" height in heritage areas, noting that in some instances greater height may be appropriate and consistent with heritage values.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas), with amendments.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 needs clarification that the policy only applies within heritage areas.	Amend HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows:  Manage the height of development <u>within heritage areas</u> to recognise and respect the unique form and scale of heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and the Waterfront Zone.	Accept	Yes
Anna Kemble Welch	434.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 should allow heights of up to 6 storeys in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area, providing the street frontages of the historic buildings are retained while providing for increased height of new structures set back from the street. The provision restricts the development of buildings in the Newtown shopping Centre, which hinders their sustainable long term use and commercial viability. There is a missed opportunity for housing intensification in the heart of the vibrant shopping precinct. These buildings are ideally situated along a main transport route very close to major community amenities including schools, library and hospital. The suburban centre zone and Newtown shopping centre are ideally situated for an increase in housing by allowing for increased height for apartments to be built, as well as set back on the sites to retain the sense of place of the old shops at street level.	Seeks that HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) is amended to allow heights of up to six storeys in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area, providing that the street frontages of historic buildings are retained while providing for increased height of new structures set back from the street.	reject	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.23	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	The Proposed District Plan includes 12m height limit for the Newtown Heritage Area while also providing for a 21/22m height limit for sites to the rear of the shop frontages.  [Inferred reference to submission 434.7]	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.75	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P12	Support	This policy will help enhance heritage areas previously compromised by poorly designed adjacent buildings.	Retain HH-P12 (Non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P12	Support	Supports HH-P12 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P12 (Non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.77	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14.	Amend HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:  1.  (...)  d. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, design and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area;	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.24	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-P13 as it is important that the scale, form, proportions, design and materials that have been identified are compatible with the heritage values of the heritage area.	Allow	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.76	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	This policy is helpful in that it signals the need for adherence to sensitive design when altering structures in heritage areas, recognising the importance of these areas to Wellington identity and character.	Retain HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	Notte Policy HH-P13 is very similar to Policy HH-P7 and replicates some of the matters that consent authorities should have regard to when providing for additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures. We propose a similar amendment to Policy HH-P13, for the reasons set out above in relation to Policy HH-P7.	Amend HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:  Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use (including reuse)	Reject	no

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	<p>Supports HH-P13 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.48	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	<p>Considers the content in the policy should be reordered.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend the order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extent to which the work:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use;</del></li> <li><u>b. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values;</u></li> <li><del>c. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values;</del></li> <li><u>d. Respects the valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design;</u></li> <li><u>e. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area;</u></li> <li><u>f. Responds to the relationships between buildings and structures within the heritage area;</u></li> <li><u>g. Enables any adverse effects on heritage values to be reversed;</u></li> <li><u>h. Minimizes the loss of heritage fabric and craftsmanship;</u></li> <li><u>i. Is in accordance with any conservation plan that has been prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional;</u></li> <li><u>j. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use;</u></li> <li><u>k. Increases structural stability, accessibility and means of escape from fire; and</u></li> <li><u>l. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide;</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	reject	no

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Anna Kemble Welch	434.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	Considers that HH-P13 should be amended to allow for essential earthquake strengthening of buildings in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area. The provision restricts the development of buildings in the Newtown shopping Centre, which hinders their sustainable long term use and commercial viability. There is a missed opportunity for housing intensification in the heart of the vibrant shopping precinct. Wssential earthquake strengthening of the old buildings should be allowed, as well as increasing housing intensification at the same time.	Seeks that HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) be amended to allow for essential earthquake strengthening of buildings in the Newtown Shopping Centre historic Area.	Reject	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	Considers that HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to development in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.77	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support	This policy is helpful in that it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.171	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	HH-P14 is generally supported as it provides for new buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.126	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP14	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.172	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Amend	Considers that HH-P14 should be amended to focus on identified heritage values as outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory and balanced with the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. Blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide more than adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value.	Amend HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:  Provide for new buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the works will not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to:  1. The extent to which the work: a. Respects any valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design; b. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, design and materials of the heritage area <u>and the role and function of the Zone; and</u> c. Is sited to maintain a consistent pattern of front façade alignment; <u>and</u> <del>d. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide.</del> <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.127	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HHP14	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support	Supports HH-P14 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.  Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	Supports HH-P14 in part. Supports providing for new buildings and structures within heritage areas and the matters to have regard to, other than the Heritage Design Guide.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.	Accept in part	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Amend	Submitter considers that HH-P14.1.d's reference to having regard to the Heritage Design Guide should be removed.	Amend HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:  Provide for new buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the works will not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to:  1. The extent to which the work: ... <b>d. Fulfills the intent of the Heritage Design Guide.</b>	Accept	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P15.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options.  Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Opposes HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers that the HH-P15.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options.  Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as follows:  ... 3. For relocation outside of the heritage area, alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option <u>to avoid demolition</u> . ...	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.78	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers clarification is needed in title of HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures)	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) title as follows:  Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures <u>within heritage areas</u> .	Accept	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support in part	Supports the direction of policy.	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) with amendment.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only occur if there all alternatives have been explored. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: ... and relocation is <del>considered by Council to be</del> a reasonable option.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.78	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	This policy signals a preference for maintaining contributing buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ.	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	Supports HH-P15 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance.  The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.  Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P16.2 states that 'total demolition is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that demolition is one reasonable option among other options.  Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate demolition. The wording of this policy for contributing buildings should align with the policy for demolition of scheduled buildings.	Opposes HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	<p>Considers that the HH-P16.2 states that ‘total demolition is considered ... to be a reasonable option’ which can be taken to mean that demolition is one reasonable option among other options.</p> <p>Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate demolition. The wording of this policy for contributing buildings should align with the policy for demolition of scheduled buildings.</p>	<p>Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>... 2. Alternatives to total demolition have been explored and it has been demonstrated that there are no <u>reasonable alternatives</u> to total demolition. <del>is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.</del></p>	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers that HH-R16 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to demolition in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-R16 ( Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.79	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers clarification is needed in title of HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures)	Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures <u>within heritage areas.</u>	Accept	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support in part	Supports the direction of policy.	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures), subject to amendment.	Accept	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.171	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only occur if there all alternatives have been explored. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) as follows: ... and relocation is <del>considered by Council to be a</del> reasonable option.	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.79	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington’s identity and character.	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	<p>Supports HH-P16 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.80	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P17	Support	This policy will help facilitate knowledge of archaeological sites: an important first step in ensuring their ongoing recognition and protection.	Retain HH-P17 (Information, advocacy and advice) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.81	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P20	Support	This policy will enable activities that increase appreciation of sites whilst protecting them	Retain HH-P20 (Modification of scheduled archaeological sites and earthworks within their extent) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.172	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P21	Support	Support policy as worded – demolition of scheduled sites should only occur if it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives	Retain HH-P21 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.82	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P21	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of archaeological sites to our history and identity	Retain HH-P21 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.93	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.83	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	HH-R1 is supported as it supports sustainable ongoing use of heritage buildings and structures.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports HH-R1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings being permitted activities.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.173	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Support rule as proposed, as it enables the demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.84	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	HH-R2 is supported as it facilitates enhancement of heritage.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings being permitted.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures)	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.173	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	HH-R2 is supported as it permits the demolition of non-scheduled heritage buildings on a heritage site when the building has no heritage value.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports HH-R2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structure) as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports HH-R2 as notified.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided under HH-R3.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) where compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain the Discretionary Restricted activity status at HH-R3.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.80	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Amend	Considers it necessary to add HH-P5 (Conservation plans) and HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) to the list of matters of discretion.	Amend HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved.  Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P6 and HH-P7; 2. The extent of compliance with HH-S4.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.25	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R3 to be a restricted discretionary activity where compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved.	Allow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.94	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports this rule as it makes provision for additions and alterations to heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.85	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	HH-R3 is supported as it facilitates changing use of heritage buildings whilst safeguarding heritage values.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted, subject to the comments made in relation to Standard HH-S1.1.b above. Argosy supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary. The provision, subject to the amendments sought to Standard HH-S1.1.b, provide appropriate restrictions on additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified, subject to amendments to HH-S1.1.b.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports HH-R3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports Rule HH-R3 as notified. Fabric supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures)	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.95	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports this rule as it makes provision for new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.86	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	HH-R4 is supported as it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures and within heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.174	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Oppose in part	HH-R4 is opposed as it restricts non-heritage buildings on heritage sites, which will hinder development potential in medium and high density areas where this will not affect built heritage values. HH-R2 permits partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures. By comparison, Rule HH-R4 permits new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m2 limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with the heritage character. (Option A)	Opposes HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.175	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Amend	Considers that HH-R4 should be amended to remove compliance with HH-S2. HH- S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2.	Amend HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted <del>Where:</del>  <del>a. Compliance with HH-S2 is achieved.</del>	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.26	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Oppose	HH-R4 in conjunction with HH-S2 control the addition of buildings on sites of heritage buildings. New buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is controlled by district plan rules.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports HH-R4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	Supports HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures)	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.87	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	HH-R5 is supported as it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.176	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Oppose in part	HH-R5 is opposed as it only allows additions to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of a heritage buildings where HH-S3 is achieved. HH-S3 limits modifications to less than 10% and where there are no additional storeys to the existing building. Additions to buildings are covered by other general rules and standards in the Heritage Overlay or underlying Zone so it is considered unnecessary to also control this matter here.	Opposes HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.177	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Amend	Considers that HH-R5 should be amended to remove the reference to HH-S3. HH- S3 limits modifications to less than 10% and where there are no additional storeys to the existing building. Additions to buildings are covered by other general rules and standards in the Heritage Overlay or underlying Zone so it is considered unnecessary to also control this matter here.	Amend HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted <del>Where:</del>  <del>a. Compliance with HH-S2 is achieved.</del>	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.27	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Oppose	HH-R5 in conjunction with HH-S3 control additions to non-scheduled buildings on sites of heritage buildings. In the same way as new buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values, substantial additions likewise have potentially adverse effects.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept in part	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	Supports HH-R5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.88	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	HH-R6 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	Supports the Proposed Plan enabling heritage buildings to be repositioned.	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	Supports HH-R6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.89	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support	HH-R7 is supported as it will help decrease seismic risk whilst not making it overly difficult for building owners to do so.	Retain HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support	Supports HH-R7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.49	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support in part	Support removal of chimneys to be restricted discretionary but not reference to HH-P6	Retain rule HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) with amendments.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.50	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Amend	Do not support the matters of discretion at HH-P6.	Amend rule to remove matter of discretion as HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys)	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.81	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Amend	Considers provision is blank and does not have any related points.	<p>Amend HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site:</u></p> <p><u>An application under this rule for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site must be accompanied by:</u></p> <p>2. <u>A Heritage Impact Assessment of the relocation of the building, notably assessing: a. The heritage values of the building in its current location; and b. The heritage values of the building resulting from its relocation;</u></p> <p>3. <u>An assessment of alternatives to relocation that have been considered by the applicant, including evidence demonstrating why none of these alternatives are reasonable;</u></p> <p>4. <u>A Heritage Construction Management Plan notably outlining the measures and methods that will be taken to protect the building before, during, and after the relocation; and</u></p> <p>5. <u>A Conservation Plan where one exists.</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.28	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R8 as a discretionary activity.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.90	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	HH-R8 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	Supports the Proposed Plan enabling heritage buildings to be relocated.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	Supports HH-R8 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.82	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Considers more information requirements are required to accompany applications for total demolition of heritage buildings and structures. This is based on the need for greater assessment from professionals, and the need to add options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse, or restoration.	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows:  (...)  <u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment for the demolition of a building;</u> <del>2.</del> <u>2.1-</u> A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience, <u>provided by a suitably qualified structural engineer;</u> <u>3. Where the building is identified as being beyond repair, a condition survey report of the building, provided by a suitably qualified professional;</u> <del>4.</del> <u>4.2-</u> Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor; <del>5.</del> <u>5.1-</u> Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief; <del>6.</del> <u>6.4-</u> An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space; <del>7.</del> <u>7.5-</u> A valuation of the: a. Building following completion of works; and b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works; i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; <del>and</del> <del>8.</del> <u>8.6-</u> An assessment of alternatives to total demolition that have been considered by the applicant, including <u>options for seismic strengthening, reuse, or restoration where applicable, and evidence demonstrating why none of these options are reasonable; and</u> <del>9.</del> <u>9.9-</u> A Conservation Plan where one exists.	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.29	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R9 for greater assessment from professionals, and the need to add options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse or restoration.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.83	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Considers clarification is needed on who will undertake the peer review referred to in the final sentence in HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures)	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows:  (...) The Council will obtain a peer review <u>by a suitably qualified professional</u> of the information provided by the applicant.	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.30	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment for the council to obtain a peer review by a suitably qualified professional of the information provided by the applicant.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.174	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Support discretionary activity status for demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.91	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.48	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose in part	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity. While Argosy is not currently intending to demolish any of the scheduled heritage buildings it owns, it opposes Rule HH-R9 in part as set out below. It is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule, where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate. We also note that the information requirements under this Rule are potentially onerous and inappropriate. The mandatory considerations under HH-R9 which relate to costs of works, market demand and financial returns do not relate to the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (as required under s 6 of the RMA) and should not be mandatory application requirements.	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Discretionary  <del>Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HHR9 must be publicly notified.</del>  Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for total demolition of heritage buildings and structures: An application under this rule for the total demolition of heritage buildings and structures must be accompanied by: 1. A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience; 2. <del>Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor;</del> 3. <del>Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief;</del> 4. <del>An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space;</del> 5. <del>A valuation of the:</del> <del>a. Building following completion of works; and</del> <del>b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works;</del> <del>i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; and</del> ...	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.31	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose	While in general the notification provisions provide the appropriate framework for decisions on notification, there are circumstances where public notification is always appropriate. The information requirements are also appropriate for this sort of application.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Supports HH-R9 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose in part	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity.  Considers that the information requirements under this Rule are potentially onerous and inappropriate. These requirements do not relate to the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (as required under s 6 of the RMA) and should not be mandatory application requirements.  Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.	Opposes HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) in part and seeks amendments.	Accept in part	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity.  Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.	Delete the notification clause under HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Discretionary  <del>Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HH-R9 must be publicly notified.</del>	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity.  Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.	Delete the notification clause under HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Discretionary  <del>Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HH-R9 must be publicly notified.</del>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.92	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	HH-R10 is supported as it supports sustainable ongoing use of heritage areas.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.49	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	<p>Supports HH-R10 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings being permitted activities.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports HH-R10 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.84	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers matters of discretion in HH-R11.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) should include HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas). Matters of discretion should have an additional point referring to HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) for buildings and structures within a heritage area, except non-heritage buildings and structures.	<p>Amend HH-R11.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary (...)</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters in HH-P4, HH-P11 and HH-P13; <u>and</u></li> <li>2. <u>The matters in HH-P6 for buildings and structures within a heritage area, except non-heritage buildings and structures.</u></li> </ol>	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.32	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R11.2 to a restricted discretionary activity and that consideration should be given to matters of discretion.	Allow	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.85	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) needs to be included in matters of discretion.	Amend HH-R11.3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows:  Activity status: Restricted Discretionary  (...)  Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in <u>HH-P4</u> , HH-P11 and HH-P13; <u>and</u> 2. The extent of compliance with HH-S4.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.33	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R11.3 to a restricted discretionary activity and that consideration should be given to matters of discretion.	Allow	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.50	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	Supports additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted, subject to the comments made in relation to Standard HH-S1.1.b above. Argosy supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary. The provision, subject to the amendments sought to Standard HH-S1.1.b, provide appropriate restrictions on additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified, subject to amendments to HH-S1.1.b.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.178	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Oppose in part	HH-R11 is opposed in part and should be clarified.	Opposes HH-R11 in part (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.179	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers that HH-R11 should be amended. HH-S1 only allows minor Internal alterations and states that this Standard does not apply to non heritage buildings. The rule should reflect this to be clear. Accordingly, Kāinga Ora seeks changes to the rule to improve clarity. Consequential changes to restricted discretionary activities should be made to reflect that changes to non-heritage buildings are permitted.	Amend HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted Where: <u>a. Non-heritage buildings and structures are affected;</u> <u>or</u> <u>b. For heritage buildings and structures - Compliance with HH-S1 is achieved.</u>	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.34	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	The amendment as proposed by the submitter helps to clarify the intent of this provision.	Allow	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	<p>Supports HH-R11 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.51	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	<p>Considers that there is no rationale given for having different considerations in these zones for additions and alterations.</p> <p>Considers the approach should be based on the heritage values of the place not what zone the place is in.</p>	Amend HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) so that there are not different considerations depending on the zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	Supports HH-R11 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Peter Fordyce	431.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers that Historic Heritage rules governing demolition of pre-1930s buildings should have their coverage increased to more widely cover demolition prevention of pre-1930s dwellings in areas under protection.	<p>Seeks that HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) have increased demolition protection coverage for pre-1930s dwellings in Heritage Areas.</p> <p>[Decision requested - submission refers to Historic Heritage provisions]</p>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.175	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	Support permitted activity status for total demolition repositioning, or removal of identified non-heritage building or structure in heritage area.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.93	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	HH-R12 is supported as it facilitates enhancement of heritage areas.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept	No



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	<p>Supports HH-R12 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	Supports HH-R12 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that HH-R14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to development in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.	Reject	no

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.86	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers a minimum size to allow for small structures in heritage areas (e.g. bollards, kerbing) necessary. Without this provision any structure, no matter how small, will require resource consent.	<p>Add new permitted activity rule for 'All zones' being HH.13.1 (Heritage Areas - New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The works involve the construction of a structure associated with the operation, use and maintenance of the legal road; or</u></p> <p><u>2. The height of the structure does not exceed 1.0 metres; or</u></p> <p><u>3. The structure is a lamppost.</u></p> <p><u>1. 2. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</p> <p>i. HRZ-S1;</p> <p>ii. HRZ-S3;</p> <p>iii. HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback;</p> <p>iv. HRZ-S5;</p> <p>v. HRZ-S6;</p> <p>vi. HRZ-S7;</p> <p>vii. HRZ-S8;</p> <p>viii. HRZ-S9; and</p> <p>ix. HRZ-S10.</p> <p><u>2.3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary (...)</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.35	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	HNZPT supports the addition of new permitted activity rule for 'all zones' being HH.13.1.	Allow	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.94	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	HH-R13 is supported as it facilitates changing use of heritage areas whilst safeguarding heritage values	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.51	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	Supports new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures and within heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.180	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose in part	HH-R13 is opposed as it restricts new buildings and structures that are at the rear of the primary residential building as this will hinder development potential in high medium and high density areas where this will not affect heritage area values.	Opposes HH-R13 in part (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) and seeks amendment.	reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.181	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that HH-R13.1 should be amended to remove the reference to HH-S2. Rule HH-R13 permits new buildings and structures within heritage areas where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. (Option A)	Amend HH-R13.1 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:  Activity status: Permitted <del>Where:</del>  <del>a. Compliance with HH-S2 is achieved</del>	reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	Supports HH-R13 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.  Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.52	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that there is no rationale given for having different considerations in these zones for additions and alterations.  Considers the approach should be based on the heritage values of the place not what zone the place is in.	Amend HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) so that there are not different considerations depending on the zone.	Accept in part	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support in part	Supports HH-R13.2 in part. Supports the restricted discretionary status in HHR13.2.	Retain HH-R13.2 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that public notification should be precluded from HH-R13.2. Submitter considers that non-notification which is adopted by the Operative District Plan, is proven and efficient, and should be maintained.	Amend HH-R13.2 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: ... <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HH-R13.2a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.36	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose	New buildings within heritage areas have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is subject to the normal RMA notification standards.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support in part	Supports HH-R13.3 in part. Supports the restricted discretionary status in HHR13.2.	Retain HH-R13.3 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that public notification should be precluded from HH-R13.3. Submitter considers that non-notification which is adopted by the Operative District Plan, is proven and efficient, and should be maintained.	Amend HH-R13.3 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: ... <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HH-R13.3 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.37	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose	New buildings within heritage areas have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is subject to the normal RMA notification standards.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	Supports HH-R13 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.95	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R14	Support	HH-R14 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R14 (Repositioning of contributing buildings and structures within a heritage area) as notified.	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R14	Support	<p>Supports HH-R14 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R14 (Repositioning of contributing buildings and structures within a heritage area) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.87	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Amend	<p>Considers the provision is blank and does not have any related points as to what should be included as part of an application for resource consent under this rule. Considers further guidance on accompanying information requirements is appropriate to include for this rule.</p>	<p>Amend HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site:</u></p> <p><u>An application under this rule for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site must be accompanied by:</u></p> <p><u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment of the relocation of the building, notably assessing:</u> a. <u>The heritage values of the heritage area and the contribution of the building in its current location; and</u> b. <u>The heritage values of the heritage area resulting from the relocation of the building;</u></p> <p><u>2. An assessment of alternatives to relocation that have been considered by the applicant, including evidence demonstrating why none of these alternatives are reasonable;</u></p> <p><u>3. A Heritage Construction Management Plan notably outlining the measures and methods that will be taken to protect the building before, during, and after the relocation.</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.38	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R15 as a discretionary activity status.	Allow	Accept in part	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.96	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	HH-R15 is supported as it supports maintaining contributing buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	<p>Supports HH-R15 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers that HH-P16 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to demolition in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.88	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers this provision is blank and does not have any related points as to what should be included as part of an application for resource consent under this rule. Considers further guidance on accompanying information requirements is appropriate to include for this rule.	<p>Amend HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the total demolition of contributing buildings and structures:</u>  <u>An application under this rule for the total demolition of heritage buildings and structures must be accompanied by:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment of the demolition of the building;</u></li> <li><u>2. A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience, provided by a suitably qualified structural engineer;</u></li> <li><u>3. Where the building is identified as being beyond repair, a condition survey report of the building, provided by a suitably qualified professional;</u></li> <li><u>4. Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor;</u></li> <li><u>5. Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief;</u></li> <li><u>6. An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space;</u></li> <li><u>7. A valuation of the:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Building following completion of works; and</u></li> <li><u>b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works;</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; and</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li><u>8. An assessment of alternatives to total demolition that have been considered by the applicant, including options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse, or restoration where applicable, and evidence demonstrating why none of these options are reasonable.</u></li> </ol> <p>The Council will obtain a peer review by a suitably qualified professional of the information provided by the applicant.</p>	Accept in part	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.39	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R16 as a discretionary activity status.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.97	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	<p>Supports HH-R16 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Peter Fordyce	431.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers that Historic Heritage rules governing demolition of pre-1930s buildings should have their coverage increased to more widely cover demolition prevention of pre-1930s dwellings in areas under protection.	<p>Seeks that HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) have increased demolition protection coverage for pre-1930s dwellings in Heritage Areas.</p> <p>[Decision requested - submission refers to Historic Heritage provisions]</p>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.98	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R18	Support	HH-R18 is supported as it will enable activities that increase appreciation of sites whilst protecting them.	Retain HH-R18 (Modification of a scheduled archaeological site, including earthworks within the mapped extent) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.99	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R19	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of archaeological sites to our history and identity.	Retain HH-R19 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R20	Oppose	Opposes the rule enabling alterations to enable building access at ground floor level of 32 the Terrace 'The Braemar building' being permitted as they may have an adverse effect on heritage.	Delete rule HH-R20 (Alterations to enable building access at ground floor level of 32 the Terrace 'The Braemar building')	Reject	no



## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.52	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Oppose	Considers standard HH-S1.1.b would restrict internal additions and alterations of heritage buildings and heritage structures which would otherwise be permitted. It is important to encourage and enable the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings to ensure that they are occupied and maintained, this includes the ability to change internal floor layout and height for modern uses	Delete HH-S1.1.b (Permitted additions, alterations, and partial demolition) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	Supports HH-S1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance.  The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Amend	Considers that as per the current District Plan, structural strengthening which is visible from the exterior of the building should not be a permitted activity as this is likely to have an adverse effect on heritage values.	Amend HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as follows  1. The works must be internal to built heritage and not: a. Involve buildings where the whole interior, or individual interior elements have been specifically scheduled (and the work affects the scheduled interior or elements; or b. Result in new internal walls, floor levels or <u>internal structural strengthening</u> visible from the exterior of the building	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.40	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-S1 as internal structural elements have the potential to adversely impact on heritage values.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Amend	Considers that HH-S1 should apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas also as visible strengthening is likely to have an adverse effect on the area.	Seeks that HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	Supports HH-S1 as notified as it recognises that the standard does not apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas.	Retain HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose in part	HH-S2 is opposed on the grounds that it will prevent development rights to be exercised at the rear of 274 Oriental Parade. The potential heritage listing of the building will not allow the development of the area of approximately 800 square metres. The rear of the site has a pedestrian right from Wilkinson St. The Submitter considers that the heritage listing will make the realisation of the development potential far more difficult to achieve.	Opposes HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as notified and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that wording in HH-S2 should be amended to allow the development of new buildings on sites of heritage buildings.	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) to allow the development of new buildings on heritage building sites.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.182	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose in part	HH-S2 is opposed and an amendment is sought.	Opposes HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.183	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that HH-S2 should be amended to remove the size and height limits for accessory buildings in order to not restrict development on heritage sites. The Standard restricts non-heritage buildings on heritage sites, which will hinder development potential in high medium and high density areas where this will not affect built heritage values. HH-R2 permits partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures. By comparison, Rule HH-R4 permits new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m <sup>2</sup> . Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m <sup>2</sup> limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with the heritage character. (Option B)	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as follows:  Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone: 1. Any new building or structure must be: a. Accessory to the primary residential building; <u>and</u> b. Located to the rear of the primary residential building; <u>and</u> c. Smaller than 10m <sup>2</sup> . 2. Any new structure (excluding buildings provided for in HH-S2.1) must have a maximum height of 1.5m	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.184	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that HH-S2 should be amended to remove the size and height limits for accessory buildings in order to not restrict development on heritage sites. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m2 limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with heritage character. (Option B)	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as follows:  Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone: 3. Any new building or structure must be: a. Accessory to the primary residential building; and b. Located to the rear of the primary residential building; and c. Smaller than 10m2. 4. Any new structure (excluding buildings provided for in HH-S2.1) must have a maximum height of 1.5m	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Support	Supports HH-S2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S3	Support	Supports HH-S3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S3 (Modifications to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Parliamentary Service	375.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support in part	HH-S4 is supported due to the differentiation of maximum heights across the Parliament Precinct. However the wording used in this Standard is ambiguous, and does not appear to align with the height controls set out on the Council's interactive maps.	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Parliamentary Service	375.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Amend	Considers that the wording in HH-S4 should be amended to avoid any ambiguity about maximum heights allowed at the site. The wording used in this Standard is ambiguous, and does not appear to align with the height controls set out on the Council's interactive maps. The submitter requests that the wording is amended to avoid any ambiguity about maximum heights allowed at the site.	Amend HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as follows:  Location ... <u>Between Parliament buildings and Museum Street From the front (eastern edge) of Parliament buildings westward to Museum Street.</u>	Accept	Yes

## General Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support	Note the maximum height above ground level for the part of the Stout Street Precinct heritage area that includes 15 Stout Street and 143-149 Lambton Quay is 50m. This is appropriate in light of the building heights on the site and in the surrounding area and Argosy supports this height limit. The maximum height above ground level for the sites at 360-366 Lambton Quay is 95m in the airspace above 360-366 Lambton Quay and 8 Wills Street. This is also appropriate in light of the existing building heights and Argosy supports this height limit	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.185	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Oppose in part	HH-S4 is opposed and amendments are sought.	Opposes HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) and seeks amendments.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.186	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Amend	Considers that HH-S4 should be amended to align with other relief relating to Zone provisions as the heights of buildings should be comparable with the underlying zone rather than the heritage provisions particularly at the interface with the underlying zone.	Amend HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) to:  - Align height limits with amended Historic Heritage Standards, - Amend underlying zoning according to Appendix 4, - Amend Residential and Centre Zones heights and Heights in relation to boundary standards.  [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 4]	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support	Supports HH-S4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S5	Support	Supports HH-S5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S5 (Grazing of stock) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S6	Support	Supports HH-S6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S6 (Earthworks for the maintenance and repair of existing roads, walking and access tracks, and operation of existing cultivation areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S7	Support	Supports HH-S7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S7 (Mowing of lawns, trimming and pruning of trees and vegetation within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Mapping Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phil Kelliher	58.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Amend Heritage Area overlay to include the following buildings on Tutchen Avenue: 1 Tutchen Avenue 2 Tutchen Avenue 3 Tutchen Avenue 4 Tutchen Avenue 5 Tutchen Avenue 6 Tutchen Avenue 8 Tutchen Avenue [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of Heritage Areas to include 1 to 6 Tutchen Avenue and 8 Tutchen Avenue, as recommended by the Pre-1930 Character Area Review by Boffa Miskell.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Elice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow	Reject	No
Turi & Jane Park	73.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is removed from the Moir Street Heritage Area.	Amend the extent of Heritage Area to exclude 134 Brougham Street.	Accept	Yes
Tim Bright	75.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should be increased to include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Amend extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area mapping to include the houses on Tutchen Avenue.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.42	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Elice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow	Reject	No
Tim Bright	75.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that a new Heritage Area should be created for Claremont Grove.	Amend the mapping to include a Heritage Area over Claremont Grove.	Accept in part	No
Scots College Incorporated	117.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the maps do not identify the curtilage around the heritage listed main College building in order to limit the application of HH-R4 to the reasonable vicinity of the listed building. Because the Campus is a very large site this change is sought so that resource consent is not unnecessarily required for building work that is sufficiently far away from the main building.	Amend the District Plan map to identify the curtilage of the College Main Building, with the curtilage being the area occupied by the listed building and the area within 25m of the building footprint.	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington	182.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the Item 46 (Ascot Street) of Schedule 2 - Heritage Areas, but considers it is too small and should be extended north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.	Extend the Ascot Street heritage area in the mapping.	Reject	No

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the extent of SCHED3 (Heritage Areas) Item 43 should be amended to exclude the park on 52 Elizabeth St and properties in the park's proximity.	Seeks to remove Schedule 3 overlay as shown in image supplied in full submission.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 79A Todman Street (Sutch-Smith House) Reference: <del>520</del> <u>519</u>	Reject	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 53 Trellissick Crescent (Kahn House) Reference: <del>521</del> <u>520</u>	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.11	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 18 Vera Street (Firth House) Reference: <del>522</del> <u>521</u>	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 154 Victoria Street Reference: <del>523</del> <u>522</u>	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 9 Waiapu Road (Hirschfeld House) Reference: <del>524</del> <u>523</u>	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 134 Willis Street Reference: <del>527</del> <u>524</u>	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 233 Willis Street Reference: <del>528</del> <u>525</u>	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 12A Parliament Street should be identified as a non-heritage building within the Ascot Street Heritage Area as its heritage value is uncertain.	Amend ePlan map so that 12A Parliament Street should be identified as a non-heritage building within the Ascot Street Heritage Area.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 16 Parliament Street is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 16 Parliament Street.	Accept	Yes

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.19	Mapping / Mapping General /	Amend	Considers 6 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 6 Glenbervie Terrace.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.20	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 8 Glenbervie Terrace does not currently have a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Amend ePlan to add a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 8 Glenbervie Terrace.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Amend ePlan so that 11 Glenbervie Terrace is made into a separate property from 8 Parliament Street on the map.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.22	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Amend ePlan so that 11 Glenbervie Terrace is given a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Retain the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 8 Parliament Street.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.24	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenbervie Terrace in the planning maps.	Amend the ePlan so that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is made into a separate property from 15 Glenbervie Terrace on the map.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenbervie Terrace in the planning maps.	Amend the ePlan so that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is given a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenbervie Terrace in the planning maps.	Retain the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 15 Glenbervie Terrace.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.27	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 19 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 19 Glenbervie Terrace.	Reject	No

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.21	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.28	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that 19 Glenberrie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 19 Glenberrie Terrace.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.29	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is currently combined on the map with 19 Glenberrie Terrace. 21 Glenberrie Terrace is also an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 and currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map (from 19 Glenberrie Terrace).	Amend the ePlan so that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is made into a separate property from 19 Glenberrie Terrace on the map.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.30	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is currently combined on the map with 19 Glenberrie Terrace. 21 Glenberrie Terrace is also an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 and currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map (from 19 Glenberrie Terrace).	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 21 Glenberrie Terrace, once separated from 19 Glenberrie Terrace.	Reject	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.31	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that 23 Glenberrie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 23 Glenberrie Terrace.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.32	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers 111 Hill Street is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 111 Hill Street.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.33	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 214 Sydney Street does not currently have a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.	Add a "Heritage Area - Contributing Building" dot on the map for 214 Sydney Street.	Accept	Yes



## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the area has special historical qualities.	Seeks that the following sites are added as a new heritage area:  Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.  Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.  Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.  Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.	Reject	no
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.47	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the recognition of heritage within those areas in Newtown, which have specific and identified cultural historical value. These areas should be protected from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 RMA.	Allow	Reject	no
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.116	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	no
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the overlay boundaries at Albion Battery and Mine Remains should be redefined. No part of the Albion Battery and mine remains are located on Te Kamaru Station. The Albion Battery is located to the west of the boundary with Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd's land.	Remove the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains overlay at: - Fee Simple, 1/1 - Lot 2 Deposited Plan 375401 - Section 66, 74, 76-77, 79, 84 Terawhiti District - Part Section 13 Makara District - Part Section 18, 27-28, 54, 60-65, 73, 75, 78, 80-82 Terawhiti District - Lot 3 Deposited Plan 477282, 15, 650, 824 m2  [Refer to original submission for full list]	Reject	no
Margaret Cochran	382.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Oppose the Proposed District Plan's heritage areas boundaries.  Submitter wishes to see it (Thorndon Historic Area) amended to retain the existing area boundaries.	Opposes Proposed District Plan's mapping of Thorndon's Heritage Area in its current form and seeks amendment.	Reject	no

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Margaret Cochran	382.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Seeks to see the Thorndon Historic Area amended to retain the existing area boundaries.</p> <p>The submitter has lived in and knows intimately the Thorndon historic area centred on Ascot Street and Glenbervie Tce.</p> <p>The re-drawing of the boundaries of this area in the Proposed District Plan make no sense at all, arbitrarily cutting out buildings on its periphery. Historic areas should have clear physical boundaries, not indistinct lines between adjacent properties. Inappropriate development on the edge of an historic area is as damaging as it is within the area.</p> <p>The strong physical boundaries of Tinakori Road, Bowen Street and the Urban Motorway are ideal for defining the Thorndon Historic Area, as they have been since the establishment of the first ever national heritage area zoning — the Residential E Zone in 1975. This single action lead by the community, has preserved the “Thorndon” so valued nationally 47 years later.</p>	Amend the mapping of the Thorndon Heritage Area to retain the boundaries in the Operative District Plan.	Reject	no
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.291	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Reject	no
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.46	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>HPW supports the addition of those identified heritage areas.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.</p>	Amend the mapping of the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage area (#40) to more accurately define the heritage features.	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The Heritage Building listing of 28 Robieson Street is opposed. Considers the house is deemed to be in poor condition and remediation work is estimated to cost as much as \$800 - \$1million. Detailed renovations plans from the owners have been provided, which include repurposing the timber from the house and other special aspects of the building. Considers a heritage listing on the property would incur risks, costs and stress to the owners, who wish to renovate the house.</p> <p>It is argued that the heritage value of the building is low, and that the listing would not result in any positive net benefits for society or the owners. It is considered that the listing would insted lead to a worse heritage outcome for the community due to the significant impacts on the owners linked to the condition of the building.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Building and map.	Accept	Yes

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ian Attwood	FS16.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Scheduling will inevitably incur additional costs and constraints on developments and improvements and will consequently be counterproductive to the preservation of architectural heritage. Council has not provided substantiated independent evidence that 28 Robieson Street has significant or architectural merit and heritage value to the community.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Accept	Yes
Sophie Kahn	FS76.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The owner (of 28 Robieson Street) points to the crippling costs that urgently-needed renovations to the house will incur on them if Heritage standards are to be met, and states that the potential of being unable to meet these costs will merely result in worse outcomes for Heritage - the very opposite of what WCC aims for. This reflects the Kahn House situation.	Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and map  - Do not force private homes on the Plan unless there is full commitment to full and fair financial compensation in perpetuity for the financial burdens private homeowners will face if the listing is truly historically significant, offer to purchase private homes proposed for listing when the owner disagrees should be considered.  Only propose for listing private homes that have had an independent body's full analysis of outcomes the homeowner will face and that concludes, with robust evidence, that the public need is such that the rights of the homeowner, as well as the mental and financial well being of the homeowner can indeed be justly considered secondary to the needs of an abstract entity (i.e. the 'public'; future generations)	Accept	Yes
Peter Fordyce	431.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas should be expanded. Wellington's built heritage comprises a vital part of the city, featuring a cityscape that is not only unique within New Zealand, but the world. This contributes to not only tourism, but fosters a sense of "place" for residents. While the rules as they currently exist provide some protection, this does not go far enough, and irreplaceable buildings and streetscapes are at risk of being lost.	Seeks that Heritage Areas be expanded in the mapping.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Elice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow	Reject	no
Michael O'Rourke	194.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Amend the mapping to extend heritage area from 30% to 50% of the existing heritage area.	Reject	no
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan will maintain the existing or 50% protected heritage/character areas within the central city and those suburbs like Thorndon, Mount Victoria, Mount Cook and Aro Valley and Brooklyn.	Reject	no

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Century Group Limited	238.4	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the identification of the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) as being subject to the 'extent of place' for Item 44 (2 Bunny Street) in SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings). Considers that the extent of place is associated with the Railway Station building which is located some 130m to the south-west of the Property, and the Property has no spatial, functional or historical relationship with the Railway Station building or the railway platforms. Century Group seeks that this anomaly be rectified as they consider it is plainly an error.	Delete the extent of place that applies to the property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) relating to item 44 (2 Bunny Street) in SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).	Accept	Yes

## Appendix B – General submissions on Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paul Burnaby	44.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Council should provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value. The following are examples to indicate the types of incentives, and is certainly not meant to be exhaustive, as there are many incentives that may be open to Council:</p> <p>(a) Enabling Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs) for owners of historic heritage places</p> <p>(b) Providing a 'fast-track' process for proposed development where a Conservation Plan has been prepared and provided for a historic heritage place, and where the Conservation Plan has been used to guide the proposed development.</p>	Seeks that Council provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value.	Accept in part	No
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the application of a recession plane standard to sites adjoining scheduled heritage will to some extent avoid the adverse effects of visual dominance which can arise when new buildings are out of scale with the existing environment [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks that all sites adjoining a scheduled historic heritage item or scheduled historic heritage site/building or Historic Reserve should be subject to the Height In Relation To Boundaries (HIRB) variation of 3 metres and 45 degrees.	Reject	No
Regan Dooley	239.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP has too many protections for heritage and character generally.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to reduce heritage protection to enable more intensification.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was listed as a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness.</p> <p>The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas is exempt from any other controls arising from Heritage Area status.	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.15	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers the earthworks, historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapters should recognise the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu and require appropriate consents to include an accidental discovery protocol. This would give effect to Policy 22 of the RPS.</p>	Seeks to amend the PDP to manage the accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu to protect historic and cultural values.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	<p>Acknowledges the differentiation between historic heritage and character precincts, even though there is some overlap with some character precincts also being identified as heritage areas, or containing heritage buildings.</p>	Not specified	No decision sought	no

## Appendix B – Historic Heritage - Other

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Norman	247.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the highest level of The Terrace has buildings which provide a rare reminder of 19th century Wellington.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC include advice from Heritage New Zealand with regards to large buildings at the highest levels of The Terrace.	Reject	No
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that any statement made by the Council in respect of the Cemetery's history is fully and properly researched by qualified people and that such research is done in consultation with the Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery.	Accept in part	No
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery are party to any change of status that might later be proposed to the listing in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	No
Cherie Jacobson	251.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Supports the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission.	Seeks that the table of specific submission points on the Proposed District Plan in the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission are submitted.	Accept in part	Yes
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the heritage scheduling of additional sites identified by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that the Heritage Buildings identified by the Historic Places Wellington submission are listed in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. (Historic Places Wellington Submission 182).	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.25	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. There is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. Overzoning has many negative effects on the urban environment.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that local and overseas research has shown that heritage contributes to positive economic, environmental, social, and cultural wellbeing outcomes.  Considers that Seville, Graz and Copenhagen are good examples of cities that have strong heritage values.	Not specified	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that heritage and character can make a significant contribution to the city's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use and mitigating the effects of climate change through building community cohesion and resilience.	Not specified	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Council continue its program of waiving resource consent fees for heritage items as an incentive to keep places in sustainable use.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.6	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the lack of public consultation throughout the planning process combined with flawed analysis, particularly around character areas, has resulted in a schedule that does not adequately protect historic heritage nor reflect what Wellingtonians value.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.7	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the methodology that has been used for selecting potential new places to add to the schedule is unclear. Considers that the section 32 analysis has limited information about the methodology used.  States there is no heritage study listed in the technical assessments, reports and background content informing the Proposed District Plan. Considers that the work undertaken to review the schedule outline in the relevant section 32 analysis report is ad hoc in nature, is not indicative of the expected methodology for a professionally heritage study.	Not specified	No decision sought	No

## Appendix B – Historic Heritage - Other

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.8	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that the Council has not adequately sought the views of the community on historic heritage in the development of the PDP.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the section 32 report notes engagement with owners, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Thorndon and Mt Victoria heritage groups on proposed new heritage listings but not with the general public. Considers that there was no awareness campaign activity commonly undertaken by TAs occurring, such as social media posts, newsletter content, or press releases, for example.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.9	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that as the submissions on the draft district plan also included nominations for heritage listings that this is indicative of a lack of public engagement.</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.10	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that much of the character areas are likely to meet the threshold for scheduling as historic heritage for their historical and physical significance.</p>	Seeks that the Council apply the Greater Wellington Regional Council 'Guide to historic heritage identification' to assess the value of the character areas.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.10	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's process and their proposal lacks evidence - including the proposed listings in SCHED1.</p> <p>The further submitter supports this view and have also been disappointed with the Council's lack of diligence and rigor applied to justifying the original submitters proposal. The RMA sets clear requirements in s32 Clause 1(c) that the evaluation must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. This requirement has not been met by the Council's evaluation.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / Seeks that the Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.12	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that there is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that the Council's 2019 HBA does not include any analysis of the impacts of heritage and character provisions on the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.14	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that the Council should refer to guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia. Guidance should be reviewed when undertaking evaluations of the impacts of proposed policies and changes on community value, cost-benefit analysis and non-use and community values. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that Council use guidance from the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia to better evaluate the impacts of Heritage listings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No

## Appendix B – Historic Heritage - Other

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers there to be insufficient evidence of Brooklyn suburbs character or heritage value.	Seeks for WCC to investigate Character/ Heritage in the Brooklyn suburb.	Reject	No
Philip Cooke	465.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended to remove protection of the roof design.</p> <p>The unusual arrangement or intriguing roof design is highlighted in the Physical Values and Rarity as of importance. The submitter considers that this feature was originally intended to be hidden from view. The roof's internal gutters are a problematic design which have resulted in damaging leaks twice in the last 23 years and would benefit from re-configuration.</p>	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended to remove protection of the roof design.	Accept in part	No
Philip Cooke	465.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended with regard to its description of 'Age' under Physical Values.</p> <p>Considers that the description has "the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation in the Wellington region" but it should be amended to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria".</p>	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended in its description of Age under Physical Values to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria" rather than the "context of human occupation".	Reject	No
Rita Angus Cottage Trust (formerly Thorndon Trust)	494.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Historic Heritage Area Evaluation report December 2021 on the Ascot Street Heritage Area should be amended to correct two mistakes regarding Cooper's Cottage.	<p>Seeks that Cooper's Cottage should be HNZPT Category 2 listed in both the <i>Acknowledgements</i>, page 2, and the <i>List of Places</i>, pages 21-36 (not Category 1).</p> <p>In the <i>Inventory of buildings and features</i> table, pages 275-8, Cooper's Cottage should be status 4 (not status 3).</p>	Accept in part	No



## Appendix B – Historic Heritage – Appendix 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.36	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support in part	Supports APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes and considers these advice notes are a useful source of advice and further information for various aspects of heritage.	Retain APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes with amendments.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.37	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers that it is common practice (and is a requirement for archaeological authorities under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act) that tangata whenua are notified in the event of any discovery which may be of Māori origin.	Amend the end of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and Accidental Discovery section in APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes to include the following: ... The Police will also need to be notified if any koiwi/human remains are revealed and if any artifacts/taonga tūturu are found the Ministry for Culture and Heritage must be notified. <u>Where the discovery is of Māori origin the relevant iwi representatives will need to be notified.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.12	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	The submitter seeks for APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes to include the following: Where the discovery is of Māori origin the relevant iwi representatives will need to be notified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because relevant iwi representatives should be notified when discoveries are of Māori origin. It is important for discovery processes are to be outlined in the plan and for awareness to be spread about the issue.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.169	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers in the 'ICOMOS NZ Charter and other policy documents and guidelines' section of APP1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes), the final sentence is long and confusing and required clarification.	Amend APP1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes) as follows:  ICOMOS NZ Charter and other policy documents and guidelines (...) <del>These documents provide important references in identifying and protecting heritage, and in the resource consent process including for the assessment of environmental effects.</del> <u>These documents provide important references in identifying and protecting heritage. They also contribute to the assessment of environmental effects within resource consent processes.</u>	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.170	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers in the 'Conservation plans' section of APP1, a conservation plan is incorrectly defined as a method, which is inconsistent with its true meaning. The definition should be rephrased to match the definition in the "ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value".	Amend APP1 (Historic and Heritage Advice Notes) as follows:  (...)  Conservation Plans  <del>A conservation plan is a method of managing the cultural significance of a place of cultural heritage value.</del>  <u>A Conservation Plan is an objective report which documents the history, fabric, and cultural heritage value of a place, assesses its cultural heritage significance, describes the condition of the place, outlines conservation policies for managing the place, and makes recommendations for the conservation of the place.</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.50	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	Revised description of the purpose of a conservation plan is preferable to the wording as notified.	Allow	Accept	Yes

