

Appendix 2: Chapter 10 Table of Recommendations to Submissions and Further Submissions

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
Schedule 10.1							
3.1	Tony Jack	Schedule 10.1 Trees- T55	Decision: Amend Historic Heritage register to remove 2 Kohekohe trees on page 10-49 of Proposed District Plan. Reasons: A liability, and one may be dead. 7 Maple Lane, Waikanae.	7	Accept	Reviewed by Council's arborist. Trees dying and, therefore, we recommend Tree 55 is removed from Schedule 10.1	Yes
68.1	Kapiti Women's Centre	Chapter 10: Building- B119	Decision: Supports the identification of the Women's Suffrage Centennial Gardens being given historic heritage status. Reason: Kapiti Women's Centre, 7 Ngahina Street, Paraparaumu.	7	Accept.	Supports is acknowledged.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part (neutral)</i>	7	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
306.3	Collin Hope	Chapter 10: Building B118	Decision: Support Historic Heritage Place listing 118 'Hope House' and amended to include the following wording in the schedule: "Built between 1991-1994 as a residential sculptural form, designed by registered	7	Accept.	Submission supports listing and seeks an amendment to the description this amendment is recommended. Submitter now seeks house not be included however this change of direction is not included in the submission and therefore is not	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			architect (award winning) Dave Launder and owner/artist Collin Hope. Notable for its form internally and externally and identified on the Raumati landscape and amenity. The house has featured in national press and dedicated programme television and has its own dedicated website at www.casaesperanza.co.nz ".			within scope	
FS175			<i>Support</i>	7	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
139.20	Raumati South Residents Association	Chapter 10: Trees- T52, T62, T83	Decision: Support the provision with amendments to address the following in respect of notable trees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct the address for notation T52- change to Tennis Court Road, Raumati South; - Correct the address for notation T62- change to 51 Leinster Ave, Raumati South; - Correct the address for notation T83- change to 6 and 8 Kainui Road, Raumati South. 	7	Accept re T52. Reject re T62. Accept re T83.	Amendments are recommended to Schedule 10.1 to read "Raumati South" for T52 and T83 as this is consistent with NZ post addresses. Submission appears to have incorrect reference to T62 as this is located in Waikanae and T65 and 66 are located at 51 Leinster Avenue	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
176.2	Kerry Dalton	Chapter 10: Tree T21	Decision: Remove notable tree T21 from Schedule 10.1. Reasons: Norfolk Island Pine, Road Reserve, cnr Tangahoe & Aperahama Sts, Paekakariki. Submitter- 8 Tangahoe Street. Tree impedes sunlight to house and section in winter. Difficult to get pruned if listed. Not native. There are other similar trees that are not listed. Tree protected by fact that it is on road reserve and the council is the owner.	7	Accept	The long term heritage value of the tree would be impossible to preserve even if the notable tree section of the STEM report were to apply Tree is recommended for removal from the schedule	Yes
382.1	Vincent Osborne	Chapter 10: New Trees (Withdrawn)	Decision: Amend planning maps and register of historic heritage to add the macrocarpa hedge at 84 Te Moana Road, Waikanae as a listed heritage tree.	N/A	N/A	Submitter is owner of part of the hedge- extends onto council road reserve. Hedge does not fit listing criteria. See feedback from roading. SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN.	N/A
FS34			<i>Oppose</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A
406.20	Paekakariki Community Board	Chapter 10: New Building	Decision: Add the Perkins Farm woolshed to the heritage register.	7	Reject	Opposed by NZTA (landowner). It is Council practice not to proceed with scheduling unless there is landowner agreement therefore	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Reasons: It was built circa 1940, and it is one of the few remaining extant woolsheds on its original site in the Kapiti District. Presents a significant and important theme in the history of farming and the past pattern of development - a pattern which is about to undergo substantial change with the Transmission Gully Road of National Significance route likely to change much of the surrounding land use, and very probably the use of building itself.			listing is not recommended	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
306.5	Collin Hope	Chapter 10: Trees	Decision: Add the stand of mature native karaka trees (7-10 trees) on the adjoining commercial (working environment) property on Margaret Road as notable/heritage trees in the District Plan, even though they are not indigenous.	7Error! Reference source not found.	Reject	These trees do not fit the criteria for listing therefore we are not recommended to be included in Schedule 10.1.	No
460.37	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Buildings- B10, B37, B74, B105,	Decision: [abbrev. see full sub summary] Support Sched. 10.1 with updates. See pp18 & 19 of the sub for details. Includes:	7 & 11	Accept in part	Corrections requested are recommended Stringer Wind Rain House is recommended to be added to the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		Area, A24, W4-Takamore, B3, B14, New WT, New Tree, New buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DPlan ID B10: Maori University Building. Contains one Cat 2 building. - DPlan ID B37: William Jenkins' Cottage. Not NZHPT registered. Aka Misses Jenkins' Cottage. - DPlan ID B74: St Andrew's Church Scottish Kirk. Not NZHPT registered. - DPlan ID B10S: St Andrew's Church Hall (Scottish Kirk). Now used as the hall for St Andrew's Church. - DPlan ID A24 Paekakariki Railway Station and Yard Historic Area. Remove the North End Signal Box from the list of 'Contributory Places' - relocated to Ohakune. '2 water vates' should be '2 water vats.' - Takamore waahi tapu. Widen extend to match NZHPT review which extended registration. Contains sites of cultural and historical importance, and arch. sites. - DPlan ID B3: St Mary's Catholic Church and DPlan ID B14: 			<p>schedule - supported by NZTA The Waahi tapu listing for W4 is recommended to be included in "Wahanga Rima" with the extent listed in the HNZ register.</p> <p>There is no support, currently, for Te Pou o Tainui to be listed as a Waahi Tapu by the Marae Trustees. Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki, we therefore do not recommend that Te Pou O Tainui Marae is included in the PDP.</p>	

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>Roman Catholic Church Pukekaraka Conservation Area Otaki: clarify the difference between these two listings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add to schedule: Te Pou ō Tainui waahi tapu NZHPT Register number 7506. Te Pou ō Tainui marae .Extent of registration includes the land known as Pukekaraka 4B Maori Reservation (NZ Gazette 1970, p.1201) Wellington Land District and the site known as Te Pou ō Tainui thereon, including the Hauhau flagpole and the totara tree.' - Add to Notable Tree list: 'Te Totara ō Tawhiao', planted by King Tawhiao'. - Consider adding to schedule 10: Stringer Wind Rain House: 224 Main Road, SH1, Paraparaumu. Designed in 1984 by Nigel Cook. One of four wind rain houses in NZ. At the forefront of sustainable, ecology-centred architectural design in NZ. 				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>Reasons: W4 is a waahi tapu that is already scheduled in the operative district plan so has been carried over from there.</p> <p>Map 6B & 9B</p> <p>Amended listing: Takamore waahi tapu: Lots 1 & 4 DP 88064, Pt Ngarara WestA24 B (SO 20313), Lots 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10. Lots 3, 4, 5, 7. Lots 8-10 DP 85160, Lots 3-4, Ngarara West A Sec 24C Elk. Lot 1 DP 17617, Pt Lot 1 DP 24354, Lot 1 DP 27661., Pt Lot 1 DP 57749, Lots 1-2 DP 69476, Sec 1-2,6-17, Lot 3 DP 52593 Wellington Land District.</p> <p>New item: Te Pou 0 Tainui waahi tapu Register number 7506. Extent of registration Pukekaraka 4B Maori Reservation (NZ Gazette 1970, p.1201) Wellington Land District. Including the Hauhau flagpole and the totara tree.</p>				
FS177			<i>Oppose</i>	7	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
460.38	Heritage New	Chapter 10:	Decision: Add a new column to	7	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended	yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Zealand	Schedule 10.1	Schedule 10.1 Schedule of historic heritage, NZAA site number. Seek that this column is populated with the corresponding New Zealand Archaeological Associations site number where applicable.			to the explanatory text above the Schedule to provide for the NZAA number to be included in the "other identifiers" column, where possible, rather than a new one.	