## Appendix B – Historic Heritage – Appendix 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.35	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.82	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	Support the mention of the ICOMOS Charter and HNZPT Sustainable Management series here.	Retain reference to ICOMOS Charter in APP1 as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Opoutere Trust	3.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that Firth House at 18 Vera Street should not be included as a heritage building under SCHED1. Disagrees with the Council's heritage assessment that the house is 'largely unmodified'. The house has been extensively remodelled since 1995 under WCC supervision. Little remains from the house's original design. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	yes
Sophie Kahn	FS76.2	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	The Trust states that the original house no longer exists - that modification under Council's approval decades ago (1995 and 2005) left virtually nothing of the original design intact. The accurately and authentically of the remaining heritage value is low.  The modifications were made thirty years ago for very good reasons: the house had to be altered to make it livable for the present. This reflects the Kahn House situation where external an internal modifications have been made, significantly reducing the accuracy and authentically of the remaining 'heritage' value.  This also demonstrates that the old modernist houses will over time require major updating to meet the needs and safety requirements of the present, and many of the changes result in changes to the authenticity of the original designs. This is now acutely pertinent for the Kahn House.	Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  Seeks that Council: - Do not list private homes that have undergone such major alterations where virtually all or none of the original heritage structure exists. - Consider the impact the listing will have on the homeowners ability to make updates and upgrades, especially when the homes is in urgent need of updating - Consider that heritage listing a private home will prevent the homeowner from making changes as desired, and that older heritage homes are often unfit (either unsafe and/or constructed considering primitive living conditions/) for modern living.	Accept	yes
Sophie Kahn	FS76.3	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	The submission (3) discusses that the architectural heritage and original design of 18 Vera Street is well documented in publicly accessible archives and argues with that this is where heritage resides, and is accessible to the public. Kahn House agrees with this point.  Opoutere Trust points out that there is a well known restored, preserved, superior, and awardwinning example of Firth's best work in Wellington. It has not been scheduled. The submitter exposes that the identification process is inequitable, unfair, biased, and based on questionable evidence. Kahn House supports this point and agrees the process for identification of homes for listing is poorly evidenced, apparently random and without justification. Indeed, it is highly concerning that it became clear during this process that the WCC itself does not even know what is in its inventory.  Opoutere Trust points out that for the owner of a private suburban home severe outcomes are evident: loss of capital value, reduced sales pool, constraints on development and improvements, and increased compliance costs. The owner states he would not have purchased the property if he had been aware that thirty years later the house would be scheduled. Kahn House shares concerns about the grave financial outcomes and endorse his point that owners would never have purchased / built their homes if as a result of this retrospective action.  Kahn House supports the submitter's point about the WCC's ability to unilaterally change home designations being unfair to homeowners and endorses an urgent independent review of the means by which government bodies (and Crown Entities) are able to use their power to severely negatively impact the financial (and other) futures, and impose on the property rights of select NZ private citizens.  [Inferred reference to submission point 3.1]	Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  Seeks that: - All privately-owned, standalone independent suburban homes (not in identified precincts) should be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings' - unless the owner(s) seeks and agree to listing. - WCC must provide evidence they have identified effects of listing on private owners (including a financial analysis by an independent body), as well as provide evidence that their quantitative and qualitative evaluation for all private owners has been achieved to a level of detail and accuracy proportional to the significance of the effects on private owners. - List only (and only with full agreement of owners) superior examples of a desired architects/movements/etc representation on the Plan, with detailed, factually-correct reason why it is the key representation of the movement. - One or two listings of each representative theme is reasonable (not redundant listings from a single architect). Any more is excessive, and needs justification. - Do not place 'public need' - especially when no evidence is provided of this need - over the financial security of NZ citizens. Especially in circumstances where the homes are not in a recognised precinct and are almost entirely hidden from public view	Accept	yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The submitter notes that there appears little reasoning for why some buildings are proposed for listing and others (often better examples) are not. The submitter also notes that the Council had failed to understand what it has in its own heritage inventory and that there is no clear classification system of architectural themes.</p> <p>The submitter share the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to identifying which properties should be scheduled for listing.</p> <p>The Council has not considered any direct alternatives or options to listing this home to achieve their outcome as would be expected under Clause(1) (b) (i) of s32 of the RMA. This situation reflects the experience with the further submitters home, 28 Robieson St.</p> <p>The further submitter does not support listing where there is no justification given for selection over alternatives (direct alternatives not considered).</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and requirements of the RMA.</p>	Accept	yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the submitters view that the Council has made no effort to understand the impacts that the listing will have on the individual homeowner, and that this impact is significant for isolated homes.</p> <p>The Council has failed to identify the effects of listing and undertake an evaluation or quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significant of the regulatory intervention as required under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner's consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only consider listing buildings where there is a net benefit to the community from doing so. Identify the full range of effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance the effect imposed by heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>	Accept	yes
Mark Whitaker Levett	7.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that very little of the original heritage features of the building exists anymore. The building has undergone numerous construction changes. [Refer to original submission for full list of changes].</p> <p>The Historic Heritage Evaluation refers to features that no longer exist on the current building. Earlier WCC assessments have determined the heritage values to be low, and there is nothing in the current assessment that changes this position.</p> <p>Only has a Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Category 2 listing.</p>	Remove Item 524 (134 Willis Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.43	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	134 Willis Street is included in the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangi Kōrero as a Category 2 place and has heritage values to support its inclusion in schedule 1.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	reject	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitters supports this submission. Heritage value is higher in buildings that are in both original and good condition.	Allow / Seeks that the Council only consider buildings with high heritage value to the community for evaluation and potential listing.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 –	Support	The further submitter supports the position of the submitter that reflects their own experience of claimed features that no longer exist being used in our heritage assessment. The further submitter covered this in their submission in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak".	Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.	Accept	Yes
		Heritage Buildings		The process and evidence used to justify the Council's proposed listings is insufficient.  [See original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. The full range of effects of listing are identified and the costs and benefits are quantified to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).	Accept	Yes
Tony De Lorenzo	9.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that if the PDP is adopted the Council will make ownership of historic properties unaffordable for all except the wealthiest people in Wellington.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the original submitters concerns around affordability and impact on their financial wellbeing. The Council must consider the costs of a heritage protection regime that demands heritage services form private homeowners. Reduced property value and higher compliance limits access to funds that can be used to remediate and maintain these properties and can lead to less heritage being protected.  Requiring the Council to compensate owners for the heritage services they mandate, or for them to offer to purchase properties where owners are opposed, would provide important balance and restraint to their incentives to over procure heritage as they bear no cost of doing so.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council offer to purchase homes proposed for listing when the owners are opposed.  Seeks that the Council investigate other non-regulatory incentive schemes (as expected under the RMA) including enduring rates remissions for private owners providing heritage services to the city.  Seeks that the Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and meeting the requirements of the RMA.	Reject	No
Tony De Lorenzo	9.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Seeks that all heritage listings to 1 Ranfurly Terrace (SCHED1 Item 415) are deleted and this property is given a generic area based heritage listing. Currently listing is unclear and too restrictive, and will incur disproportionate costs to the owners.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete item 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) from SCHED1 - Heritage buildings.	Accept in part	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tony De Lorenzo	9.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Seeks that the specific listed provisions in column 5 of SCHED1 Item 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) are amended (if this listing is not deleted in its entirety). Currently listing is unclear and too restrictive, and will incur disproportionate costs to the owners. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend term 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) of SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as follows: Protections Required <del>All of the exterior of the house including the Exterior - facades, roofs-roofline</del> , chimneys and chimney pots. <del>All of the front garden including Front garden</del> – masonry front fence, piers, and metal gates; front garden formal layout including edging around planter beds; tiled path; tiled steps to entrance, rendered plinths, and tiled porch floor. <del>Specific items in the rear garden</del> <u>Rear garden</u> - three sections of masonry fence with plinth, bottle balusters, and top rail. <del>The interior of the house including any Interior- including any original</del> lath and plaster walls and ceilings; decorative plasterwork including ceiling roses, cornices and mouldings, and decorative plaster arches; timber floorboards; timber joinery including timber panelled doors, skirting boards, and architraves. (...)	Accept in part	Yes
Rachael Bell and Michael McCormack	15.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Support the removal of 355 The Parade from the list of heritage buildings. The values that this building was proposed to be scheduled for are seen in other buildings in Wellington.	Retain SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) as notified.	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports that 355 The Parade is not listed as we understand this would have imposed a significant burden on the owners for little value. This case sets a clear precedent for the Council taking into account the burden imposed on private homeowners, low heritage value, to removing buildings from SCHED1.  The further submitter does not believe the Council has correctly recorded the original submitters view as support of SCHED1 when the submission's purpose is to discourage the relisting of their property.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council correct the submitters position to 'support in part' as its only in relation to their property not being scheduled (i.e. the part they support).	Accept	No
Wellington Amusement Holdings	22.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The portion of the cinema building identified to justify listing does not have sufficient heritage value.  Retention and strengthening of this portion of the building compromises redevelopment options, including the continuation of viable cinema activities.	Remove Item 505 (Penthouse Cinema) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi) is not included.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage buildings with amendment.	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.26	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	OSH supports currently scheduled heritage buildings in our local area, and HNZPTs proposals.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter believes the Council's efforts to delist the library is likely pragmatic. and will save Wellington rate payers from significant excess expense. In short, there is likely a net benefit to community of delisting. We are sympathetic to this situation.</p> <p>The further submitter notes that Council's approach clearly demonstrates the recognition excessive costs and restrictions that arise from remediating a heritage listed building.</p> <p>Notes that the fact that the Council are actively delisting their own buildings to allow significant remediation to occur to avoid this cost on one hand, while they actively pursue the listing of private isolated homes (and other buildings) also in similar need of significant remediation is hypocritical and offensive. The same burden the Council is seeking to avoid, they seek to impose on private homeowners - despite being significantly better placed to bear the burden than private homeowners.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council retain the delisting of the Wellington City Library as proposed and seek heritage input into the remediation project.</p> <p>Seeks the removal of the proposed listings of isolated private homes that are in need of remediation, that have low heritage value, where listing would impose a significant financial burden, and the owners are opposed.</p> <p>Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (as it fits these same criteria)</p>	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.25	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage buildings in Wellington and HNZPTs amendments and proposals.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi) should be included on Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) as it has been entered on the NZ Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero as a Category 1 Historic Place (list number 9761).	Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to include the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi)	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that the McClean Flats are not included.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage Buildings with amendment	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include the McLean Flats as it has been entered on the NZ Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero as a Category 1 Historic Place (list number 9783) in the same listing as the Gordon Wilson Flats which is included in Schedule 1.	Amend SCHED1-Heritage Buildings to include McLean Flats as either a separate listing or as part of the listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats (#299).	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that Hurston House is not included.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage Buildings with amendment	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include Hurston House as this building has recently been added to the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 2 Historic Place (list number 9954).	Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to include Hurston House	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	Notes that a number of entries in Schedule 1 have incorrect New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero references, and incorrect addresses.  Notes several instances where legal descriptions appear to be incorrect.	Seeks that all SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings entries are checked for accuracy in terms of address, legal descriptions and Heritage New Zealand Listing number.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.  The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.  Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).  Seeks that the Council correct errors, and consult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).  Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.	Accept in part	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 164.2 has an inaccurate HNZPT # and should be amended.	Amend the SCHED1 Item 164.2 (Cemetery Lychgate) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Historic Place Category 2, <del>1362</del> <u>1400</u>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 165 does not have a HNZPT #.	Amend the SCHED1 Item 165 (Jewish Chapel (former)) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 1362</u>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 179 address should be amended to 55 Lambton Quay (the official address HNZPT uses for this place).	Amend the SCHED1 Item 179 (Government Buildings) address as follows:  (Address) <del>45</del> <u>55</u> Lambton Quay	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented. [See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 187 entry incorporates two entries in the NZ Heritage List #212 and #1336 and is missing a NZ Heritage List Entry #.	Amend the SCHED1 Item 187 (Old BNZ Building 2) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 1336</u>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.49	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 220 address is for the vicarage (94 Hamilton Road) and should be amended to the church (90 Hamilton Road).	Amend the SCHED1 Item 220 (All Saints' Church) address as follows:  (Address) <del>94</del> <u>90</u> Hamilton Road	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>The SCHED1 Item 227 legal description should be amended to the legal description for the church and not the hall.</p> <p>The WCC inventory and NZ Heritage List entry refers to the Church, not the hall, and the current legal description refers to the parcel of land where the hall is situated.</p>	<p>Amend SCHED1 Item 227 (St Annes Church) legal description as follows:</p> <p>(Legal Description) <del>Lot 2 DP 82032 – subj to electricity easement Lot 1 DP 90016</del></p>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>SCHED1 Item 234 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.</p>	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 234 (Wellington Central Fire Station) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) <del>3654</del> <u>3645</u></p>	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.52	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 274 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 274 (Missions to Seamen Building) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) <del>3411</del> <u>3611</u></p>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented. [See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.53	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 350 name should be amended to be consistent with SCHED3 Item 12 (St John's Presbyterian Church).	<p>Amend SCHED1 Item 350 (St John's Church) name as follows:</p> <p>(Name) St John's <u>Presbyterian</u> Church</p>	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.54	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>THE SCHED1 Item 429 address should be amended to 151 Cuba Street as currently it has the same address given to Item 82.2 (Berry Building) 145-149.</p>	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 429 (Shop/dwelling) address as follows:</p> <p>(Address) <del>149</del> <u>151</u> Cuba Street</p>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.23	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>	Accept in part	No
Tim Bright	75.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	No details supplied	[Not specified]	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ngatiawa Russell Masonic Lodge 345	78.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall was purpose built for the use of Freemasons and is of no symbolic, traditional or cultural value to the local Masonic community.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Masonic Hall has little use to the rest of the Johnsonville community and is unlikely to have appeal to other organisations.</p> <p>Including the Hall in the SCHED1 reduces the future development potential of the site and future value of the building in a commercial sense.</p>	Remove Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	No
Ian Attwood	79.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that Firth House (Item 521) should not be included in SCHED1 because it has been substantially altered and considers that it does not accurately, authentically, and with fidelity reflect Firth's commitment to social housing design in 1941 for which listing is proposed.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including appendices for detailed reasons]</p>	Remove Item 521 (Firth House) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).	Accept	Yes
Sophie Kahn	FS76.1	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The homeowner (18 Vera Street) identifies there are severe failings in the Council's heritage evaluation process. This reflects Kahn House's experience.</p> <p>The homeowner of 18 Vera Street confirms the house has undergone wholly transformative alteration and thus the key reason for listing has no convincing basis. What council is seeking to protect simply does not exist. The further submitter concurs with the owners assertion that Firth House should not be listed in the District Plan.</p>	<p>Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as significant, fully consented, modifications have occurred on the home, and therefore the heritage value has been reduced.</p> <p>Ensure the heritage evaluations are made using current and accurate information.</p> <p>Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence of 'public desire' and 'public need' when considering the listing of personal homes.</p>	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the position of the submitter which reflects their own experience, of claimed importance of features that no longer exist, and grossly misrepresentative claims of heritage value. The further submitter covered this in their submission in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63.</p> <p>The process and evidence used to justify the Council's proposed listings is insufficient.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p>	Accept	Yes
Judith Graykowski	80.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	No details supplied	Not specified	No decision sought	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Joanna Newman	85.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the reasons for including these buildings are just as well justified as those that are already listed (Reasons listed in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that 53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were proposed to be included in the Draft District Plan and have been removed in the Proposed District Plan. WCC reassessment documents do not support this decision.</p> <p>[See original submission for further detail]</p> <p>Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.</p>	<p>Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to add the following properties:</p> <p>13 Austin Street 67 Austin Street 17 Brougham Street 33 Brougham Street 123 - 125 Brougham Street 136/138 Brougham Street 53 Ellice Street 9 Hawker Street 43 Hawker Street 71 Hawker Street 7 Paterson Street 58 Pirie Street 49 Porritt Avenue 23 Stafford Street 1 Tutchen Avenue 53 Ellice Street 67 Austin Street</p> <p>[See original submission for summary of heritage significance]</p>	Reject	No
Angus Hodgson & Sebastian Clarke	86.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that Boffa Miskell report on pre-1930s Character Area review (2019) identified 61 Hankey Street as being of potential historic significance, and worthy of consideration.</p> <p>Considers that for 61 Hankey Street received New Zealand Institute of Architects Wellington Branch - Enduring Architecture Award 2004.</p> <p>Considers that 61 Hankey Street has significant architectural values.</p> <p>Considers that 61 Hankey Street has many heritage value criteria.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasoning]</p>	Add 61 Hankey Street, Mount Cook to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	The Wellington Operative District Plan specified the curtilage of the heritage listing under Hunter Building so that works outside of the curtilage are not unnecessarily subject to the heritage rules of the PDP. The Hunter Building should be defined as comprising only the entire external building envelope so as to exclude the interior of the building. The heritage value of the Hunter Building relates only to its external façade and envelope rather than any interior features.	<p>Seeks amendment to Item 171 (Hunter Building, Victoria University) of SCHED1 - Heritage buildings to only include the external building envelope, not the inside of the building as follows:</p> <p>Hunter Building (<u>external building envelope</u>), Victoria University</p>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.44	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Rules HH-R4 and HH-S2 of the PDP serve to manage the curtilage and surrounds of heritage places. As such the requested change can be accepted.	Allow	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Gordon Wilson Flats have insufficient heritage value to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Schedule.</p> <p>The University also seeks to remove GWF from the Heritage Schedule because:</p> <p>(i) there are no reasonable alternatives to total demolition considering the maintenance, repair and seismic strengthening required;</p> <p>(ii) the building is unusable for any purpose in its present state;</p> <p>(iii) there is no appetite from the University, Council or Housing and Urban Development to repair, refurbish and use the building because it does not fit current needs; and</p> <p>(iv) the cost of refurbishment and conversion to an acceptable design and standard would make such a proposition a financial failure.</p>	Remove Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats (Lot 1 DP 363050)) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.48	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Gordon Wilson Flats are entered in NZ Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero as a Historic Place Category 1 and has heritage values to support its inclusion in Schedule 1.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 106.28]</p>	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.158	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers the original submitter has not sufficiently explored contemporary strengthening options for repurpose and reuse of this heritage building. Considers the building is a quality building with unique attributes and history, and recognised with a category 1 listing by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga. Considers the carbon emissions associated with converting the building to much needed student accommodation are significantly less than those associated with demolishing it and constructing a new building.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Robert Stout Building has insufficient heritage value to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Schedule.</p>	Remove Item 497 (Robert Stout Building (PT TOWN BELT TN OF WELLINGTON)) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.27	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangi Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports the heritage listing of all the buildings in Mount Victoria proposed to be included in SCHED1.</p>	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified, with respect to any buildings in Mount Victoria	Accept	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that additional buildings in Mount Victoria are worthy of heritage listing and should be included in SCHED1.</p> <p>53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were included in the Draft District Plan but are not in SCHED1 of the PDP.</p> <p>Other buildings should be included.</p> <p>67 Austin Street was included in the Draft District Plan but is not in SCHED1 of the PDP.</p>	<p>Add the following buildings to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings:</p> <p>13 Austin Street  67 Austin Street  17 Brougham Street (Owd Trafford)  33 Brougham Street (Hutchinson's House / Women's House)  123-125 Brougham Street (Ionian Flats)  136/138 Brougham Street (Rev Moir's wife's houses)  53 Ellice Street  9 Hawker Street (Hamilton Flats)  43 Hawker Street (Bernard Freyburg's House)  71 Hawker Street (Paterson's House)  7 Paterson Street (William Waring Taylor's House)  58 Pirie Street (George Winder's House)  49 Porritt Avenue (Kate Edger's House)  23 Stafford Street (Wellington Harbour Pilot Holmes's House)  1 Tutchen Avenue (Wellington Harbour Pilot Shilling's House)</p>	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.199	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further subimtter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Oliver Sangster	112.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the inclusion of the Gordon Wilson Flats on SCHED1-Heritage buildings (# 299).</p> <p>Considers that the flats are an embarrassing and sorry sight in a time when there is a growing problem of homelessness and high rents in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that the flats need to be demolished to make way for more housing near our city centre and Victoria University.</p> <p>Considers that because they already have Heritage New Zealand protection, further protection under the District Plan is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Seeks that Item 299 - Gordon Wilson Flats be deleted from SCHED1 - Heritage buildings</p>	Reject	No
Scots College Incorporated	117.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that the maps do not identify the curtilage around the heritage listed main College building in order to limit the application of HH-R4 to the reasonable vicinity of the listed building. Because the Campus is a very large site this change is sought so that resource consent is not unnecessarily required for building work that is sufficiently far away from the main building.</p>	<p>Amend item 219 (Scots' College Main Building) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings by inserting <u>Building curtilage for application of the historic heritage rules is mapped</u> against the item, in a similar manner to the heritage listed Hunter Building on the large Kelburn Campus.</p>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.45	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The submission makes a reasonable point that there is no identified curtilage for the recognised heritage building at Scots College. The New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero identifies an extent of the listing, which may form a practical basis for the mapping of a curtilage for this building.</p>	Allow	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Singvest Group Limited	129.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 522 (154 Victoria Street - Commercial Building) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the decision to include the Building on Schedule 1 was not conducted fairly or follow due process. [Refer to original submission for comprehensive detailing of process].</p> <p>The comprehensive heritage assessment by heritage expert David Kernohan in 2007 concluded that the recommendation for listing was "unreasonable and should not be sustained".</p> <p>Based on assessments from David Kernohan and Mark Leong (architect), considers that the WCC 2021 Heritage Evaluation Report drew incorrect conclusions which has led to an incorrect assessment that the Building holds significant heritage value.</p> <p>Considers that the impact of the Schedule 1 listing is that SGL will not be able to keep the site commercially viable.</p> <p>With demolition being significantly constrained by a listing, the Building is at risk of becoming uninhabitable after March 2026 as it is also designated as earthquake prone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].</p>	Delete Item 522 (154 Victoria Street - Commercial Building) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter shares the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to SCHED1 listings. The further submission details significant failings in the identification of heritage, assessment of heritage value, identification of effects of listing, and undertaking an evaluation or quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significant of the regulatory intervention as required under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>	Accept in part	no
Andrew Gan	136.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building into a modern complex to suit the needs of the community in the near future. Inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.</p>	Delete Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 514 (28 Robieson Street - Toomath House) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that there are several inaccuracies within the Historic Heritage Evaluation.</p> <p>The house is in need of extensive repairs, maintenance and upgrading and the statement in the Evaluation report that <i>the fabric appears to be sound</i> is incorrect. Significant changes are essential for the survival of the building and to ensure it can continue to serve a useful purpose as a healthy and well-functioning family home. The New Zealand modernist architecture of this house has led to water damage to the property. The building is reasonably intact however several changes have occurred. The neighbouring houses, also designed by Toomath and more refined examples of the architect's design achievements, have not been scheduled.</p> <p>Including the site extent would serve no constructive purpose, creates further challenges for the owners, and prevents alterations that enable appropriate use and enjoyment of indoor-outdoor flow.</p> <p>Considers that the property is not significant for its open plan layout. The study extension, which has significance assigned to it, is an area subsequently destroyed by water damage. Considers that the proposal for listing the exterior is unsubstantiated as much of the evaluation is concerned with the interior. Considers that most of the exterior materials were imported.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street - Toomath House) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the submission, and notes that they were surprised at the low quality, lack of evidence, and inaccuracies in the report. The assessment made no attempt to assess heritage value.</p> <p>The further submitters own assessment expands on their findings with regard to the quality of the heritage assessment in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63 (Of FS 91).</p> <p>The submission from a heritage expert (independent from the Council) notes the modifications and changes that have occurred to the property and that is it not in original condition as simply assumed in the assessment.</p> <p>The further submitter supports the submission and agree the home is far from the example of 'integrity and authenticity' claimed by the Council and does not warrant listing.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the view that scheduling would place a disproportionate and unreasonable burden on us as homeowners.</p> <p>The further submitter supports this submission and note that listing would reduce our ability to remediate known issues with our property and lead to poor outcomes for both our home, us, and the community.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that other authorities including Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, recognise that some buildings are more significant than others. The "blanket" approach taken by Wellington City Council makes it difficult to apply heritage in practice.	Seeks that consideration is given to the ranking of heritage items in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Grant Buchan	143.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the protection of Heritage Buildings which are excellent examples of their type and are preserved in good and close to original condition.	Not specified.	Noted	No
Wellington Chinese Baptist Church	144.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building and neighbouring properties (i.e. 22, 26, 28 Donald McLean Street) into a complex to service the community better and more widely. Item 490 (24 Donald McLean Street) has the largest area and is located at the centre of the plots and its inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.	Remove Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Submitter opposes delisting of Chinese Baptist Church from Shedule 1 item 490.  This area and street Donald Maclean Street is part of our submission to make a character precinct or a heritage area. This street has many of the oldest houses in Newtown as shown on the Thomas Ward map.  There is also support for a new character precinct from other submissions as well as the Clare Nolan et al [submission 275] and the Newtown Residents Association submission.  A new development would impact detrimentally on older heritage houses. Also, on the streetscape and primary consistency of the street according to Boffa Miskel report 2019.  Also, the church itself has heritage attributes otherwise would not be listed with WCC.	Disallow	Accept	No
Hannah Gao	145.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building into a modern complex to suit the needs of the community in the near future. Inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.	Remove Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
The Coronation Lodge	149.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall was purpose built for the use of Freemasons and is unlikely to have appeal to other organisations. Including the Hall in the SCHED1 reduces the future development potential of the site and future value of the building in a commercial sense.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Delete Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.2	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.55	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Sophie Kahn	161.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that Kahn House (#520) should not be included on SCHED1-Heritage buildings for the following reasons:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Listing is causing emotional distress.</li> <li>- The house is the submitter's sole asset.</li> <li>- The house needs alterations to modernise it and make it suitable for well-being and safety reasons.</li> <li>-Listing could see significant diminution in capital value</li> <li>- It is very unlikely they will continue to contemplate living in the house if they have their rights to developing the house constrained</li> <li>- It is privately, not publicly owned</li> <li>- The owners agreed to listing the house with Heritage New Zealand due to assurances there would be absolutely no restrictions imposed on the owner as a result of the listing - at the time or in the future.</li> <li>- The house is not Plischke's first construction in New Zealand and it is regarded as being far from his best work.</li> <li>- There is only one room that is 'special' - the living/dining room.</li> <li>- Substantial changes have already been made to the house.</li> <li>- Sufficient examples of Plischke's work, both private and public commissions are already listing by Heritage New Zealand and proposed in the District Plan.</li> <li>- Considers that homes, like humans, are at their best when they are living, breathing, adapting entities.</li> <li>- Concerned about loss of right to privacy of our personal history.</li> <li>- Listing the house in the PDP undermines human rights and renders the house incapable of reasonable use.</li> <li>- Listing can lead to neglect.</li> </ul> [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) is removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.47	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Kahn House is included in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 1 place and has heritage values to support its inclusion in Schedule 1.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The Kahn House as it now stands needs to be modernised if it's to become a viable contemporary home.  What constitutes a contemporary home in 2022 is very different to what was built in constrained circumstances in 1941.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The Kahn House, whilst having minimal architectural significance in context when built, is not regarded as a leading example of Plischke's work or of Modernist design principles.  Plischke's superior homes are scheduled or already protected, not least by their current owners (Sutch and Lang).  The Kahn House history is well-documented in various publications and archives. This is where the 'heritage' is best served and protected.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	'Locking up' the Kahn House against the wishes of the family does little to further preserve whatever influences the Modernist architects' had then and now.  It is debatable whether the Kahn House is Modernist as Plischke himself considered it more European-inspired than Modernist and was in fact contrary to the prevailing view of New Zealand architects at the time.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Scheduling the Kahn House is against the wishes of the family. It imposes not insignificant constraints on the right to determine the future of their home. It interferes with an intensely private family's desire for privacy and self-determination.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No
Ian Attwood	FS16.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Stripping a family of its legally established wealth and managerial right to their primary asset seems contrary to the legal intentions of property law.  Heritage rights for Māori and taonga are well established. 'Locking up' marae as examples from 1941 and preservation of 'heritage' would be totally unacceptable, but that is what is proposed in the District Plan for our homes.  The 'heritage' of the Kahn House belongs to the family and owners unless they willingly agree to share it with the citizens of Wellington in the interest of the community.  Council have no business interfering and impacting long-standing private property ownership.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ian Attwood	FS16.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Actions and evident attitudes at Council have been deeply impactful and distressing to the Kahn family. It is highly regrettable given the historical context of Nazi persecution and diminution of assets. History and heritage are a measure of our society - in the District Plan lessons have not be learnt and the consequences are profound and difficult to accept.</p> <p>Tiriti o Waitangi has illustrated time and time again that the use of power against disadvantaged communities does not deliver fair and equitable outcomes to the benefit of all.</p> <p>Council have chosen an adversative process that benefits no party and where alternatives might be preferred.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.156	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers the building has significant heritage value. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has listed this building as Historic Place Category 1, which is sufficient basis for it being in the heritage schedule in the PDP.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The submitter notes that there appears little reasoning for why some buildings are proposed for listing and others (often better examples) are not. The submitter also notes that the Council had failed to understand what it has in its own heritage inventory and that the there is no clear classification system of architectural themes.</p> <p>The submitter share the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to identifying which properties should be scheduled for listing.</p> <p>The Council has not considered any direct alternatives or options to listing this home to achieve their outcome as would be expected under Clause(1) (b) (i) of s32 of the RMA. This situation reflects the experience with the further submitters home, 28 Robieson St.</p> <p>The further submitter does not support listing where there is no justification given for selection over alternatives (direct alternatives not considered).</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and requirements of the RMA.</p>	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter agrees with the original submitter that the entire process of having their home proposed for listing has and continues to be stressful, tiring, and detrimental to their mental health. This is especially relevant for consultation and engagement of listing family homes.</p> <p>The further submitter supports the submitters concerns about the lack of consideration of homeowner's rights to privacy in their own homes where they become an listed and 'promoted' by the Council.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council provide clarification of what information about private homes will become public should they be listed as part of the Council's engagement policy and processes.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council ensure residents of listed homes retain their right to privacy.</p>	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the submission, and was surprised at the low quality, lack of evidence, and inaccuracies in our heritage assessment report. The assessment made no attempt to assess heritage value and was never intended to identify the effects of heritage listing.</p> <p>The further submitters submission expands on their findings with regard to the quality of our heritage assessment in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the original submitters concerns that the heritage listing would prevent or inhibit modifications to their home to make it safe for their elderly family to comfortably live there. The health and safety of inhabitants (and modifications to support or facilitate this) should come above providing heritage services to the community that has no access to the private home.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council consider the current and future health and safety needs of the occupants (their 'use value' of the property) above heritage value to the community.</p>	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter shares the original submitters concerns in terms of impact on capital value. A registered valuation the further submitter commissioned for their property illustrated a 30% fall in value would occur if the listing was to proceed. As the Council, nor proponents of listing bear the cost of listing their views should be secondary to owners.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner's consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.</p>	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.26	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangi Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.</p>	Disallow	Accept	no
Stephen Inzon	177.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall is significant to the Freemasons community but has little relevance to the rest of the Johnsonville community.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Delete Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.3	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tim Appleton	181.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church, 24 Donald McLean Street) on SCHED1- Heritage Buildings for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- considers that more old buildings do not need to be protected in Newtown.</li> <li>-considers more cost effective housing is needed.</li> <li>- considers the owners should be able to decide for themselves whether or not to develop.</li> <li>- considers the buildings next to the church do not have a nice look and are no in keeping with the main church building.</li> </ul>	Delete item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church, 24 Donald McLean Street) from SCHED1- Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the Commissioners discount generic submissions in support for SCHED1 listings as they provide no additional evidence relating to specific items proposed.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner’s consent.</p>	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the Wellington Central Library should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Add Wellington Central Library to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street, Island Bay, should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Add Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street Island Bay to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington	182.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Shirley Smith Family Trust	187.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 519 (Sutch-Smith House, 79A Todman Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  Considers that the Historic Heritage listing will have a detrimental effect on the overall value of property while achieving no real benefit to it. The listing imposes potential financial harm on the beneficiaries without realistically protecting the house in any meaningful way.  Considers that the house is better protected by the will of the family and the Trust than by a Heritage listing. The family are deeply committed to the house and would never alter its exterior fabric further than it has already been altered. Nor would they pass it on to someone who didn't share their commitment.	Delete Item 519 (Sutch-Smith House, 79A Todman Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sophie Kahn	FS76.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The Submitter (187) is another Plischke home that points to the significant financial harm it will cause the owner and that the reason for doing this to the owner has no sound purpose. Specifically, it will not result in protecting the home in any meaningful way. The further submitter considers that the only outcomes of a forced listing are likely to be negative.</p> <p>The Submitter (187) also points out that the WCC have no reason to claim that the home will be better protected by them and not the owners. The further submitter agrees - Kahn House will be better protected by the Kahn family than a Heritage Listing.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete item 519 (Sutch-Smith House) from SCHED1- Heritage Buildings</p> <p>Do not list private homes in Schedule 1 without owner's consent</p> <p>Consider that the heritage protection of private homes can be maintained by altruistic value to the homeowner</p> <p>Do not list homes that are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct.</p> <p>Do not propose for listing homes where the architect/movement is already adequately represented in the Plan.</p> <p>Commission review into assertion Listing of private homes will achieve desired heritage outcomes as opposed to undesired outcomes.</p> <p>Commission review on the severe financial outcomes on private home owners, including what this means for their well-being in old age.</p> <p>Commission review on the need for a full, robust and encompassing consideration of all the impacts on individuals impacted by the heritage listing process</p>	Accept	No
Nicola Crauford	208.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the house has been altered far beyond its original design in order to meet the needs of modern living.</p> <p>Considers that the original design and concepts have been well preserved.</p> <p>Considers that the house no longer represents those original concepts and designs.</p>	Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	yes
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all current buildings listed in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings in mount Victoria	<p>Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the reasons for including these buildings are just as well justified as those that are already listed (Reasons listed in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that 53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were proposed to be included in the Draft District Plan and have been removed in the Proposed District Plan. WCC reassessment documents do not support this decision.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to add the following properties:</p> <p>13 Austin Street  67 Austin Street  17 Brougham Street  33 Brougham Street  123 - 125 Brougham Street  136/138 Brougham Street  53 Ellice Street  9 Hawker Street  43 Hawker Street  71 Hawker Street  7 Paterson Street  58 Pirie Street  49 Porritt Avenue  23 Stafford Street  1 Tutchen Avenue  53 Ellice Street  67 Austin Street</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for summary of heritage significance]</p>	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.177	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Accept in part	No
Mike Camden	226.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports the heritage schedule and new listings, but considers that consultation with community groups and NZIA and a public process for selecting new listings would have been preferable.</p>	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.</p>	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Central Library should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Wellington Central Library to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	The further submitter believes the Council's efforts to delist the library is likely pragmatic. and will save Wellington rate payers from significant excess expense. In short, there is likely a net benefit to community of delisting. We are sympathetic to this situation.  The further submitter notes that Council's approach clearly demonstrates the recognition excessive costs and restrictions that arise from remediating a heritage listed building.  Notes that the fact that the Council are actively delisting their own buildings to allow	Amend / Seeks that the Council retain the delisting of the Wellington City Library as proposed and seek heritage input into the remediation project.  Seeks the removal of the proposed listings of isolated private homes that are in need of remediation, that have low heritage value, where listing would impose a significant financial burden, and the owners are opposed.	Accept	No
				significant remediation to occur to avoid this cost on one hand, while they actively pursue the listing of private isolated homes (and other buildings) also in similar need of significant remediation is hypocritical and offensive. The same burden the Council is seeking to avoid, they seek to impose on private homeowners - despite being significantly better placed to bear the burden than private homeowners.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (as it fits these same criteria)	Accept	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street, Island Bay, should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street Island Bay to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.33	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.34	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Supports evidence submitted by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that additional heritage listings are added for decorative/coloured glass.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Schedules / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Cherie Jacobson	251.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner’s consent.  Seeks that the Commissioners note the submitters dissatisfaction with the Council's processes and questioning if the validity the proposed buildings as representative of Wellington.	Reject	No
Graeme Webster	255.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that Toomath House is a private dwelling with little to no historic or heritage value.  The site is not visible from the road.  Heritage status would impose an unfair financial burden on the owners.  Considers that it is unreasonable to list a property as heritage status without owners consent.	Remove item 514 (28 Robieson Street, Toomath House) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports this submission point. The property has low heritage value. Listings should focus on publicly accessible buildings or purchasing private properties with 'significant heritage' with a view to make them publicly accessible.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.  Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).	Accept	Yes
Graeme Webster	255.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Considers that 26 Robieson Street is a private dwelling with little to no historic or heritage value.  The site is not visible from the road.  Heritage status would impose an unfair financial burden on the owners.  Considers that it is unreasonable to list a property as heritage status without owners consent.	Seeks that 26 Robieson Street is not identified as a heritage building (as notified) and is not entered onto SCHED1-Heritage buildings in the future. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports this submission point. Notes that properties that are isolated with limited visibility or value should not be considered for listing. Heritage should focus on publicly accessible buildings or purchasing private properties with 'significant heritage' and a net-benefit to the community with a view to making them publicly accessible.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Seeks that 26 Robieson St, Roseneath Wellington not be considered for heritage listing in the future.  The Council only consider buildings with high heritage value to the community for evaluation and potential listing.	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the original submitters view that listing should only occur with homeowners consent. Notes that it is profoundly unfair to list an isolated homes with low heritage value at extreme financial costs to owners without their consent.	Allow / Seeks that the Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner’s consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.	Accept in part	No
Johnsonville Masonic Hall	263.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Freemasons Hall has little relevance to Johnsonville Community and that this building should not be included in the heritage schedule.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.180	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to re-order Schedule 1 alphabetically by street name.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.181	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers 'Willowgrove' has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add 'Willowgrove' to SCHED1 (Heritage buildings) as follows:  <u>Address: 17 Parkvale Road, Karori</u> <u>Name: Willowgrove</u> <u>Legal Description: Lot 2 DP 44016</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire external building envelope</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.182	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers the Tea Rooms and Bakehouse (former) has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add 'Tea Rooms and Bakehouse' (former) to SCHED1 (Heritage buildings) as follows:  <u>Address: 249-261 Mansfield Street, Newtown</u> <u>Name: Tea Rooms and Bakehouse (former)</u> <u>Legal Description: Part Section 875 TN of Wellington</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire external building envelope</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
CAMJEC Commercial Limited	268.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the site at 233 Willis Street being included in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings on the basis that this building does not meet the requirements to be listed as a Heritage item [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to remove item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Accept	Yes