Schedule 10.2							
53.2	Chris & Esmee Brown	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2 ADP	<p>Decision: Amend Accidental Discovery Protocol to be more flexible when dealing with middens and dunes where iwi are satisfied that no more information will be gained by investigating them.</p> <p>Reason: The Rural Dunes area is littered with middens. Development to date have required some of these to be investigated in detail. Further investigation of middens is unlikely to lead to greater knowledge than what has already been garnered. Seek an alternative to investigation by the Historic Places Trust be allowed where Iwi are satisfied there is nothing more to be learned.</p>	9	Reject	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as the wording of the Heritage NZ Act is that an archaeological authority must be obtained where it is 'known or suspected' that a pre-1900 site of human activity would be affected. The Act overrides anything in the District Plan and must be complied with. Heritage NZ is responsible for administering the Act,	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Such alternatives may be the in situ reintering of middens at a greater depth where they are unlikely to be further disturbed.				
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	9	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
319.31	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2 ADP	Decision: Support the accidental discovery clauses included in Schedule 10.2.	6 & 9	Accept in part	Insofar as the schedule is retained but some amendments are made as the result of other submissions	Yes
441.66	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10- Schedule 10.2 ADP	<p>Decision: Amend schedule 10.2 to change all references to an "accidental discovery protocol" to "archaeological discovery protocol".</p> <p>Reasons: Supports protocols that help protect archaeological values. However, accidental discovery protocols can be problematic if used incorrectly. They should not be used as a substitute for professional archaeological advice. Kapiti Coast district is a rich archaeological landscape and it is important that this is considered prior to any ground</p>	9	Reject	We consider that the name " <i>Accidental Discovery Protocol</i> " more accurately reflects the purpose.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			disturbance. The finding of archaeological remains should not be "accidental."				
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	9	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose in part</i>	9	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.40	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2 ADP	Decision: Schedule 10.2 - Seek amendment Supports with amendment to add "Advice" before "Note:" prior to "Work affecting archaeological sites..." Reasons: Best practice to use the term 'advice note'.	9	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to clarify that this schedule provides advice to plan users and advises them of their responsibilities under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act	Yes
FS29			<i>Oppose</i>	9	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
460.41	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2 ADP	Decision: Oppose in part with amendment to rename Schedule 10.2 "Accidental Archaeology". Reasons:	9	Accept in part	No amendment recommended to name as accidental discovery protocol is considered more appropriate however further advice regarding HNZ processes is recommended to be added to the protocol	Yes
FS29			<i>Oppose</i>	9	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
460.42	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2	Decision: That the Accidental Discovery Protocol set out in	9	Reject	Amendments are recommended to clarify that this schedule provides advice to plan users and	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		ADP	<p>Schedule 10.2 - Accidental Discovery Protocol is deleted in full.</p> <p>Reasons: The Accidental Discovery Protocol will mislead property owners. An accidental discovery protocol is a tool which is used as a condition of resource consent when there is a low likelihood of encountering archaeological resources. It is not a method to manage archaeological resources. Concern that the Protocol will act as a mechanism for owners to undertake work, without first obtaining an archaeological authority under the Historic Places Act 1993, should their site/property contain an archaeological site. If a site is known to be a pre-1900 archaeological site, the archaeological authority process under the Historic Places Act must be followed.</p>			advises them of their responsibilities under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act	
FS29			<i>Oppose</i>	9	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.43	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Schedule 10.2 ADP	Decision: That reference to follow the Accidental Discovery Protocol set out in Chapter 10 is	9	Accept in part	See 460.42	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
			<p>amended as follows: delete "Accidental Discovery Protocol" and replace with "Advice Note", and add "(if applicable)." Following "...shall be followed". That consequential amendment is made throughout all Chapters of the Plan.</p> <p>Reasons: See also 460.41 &43. Amend to: 'The Advice Note, set out in Schedule 10.2, shall be followed (if applicable).</p>				
FS29			<i>Oppose</i>	9	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
Definitions							
219.9	Horticulture New Zealand	Chapter 01: Definitions- Land Disturbance	Decision: Amend the definition of 'land disturbance' as follows: delete 'a) Any new fencing, tree planting or tree removal' from the definition.	6 & 10	Accept in part	Definition is recommended to be amended to limit it to the context of historic heritage and simplify the definition however tree planting and removal is included in the definition.	Yes
FS9, FS10, FS106			<i>Support</i>	6 & 10	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
92.8	Winstone Aggregates	Chapter 01: Definitions-Land Disturbance	<p>Decision: Delete the definition of land disturbance.</p> <p>Reasons: The definition repeats matters already contained in the definition of earthworks. It is superfluous and in some places conflicts with definitions for earthworks and extractive industries. This does not support clear interpretation or use of the rules and standards in the plan, as it results in definitions with overlaps and multiple standards applying to a single activity.</p>	6 & 10	Reject	Definition is recommended to be amended to limit it to the context of historic heritage and simplify the definition however tree planting and removal is included in the definition.	No
250.7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Chapter 01: Definitions-Land Disturbance	<p>Decision: Submission seeks that the definition of 'land disturbance' be deleted.</p> <p>Reasons: Term is not used anywhere in the PDP.</p>	6 & 10	Reject	Definition is recommended to be amended to limit it to the context of historic heritage and simplify the definition however tree planting and removal is included in the definition.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS139, FS142, FS146, FS167, FS191</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	6 & 10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
272.3	Te Anau Trust	Chapter 01: Definitions- Land Disturbance	Decision: Amend the definition of 'land disturbance' to exclude minor gardening/landscaping activities and allow for boundary fences. Reasons: The definition is too restrictive.	6 & 10	Accept in part	Definition amended to relate it to the context of historic heritage.	Yes
441.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 01: Definitions- Partial demolition	Decision: Amend the definition of "partial demolition" to be "façadism" and replace this term throughout the plan. Reasons: Façadism means to demolish a substantial part of any building or structure. Façadism includes facade retention which normally involves the demolition of the rear or a substantial part of a building or structure and the retention of the front or main facade and the construction of a new building or structure behind the preserved facade.	6	Reject	No amendments are recommended as there are other forms of partial demolition of buildings which are encompassed by the definition and this term is more readily understood.	No
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
460.1	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 01: Definitions- Minor work, repair and maintenance for historic heritage (new definition)	<p>Decision: Delete the definition of "minor work" relating to historic heritage and replace with a new definition of "Repair and Maintenance, for historic heritage" with consequential amendments throughout the plan:</p> <p>- Add a new definition for "Repairs and Maintenance for historic heritage" as follows:</p> <p>"In relation to a protected historic heritage features, means making good any decayed or damaged fabric to a documented earlier form.</p> <p>Repairs may include the use of retrieved heritage fabric, original materials and/or new materials, only where the use of new materials is necessary to provide significantly better performance as part of the repaired area.</p> <p>Repairs and maintenance also includes general maintenance and regular protective care such as cleaning or preparing and repainting already painted</p>	6 & 10	Accept	Amendments are recommended including adding a definition of "repair and maintenance" and deletion of the definition of "minor work" with consequential amendments throughout the provisions.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>surfaces. Where the heritage item is a park, garden, or setting, repairs and maintenance includes general grounds maintenance and pruning, it does not include the establishment of new paths, driveways, fencing or garden structures or the removal of mature specimen trees that are in a health condition.”</p> <p>Reasons: Not opposed to a level of work which can take place as "minor work" but wish to ensure that the definition is appropriate and reflects the exact nature of works to be undertaken. Regular repair and maintenance of historic buildings is important to maintaining heritage values and should be encouraged. Generally, repair work will involve replacing existing fabric with a similar new material.</p>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
460.2	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 01: Definitions- Alterations or addition for historic heritage (new definition)	Decision: Add a new definition as follows: "Alterations or addition for heritage historic: Alterations and additions means that any alterations or additions to a historic heritage should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material." Reasons: Adopted from ICOMOS NZ Charter.	10	Reject	The suggested wording introduces an element of subjectivity which is undesirable in a definition. In any case, we consider that the term is adequately covered by the definition of each term individually.	No
460.3	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 01: Definitions- Demolition, Partial demolition	Decision: Add a new definition as follows: "Partial demolition: means to permanently remove, deconstruct or demolish a part of any building. Partial demolition is distinct from alteration, which seeks to replace materials. Partial demolition should be limited to parts of the building that are beyond physical repair due to fire or other damage or limited to parts of the building (including interior) that have been identified in a conservation	10	Reject	The defined distinctions between existing definitions "alteration" and "partial demolition" are sufficient.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>plan or heritage assessment as having no significance, are not contributory to the significance of the heritage place, are intrusive, or where the partial demolition reveals fabric of higher degree of significance. Partial demolition may include facade retention which normally involves the demolition of the rear or a substantial part of a building or structure and the retention of the front or main facade and the construction of a new building or structure behind the preserved façade.”</p> <p>Reasons: 'Partial demolition means to permanently remove, deconstruct or demolish a part of any building. Partial demolition is distinct from alteration, which seeks to replace materials. Partial demolition should be limited to parts of the building that are beyond physical repair due to fire or other damage or limited to parts of the building (including interior) that have been identified in a conservation plan or heritage assessment as</p>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			having no significance, are not contributory to the significance of the heritage place, are intrusive, or where the partial demolition reveals fabric of higher degree of significance. Partial demolition may includes façade retention which normally involves the demolition of the rear or a substantial part of a building or structure and the retention of the front or main façade and the construction of a new building or structure behind the preserved façade.'				