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Aimee Poy	272.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the church at 24 Donald McLean Street being included in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings.</p> <p>Considers that significant changes of appearance of the church building in the future can't be made.</p> <p>If it is heritage listed then the Church will not be able to carry out its vision for the future and serve the local community.</p> <p>The neighbouring properties adjacent to the Church will also be affected as this will significantly alter the development potential.</p>	Remove item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Julie-Anne Daysh	330.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes heritage listing of Item 525 at 233 Willis Street. Resource consents (SRs 496847 &amp; 499648) have been granted to build apartment buildings on the site, namely at Part Lot 7, DP 557, and Lot 1 and 2 DP 5171, and Lot 1 DP 2988.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete Item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) in its entirety.	Accept	Yes
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>There are multiple reasons why the consideration of scheduling 61 Hankey Street is warranted. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boffa Miskell report on pre-1930s Character Area review (2019) identified 61 Hankey Street as being of potential historic significance, and worthy of consideration</li> <li>• New Zealand Institute of Architects Wellington Branch – Enduring Architecture Award 2004 for 61 Hankey Street.</li> </ul> <p>The owners have presented their summary statement of significance could be: 61 Hankey Street has significant architectural values within the Wellington region as a fine example of an intact, single-detached modernist house, designed by prominent Wellington architects Bill Toomath and Derek Wilson.</p>	Amend SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) to include 61 Hankey Street.	Accept	Yes
Cho Yam Chan	335.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes heritage listing of Item 525 at 233 Willis Street. The theme and integrity of the original design of 233 Willis Street has been lost, as the front showroom which protruded out from the front of building was destroyed during the Willis Street road widening. There is limited community recognition of the site, as there are only 2 photos of the building on the NZ Archive website. There are other Anscombe buildings in the heritage list worth preserving.</p> <p>NBS rating is at 34%, which would need to be raised through strengthening. Strengthening would require further capital investment in the vicinity of a few millions, which is more than the value of the building improvement value.</p> <p>The site is also suited for apartment development. The economic value lies in the land. The best return value on investment and best use of the site is apartments/residential development with commercial units at ground level.</p>	Delete Item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) in its entirety.	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wayne Coffey and Gregory Young	347.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include the Salvation Army Citadel building on Jessie Street. The building has special architectural, social and cultural heritage significance. The Citadel was purpose built as a place of community gathering and worship for a noteworthy group, the Salvation Army. Salvation Army activity on the site dates back over 100 years. It was the home of the world renowned Wellington Citadel Salvation Army Band for more than 125 years. Wellington city is in need of a medium sized performance venue and the Citadel would be suitable for that purpose. The quality space has excellent features for public performance. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend SCHED1-Heritage Buildings to include the Salvation Army Citadel building on Jessie Street.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.53	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	Considers that the Wharenui Apartments at 274 Oriental Parade (Item 509) should not be listed under SCHED1. The entire external building envelope has been assessed and listed on the heritage building list. The leasehold company that owns the apartments do not support this listing. A heritage listing imposes significant costs and restrictions on the maintenance of the building. The heritage values of the building are not considered to warrant additional costs and restrictions linked to the listing. The heritage values listed in Item 509 predominantly relate to value associated with the site, not the actual building. The architectural style of the building is less coherent than suggested by officers and does not warrant listing. The listing is considered to not be a sustainable allocation of resources. Detailed counterpoints to heritage values listed in Item 509 are provided. Namely:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjacent buildings were completed in the late 1930s and early 40s and arguably influenced the modernist movement more than Wharenui apartments.</li> <li>- The building's architects have worked on a great number of buildings within Wellington.</li> <li>- The heritage status is only applied to the exterior of the building envelope, which is already protected in an archaeological sense since it is listed on the archaeological alert layer.</li> <li>- Despite having a unique outward design, the scale and materials of the building are not unique for the area.</li> <li>- The building was completed in 1958, 30 to 40 years apart from the first modern apartment towers in the area, which are not listed as heritage buildings.</li> <li>- The building's 15m setback makes it hidden from the street.</li> <li>- Minor maintenance has occurred and will need to occur in the future due to the material state of the building and its location being near the beach.</li> <li>- The modernist architectural style and multi-use development is already represented within Oriental Bay.</li> </ul> [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 509 (274 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the Wharenui Apartments at 274 Oriental Parade (Item 509) should not be listed under SCHED1. The entire external building envelope has been assessed and listed on the heritage building list. The leasehold company that owns the apartments do not support this listing. A heritage listing imposes significant costs and restrictions on the maintenance of the building. The heritage values of the building are not considered to warrant additional costs and restrictions linked to the listing. The heritage values listed in Item 509 predominantly relate to value associated with the site, not the actual building. The architectural style of the building is less coherent than suggested by officers and does not warrant listing. The listing is considered to not be a sustainable allocation of resources.</p> <p>Detailed counterpoints to heritage values listed in Item 509 are provided. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjacent buildings were completed in the late 1930s and early 40s and arguably influenced the modernist movement more than Wharenui apartments.</li> <li>- The building's architects have worked on a great number of buildings within Wellington.</li> <li>- The heritage status is only applied to the exterior of the building envelope, which is already protected in an archaeological sense since it is listed on the archaeological alert layer.</li> <li>- Despite having a unique outward design, the scale and materials of the building are not unique for the area.</li> <li>- The building was completed in 1958, 30 to 40 years apart from the first modern apartment towers in the area, which are not listed as heritage buildings.</li> <li>- The building's 15m setback makes it hidden from the street.</li> <li>- Minor maintenance has occurred and will need to occur in the future due to the material state of the building and its location being near the beach.</li> <li>- The modernist architectural style and multi-use development is already represented within Oriental Bay.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Item 509 (274 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Wētā FX	364.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Heritage listing of Item 511 (139 Park Road) in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings. Weta FX has identified this location as the only one fitting the unique attributes they need to increase their crew members and provide work spaces for them in Miramar.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes 139 Park Road, Miramar being included in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (Item 511).	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter believes the RMA places the onus on the Council to provide evidence that there is a higher net-benefit to the community of listing than not listing in order to justify listing a building. The RMA explicitly seeks to balance social, economic, and cultural wellbeing - not just cultural. The Council must weigh the impacts of listing on jobs and the local economy in addition to the financial burden on the owner. The further submission expands on this issue in the section titled "The Council has failed to effectively consider cost and benefits" on page 52.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 511 (139 Park Road) be removed from SCHED1.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>	Reject	No
Wētā FX	364.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the Heritage listing of Item 511 (139 Park Road) in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings. Weta FX has identified this location as the only one fitting the unique attributes they need to increase their crew members and provide work spaces for them in Miramar.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Item 511 (139 Park Road) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.125	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Argosy's property at 15 Stout Street is recognised as a heritage building as the 'Department Building'. The entire external building envelope is listed.	Retain Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings, Ref 23 as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.126	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>The former State Insurance Building comprises the first eight floors of the building. In 1998, a three storey addition designed by Athfield Architects, was constructed on top of the former State Insurance Building (Athfield Addition). Argosy opposes the Athfield addition being included in the listing of the State Insurance Building for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Wellington City Council Heritage Inventory describes the history, architectural information and cultural value of the building. The Heritage Inventory's recognition of the heritage values of the building is limited to the former State Insurance Building. It describes the Athfield Addition as "a large and somewhat incongruous" addition.</li> <li>- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga lists the former State Insurance Office Building on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Kōrero.<sup>2</sup> The building was registered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Kōrero in 1981 (before the Athfield Addition was constructed) and the listing describes the former State Insurance Office Building and not the Athfield Addition.</li> <li>- A heritage order was issued in relation to the State Insurance Building on 29 September 1987. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga is the heritage protection authority in relation to this heritage order. Because the heritage order was issued before the Athfield Addition was constructed, the Council is not restricted by the requirements in s 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to altering the heritage listing of the building in the Proposed Plan to exclude the Athfield Addition.</li> <li>- The Athfield Addition does not have any heritage value and should be excluded from the heritage listing of 143 Lambton Quay in the Draft Plan. It is not appropriate for this addition to be subject to the controls of being a heritage building in the Proposed Plan when it has no heritage value and can be easily distinguished from the former State Insurance Building.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Schedule 1, DP Ref 181:</p> <p>Entire external building envelope of former State Insurance Building. <u>Listing excludes the 1998 three-storey addition designed by Athfield architects.</u></p>	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.46	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Although the submission is correct regarding the 1998 addition, the listing in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero is for the entire building. The building, including the 1998 addition, need to be read a whole, and it is appropriate for the scheduled item to include the whole building.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.127	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage buildings	Support	Argosy's property at 360-366 Lambton Quay is recognised as including two heritage buildings: the 'Equitable Building and Investment Co. Building' and 'Stewart Dawson's Corner'. The entire external building envelope is listed in relation to both buildings.	Retain the Schedule 1 - Heritage buildings listings for Ref 191.1 and 191.2 as notified.	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.119	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	SCHED1 is partially supported and additional Heritage Buildings are proposed.	Retain Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.120	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that SCHED1 should include the Michael Fowler Centre, the Municipal Office Building, the Civic Administration Building and Wellington Public Library. These buildings should be identified as having heritage values within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.	Amend Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings to include: - The Michael Fowler Centre, - The Municipal Office Building, - The Civic Administration Building, - Wellington Public Library.	Reject	No
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Supports the heritage scheduling of additional sites identified by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that the Heritage Buildings identified by the Historic Places Wellington submission are listed in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. (Historic Places Wellington Submission 182).	Reject	No
Murray Pillar	393.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	Supports the WCC proposals for retaining existing, and adding new, listed heritage buildings.	Retain all existing and new Items in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.	Accept in part	No
Murray Pillar	393.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the selection of new listings for SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings involved greater consultation with Historic Places Wellington and other community groups, and to have been a public process.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.101	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings as notified, with amendments [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.  Seeks that the Commissioners note the submitters dissatisfaction with the Council's processes, questioning if the proposed buildings reflect the values of Wellingtonians, and earlier taking exception to the lack of evidence used to inform the Council's process (412.3). The justification of SCHED1 listings is equally lacking in evidence.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.102	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the Heritage items schedule does not adequately protect historic heritage nor reflect what Wellingtonians value.</p> <p>Considers that the schedule will not meet objective HH-O1. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the original point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes with the process to identify heritage.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.103	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports the addition of new places to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.</p>	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes the Council's engagement and understanding of what the community values.</p> <p>The further submitter has also been disappointed with the Council's engagement. The Council should spend the time and effort to understand how much value the community places on different types of heritage. This work would then inform Council resourcing and support quantitative net benefit assessments of listings as expected under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.104	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Does not support the protection of facades only where heritage fabric exists in addition to the facade and considers that this is likely to lead to adverse effects on heritage.</p>	Not specified	No decision sought	No
VicLabour	414.60	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	<p>Considers The Gordon Wilson flats are an example of where heritage protection has gotten in the way of the city's priorities.</p>	Not specified	No decision sought	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The Heritage Building listing of 28 Robieson Street is opposed. Considers the house is deemed to be in poor condition and remediation work is estimated to cost as much as \$800 - \$1million. Detailed renovations plans from the owners have been provided, which include repurposing the timber from the house and other special aspects of the building. Considers a heritage listing on the property would incur risks, costs and stress to the owners, who wish to renovate the house. It is argued that the heritage value of the building is low, and that the listing would not result in any positive net benefits for society or the owners. It is considered that the listing would instead lead to a worse heritage outcome for the community due to the significant impacts on the owners linked to the condition of the building. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Building.	Accept	Yes
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that the Council failed to meet the NZ Treasury's expected standards of good regulatory practice with their proposal, evidence base and evaluation of options to list 28 Robieson Street as a Heritage Building. The New Zealand Treasury sets expectations for good regulatory practice, stating that net benefits need to be considered, that regulated parties should be treated fairly and the Council should seek to meet their objectives in a way that has the least impact on property rights, market competition and individual autonomy. For instance, the Treasury's guidance report 'Best Practice Monitoring and Review' (2019) suggests that 5 to 10 per cent of the total time and budget committed to an intervention should be spent on review, monitoring and evaluation. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that the Council meets the New Zealand Treasury standards and guidelines on regulatory practice, monitoring and review in regard to listing 28 Robieson Street as a heritage building. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers the evidence base for the historic heritage section of the section 32 evaluation is weak in regard to heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. Has concerns with low-quality analysis, considers some reports do not exist, some are still draft reports, some are missing content, and some are summer student projects. The low quality of these reports implies the Council was never expecting to be asked to provide evidence. Any evidence used to form proposals of this scale and significance needs to have a level of detail and analytical rigour that is commensurate to the impacts in addition to transparency, and the findings being clearly documented. Considers some reports which form the evidence base are also not publicly available. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that the evidence base for the historic heritage section of the Section 32 have a level of detail and analytical rigour that is commensurate to the impacts in addition to being transparent, and the findings being clearly documented. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	no
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.33	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that council has failed to have an effective and unbiased process to identify heritage. Considers the identification process used by Council lacks the detail and rigour that corresponds to the scale and significance of the proposal to list 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.34	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers there is little evidence to support modernist architecture being under-represented in the heritage schedule being used as a reason to list 28 Robieson Street. Considers that there are modernist buildings that are not classified as modernist by Council already listed and that no consideration has been given to modernist representation across the Greater Wellington region. Considers it is unreasonable for the Council to claim the architectural theme of modernism is under-represented, if classification is lacking or undefined. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that the Pukehinou flats are modernist flats with distinctive round windows at the bottom of Brooklyn hill are easily viewably by the public. The flats are owned and managed by the Council. This imposing building has similarities to other notable architects of the era. The flats are unlisted and unfortunately, they were documented as being in poor condition in 2017. Queries why some buildings and architects attract attention but others do not and notes Burren and Keen largely appear to be ignored in the literary history and heritage of the city. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that Toomath house has very low community amenity value and option use value. Since the owners have bought the house in 2014, there has been no requests to visit or tour the house. It is considered that the highest actual use value attained from private homes, and from Toomath house, is from living in them. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	A registered valuation of Toomath House (28 Robieson Street) has assessed that the property will have a 29% drop in value as a result of a Heritage Listing, amounting to a loss of \$450,000. This will impact the owners' financial wellbeing, security, and retirement plans. It is also considered that the home is in poor condition, costs to remediate are high and there is uncertainty and list with the property being heritage listed. [Refer to original for full reason, including Appendix A]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.111	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Acknowledges the building at 22 The Terrace is recognised as a heritage building. The entire external building envelope is listed.	Retain item 287 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.	Accept	No
Wingnut PM Ltd	428.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Former School and Convent have little to no architectural merit, has been altered many times, and is poor build quality.  Preservation while developing for future use would be difficult.  Considers that expansion of the Post Production Music composing and recording base would be difficult.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend Item 120 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to remove The Former School and Convent 1899.  [See original submission for map of building]	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.49	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Schedule 1 item 120 (chapel and retreat house) is entered on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a category 2 place, and has sufficient heritage value to merit its inclusion in the schedule.	Disallow / Retain as notified (with minor amendment as per the original HNZPT submission)	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.157	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers the building has significant heritage value.	Disallow	Accept in part	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.28	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangi Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.173	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The RVA opposes the submission point as it is unclear if the relief sought is consistent with financial contributions regime under the RMA.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.173	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Ryman opposes the submission point as it is unclear if the relief sought is consistent with financial contributions regime under the RMA.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Rachel Underwood	458.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the Council's proposals for retaining existing, and adding new, listed Heritage Buildings but considers a public process should have been followed to select them with consultation with Heritage Places Wellington and community groups.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings, as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	Reject	No
Philip Cooke	465.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is highly modified from the original Victorian building and relies on the surrounding buildings for scale and context.  Considers that 20 Austin Street's contribution to the townscape is not in isolation nor is it held in high public esteem by the local community without the context of the surrounding buildings.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is only included as a listed Item on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings if the surrounding buildings are included within the Character Precinct boundary.	reject	No
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The submitter requests removal of 20 Austin Street from the list of heritage buildings IF Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area. We do not believe this should occur, however we agree that Claremont Grove does provide context to this house. Claremont Grove must be made a Heritage Area (refer to our submission on the Proposed DP).  Do not remove this house from the list of heritage buildings because, if Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area in this Plan, it may be in future.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Philip Cooke	465.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that 20 Austin Street's contribution to the townscape is not in isolation nor is it held in high public esteem by the local community without the context of the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Remove Heritage Building Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in its current form.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept	Yes
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The submitter requests removal of 20 Austin Street from the list of heritage buildings IF Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area. We do not believe this should occur, however we agree that Claremont Grove does provide context to this house. Claremont Grove must be made a Heritage Area (refer to our submission on the Proposed DP).</p> <p>Do not remove this house from the list of heritage buildings because, if Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area in this Plan, it may be in future.</p>	Disallow	Reject	No
WingNut Films Productions Limited	467.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Oppose the heritage listing of the Bulk Storage Tank at 139 Park Road.</p> <p>Considers that the tank is predominantly a steel structure and has significant rust. The roof has a large number of leaks and significant amounts of water come into the building whenever it rains. The tank also has a condensation problem which makes it unsuitable for the vast majority of activities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Heritage listing 511 - 139 Park Road from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter support this submission. If the Council had identified the effects of listing the tank, and its poor state, and weighed the benefits and costs (as required under s32 of the RMA) it seems likely this would not have been proposed for listing.</p> <p>Remedial work to resolve the issues would be significant and only increase if the listing proceeded.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e., free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>	Reject	No
Olympus Apartments	473.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed heritage designation of the Olympus Apartments.</p> <p>Considers that the added cost of any improvements or maintenance if the building is designated historic is concerning, especially as many owners are retired and on fixed incomes.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Heritage Listing 510 (280 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Olympus Apartments	473.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers 280 Oriental Parade does not qualify as a Listed Heritage Building.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Heritage Listing 510 (280 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended so that the Item List is aggregated into defined areas of the city.</p> <p>This is to enable the public to readily access a definitive list for the neighbourhood where they live and other areas of interest.</p>	Seeks that the Items List in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings are aggregated into defined areas of the city.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Rita Angus Cottage Trust (formerly Thorndon Trust)	494.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the inclusion of Item 470 (Cooper's Cottage) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Retain Item 470 as a listed building in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 2