<i>FS29</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
191.10	Landlink Ltd	Chapter 01: Definitions- Minor work	Decision: Oppose definition of "minor work" as it is unclear what rule it relates to and seek that this definition be deleted.	10	Accept in part	'Minor work' is recommended to be replaced with 'repair and maintenance' in all rules and 'minor work' definition is recommended to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS41, FS142, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	
General							
133.20	Jan Nisbet	Chapter 10: Misc	Decision: Suggest part of the Turf Farm could be used for a museum/historic display area.	6 and 7	Reject	Howarth Block/ Turf farm zoned Open Space (Recreation). Museum/historic display would appear to be permitted as 'community and cultural activities'. Buildings may need consent. Therefore provided for, but the Council as a landowner would need to decide	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						appropriateness.	
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support</i>	7	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
280.31	Bryce Wilkinson	Chapter 10: General	Decision: Amend policies and rules to permit activities that provide net benefits to the community and only protect something to the extent that doing so provides net benefits and replace fuzzy language with language that minimises the scope for arbitrary decision making. Consequential changes to the rules in this chapter should be made.	6	Reject	These provisions protect specific heritage features from inappropriate development. Section 6 RMA establishes historic heritage as a matter of national importance, requiring that it be protected from inappropriate development.	No
<i>FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.10	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10- Misc	Decision: Amend as follows: replace Category "I" and Category "II" with Category "1" and Category "2". Reasons:	6	Accept	Amend NZHPT category to match their change to Arabic numbers.	Yes
460.32	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Misc	Decision: that Council develop very clear guidance for assessing the potential effects of earthquake strengthening, earthquake prone building or structures which is linked with	10	Reject	Amendments are recommended to Rule 10A.2.1 to clarify when resource consent is required for earthquake strengthening of HNZ listed buildings	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			the Earthquake-prone Building Policy, prepared under the Building Act.				
497.9	RNR Trust	Chapter 10: All Rules	Decision: Oppose policies especially 10.5, 10.10 and 10.11, oppose the rules in the tables in Chapter 10, particularly where they restrict use of the submitters land.	N/A	N/A	SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN 13 OCT 2015	N/A
<i>FS125</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A
Rules							
208.51	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.4- Notable trees (trimming)	Decision: Oppose in part 10A.1.4 Permitted Activities, and amend to add a clause as follows "the removal of branches which do not form part of the main structure of the tree to protect electricity transmission and associated telecommunication lines". Reasons: While the rule is supported, it should also extend to the removal of branches close to the National Grid. Vegetation trimming and removal close to the National Grid is an essential	10	Accept in part	Amendment is recommended to be consistent with the urban tree variation and enable trimming of trees for network utilities and access	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			maintenance activity as vegetation growing too close to existing transmission lines pose very real risks to the operation of the line as a result of flashovers.				