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.55	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose in part	Notes that a number of entries in Schedule 1 have incorrect New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero references.	[Inferred Decision requested] Seeks that all SCHED2 - Heritage Structure entries are checked for accuracy in terms of heritage New Zealand Listing number.	Accept	no
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.56	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 Item 4 does not have a HNZPT #.	Amend SCHED2 Item 4 (Seatoun Tunnel) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 3650</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.57	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 Item 28 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.	Amend SCHED2 Item 28 (Queen Victoria Statue) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) Historic Place Category 2, <del>28-3663</del>	Accept	Yes
Tim Bright	75.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures	Reject	No
Judith Graykowski	80.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures	Reject	No
Judith Graykowski	80.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include all other tunnels of a similar era to the Mount Victoria Tunnel.	Add all other tunnels of similar era as the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Reject	No
Joanna Newman	85.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include the Mount Victoria Tunnel.  Considers that the Mount Victoria tunnel is not included in the list of heritage structures, while all other early road tunnels in Wellington are, namely Karori, Seatoun, Northland, Hataitai Bus Tunnels.  Considers that this tunnel is arguably one of the most 'storied' tunnels in Wellington, whether from the earliest days construction by Depression workers and Government grant, and burial of a murder victim on site during construction to the current history of tooting in the tunnel.  Supports evidence from the Mt Victoria Historical Society submission.	Add the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Reject	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that Mount Victoria tunnel is unique amongst tunnels in not being a heritage structure.  Considers that the tunnel is the most 'storied'.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.200	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.	Accept in part	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 2

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Vivienne Morrell	155.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified.	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed to the listing of operational infrastructures because of the costs this imposes of maintaining and adapting our infrastructure networks to best serve the communities of today and tomorrow.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Commissioners note the impact of adding heritage restrictions to operational infrastructure and providing for future needs of our communities.  The Council does not add any items of operational infrastructure to SCHED2.  The Council only list structures where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).	Reject	no
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include the Mount Victoria Tunnel.  Considers that the Mount Victoria tunnel is not included in the list of heritage structures, while all other early road tunnels in Wellington are, namely Karori, Seatoun, Northland, Hataitai Bus Tunnels.  Considers that this tunnel is arguably one of the most 'storied' tunnels in Wellington, whether from the earliest days construction by Depression workers and Government grant, and burial of a murder victim on site during construction to the current history of tooting in the tunnel.	Add the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.178	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.79	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Add Tyers Stream Dam to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified	Accept in part	No
Cherie Jacobson	251.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.183	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend Schedule 2 (Heritage structures) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 2

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.29	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.184	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers Glenside Milk stand has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Glenside Milk stand to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows:  <u>Address: Middleton Road (corner of Middleton Road and Glenside Road), Glenside Name: Glenside Milk stand</u> <u>Legal Description: Legal Road</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, C, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.30	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.185	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers The Tram Pole on Jervois Quay has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Tram Pole to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows:  <u>Address: Jervois Quay (corner of Jervois Quay and Wakefield Street)</u> <u>Name: Tram Pole</u> <u>Legal Description: Legal Road</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.31	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.186	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers Tyers Stream Dam has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Tyers Stream Dam to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows:  <u>Address: Tyers Stream Reserve, Ngauranga</u> <u>Name: Tyers Stream Dam</u> <u>Legal Description: Fee Simple, 1/1, Lot 4 Deposited Plan 58937</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, B, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.32	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.187	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED2 (Heritage structures) - 63 as follows: <del>TBC</del> <u>Legal Road</u>	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.33	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 2

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Claire Bibby	329.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the survey marker used for the Tawa tunnel construction should be added to SCHED2 as a heritage structure. The survey marker was used to assess the centre line of the railway tunnel, and has a view shaft on property 395 Middleton Road. Support for this heritage nomination is attached in Appendix A, B, C, from Glenside Progressive Assn. Inc, the Tawa Historical Society and the Rail Heritage Trust. The survey mark is located on property 395 Middleton Road (Lot 2 DP76164). Approximate location of marker (41.197092, 174.820693).</p> <p>As stated in the 'Historic Heritage Study for the Upper Stebbings and Marshall Ridge Structure Plan' by Elizabeth Cox (2018, p.4):"Preserve the area around the Railway Survey Peg Protection of this site should be considered, plus protection of a view shaft between the tunnel and peg."</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Add the survey mark used for the construction of the Tawa No.2 tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.34	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Reject	No
Claire Bibby	329.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the concrete milk stand on the corner of Glenside and Middleton Road should be considered a Heritage Structure. Approximate location is 41.20574 174.81178.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Add the concrete milk stand on the corner of Glenside and Middleton Road to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.35	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Claire Bibby	329.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers there should be a property listing on the Reedy block for the area adjacent to Westchester Drive and Te Kahu Road. There should be a comment included in the Property Report and in the District Plan that there is a burial site dating back to about 1841 on this block. This would ensure it is not destroyed accidentally and will enable a proper archaeological investigation to be carried out.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Seeks that the burial site dating back to about 1841 at 28 Westchester Drive be included in a property listing in SCHED2 - Heritage Structures. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Tawa Historical Society	386.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the SCHED2 - Heritage Structures listing of Item 60 (Elsdon Best Memorial) should be amended to include an enlarged area encompassing the Tawa War Memorial at the Northern end of Oxford Street, and the World War I memorial rock (recently moved from Willowbank Park).</p> <p>Considers that it is appropriate to enlarge (or add to) the existing memorial area to include the other memorials now in the area.</p> <p>Considers that the Enlarged Memorial area will meet the following heritage values: A, C, D, E, F</p>	Amend Item 60 (Elsdon Best Memorial) in SCHED2 - Heritage Structures to include an enlarged area encompassing the Tawa War Memorial at the Northern end of Oxford Street, and the World War I memorial rock (recently moved from Willowbank Park).	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.121	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support in part	SCHED2 is partially supported and additional Heritage Structures are proposed.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures with amendment.	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 2

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.122	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that SCHED2 should include the City to Sea bridge and Civic Square. It should include all features associated with the City to Sea Bridge, including the decking, the steps, the sculptures: and the paving, steps, sculptures, water features and other items which comprise the original design for the square, including the walkway which links the two levels of the above features.	Amend SCHED2 - Heritage Structures to include: - The City to Sea Bridge and all associated features, - Civic Square.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose	The submitter seeks to include the City to Sea bridge and Civic Square as heritage structures. While Willis Bond and Company Limited appreciate the reasons for the submission and are supportive of protecting historic heritage, we agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga(sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.36	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.105	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified, with amendments	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.106	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports the addition of new structures to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified	Accept in part	No
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Not specified	Considers that 28 Robieson Street may have more heritage protection than the bucket fountain and considers this to be odd. The fountain has high community value and the fact that it is not listed suggests there are issues with the way the Council is identifying and prioritising historic heritage within the city. Queries why some buildings and architects attract attention but others do not and notes Burren and Keen largely appear to be ignored in the literary history and heritage of the city. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Sophie Kahn	FS76.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	The Submitters (415) point to the inexplicability of the way structures of infinitely more heritage value to the community are not proposed for listing (such as the bucket fountain) but lowvalue structures are.  They (415) also point to the fact that the WCC has removed several public structures of extremely high heritage value to the community from the Plan (eg. Public library) whilst forcing extremely low-value privately owned structures on it. One can only conjecture why. Could it be the WCC recognises the burden listing inflicts on owners and does not wish that on themselves?  The Submitters (415) suggest the WCC's process for identifying structures is broken. The further submitter concurs. Kahn House is of extremely low-value to the community and absolutely no evidence exists to suggest any more than a handful of individuals (many of whom do not even reside in this city and who have never actually seen Kahn House) wish Kahn House to be protected.	Amend / Remove item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage buildings.  Seeks that an independent Body is hired to complete a full review and audit of the the way WCC is identifying which structures require listing on the Plan and which don't.  A review to understand why WCC is identifying three times the number of homes requiring heritage status relative to total housing stock as compared to Auckland City Council.  Require that the WCC provide full quantitative and qualitative data and evidence to support their forcing private homes on the plan.	No decision sought in primary submission	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jean Morgan	5.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	The entirety of Porritt Avenue in Mt Victoria should be a Heritage Area to retain the history of the area. It is an unbroken streetscape in the city. (Option A)	Retain Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept	No
Barry Insull	32.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that last names in Item 38 required protections are not up to date. Identification of each of the baches at Mestanes Bay is both unclear and generally reflects earlier times.	Seeks that last names in SCHED3 (Heritage Areas), Item 38 (Mestanes Bay Baches) be updated to reflect current leases.	Reject	No
Barry Insull	32.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that last names in Item 39 required protections are not up to date. Identification of each of the baches both at Red Rocks is both unclear and generally reflects earlier times.	Seeks that last names in SCHED3 (Heritage Areas), Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) be updated to reflect current leases.	Reject	No
Barry Insull	32.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) in SCHED3 fails to include the wording "Historic Area" and should be amended.	Seeks that HNZPT of column, Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) make mention of Heritage Area.	Reject	No
Barry Insull	32.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of Red Rocks Baches in SCHED3.	Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Gregory Webber	33.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Green Street is given heritage protection to match Coromandel Street and Wilson Street as these have similar era housing	Seeks that Green Street is included as a Heritage Area	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.220	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
E W Limited	45.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the existing building at 241 Tinakori Road may be on the site of an 1870s retail building but extensive modifications have left very little of the original building.  As the exterior was completely rebuilt in the 1920s and the interior has also been altered, it does not represent an 1870s retail building or even a heavily modified version.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that 241 Tinakori Road should either be excluded from the SCHED46 - Ascot Street Heritage Area;  or be assigned a heritage status of 1, "Neutral impact on heritage area";  or, at most, 2, "Contributes to the values of the heritage area".	Accept in part	Yes
Phil Kelliher	58.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports that Porritt Avenue is zoned Heritage Area.	Retain Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as a Heritage Area.	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.40	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phil Kelliher	58.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas:  1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896 3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.41	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Elice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.58	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Opposes SCHED3-Heritage Areas to the extent that the Truby King Historic Reserve is not included on the schedule.	Retain SCHED3-Heritage Areas with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.27	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	OHS generally supports currently scheduled heritage areas in the wider Wellington area and HNZPTs proposals.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.37	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage areas in Wellington and HNZPTs amendment proposals.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.59	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 (Historic Areas) should include the Truby King historic area as it is included in the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as an historic area (list number 7040).  Acknowledges that several individual buildings within this historic area have been included in Schedule 1 (Historic buildings), but considers that the Truby King historic area as a whole, including the gardens, landscaping, and settings of the buildings, has significant heritage values and merits inclusion in SCHED3.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include a Truby King Heritage Area (HNZPT#) 7040.	Accept	yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.60	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Opposes SCHED3-Heritage Areas to the extent that there are minor errors and missing New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero references on the schedule.	[Inferred Decision requested] Seeks that all SCHED3 - Heritage Area entries are checked for accuracy in terms of address, legal descriptions and Heritage New Zealand Listing number.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.61	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The SCHED3 Item 5 HNZPT # should be amended to reflect that the Heritage Area also incorporates the 'Dominion Observatory Historic Area'.	Amend SCHED3 Item 5 (Wellington Botanic Gardens) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) Wellington Botanic Gardens Historic Area, 7573 <u>and</u> Dominion Observatory Historic Area, 7033	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.62	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 14 does not have a NZHPT # reference and name should be changed.	Amend SCHED3 Item 14 (Parliamentary Precinct) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Government Centre Historic Area, 7035</u>	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.63	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 19 does not have a NZHPT # reference and name should be changed.	Amend SCHED3 Item 19 (Wright's Hill Gun Emplacement) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Wrights Hill Fortress Historic Place Category 1, 7543</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.64	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 21 does not have a NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 21 (Old Coach Road) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Old Coach Road Historic Place Category 1, 7396</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.65	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 22 does not have a NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 22 (Evans Bay Patent Slip) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Evans Bay Patent Slip Historic Place Category 2, 2895</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.66	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 27 should include both the Cuba Street Historic Area and the Footscray Avenue Historic Area and this should be reflected in the NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 27 (Cuba Street) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Cuba Street Historic Area, 7209 and Footscray Avenue Historic Area, 7209</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.67	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 28 is incorporated by the Government Centre Historic Area (although not all the boundaries correspond exactly in all aspects) and this should be reflected in the NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 28 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Government Centre Historic Area, 7035</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.68	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 39 has an incorrect NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 39 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Red Rocks Baches Historic Area, 7509</u>	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.69	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 40 has an incorrect NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 40 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows:  (HNZPT #) <u>Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Remains, Historic Place Category 2, 9032</u>	Accept	Yes
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	Opposes Armour Avenue (Item 41 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.  Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.  Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.	Delete Item 41 (Armour Avenue) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Doctors' Common Heritage Area (Item 42 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.	Reject	No
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Elizabeth Street Heritage Area (Item 43 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 43 (Elizabeth Street Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.	Reject	No
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 44 (Moir Street Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.	Reject	No
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (Item 45 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.	Reject	No
Phil Kelliher	FS57.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Supports evidence provided by the WCC for the inclusion of Porritt Ave into new Heritage Area (45) This addition recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place. Porritt Avenue recognised by experts as an important example of an intact late 19th / early 20th century streetscape. There are unlikely to be few others in Wellington from the same period that can match its overall integrity.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Turi & Jane Park	73.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is removed from the Moir Steet Heritage Area.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage Areas) to remove 134 Brougham Street from item 44 (Moir Street Heritage Area), with the following changes to Item 44 required:  1. Column 4 (Legal Descriptions) - delete the legal description for 134 Brougham Street as follows:  <del>Brougham Street – 134 (PT SEC 294 TOWN OF WELLINGTON) ...</del>  2. Column 5 (Protections Sought) add 134 Brougham Street to the exclusions as follows: ... <u>134 Brougham Street</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Tim Bright	75.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should be increased to include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Amend the Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas include Tutchen Avenue.	Reject	No
Tim Bright	75.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that a new Heritage Area should be created for Claremont Grove.	Amend SCHED3 to add a Heritage Area for Claremont Grove.	Accept in part	No
Judith Graykowski	80.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the extent of Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.	Reject	No
Joanna Newman	85.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue. Considers that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape. The street was created by the Tutchen, on their estate, before being taken over by the Council. Council is also proposing to add the building which was the original Tutchen home, backing onto Tutchen Avenue, to the District Plan heritage list. Tutchen Avenue is included in the 'primary/contributory' pre-1930 character area in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review commissioned by Wellington City Council. Housing on the street is just as 'primary/contributory' to character as the overall housing stock of Porritt, Armour and Albany Avenues. There is only one building (No. 10 and 12) which is not original. An important figure in Wellington's history – Wellington Pilot, William Shilling – lived at No. 1 Tutchen Avenue for many years. It is topographically a prominent site in this part of Mt Victoria and in the middle of the proposed Porritt Avenue and Armour Avenue heritage areas. To allow a large concentration of four-storey, mixed-use apartments in the middle of this heritage area would destroy the character of both. The narrowness of the street – barely more than a drive-width – reflects its origins as a private way created by the Tutchen, who accessed the stables behind their Pirie Street residence via it. Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (No 45):  1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896 3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 12 Tutchen Avenue Built 1926, Rear of the listed building at 56 Pirie St.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Quayside Property Trust	104.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that 115 Brougham Street should not be included in Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as this site is not currently listed as a historical building within the operative District Plan or from Heritage New Zealand.</p> <p>The site is not accessible from Porritt Avenue and is generally cut off, so cannot allow for the enjoyment of historical architecture values.</p> <p>The site has undergone various types of work to alter the building.</p> <p>The people who might have stayed at the property is not significant.</p> <p>The site has no street scape bonus and low level of design integrity.</p> <p>The site does not meet physical and social values.</p> <p>The site does not meet representativeness because this building was constructed and used as a private school by the McDonnell family, and likely funded by the profits of land wars that have been damaging to the Māori culture.</p> <p>The site has no visual connection to Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>WCC will manage designs and alterations because it is within a character precinct.</p>	Amend Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to remove 115 Brougham Street.	Accept	Yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Quayside Property Trust	104.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that 115 Brougham Street (The site) not currently listed as a historical building within the operative district plan or from Heritage New Zealand.</p> <p>Considers that the site is not accessible from Porritt Avenue and is generally cut off, so cannot allow for the enjoyment of historical architecture values.</p> <p>Considers that the site has undergone various types of work to alter the building.</p> <p>Considers that the people who might have stayed at the property is not significant.</p> <p>Considers that the site has no street scape bonus and low level of design integrity.</p> <p>Considers that the site does not meet physical and social values.</p> <p>Considers that the site does not meet representativeness because this building was constructed and used as a private school by the McDonnell family, and likely funded by the profits of land wars that have been damaging to the Māori culture.</p> <p>Considers that the site has no visual connection to Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that WCC will manage designs and alterations because it is within a character precinct.</p>	<p>Seeks that 115 Brougham Street has its Contributing Building status removed.</p> <p>Amend Item 45 as follows:</p> <p><del>Brougham Street – 115 (PT LOT 2 DP 12250 LOT 1 DP 34813 – ROWENA HOSTEL)</del></p>	Accept	Yes
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>115 Brougham Street should not be removed from the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area because of its historical significance, it can be seen from there, and the former school also had a connection with a small school and building still extant in Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>Do not remove 115 Brougham Street from the Heritage Area.</p>	Disallow	Reject	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is integral to Porritt Avenue surrounds. Considers that Tutchens created the street.</p> <p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is included in the Boffa Miskell report.</p> <p>Considers that William Shilling lived at Tutchen Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that allowing high development in Tutchen Avenue would impact character of surrounding character areas.</p> <p>Considers that the narrow nature of the street is evidence that it was a private way created by Tutchens. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas:</p> <p>1 Tutchen Avenue 3 Tutchen Avenue 5 Tutchen Avenue 2 Tutchen Avenue 4 Tutchen Avenue 6 Tutchen Avenue 8 Tutchen Avenue 12 Tutchen Avenue</p>	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.201	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Claremont Grove represents the Victoria Bowling Club.</p> <p>Considers that Claremont Grove and Victoria Bowling Club were a hub for Mt Vic in early days.</p> <p>Considers that houses of many founders still exist around Mt Vic.</p> <p>Considers that two of the houses in the area are on the District Plan Heritage Building list already and high development of surrounding properties would destroy heritage value of those two properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add a new Heritage Area for Claremont Grove that includes the following properties:</p> <p>1 Claremont Grove 3 Claremont Grove 5 Claremont Grove 7 Claremont Grove 9 Claremont Grove 15 Claremont Grove 16 Austin Street 18 Austin Street 20 Austin Street 22 Austin Street 11 Austin Street 13 Austin Street 17 Austin Street</p>	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.202	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that lower Ellice Street is composed of significant Victorian houses.</p> <p>Considers that the relative integrity of the houses, their homogeneity and shared history and picturesque qualities mark this as an area of high heritage value."</p> <p>Considers that two houses on the southern side of Ellice St, no.28 &amp; 32, compliment the houses on the northern side of the street.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add a new Heritage Area for lower Ellice Street that includes the following properties:</p> <p>21 Ellice Street 23 Ellice Street 25 Ellice Street 27 Ellice Street 28 Ellice Street 31 Ellice Street 32 Ellice Street 33 Ellice Street 35 Ellice Street 37 Ellice Street 39 Ellice Street 41 Ellice Street</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for a map of the area].</p>	Reject	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.203	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.	Reject	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the extent of Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.	Reject	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new SCHED3 - Heritage Area for Claremont Grove.	Accept in part	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new SCHED3 - Heritage Area for lower Ellice Street as detailed in Michael Kelly's Mt Victoria Heritage Study (2017).	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED3- Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Te Ngākau Civic Square should be included on SCHED2 - Heritage areas.  [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Te Ngākau Civic Square to SCHED2 - Heritage Areas.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.5	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitters seek to include Te Ngākau Civic Square as a heritage area. While Willis Bond and Company Limited appreciate the reasons for the submissions and are supportive of protecting historic heritage, we agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga(sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow / For clarity, we support the inclusion of Wellington Central Library as a heritage building within SCHED1.	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria	Retain Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.49	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Supports the Thorndon Heritage Area (DP ref #46) but considers it is too small and should be extended north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.	Retain Item 46 (Ascot Street) of Schedule 2 - Heritage Areas, but extend north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.	Reject	No
Craig Forrester	210.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Heritage area over Moir Street. Identified in SCHED3- Heritage Areas	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage areas (#44)	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (No 45) as follows:</p> <p>1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896            3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894            5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894            2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896            4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894            6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896            8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896            12 Tutchen Avenue Built 1926, Rear of the listed building at 56 Pirie St.</p>	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.179	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Jane O'Loughlin	FS98.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The Porritt St Heritage Area should include Tutchen avenue. Agree that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape. If it remained outside the heritage area and was developed to up to 6 stories, this would significantly impact the surrounding heritage and character areas.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Supports the addition of a new Heritage Area at Claremont Grove.</p> <p>Considers that Claremont Grove is historically important due to the Victoria Bowling Club.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Heritage Area to SCHED3 - Heritage Areas for Claremont Grove, with the following properties (Significance of properties on original submission) as follows:</p> <p>1 Claremont Grove            3 Claremont Grove            5 Claremont Grove            7 Claremont Grove            9 Claremont Grove            15 Brougham Street            16 Austin Street            18 Austin Street            20 Austin Street            22 Austin Street            11 Austin Street            13 Austin Street            17 Austin Street</p>	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.180	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community.</p> <p>The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population.</p> <p>Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access.</p> <p>New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing.</p> <p>Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas is amended to include any areas that contain pre-1935 buildings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that evidence from the Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) supports Hay Street being a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area.</p> <p>[Refer to Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) provided with submission for details].</p>	Seeks that Hay Street area is amended to be a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED3- Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Te Ngākau Civic Square should be included on SCHED2 - Heritage areas [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Te Ngākau Civic Square to SCHED2 - Heritage Areas	Reject	No
Adam King	246.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Oppose the Inclusion of 12A Parliament Street, Thorndon, Wellington in the Ascot Street Heritage Area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain as notified with amendment below.	Accept	Yes
Adam King	246.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers Historic Heritage Area Evaluation report provided refers to properties within the proposed heritage area as having characteristics which are not consistent with that of 12A Parliament Street.	Seeks to remove 12a Parliament St (Legal Description Part Lot 8 DP 632 and Part Section 522 Town of Wellington) from Heritage Area 46 - Ascot Street, Hill Street, Glenbervie Terrace, Parliament Street, Sydney Street West, Tinakori Road.	Accept	Yes
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of Bolton St Cemetery as a heritage area.	Retain Item 2 (Bolton Street Cemetery) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Cherie Jacobson	251.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept	No
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was designated a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness.</p> <p>The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that if Salisbury Garden Court is not exempt from all Heritage Zone Controls except HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures ) and HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures), then Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) is deleted from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.188	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend Schedule 3 (Heritage areas) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.189	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 20 as follows: <del>TBC</del> <u>A, B, C, E, F</u>	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.190	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	<p>Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 21 as follows:</p> <p>Includes all above and below ground features associated with the Old Coach Road including - pathway and original track formation that underlies the road; original earthworks cuttings.</p> <p><del>Exclusions – TBC</del></p>	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.191	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED 3 (Heritage structures) to remove 50, 52, 61 and 63 Elizabeth Street from Item 43 - Elizabeth Street Heritage area.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.192	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 134 Brougham Street should be retained within the Moir Street heritage area as this adds to the collective heritage values of the context, however, exclude the rear addition from the extent of 134 Brougham Street.	<p>Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 44 as follows:</p> <p>Exclusions - the following buildings or structures have been identified as non-heritage</p> <p>2, 2a Moir Street  <u>134 Brougham Street (rear addition only)</u>            33 Moir Street            existing accessory buildings and minor residential units as at 18 July 2022</p>	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Although modified, 134 Brougham Street is very important to the Moir Street Heritage Area because it is the house of Rev Moir and is at the main 'gateway' to the area.</p> <p>We do not support removal of 33 Moir Street from the Heritage Area, however.</p>	<p>Allow / Allow submission in part.</p> <p>Clarify that:</p> <p>- 33 Moir Street is not proposed for removal</p> <p>- What exactly is meant by “the rear” of 134 Brougham Street because the way it is set out in the submission is not clear.</p>	Reject	no

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.193	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers it necessary to remove 12A Parliament Street as a contributing building and instead identify this as a non-heritage building in SCHED3 to reflect mapping change – SCHED3-46.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 as follows:  Exclusions - the following buildings or structures have been identified as non-heritage -6, 8, 19, 19C, 19D, 19E, 19F, 21, 23 Glenbervie Tce  <u>12A Parliament Street</u> 111 Hill Street existing accessory buildings and minor residential units as at 18 July 2022 N.B.: 119 Hill St and 2 and 4 Parliament St are the same property. 9 Ascot St and 206 Sydney St W are the same property.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.194	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 as follows:  (...)  Parliament Street - 1 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 2 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 4 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 6 (ALL PLAN A 1230), 8 (LOT 1 DP 60215 - UNIT PLAN 60755), 9 (LOT 1 DP 5571 - 14 M2 CARPAD ON ROAD RESERVE), 10 (LOT 1 DP 85326), 11 (LOT 1 DP 303746 LOT 2 DP 5571 - 16 M2CARPAD & LAND ON ROAD RESERVE), 12 (LOT 2 DP 85326 - 13 M2 DOUBLE GARAGE ON ROAD RESERVE), <del>12A (Part Lot 8 DP 632)</del> , 13 (LOT 2 DP 303746), 14 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON - 12 M2CARPAD ON ROAD RESERVE),  (...)	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.195	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	16 Parliament Street is not currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 46.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to list 16 Parliament Street as an exclusion (non-heritage) property.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.196	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	8 Glenbervie Terrace is currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 – 46 but should be a Heritage Area listed building.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 – Item 46 to include 8 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.197	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	8 Glenbervie Terrace is currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 – 46 but should be a Heritage Area listed building.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to remove 8 Glenbervie Terrace from the exclusion (non-heritage building) list.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.198	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is not currently a Heritage Area listed building in SCHED3 – Item 46.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to include 11 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.199	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 21 Glenbervie Terrace is listed as a Heritage Area listed building and an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but should only be an exclusion.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to remove 21 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.200	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers 21 Glenbervie Terrace is listed as a Heritage Area listed building and an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but should only be an exclusion.	Seeks to retain 21 Glenbervie Terrace as an exclusion (nonheritage) property in SCHED3 (Heritage structures)	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.201	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 23 Glenbervie Terrace is 6 flats, but in the exclusion list it is only listed as 23 Glenbervie Terrace.	Amend the exclusion (non-heritage building) list in SCHED 3 – Item 46 as follows: (...) <del>23 Glenbervie Tce</del> 23/1, 23/2, 23/3, 23/4, 23/5, and 23/6 <u>Glenbervie Terrace</u>	Accept	yes

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Everard Aspell	270.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Mount Victoria.	Reject	No
Everard Aspell	270.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Mount Cook.	Reject	No
Everard Aspell	270.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Thorndon.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.113	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Part of WCC's summary:                      ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.                      ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.                      There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Everard Aspell	270.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Aro Valley.	Reject	No
Everard Aspell	270.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Newtown.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Everard Aspell	270.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Berhampore.	Reject	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.52	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the area has special historical qualities.</p>	<p>Seeks that the following sites are added as a new heritage area:</p> <p>Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.</p> <p>Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p> <p>Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.</p>	Reject	No
Marilyn Powell	281.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Hobson Street area has many housing examples of the Victorian merchant-class.</p> <p>Hobson street is a suggested tourist walking trail to visit Katherine Mansfield House, amongst other notable buildings.</p> <p>Pre-covid tour buses included Hobson Street on their route.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add the area of High Density Residential Zone at Hobson Street.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.75	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the rows of cottages and villas to the west of Epuni Street have heritage value and should be scheduled as heritage, as these are a significant factor in the attractiveness of the area, and the HRZ zoning will destroy this.</p>	<p>Seeks that the rows and cottages to the west of Epuni Street are included as a heritage area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No



## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Tyler	357.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that 34 Hawker Street should no be included in SCHED3-Heritage Areas. The submitter notes that the property was purchased with no classification and a classification will now significantly reduce the value, enjoyment, and usage of the property. The adjacent property has a proposed 21m height, which will significantly increase its value. There is a big disparity in property values of adjacent properties due to the classification process.	Amend SCHED3-Heritage Areas to remove 34 Hawker Street from Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage area).	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	This house has high historical and architectural significance, as detailed in Wellington City Council's Mt Victoria Heritage Study Report, June 2017, and should therefore not be removed from the Doctor's Common Heritage Area.  We acknowledge the owner's concern, however, that allowing 21m development right next door may devalue his property and re-iterate that such zoning is completely inappropriate for Mt Victoria.  Retain 34 Hawker Street in the Doctor's Common Heritage Area.	Disallow	Accept	No
Richard Herbert	360.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Tawa Cemetery should be classified as a Historic Reserve in SCHED3. This area should be classified as a Heritage Area, in keeping with other historic cemeteries of Wellington; Bolton Cemetery, Mount Street Cemetery and Johnsonville Cemetery. In a recent review of the WCC Cemeteries Management Plan (adopted June 2021) (Ref Chapter 4.1.2 Heritage recognition and protection) a proposed action was to "Consider scheduling the Tawa Cemetery as a heritage area in the district plan." This Amendment to the Proposed District Plan would give effect to that action point of the earlier review of Cemeteries Management Plan.	Add a new Item in SCHED3 - Heritage Area for the Tawa Cemetery, as follows:  Address - 307 Main Road, Tawa Name - Tawa Cemetery Legal Descriptions – PT SEC 52 PORIRUA DISTRICT-CLOSED CEMETERY Protection required – Includes all above and below ground features Values – A, B, C, E, F	Reject	No
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the overlay boundaries at Albion Battery and Mine Remains should be redefined. No part of the Albion Battery and mine remains are located on Te Kamaru Station. The Albion Battery is located to the west of the boundary with Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd's land.	Delete Item 40 (Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that HNZPT#1 (Aro Valley Cottages) in SCHED3 should be amended to include some of the oldest and most significant addresses in this area that have not been included. For example, 43 Palmer Street and the cottages on either side (39, 41 and 45 Palmer Street) are part the same original lot that corresponds to the Aro Street cottages at 32-38 Aro Street, , which back onto the Palmer Street properties. Significant properties on Aro Street have been designated High Density. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the Item 1 (Aro Valley Cottages) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the adjacent properties on Palmer Street.	Reject	No
Margaret Cochran	382.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Thorndon Historic Area should be extended to retain its existing boundaries as the new boundaries in the PDP are arbitrary and make no sense.	Seeks to amend Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas with respect to how the Thorndon Historic Area is defined and to retain the existing boundaries. [Inferred decision sought]	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.292	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.128	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out for the former State Insurance building (Ref 181), Argosy also opposes the Athfield addition being included in the Stout Street Precinct heritage area.	Amend Schedule 3, DP Ref 28 as follows:  Exclusions - The following buildings, structures and sites are identified as non-heritage: · Façade (above second floor), Courts Building, cnr, Stout and Whitmore Sts. · <u>1998 three storey addition designed by Athfield architects to former State Insurance Building</u>	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.129	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Argosy's property at 360-366 Lambton Quay is recognised as part of the BNZ / Head Offices heritage area	Retain listing for Ref 30 as notified.	Accept	No
Tawa Historical Society	386.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include the Tawa Cemetery (Main Road, Linden).  Notes that other cemeteries are included as Heritage Areas. The submitter understands that the Tawa cemetery is currently on the WCC's radar for recognition but wish to formally recommend its addition.  Considers that the Tawa Cemetery will meet the following heritage values: A, B, C, D, E, F	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tawa Cemetery as a listed item.	Reject	No
Tawa Historical Society	386.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include the former Tawa Flat Railway Station site on Duncan Street.  The former Tawa Flat Railway Station site was a major communications route through the area (since superseded) and part of Tawa's link to the outside world during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.  Considers that the former Tawa Flat Railway Station site will meet the following heritage values: A, B, C, E, F	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the former Tawa Flat Railway Station as a listed item.	Reject	No
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Supports the new Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Retain the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon as notified, subject to increasing the extent of the area encompassed by Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Reject	No
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon should be expanded in spatial extent to better reflect the heritage of Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Amend the extent of the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon by expanding the spatial areas.	Reject	No
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon should be expanded in spatial extent to better reflect the heritage of Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Amend the mapping to expand the spatial areas of the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include a new Heritage Area in Newtown around Emmitt Street, Green Street and Wilson Street to reflect the heritage of Newtown.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include a Heritage Area around Emmitt Street, Green Street and Wilson Street.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.96	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage area) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as a Heritage Area.	Accept	No
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.	Retain the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage area (#40) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.25	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.	Amend the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage Area (#40) description to more accurately define the heritage features.	Accept in part	yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.107	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified, with amendments	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.108	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the addition of new areas to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED3- Heritage areas as notified	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.109	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers the character areas will meet the criteria for listing.	Seeks that the character areas are assessed for inclusion in the district plan as heritage areas.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.112	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Acknowledges the building at 1 Grey Street is in scheduled heritage area, identified as Post Office Square. The building is listed as a non-heritage building.	Retain item 16 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept	No
Peter Fordyce	431.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Heritage areas are supported, but should be extended.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Anna Kemble Welch	434.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Considers that the Newtown Shopping Centre includes a small number of Historic Buildings of significance that should be retained as closely as feasible to their historic presence. However, the rest of the Newtown shopping centre is identified as a Historic Area (Part 4, Schedule 3, Heritage Areas, DP reference #33, Newtown Shopping Centre)	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, with amendment.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Anna Kemble Welch	434.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Newtown Shopping Centre includes a small number of Historic Buildings of significance that should be retained as closely as feasible to their historic presence. However, the rest of the Newtown shopping centre is identified as a Historic Area (Part 4, Schedule 3, Heritage Areas, DP reference #33, Newtown Shopping Centre)	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to remove buildings of less heritage significance in the Newtown Shopping Centre (Item 33).  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.62	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	HPW supports the retention of the Newtown heritage shopping area, since it allows for 21/22m height limits for sites to the rear of the shop frontages. The interface between this proposal and that of The Urban Activation Lab needs resolution.  [Interred reference to submission 434.13]	Disallow	Accept	No
David Lee	454.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Elizabeth St Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas.	Retain DP Ref 43 in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.205	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	No
David Lee	454.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	considers that Tutchen Avenue should be included in the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas. It is a strange anomaly that this charming little cul-de-sac, bearing the name of the original dairy farm there, has been left out.	Add Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.206	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
David Lee	454.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all Heritage Areas in the PDP.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.	Accept in part	No
Christina Mackay	478.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Submitter supports the proposed heritage area designations in Mt Victoria and Thorndon	Retain Heritage areas in Thorndon and Mount Victoria with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Christina Mackay	478.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas in Thorndon should be amended to include the 'thorndon areas' in the operative district plan.	Amend SCHED3- Heritage areas to include the 'Thorndon Areas' of the operative district plan.	Reject	No
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Item 46 (Ascot Street) should be extended to include the adjoining areas of Upton Terrace and St Mary Streets as they are of similar age and design to those in the heritage area.	Amend Item 46 (Ascot Street) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the adjoining areas of Upton Terrace and St Mary Streets.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.45	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of those identified heritage areas.	Allow	Reject	No
David Wu	489.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the PDP allows height limits twice as high (21m vs 11m) in Tutchen Avenue as the immediate street around it (such as Porritt Avenue) and should be added to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area.	Amend Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage area) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.	Reject	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Helen Heffernan	491.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, as Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are adjacent, these should be combined.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas by combining the area of Item 46 (Ascot Street) with Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) to create a combined Heritage Area named the "Thorndon Heritage Area".	Reject	No
Helen Heffernan	491.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, as Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are adjacent, these should be combined.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas by combining the area of Item 46 (Ascot Street) with Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) to create a combined Heritage Area named the "Thorndon Heritage Area".	Reject	No
Helen Heffernan	491.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Opposes the name of Item 46 "Ascot Street Heritage Area" in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as there are several other streets included in this area.	If Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are not combined as suggested by this submission;  Amend the name of Item 46 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to the "Thorndon Heritage Area" or "Thorndon Residential Heritage Area".	Reject	No
Helen Heffernan	491.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	If Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are not combined as suggested by this submission;  Amend the name of Item 35 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to the "Tinakori Road Village Heritage Area".	Accept in part	No

## Historic Heritage – Schedule 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / General TREE	Support	<p>Supports the provisions to protect notable trees.</p> <p>Considers that these are an important part of the quality of the public space and protect genetic resources.</p>	Retain the Notable Trees chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / New TREE	Amend	<p>Considers that that the provisions of the Thames Coromandel District Plan, as they relate to the management of Kauri Dieback disease, should be adopted into the Proposed District Plan where appropriate.</p> <p>Schedule 6 of the Wellington City Proposed District Plan lists several Kauri as Notable Trees and there are likely to be other Kauri within Wellington’s boundaries. Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment, and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree (“the kauri hygiene zone”) can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.</p>	<p>Add provisions to address the management of Kauri Dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease.</p> <p>Provide clear guidance for the management of Kauri Dieback disease, such as laid out in the Thames Coromandel District Plan.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.152	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Oppose in part	Seeks rewording to ensure Notable Trees do not include pest species that are registered weed species as per pest definition of the proposed district plan.	<p>Amend TREE-O1 (Purpose):</p> <p>Notable trees are recognised for their contribution to the city’s amenity, history, ecology and sense of place and cultural value to mana whenua <u>and don’t include pest species.</u></p>	Reject	No

## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Support	Supports the recognition of the cultural value of notable trees for mana whenua	Retain Objective TREE-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.153	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O2	Support	Supports TREE-O2.	Retain TREE-O2 (Protecting notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O2	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O2 (Protecting notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.154	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O3	Support	Supports TREE-O3.	Retain TREE-O3 (Maintaining notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O3	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O3 (Maintaining notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.155	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P1	Oppose in part	Seeks policy direction to enable further surveys of Notable Trees and provide for the inclusion of additional trees in SCHED6 over the life of the Plan.	Amend TREE-P1 (Identifying notable trees):  Identify notable trees having regard to: a. Tree health, condition and ecological value; <u>x. Age, height and irreplaceability;</u> b. Amenity value and community benefit; c. Notability and recognition; and d. Significant cultural and heritage value. <u>Provide opportunity to add to SCHED6 by:</u>  <u>a. requiring assessments of trees for subdivision, development and land use consent applications;</u> <u>b. supporting survey initiatives;</u> <u>c. supporting plan change processes to update SCHED6</u>	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.57	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P1	Support	Supports the policies relating to notable trees, except as specified below. It is important that notable trees are identified according to robust criteria and appropriate controls are in place for maintenance and works in proximity to trees	Retain TREE-P1 (Identifying notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.156	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P2	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P2.	Retain TREE-P2 (Support for landowners) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.58	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P2	Support	Supports the policies relating to notable trees, except as specified below. It is important that notable trees are identified according to robust criteria and appropriate controls are in place for maintenance and works in proximity to trees	Retain TREE-P2 (Support for landowners) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.157	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P3.	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No

## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.177	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Support policy as worded as it allows for trimming or pruning of notable trees where the works prevent interface with footpaths, property, or network utilities. This will provide for trimming or pruning of notable trees where it is essential for the safe and efficient operation of State Highway infrastructure.	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.59	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Supports TREE-P3, as it reflects that there are circumstances where it is reasonable or necessary to prune notable trees, including to prevent notable trees being damaged where the canopy overhangs footpaths. For example, the notable trees at 7 Waterloo Quay overhang the footpath on Waterloo Quay and pruning is necessary to prevent the trees from becoming a nuisance (and potential safety hazard) to pedestrians	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.158	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P4	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P4.	Retain TREE-P4 (Other trimming and pruning) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.60	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P4	Support	Supports TREE-P4 as it allows trimming or pruning of notable trees which is consistent with other criteria in which works to notable trees are appropriate. There are practical reasons which may not fit into TREE-P3 but in which works to notable trees are needed, and it is important that these are provided for	Retain TREE-P4 (Other trimming or pruning) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.159	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P5	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P5.	Retain TREE-P5 (Managing activities in the root protection area) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P5	Support	Supports TREE-P5 which places appropriate considerations for works within the root protection area of a tree. Argosy has also made a submission on the definition for root protection area below	Retain TREE-P5 (Managing activities in the root protection area) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.160	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and Relocation) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.178	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Support policy as worded, as it allows repositioning or relocating of notable trees where necessary to enable development and operation of infrastructure. It is noted that there is no rule to enable repositioning or relocating of notable trees for these purposes. Waka Kotahi submit that a rule be included to enable repositioning, relocation, or destruction for purposes specified in Tree-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and Relocation) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Supports TREE-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and relocation) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.161	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P7.	Retain TREE-P7 (Destruction) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.179	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support in part	Support policy.	Retain TREE-P7 (Destruction), subject to amendments.	Accept in part	No



## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.180	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Amend	Considers amendments appropriate to enable destruction of a notable tree where necessary for purposes of maintaining or developing infrastructure. It is noted that the policy requires repositioning and relocation to be explored in the first instance. Waka Kotahi also submit that a rule be included in this chapter to enable demolition where is necessary in enabling efficient development and operation of infrastructure	Amend TREE-P7 (Destruction) as follows:  Only allow the destruction of notable trees where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The tree poses a serious and imminent threat to the safety of people or property; or 2. The tree is dead, or in a state of terminal decline; or 3. <u>Destruction of the tree is necessary to enable the efficient development and operation of infrastructure</u> 4. There are no reasonable alternatives including: a. Trimming and pruning; and b. Repositioning and relocation.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support in part	Supports TREE-P7 however it is more appropriate to refer to 'removal' rather than 'destruction'.	Amend TREE-P7 (Destruction) to refer to "destruction and removal".	Accept	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.162	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support	Generally supports TREE-R1.	Retain TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.181	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support	Support permitted activity status for trimming and pruning of notable trees for specified purposes – the permitted activity status enables Waka Kotahi to trim or prune notable trees where necessary to enable maintaining the safety and operation of infrastructure – including provision for emergency works.	Retain TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support in part	Supports TREE-R1.1 to the extent that it enables trimming and pruning of trees to be permitted in appropriate circumstances, for the reasons set out above. Argosy also supports the default activity status for activities that do not comply with TREE-R1 to be restricted discretionary. However, it is considered that it is also appropriate for trimming and pruning to be permitted where the works will maintain or improve tree health. Policy TREE-P3 recognises that trimming and pruning should be allowed where the works will maintain or improve tree health, but this is not reflected in Rule TREE-R1. This is appropriate to allow for ongoing maintenance to protect the health of notable trees. We've also suggested some amendments for clarity.	Amend TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted Where: <del>a. The trimming and pruning is necessary to:</del> i. <u>The trimming and pruning is necessary to</u> comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; or ii. The works are necessary to prevent interference with footpaths, buildings, structures or network utilities and are undertaken to the minimum extent required to prevent interference and TREE-S1 is complied with; or iii. The works involve the removal of broken branches, dead wood and diseased vegetation and TREE-S1 is complied with; or <u>iv The works will maintain or improve tree health and TREE-S1 is complied with; or</u> iv. The works are essential due to a serious and imminent threat to the safety of people or damage to property and TREE-S2 is complied with.	Reject	no
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.163	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support	Generally supports TREE-R2.	Retain TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.182	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support	Support permitted activity status as it will enable Waka Kotahi to undertake works within the root zone for the purposes of undergoing maintenance and/or repair of infrastructure.	Retain TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support in part	Supports rule TREE-R2.1 however considers that it also needs to refer to existing footpaths.	Amend TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as follows: b. The works are for the maintenance and repair of existing <u>footpaths</u> , roading, transport or other infrastructure.	Reject	no
Jeremy Partridge	102.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Amend	Opposes Tree-R3.1.b (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) which allows the removal of a Notable Tree without a consent if it is deemed to be 'in terminal decline' by a Technician Arborist as a permitted activity.  Considers that as tree's age they inevitably decline and may develop large cavities, die back and be consumed by decay fungi. Such trees may be safe or can be managed to keep them safe, and may live for another 100 years. Such trees could be classed as veteran and remain very important for their historical, cultural and ecological value.	Delete the ability to remove Notable Trees as a permitted activity in TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) if it is deemed to be in terminal decline by a Technician Arborist.	Accept	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.164	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Generally supports TREE-R3.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.183	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Support the inclusion of emergency works in the permitted activity status for destruction, relocation, or removal of notable trees.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Supports the rule as it is recognised that in some instances it will be appropriate for notable trees to be destroyed, relocated or removed.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation, or removal of notable trees) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.165	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R4	Support	Generally supports TREE-R4.	Retain TREE-R4 (All other land use activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.184	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R4	Support	Support discretionary activity status for all other land use activities as it provides pathway for other relocation, removal, or destruction of notable trees for infrastructure development and maintenance purposes	Retain TREE-R4 (All other land use activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R5	Support	Generally supports TREE-R5.	Retain TREE-R5 (The storage or discharge of any toxic substance within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Generally supports TREE-S1.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.185	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Considers this standard is appropriate and should be retained.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support	Generally supports TREE-S2.	Retain TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.186	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as notified.	Accept	No

## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support in part	Supports enabling emergency trimming or pruning work, is necessary. However, in the case of a true emergency it may be difficult to advise the Council of works at least one hour prior to the works commencing. This is particularly onerous as the activity would otherwise be permitted.	Amend TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as follows:  1. The works are undertaken or supervised by a works arborist and Council is advised at least 1 hour prior to the work commencing <u>or as soon as practicable after the works have occurred.</u>	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S3	Support	Generally supports TREE-S3.	Retain TREE-S3 (Certification that a scheduled notable tree is dead or in terminal decline) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.187	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S3	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S3 (Certification that a scheduled notable tree is dead or in terminal decline) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Oppose	Standard TREE-S4 should be deleted and relocated from the Notable Trees chapter to the Infrastructure – Other Overlays Sub-Chapter. The current wording is based on the Auckland Unitary Plan and was requested by the telecommunications submitters on the draft plan.	Delete TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) in order to relocate the provision in the Infrastructure - Other Overlays sub-chapter.	Accept in part	No
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Amend	TREE-S4 should be clarified and amended. A readability edit is recommended to make it clearer how the rule is intended to apply and how it has been interpreted in practice.	Amend TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as follows: ... 2. Excavation must be undertaken <u>by drilling machine at a depth of 1m or greater</u> , hand-digging, air spade, <u>or hydro vac or drilling machine</u> , within the root protection area <del>at a depth of 1m or greater;</del> ...	Accept in part	Yes
Jeremy Partridge	102.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Amend	Considers that TREE-S4.2 should be amended to remove the ability to use a hydrovac tool to remove soil around a Notable Tree's roots.  A hydrovac uses water at high pressure to dislodge and then suck away soil around tree roots. Unfortunately the high pressure also removes outer and inner bark and damages cambium which functionally kills tree roots.	Amend TREE-S4.2 (Works in the root protection area) to remove the ability to use a hydrovac tool to remove soil around a Notable Tree's roots.	Accept in part	yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support	Generally supports TREE-S4.	Retain TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.188	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area ) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Notable Trees Chapter

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support in part	Considers the standard is generally appropriate by requires some amendments for clarity. In addition, the area restriction for a single excavation of 1m <sup>2</sup> is not necessary when a control is applied of no more than 10% disturbance to the root protection area. Having a single excavation limit may lead to a number of smaller excavation areas to fit within the permitted activity rule, where one large excavation area would be better for the tree.	<p>Amend TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as follows:</p> <p>2. Excavation must be undertaken by <u>one or a combination of the following methods</u>:</p> <p>a) hand-digging, air <del>excavation spade</del>, hydro <del>excavation vae</del>; <u>and / or</u></p> <p>b) <u>directional drilling machine</u> within the root protection area at a depth of 1m or greater;</p> <p><del>3. The surface area of a single excavation must not exceed 1m<sup>2</sup>;</del></p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Any excavation machines ...</p>	Accept in part	Yes

## Notable Trees - Definitions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jeremy Partridge	102.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ROOT PROTECTION AREA	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed definition of a Root Protection Area, with the canopy spread/dripline method proposed by Council to determine a critical area of roots, will fail to protect an adequate area and volume of roots required to maintain the tree's health, functions and physiology.</p> <p>The 'dripline half height' method proposed in the PDP derives from a British Standard method which was withdrawn in 2005 and replaced with the '12 times stem diameter' method. The NZ Arboricultural Association supports a different method which is the '12 times stem diameter multiplier method' to determine the area of roots a tree requires to function and survive and this method is also used in the Australian, American and British Trees and Construction National Standards.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the definition of 'Root Protection Area' to use the 12 times stem diameter method recommended by the NZ Arboricultural Association and not be based on the dripline or half tree height method taken from BS5837 1991.	Accept	yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ROOT PROTECTION AREA	Oppose	Notes the definition of root protection area in the Proposed Plan uses the British Standard which has been proven not to be accurate. It is sought that this be updated with the methodology most commonly used by arborists in New Zealand (from the Australian Standard).	<p>Delete the current the definition of "root protection area".</p> <p>Replace with the following definition:</p> <p><u>Means the area to be protected from root disturbance. It is calculated by using the following formula (from the Australian Standard)</u></p> <p><u>Root Protection Area = DBH x 12</u>            DBH is diameter of the trunk at breast height = trunk diameter measured at 1.4m above ground level.            Radius is measured from the centre of the stem at ground level.            For multi-stemmed trees, the following formula is used.            Total DBH = Square root ((DBH1)2 + (DBH2)2 + (DBH3)2)            The assessment of the root protection area also needs to take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>existing root morphology and site conditions such as the presence of roads, structures, and underground services,</u></li> <li>• <u>topography and drainage,</u></li> <li>• <u>the soil type and structure,</u></li> <li>• <u>the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage based on species, age, condition, and past management.</u></li> </ul>	Accept in part	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TECHNICIAN ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "technician arborist" as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TECHNICIAN ARBORIST	Support in part	Considers the definition of technician arborist is restrictive by requiring the arborist to have a Level 6 diploma. An arborist could have the necessary expertise to be a technician arborist without having this qualification.	<p>Amend the definition of "Technician Arborist" as follows:</p> <p>means a person who:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. has demonstrated competency to Level 6 New Zealand Diploma in Arboriculture standard (or to an equivalent arboricultural standard) or <u>has equivalent experience and is competent in the assessment of working around trees and their root zones on development sites.</u></p>	Reject	No

## Notable Trees - Definitions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TREE	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "tree" as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRIMMING AND PRUNING	Support	Considers the definition of trimming and pruning is appropriate.	Retain the definition of "trimming and pruning" as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WORKS ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "works arborist" as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WORKS ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition of works arborist.	Retain the definition of "Works Arborist" as notified.	Accept	No

## Schedule 6 - Notable Trees

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
David Fisher	125.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Opposes Notable Tree listing 21 at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath. The Pinus radiata trees adjacent to this area pose a risk to pedestrians and reduces light to nearby properties. The tree is also no longer fit for listing due to its position on the road reserve bank, proximity to nearby houses and consequent ongoing management required.	Opposes Item 21 - SCHED6 (Notable Trees).	Accept	Yes
David Fisher	125.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Opposes Notable Tree listing 21 at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath. The Pinus radiata trees adjacent to this area pose a risk to pedestrians and reduces light to nearby properties. The tree is also no longer fit for listing due to its position on the road reserve bank, proximity to nearby houses and consequent ongoing management required.	Amend SCHED6 (Notable Trees) to remove Item 21 (Radiata Pine at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath).	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.202	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend SCHED 36 (Notable trees) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.	Accept	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.410	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose in part	Opposes inclusion of monkey apple Syzygium smithii. This species is listed on MPI's Pest Plant Accord and is a listed Harmful Organism (called Acmena smithii) on Greater Wellington's Regional Pest Management Plan, a statutory document under the Biosecurity Act 1993. This is a serious weed and vector of myrtle rust and is within the definition of pest in the proposed District Plan. Delete lilly pilli/monkey apple reference 112 and 306 from SCHED6.	Delete the following references from SCHED6 (Schedule of Notable Trees): <del>112- 151 Abel Smith St, Te Aro, Lilly pilli/ monkey apple, Syzygium smithii, ( ) 41-294749, 174-768768</del> <del>306- 13 Myrtle Crescent, Mt Cook, Wellington, Lilly pilli/ monkey apple, Syzygium smithii, ( ) 41-302522, 174-777944</del>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.342	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 112 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.343	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 261 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.344	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 306 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.	Reject	No

## Schedule 6 - Notable Trees

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Herbert	360.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	<p>Considers that the suburb of Tawa is currently underrepresented in the list of Wellington Notable Trees and that SCHED6 should include specific trees from the suburb.</p> <p>In particular the Tawa Tree located in Redwood Bush behind approximately 2 St Held as Glade and featured on the cover of the book publication “Tawa the Tree, the Community and its Reserves” as it is possibly the largest Tawa tree in the Wellington area. Other trees that should be included are Kauri trees from the kauri plantation in Willobank Reserve (2 The Drive and 269 Main Road) and other trees recommended by Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves Inc.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full list of trees]</p>	<p>Add new Items to SCHED6 - Notable Trees from the Tawa suburb as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A selection of significant Tawa trees located in Tawa – as representatives of the tree that gave the suburb its name.</li> <li>2. A selection of Kauri trees in Wellington – as representatives of a significant NZ tree that may well become species survival plantations; including those at Willowbank Reserve, at 2 The Drive, Tawa, and at 269 Main Road, Tawa.</li> <li>3. Other examples of substantive trees in Tawa which might be recommended by the Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves Inc.</li> </ol> <p>[Refer to original submission for full list of recommendations].</p>	Reject	No
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Not specified	<p>Considers that one of the properties at 45-45 Palmer Street includes a recently listed 'Notable Tree', a copper birch in its back garden, which once again backs onto the Community Centre and Aro park area.</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.132	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose in part	<p>Notes that the property at 7 Waterloo Quay is identified as being subject to notable trees 242, 243 and 244, which are Pohutukawa. These trees are all stated to have condition, amenity and notable values. It is not known why the trees are considered to have notable (historic / scientific) values. This needs to be considered, and if the identification of these values are correct.</p>	<p>Review the values applying to trees 242, 243 and 244, and remove the tree(s) from the schedule if the re-evaluation does not pass the test for scheduling.</p>	Reject	No
Jonathan Anderson	397.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	<p>Considers that greater emphasis in the SCHED6 - Notable Trees listings should be given to another category of trees. These are the older individuals of indigenous species (i.e. grow naturally in Wellington City) that are slow growing and survive in low numbers, specifically kahikatea, matai, miro, rimu, and totara; plus nikau and northern rata. These species are of huge ecological significance.</p> <p>Considers that the current SCHED6 - Notable Trees is an ad hoc collection of trees proposed by individuals to WCC over the years. The proposed trees were evaluated under the STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) method. The submitter generally supports the use of STEM to evaluate trees for scheduling, however notes that STEM tends to favour large, impressive trees that can be said to contribute to the character of a suburb. As a result, the proposed schedule is dominated by relatively fast growing (there are more of them because they grow faster) and large sized individuals such as pohutukawa and Norfolk Island pine.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the STEM criteria for evaluating Notable Trees is used to add indigenous trees to SCHED6 - Notable Trees. This may be possible through conscious use of the existing STEM criteria such or through the Council adding an addition criterion to give greater weighting to certain species of indigenous tree.</p>	Reject	No
Jonathan Anderson	397.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	<p>Considers that in giving greater emphasis in SCHED6 - Notable Trees to a new category of indigenous species (i.e. grow naturally in Wellington City), the submitter has provided a list of individual trees for consideration to be added as listed trees under SCHED6 - Notable Trees.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for Excel spreadsheet list of individual trees for evaluation].</p>	<p>Seeks that the list of indigenous trees in the submission's Excel spreadsheet are evaluated for inclusion as listed trees in SCHED6 - Notable Trees.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for Excel spreadsheet list of individual trees for evaluation. Includes 37 Kahikatea, 11 Matai, 17 Miro, 75 Rimu, and 108 Totara trees].</p>	Reject	No



## Schedule 6 - Notable Trees

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that the Pohutukawa on the corner of St Michaels Cres and Upland Road be noted as a protected tree.	Add an Item to SCHED6 - Schedule of Notable Tress for the pohutakawa tree on the corner of St Michaels Crescent and Upland Road.	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.66	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Support	Supports the provisions to protect notable trees.  Considers that these are an important part of the quality of the public space and protect genetic resources.	Retain SCHED6 - Notable Trees as notified.  [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	No
Craig Palmer	492.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that SCHED6 - Notable Trees should be amended so that the Item List is aggregated into defined areas of the city and that the letter code values are set out on each page.  This is to enable the public to readily access a definitive list for the neighbourhood where they live and other areas of interest.	Seeks that the Items List in SCHED6 - Notable Trees are aggregated into defined areas of the city and that the letter code values are set out on each page.	Reject	No

## Definitions - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SITE OR AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	Support	Supports the definition of a site or area of significance to Māori.	Retain the definition for 'site or area of significance to Māori' as notified.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	There are a number of piped awa shown in the SASM mapped overlay. This are located in built up areas of central Wellington. It is unclear if undertaking infrastructure work above these piped awa (e.g., routine work in roads) are considered to impact in this overlay, or if it is only if the piped awa is physically altered. This should be clearly clarified in the rules.	Clarify the Infrastructure - Other Overlays rules relating to SASM as necessary such that it is clarified that work not directly affecting a piped awa (e.g. infrastructure work in roads above) is not affected by the overlay and related rules.	Accept in part	Yes
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports prioritising mana whenua input into development and design, and design which acknowledges the history of this land, and consider this a much more valuable restoration of history than heritage and character protections.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports the objective of protecting and enhancing heritage values, including heritage of significance to Māori.	Retain Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori provisions as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Youth Council	201.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Not specified	Identifies that Wellington City was built on top of significant sites for tangata whenua such as Te Aro Pā and Pipitea Pā.  Considers that the rights of mana whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over their ancestral land are essential.	Seeks that significant sites for tangata whenua are protected.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tyers Stream Group	221.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as it relates to the Tyers stream catchment .	Retain the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports the Category C classification as it applies to their land.	Retain the inclusion of Category C in the introduction to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified.	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	305.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports provisions which seek to enhance the mana of kaitiaki and to give effect at a local level to the solemn commitment to rangatiratanga contained in Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Richard Murcott	322.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.  A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the significance of the Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua is considered.	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.21	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Murcott	322.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 &amp; 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building [fill (unnatural terrain), buried streams, etc].	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.22	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kimberley Vermaey	348.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	The Sites of Significance to Maori rule framework should be clarified to be clearer when it relates to a feature such as a stream or piped waterway. It is unclear whether the rules apply to the whole site, or just the portion of the site where the feature passes through a corner of a property.	Clarify the 'Sites of Significance to Maori' chapter to state whether provisions for waterways and streams apply to whole sites or portions where the features pass through.	Accept	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.142	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Considers it to be appropriate requests modification to the MDRS adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to ensure the values in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are preserved as part of intensification activities.</p> <p>This request gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely:                      (a) Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region; and                      (b) Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognise and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua. (c) Historic heritage policies 21, 22 and 46.</p> <p>Greater Wellington acknowledges that MRZ-P4 recognises that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga applies as a qualifying matter. However we do not consider this to go far enough and it should be extended to sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.                      The extent of modification necessary will require a situation-specific impact analysis depending on the nature of the SASM, including the need to avoid adjacent intensification in some instances.</p>	<p>Seeks to modify intensification levels through setbacks and reduced building heights for areas adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to the extent necessary following site-specific analysis, and to only allow intensification on sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori where the associated buildings and structures will provide for tino rangatiratanga.</p> <p>This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.143	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Considers it to be appropriate requests modification to the MDRS adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to ensure the values in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are preserved as part of intensification activities.</p> <p>This request gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely:                      (a) Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region; and                      (b) Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognise and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua. (c) Historic heritage policies 21, 22 and 46.</p> <p>Greater Wellington acknowledges that MRZ-P4 recognises that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga applies as a qualifying matter. However we do not consider this to go far enough and it should be extended to sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.                      The extent of modification necessary will require a situation-specific impact analysis depending on the nature of the SASM, including the need to avoid adjacent intensification in some instances.</p>	<p>Seeks to include any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>	Accept in part	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter and mapping should be clarified to whether “within a site or area of significance to Māori” applies to only the line, or the entire title subject to the site.</p> <p>The clearest interpretation is that those rules would only apply to the line itself.</p>	<p>Clarify the intention of how sites and areas of significance to Māori represented by lines are to be treated within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.</p>	Accept	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter and mapping should be clarified to whether “within a site or area of significance to Māori” applies to only the line, or the entire title subject to the site.</p> <p>The clearest interpretation is that those rules would only apply to the line itself.</p>	Clarify the intention of how sites and areas of significance to Māori represented by lines are to be treated within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.	Accept	Yes
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support in part	Support for general direction of chapter, with amendments.	Seeks that there are amendments to text to reflect Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua especially at Category C.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.53	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that new or existing developments of marae should be endorsed by and based on a relationship with Taranaki Whānui.	Seeks that there are amendments to text to reflect Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua especially at Category C.	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.54	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	<p>a) that the objectives, policies, rules and standards in the chapter are amended to ensure mana whenua can exercise tino rangatiratanga over Te Motu Kairangi [389.69, 389.70, 389.71, 389.72 and</p> <p>b) That papakāinga on sites and areas of significance is a permitted activity.</p>	Reject	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.	Accept	No



## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.19	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	Accept	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.9	Part 2/ Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.69].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning maps</li> <li>• He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter</li> <li>• Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter</li> <li>• Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter</li> <li>• Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter</li> </ul> <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.23	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Lance Lones	FS81.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andy Foster	FS86.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.69]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.70	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that the objectives, policies, rules and standards in the Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are amended to ensure mana whenua can exercise tino rangatiratanga over Te Motu Kairangi.	Reject	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kōlle	FS2.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.20	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opp oses the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning maps</li> <li>• He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter</li> <li>• Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter</li> <li>• Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter</li> <li>• Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter</li> </ul> <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.24	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.42	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that the objectives, policies, rules and standards in the Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are amended to make papakāinga a permitted activity, subject to standards.	Reject	No
Lance Lones	FS81.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	Accept	No



## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their properties in Te Motu Kairangi.	Reject	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.43	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.217	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	Supports the clarification provided by the introductory text that the provisions of this chapter only apply to the use, development and activities located within the mapped extent of the scheduled Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	<p>Retain SASM chapter introduction as notified, subject to the general relief sought by WIAL in the covering submission.</p> <p>[See original submission for further detail].</p>	Accept in part	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.143	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.218	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Not specified	Considers that Moa Pont site is located within a core operational area of the airport and is subject to strict Civil Aviation regulations. As the infrastructure methods do not apply within the Airport Zone, there is no clear consenting pathway within the SASM chapter for what is otherwise a piece of regionally significant infrastructure.	Not specified.	No decision sought	
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.144	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	No decision sought in primary submission	
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.219	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.145	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.87	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.220	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that the following SASMs should not be over the Airport Zone:  - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).	Delete the following SASMs from the Airport Zone:  - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).  (Option A).	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.146	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.88	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.221	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that the following SASMs require significant changes to the Airport Zone to accommodate airport activities:  - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).	Seeks that the following SASMs require significant changes to the Airport Zone to accommodate airport activities:  - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).  (Option A).	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.147	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.89	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that given that many of the scheduled SASM are also archaeological sites (pre-1900 human activity), reference should be made within the Introduction that modifications to some of the SASM may	Seeks that the introduction to the chapter be amended to include reference to the archaeological provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.	Accept	Yes
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori may be impacted by the scale of development permitted by the plan in residential zones.  Considers that the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori provisions may not be able to cover site specific protection requirements.	Seeks that further work be undertaken in some of these areas to see if there needs to be a significant level of modification needed to the currently identified high intensification residential areas.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.111	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Greater Wellington seek to ensure all sites are recorded and provisions apply appropriate protection, including on adjoining sites.	Allow / Seeks to ensure that all sites of significance are captured in the Proposed District Plan and appropriate protections from the effects of intensification are provided, including on properties surrounding those sites.	Accept in part	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / New SASM	Amend	Considers that the Accidental Discovery Protocol and its implementation can be improved by embedding the process in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter.	Add new policy to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter that acknowledges the importance of Accidental Discovery to maintaining and protecting the sites and areas of significance to Māori and iwi.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.112	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / New SASM	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Reject	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Support	Supports the purpose of the chapter as set out in this objective.	Retain SASM-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.100	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Support	Objective SASM-O1 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.222	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Oppose in part	Supports the identification and mapping of areas and sites of significance to Māori and considers it is appropriate to protect these areas from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Retain Objective SASM-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.101	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Support	Objective SASM-O2 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O2 (Protecting the sites and areas of significance to Māori) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.223	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Oppose in part	Supports the identification and mapping of areas and sites of significance to Māori and considers it is appropriate to protect these areas from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Retain SASM-O2 (Protecting sites and areas of significance to Maori) as notified, subject to relief sought by WIAL in the covering submission.  [See original submission for further detail]	Accept in part	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.148	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.102	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Support	Objective SASM-O3 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O3 (Kaitiakitanga) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.224	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose in part	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-O3 (Kaitiakianga) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.149	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-03	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.90	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-03	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-03 (kaitiakitanga) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework, nor from the schedule of SASM. It is unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.225	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-03	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-03 (Kaitiakianga) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.150	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-03	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.91	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-O3 (kaitiakitanga) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework, nor from the schedule of SASM. It is unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.103	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.226	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance to Māori) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.151	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P1. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No



## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.227	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance to Māori) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.152	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P1. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.96	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the maintenance and repair of existing buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.18	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Supports the ability to maintain and repair activities occurring on sites/areas of significance.	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.104	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.228	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.153	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P2. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.92	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P2 (maintenance and repair) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.229	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.154	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P2. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.93	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P2 (maintenance and repair) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support in part	Supports the policy protecting spiritual and cultural values of Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori.  [Inferred reason]	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) with amendment below.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.113	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Amend	Considers that there are environmental values embedded to cultural values and this should be recognised.	Seeks that SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) is amended to include protection of environmental values that mana whenua have attributed to sites.	Accept in part	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.114	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Support and agree that SASM-P2 be amended to include the protection of environmental values that mana whenua attribute to sites.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.19	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P3	Support	Supports that the ongoing use and development of marae is enabled.	Retain SASM-P3 (Ongoing use and development of marae) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.105	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P3	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P3 (Ongoing use and development of marae) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.97	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori. An established fire station is located within a site and area of significance to Māori and this rule would provide for any future on-site alterations, subject to the protection of cultural and spiritual values	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.20	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	Supports the inclusion of this policy. It provides for the construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance so long as they consider the extent and impact on relevant matters listed in the policy.	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.106	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.230	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.155	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.94	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.231	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.156	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.95	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.232	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Not specified	<p>Considers that SASM-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori.</p> <p>Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.</p>	Clarify how SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.157	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.96	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.98	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the extension of the footprint of existing buildings providing iwi values and sufficiently considered and protected.	Retain SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) as notified.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.107	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.233	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.158	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.97	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No



## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.234	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	no
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.159	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.98	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.235	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Not specified	Considers that SASM-P5 and associated SASM-R3 provides for the 'modification of features integral to a Category A or B site of significance to Māori', however Schedule 7 does not identify any "features integral" to the Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Clarify how provisions SASM- P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) will apply to Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Accept in part	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.160	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.99	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.236	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori.  Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.	Accept in part	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.161	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.100	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.108	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.237	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.162	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.101	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P6 (destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.238	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.163	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.102	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P6 (destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.99	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the maintenance and repair of sites of significance in Category A	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.21	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	Supports that maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance is a permitted activity.	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.109	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.22	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Support	Supports that undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance is a permitted activity.	Retain SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.110	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.239	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.164	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM- R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.103	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.240	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.165	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.104	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.23	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	Supports the permitted activity of rule SASM-R3.1.	Retain SASM-R3.1 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.	Accept	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.24	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	Supports the restricted discretionary activity of rule SASM-R3.2.	Retain SASM-R3.2 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.111	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.241	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.166	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM- R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.105	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.242	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.167	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.106	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.243	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Not specified	Considers that SASM-P5 and associated SASM-R3 provides for the 'modification of features integral to a Category A or B site of significance to Māori', however Schedule 7 does not identify any "features integral" to the Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Clarify how provisions SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) will apply to Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Accept in part	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.168	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept in part	No



## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.107	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.100	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for the establishment of new buildings or structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori in Category A or B.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.112	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support in part	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1 and restricted discretionary activity status provided under SASM-R4.2, subject to the relief sought above.	Supports Rule SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	405.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support in part	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1.  Also supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B ) and seeks amendment.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.38	Historical and Cultural Values/ Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Amend	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1.  Also supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Amend SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Accept	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.244	Historical and Cultural Values/ Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.169	Part 2/ Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.108	Part 2/ Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.245	Historical and Cultural Values/ Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.170	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.109	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.246	Historical and Cultural Values/ Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori.  Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.171	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.110	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.101	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for additions within the footprint of existing buildings within sites and areas of significance to Māori in Category A or B.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.113	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) as notified.	Accept	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support in part	Supports SASM-R5 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1 and the restricted discretionary activity status provided under SASM-R5, subject to the relief sought above.	Supports Rule SASM-R5 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	No
Investore Property Limited	405.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support in part	Supports SASM-R5 in part and particular supports the permitted activity status under SASM- R4.1.  Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	No
Investore Property Limited	405.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Amend	Supports SASM-R5 in part and particular supports the permitted activity status under SASM- R4.1.  Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Amend SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Accept in part	Yes

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.247	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.172	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.111	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.248	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.173	Part 2 / Historical Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.112	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.249	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori.  Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.174	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.113	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.114	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R6 (destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.250	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

## Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.175	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.114	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.  [Inferred reference to submission 406.50]	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed.	Disallow	Accept
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.251	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport.  [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.176	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.115	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.  [Inferred reference to submission 406.51]	Disallow	Accept	No

## SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

### Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori - Mapping

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Murcott	322.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 &amp; 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Amend the 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (lines)' overlay to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.20	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Barry Insull	32.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	<p>Item 157 in SCHED7 does not mention the cliff at Red Rocks is under Historic Reserve designation and should be amended.</p>	Seeks that SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori), Item 157 have a reference to the site's Historic Reserve designation.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks for SCHED7 (sites and areas of significance to Māori) Item 157 has reference to the site's Historic Reserve designation. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission as this schedule is specifically for sites and areas of significance to Māori and Historic Reserves can be provided for in other parts of the plan.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.75	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	<p>Supports the significant sites and areas being included in SCHED7.</p>	Retain SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) with amendments.	Accept	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.76	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	<p>Considers that it may be beneficial for plan users that the places entered in Schedule 7 are cross-referenced (where applicable) with recorded New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Add an additional column to SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) headed <u>HNZPT List number and/or NZAA site record number</u> .	Accept	Yes



## SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.13	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	The submitter seeks for an additional column to be added to SCHED7 (sites and areas of significance to Māori) to cross-reference sites that are recorded in the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because this cross referencing can be found in schedules for sites and areas of significance in other plans. It is useful to see what sites are recorded under HNZPT or NZAA and which are not.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.77	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Considers that it may be beneficial for plan users that the places entered in Schedule 7 are cross-referenced (where applicable) with recorded New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.	DP Reference 14 – Ōhaua Kāinga 2 – <a href="#">HNZPT List # 6143, NZAA reference R27/1</a>	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington	182.56	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the existing sites and areas of significance to Māori and supports proposed additional sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Retain SCHED7 - (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.80	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the iwi's wish that Tyers Stream (Waitohi Steam) become a "Line of Significance" to Māori.	Retain item 168 (Waitohi Stream) in SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori as notified.	Accept	No
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the inclusion of Item 144 as a Site of Significance to Māori.	Retain Item 144 (Tutaenui Awa) in SCHED7 - Sites of Significance to Māori as notified.	Accept	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	Supports site #76 being recognised as Category C in Schedule 7, but requests that this is expanded to reflect the submitter's current land holding and areas of importance.	Retain schedule 7 listing of site 76 (Tapu te Ranga Marae) categorisation of CAT C, with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Seeks the extension of the existing map extent for site #76 in the PDP, as it doesn't accurately reflect their existing land holding and aspirations for Marae redevelopment.  Following the fire, whilst the existing Marae was burnt down, the Trust have aspirations and value associated with land as indicated in the map below, and would like to extend the site of significance extent to incorporate this land and include the existing area.	Seeks extent of site of significance to Māori be expanded for Site 76 (Tapu te Ranga Marae) of SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to reflect existing land holdings and future development.	Accept in part	Yes
Richard Murcott	322.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.  A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the location of the historic Tiakiwai Stream, Item 60 (Tiakiwai) of SCHED8 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori is more correctly represented.  [Inferred decision sought]	Reject	No

## SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.23	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.	Disallow	Accept	No
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Considers that the Waimapihi stream flowing through/beneath properties on Aro Street may be of environmental and cultural significance to the area.	Retain Item 147 (Waimapihi) in SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori). [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.72	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Considers that there are inconsistencies between Schedule 7 and the representation of sites in the District Plan map.  Southern Cross' site at 82-88 and 90 Hanson Street is subject to a site and area of significance to Māori. The map identifies that this is the Waitangi line DP ref 145, but DP ref 145 is Kumutoto Awa.	Amend schedule 7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) to match the District Plan Reference 145 with the map.	Accept	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.144	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM). This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.	Retain SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) and seeks clarification.	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	405.145	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM). This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.	Seeks that the SASM extent identified in SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) for Korokoro - Takapū Ara is clarified, provided in further detail with the identification on planning maps amended if necessary.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.112	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the acknowledgement of SASMs in the plan, acknowledging both their tangible and in-tangible significance to mana whenua.	Retain SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.113	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the addition of new sites and areas of significance.	Retain SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance as notified.	Accept in part	No

## Appendix B – Historic Heritage – Whole Submissions

Original Sub Number	Further Submitter Name	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
298	Onslow Historical Society	FS6.1	Support	Generally supports submission from Historic Places Wellington.	Allow	Accept in part	No
374	Onslow Historical Society	FS6.2	Support	Generally supports submission from Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Allow	Accept in part	No
374	Ian Attwood	FS16.19	Support	Patriarch Claude Khan said in the media in 2011 "He had no plans to "pull it down or disfigure it" and said the home should be afforded protection under the council's district plan, but not if it meant restrictions would be imposed. "If there were any restrictions on the owner, no, I'm not interested."  Council's and Heritage New Zealand's actions do not appear to show respect and consideration to his clearly stated position.	Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.	Accept in part	No
364	Jaqui Tutt	FS35.3	Support	Not specified.	Allow the submission in its entirety.	Accept in part	No
488	Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.59	Support	Supports the submission 233.	Allow	Accept in part	No
275	Sophie Kahn	FS76.11	Support	Supports the Submitter's submission (415) in its entirety and consider that the whole submission must be read in full. It is exceptional and outstanding in the detail, in-depth factual supporting evidence, logical arguments and superb data and analysis. The summary issued by the WCC is a very poor reflection of the detail, important findings, and relevant concerns with the Council's processes that relate not only to their home but to my home (the Kahn House).  Considers that WCC should not be able to list isolated individual homes (especially when not part of a heritage area, when hidden from public view, and when public access will never be allowed), without a thorough evaluation which includes the costs to the individuals compared to public benefit (if any), and, in particular, without the level of detail and evidence as demonstrated and given in the evaluation from Submitter No. 415.	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings	Accept in part	No
70	Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Accept in part	No
182	Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.1	Support	Considers the submission is an indepth, well though out analysis of what protection is needed for the last 200 years of Wellington's physical history for this city to remain a connected, beautiful and aware place in which to live. Considers that even earlier history needs to be much enhanced and also protected.	Allow submission in its entirety.	Accept in part	No
364	Aro Valley Community Council	FS134.3	Support	Not specified.	Allow the submission in its entirety.	Accept in part	No

## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paul Burnaby	44.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports the Heritage Design Guide provisions in principle.	Retain Heritage Design Guide as notified.	Reject	No
Paul Burnaby	44.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports, in principle, the proposed 'Additional Considerations' as stated on page 5 of the Heritage Design Guide (HDG).	Retain Heritage Design Guide as notified.	Reject	No
Paul Burnaby	44.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that clarification is needed as to the meaning, purpose, interpretation, and application of the 'additional considerations' within the HDG.	Clarify additional considerations in the Heritage Design Guide.	Reject	Yes
Paul Burnaby	44.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that clarification is needed regarding the status (meaning, purpose, interpretation, and application) of the orange guidance notes in the HDG.	Clarify notes on page 20 of the Heritage Design Guide.	Reject	Yes
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that Wellington needs to be striving for design excellence to ensure that our heritage buildings are part of the future.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G10 in the Heritage Design Guide should be amended to reflect that the relationship between aligning key elements is important but is not a measure of a good design.	Amend G10 (Where contrast is discouraged) in the Heritage Design Guide as follows:  ... <del>also consideration can be given to the alignment of floor levels and window heads and sills.</del>	Reject	Yes
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the relationships outlined on page 20 are too prescriptive, will lead to confusion, and should be deleted. Different buildings and different contexts need to be considered on a case by case basis.	Amend the Heritage Design Guide by deleting the whole section relating to managing scale transitions within heritage areas outlined on page 20.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports G15 in the Heritage Design Guide as correct.	Retain G15 (Retaining and restoring significant heritage shopfronts) in the Heritage Design Guide as notified.	Reject	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes G16 in the Heritage Design Guide as while it is appropriate to restore and reconstruct shopfronts, particularly where heritage fabric remains, this should not be imposed on buildings where little, or no heritage fabric remains.  G16 conflicts with the objectives outlined in the Gehl Report.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Delete G16 (Restore or reconstruct shopfronts where there is evidence of original form, detailing and materials) from the Heritage Design Guide.	Reject	No
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G40 in the Heritage Design Guide should be clarified to reflect that the strengthening of certain buildings in Wellington poses considerable challenges and the guidelines need to be flexible enough to enable a variety of engineering solutions. In some cases, an external support structure is the only option.	Amend G40 (The installation of exoskeletons, external columns, and external bracing elements is discouraged) in the Heritage Design Guide as follows:  G40. The installation of exoskeletons, external columns, and external bracing elements <del>is discouraged, should only be considered where there is no viable, alternative engineering solution and consideration should be given to particularly where</del> these would:  ...	Reject	No

## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington	182.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports the Heritage Design Guide on facadism.	Retain G37 (Built form) of the Heritage Design Guide as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission]	Retain the Heritage Design Guide with amendment.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while the submitter recognises the special significance of tangata whenua as partners in Te Tiriti they submit that other cultural backgrounds and heritages that contribute to New Zealand’s multicultural society also warrant recognition.	Amend the Heritage Design Guide outcomes as follows:  “New development respects and responds to nearby scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori, heritage areas of <u>significance to all New Zealand peoples and cultures</u> , buildings, structures and trees.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.14	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	The submitter seeks for the Heritage Design Guide outcomes to be amended as follows: “New development respects and responds to nearby scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori, heritage areas of significance to all New Zealand peoples and cultures, buildings, structures and trees.” Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because the suggested amendments will help to protect sites and areas of significance to Māori from development.	Allow	Reject	No
Go Media Ltd	236.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Heritage Design Guide expressly recognises the potential for third-party signs on heritage buildings.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.176	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers minor clarification needed in second point of G31.	Amend G31 as follows: (...) - understanding the heritage <u>value values</u> of the place through research, investigation, recording and documentation.	Reject	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.177	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers clarification is need in the third point of G31 to match wording in HH-P2.	Amend G31 as follows:  (...) - planning and carrying out maintenance and repair in accordance with <u>recognised</u> conservation principles <u>and methods</u> .	Reject	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.89	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the heritage deisgn guides should be amended to provide a set of considerations in the heritage design guide to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney, rather than providing a policy framework in the district plan.	[Inferred decision requested] Amend the heritage design guides to provide a set of considerations to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.90	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that ‘Heritage from both Tiriti o Waitangi partners’ does not capture all of Wellington’s heritage - only the heritage of the Crown and tangata whenua.	Seeks that references to ‘Heritage from both Tiriti o Waitangi partners’ be amended to ‘heritage from all of New Zealand’s peoples’ in the application section .	Reject	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.91	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that it is heritage conservation that leads to the best learning opportunities, not new development.	Seeks that the application section is amended as follows:  " <del>development</del> <u>heritage conservation</u> can lead to learning opportunities for the wider public, making currently unseen heritage and histories more accessible"	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.92	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that it may not always be appropriate to acknowledge or celebrate sites of significance to mana whenua.	Amend the Outcomes section of the heritage design guide as follows:  "Mana whenua sites of significance are acknowledged and celebrated <u>where appropriate</u> ."	Reject	No

## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.116	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Oppose	The submitter considers that it may not always be appropriate to acknowledge or celebrate sites of significance to mana whenua. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because it is up to mana whenua to decide which of their sites of significance are acknowledged and celebrated in the plan.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.93	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the heritage design guide should clearly refer to the CMU and Residential Design Guides that provide guidance on how to design new development adjacent to a heritage place.	Amend the Heritage design guide to clearly refer to the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides that provide guidance on how to design new development adjacent to a heritage place.	Reject	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.94	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline should not refer to works and that conservation is about understanding and planning and does not always involve works.	Amend G31 of the Heritage Design Guide as follows:  Consider effects on heritage fabric by: • undertaking conservation <del>works</del> with consultation, engagement and in partnership with mana whenua.	Reject	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the area-specific guides in the operative district plan should be reinstated to help to reduce the likelihood of adverse effects on heritage.	Seeks that the Area Specific Heritage Design Guides in the Operative District Plan be included.	Reject	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.83	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Supports G2 of the heritage design guide.	Retain G2 of the heritage design guide as notified.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.247	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.247	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Reject	No

## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

**Submissions identified in wrap up hearing s42A and included in this document at direction of independent hearings panel, October 2023**

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Recommended Hearing Section	Recommendation	Changes to PDP? Y/N
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support in part	Supports the definition but seeks amendment to improve the meaning of Point (f).	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' with amendment.	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Accept in part	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Seeks amendment to improve the meaning of the definition.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as follows:  ... f. The affixing of scaffolding to <u>a heritage building</u> unless the work is reasonably required for health and safety.  ...	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support in part	Supports clarification of rules for repair and maintenance of heritage buildings.	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.56	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers the wording of this definition in relation to the modification, removal or replacement of windows is confusing and needs to be amended for clarity.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as follows:  (...) h. The modification, removal or replacement of windows (all joinery, including frames, sashes, sills, casements, mullions, glazing bars), except; i. modifications as <u>necessary</u> to replace <del>an existing clear single-glazed window pane with a clear double-glazed pane.</del> a clear single glazed window pane of an existing window with a new window pane.	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Reject	No

## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Recommended Hearing Section	Recommendation	Changes to PDP? Y/N
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition is very different to the one in the current District Plan and must ensure that heritage items are not able to be adversely affected using this definition.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and repair' as follows:  Means: .... (For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter)  In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following:  <u>a. Demolition of a structural element</u> <del>a. b.</del> Changes to the existing surface treatment of fabric; ....	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Accept in part	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition should be made clearer e.g. what is meant by surface treatment?	Clarify the definition, particularly the meaning of surface treatment.	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Accept in part	Yes



## Appendix B – Heritage Design Guide

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Recommended Hearing Section	Recommendation	Changes to PDP? Y/N
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	<p>Considers that double glazing should not be permitted as maintenance and repair and should instead be subject to the considerations of a resource consent process.</p> <p>Identifies the approach of English Heritage.</p>	<p>Seeks that the definition of 'maintenance and repair' is amended as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter)</p> <p>In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>h. The modification, removal or replacement of windows (all joinery, including frames, sashes, sills, casements, mullions, glazing bars), <del>except;</del></p> <p><del>i. modifications as necessary to replace an existing clear single glazed window pane with a clear double glazed pane.</del></p>	3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees	Accept in part	yes
Penny Griffith	418.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports the submission of Historic Places Wellington.	Not specified.	<p>3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees</p> <p>As per submission of Historic Places Wellington [182]</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Christina Mackay	478.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Submitter supports Historic Places Wellington's submissions.</p> <p>Supports the submission by Historic Places Wellington including support for PDP proposals for heritage provisions, proposals for additional heritage listings, new Historical and Cultural Heritage provisions and for inner city heritage/character suburbs.</p>	<p>Supports Historic Places Wellington's submission.</p> <p>[Refer to submission 182]</p>	<p>3A - Heritage provisions and listings, SASM, and Notable Trees</p> <p>As per submission of Historic Places Wellington [182]</p>	Accept in part	No