<i>FS107</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
208.52	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.4- Notable trees (minor maintenance for network utilities)	Decision: Support 10A.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities and retain as notified provided that the change to rule 10A.1.4, requested in submission and summarised in chapter 10 opposing summary, is accepted. Reasons: Support reference to network utilities in 10A.3.4	10	Accept in part	Insofar as the rule is retained but some amendments are recommended as the result of other submissions	No
<i>FS107</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
280.32	Bryce Wilkinson	Chapter 10: rules	Decision: Add a rule that establishes a right to injuriously affected landowners to be compensated perhaps in the manner so that they are not taxed unfairly for a measure that benefits all. Consequential changes to the rules in this chapter should be made.	6	Reject.	No amendment is recommended as Section 85 of the RMA notes that compensation is not payable in respect of district plan controls on land.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Reasons:				
FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229			Support	6	Reject	As above	No
306.4	Collin Hope	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3	Decision: Amend Rule 10A.3 so that any building or development on a site adjoining a listed heritage item in the working environment is a restricted discretionary activity and Council's discretion should be limited to the effects of the building or development on the heritage feature. Reasons: To maintain its identity and presence in the Raumati Beach Landscape.	10	Accept in part	An amendment to the Working Environment provisions is recommended, to add "effect on historic heritage" to the matters of discretion for buildings not meeting permitted activity standards in the Working zones. A new rule is not recommended as it would make otherwise permitted development a restricted discretionary activity when there is a heritage feature on an adjacent site.	No
440.65	Kapiti Coast District Council	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.4.1-Default	Decision: Amend rule 10A.4.1 to clarify that subdivision is not a permitted activity.	10	Reject.	Subdivision of any land or site containing historic heritage is clearly identified as RD in 10A.3. Relief sought is unclear.	No
447.11	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.4-Notable trees (trimming)	Decision: Add the following standard under 10A.1.4: "2. The trimming of any branches that are interfering with buildings, structures, overhead wires or utility networks, but only to the extent that they are touching those buildings, or structures, or	10	Accept in part	Amendment is recommended to be consistent with the urban tree variation	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			interfering with those overhead wires or utility networks.” Reasons: Scheduled trees overhanging the rail corridor may require trimming for the safe and efficient operation of the rail line.				
441.63	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.2- Building or structure (repair & maintenance)	Decision: Amend Rule 10A.1.2 to delete standard 4 or amend to clarify whether it is intended that internal alterations to pre 1900 and NZHPT registered buildings are intended to be a permitted activity and if not what activity status is intended.	6 and 10	Accept	Standard 4 is recommended to be deleted.	Yes
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 and 10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 and 10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
441.64	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.4	Decision: Add a discretionary activity rule to 10A.4 for additions to scheduled historic heritage. Reasons: Additions are defined in the interpretation section but no provision has been made in	10	Accept in part	Amendment is recommended to RD Rule 10A.3.2 (renumbered Rule 10A.3.3) to add the words “or additions to” additions in response to other submissions.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			the rules in this chapter.				
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
		<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
441.65	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.2, Rule 10A.4.3, Rule 10A.5.1 & Rule 10A.5.2	Decision: Amend 10A.5.1 and 10A.5.2 to include all scheduled historic heritage and consequently delete 10A.4.2 and 3. Reasons: GWRC considers that all historic heritage items identified in the Schedules of Historic Heritage are worthy of requiring a non-complying resource consent for façadism, relocation and demolition or destruction, not just those registered by the NZHPT	6	Reject	No amendments are recommended as the approach sought by GWRC is restrictive, and is not consistent with the proposed policy framework. The further submission of Heritage NZ (FS175) 'supports in part' all GWRC submissions, provided that they are consistent with the amendments sought by Heritage NZ. Given that Heritage NZ's submissions support the current structure of 10A.4.2 and 3, and 10A.5.1 and 10A.5.2, we consider that Heritage NZ does not support this particular submission of GWRC.	No
FS175			<i>Oppose</i>	6	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No
		<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188,</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS189</i>							
460.26	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.2- Building or structure (repair & maintenance), Rule 10A.1.3- Place or area (repair & maintenance)	Decision: Supports in part with amendment Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities 2 & 3. 'Minor Work' as follows: replace "Minor work" with "Repair and Maintenance" and make consequential amendments made throughout the Plan. Reasons: Other parts of the sub seek to replace definition of minor work with a new definition of repair and maintenance	10	Accept in part	Insofar as the rules are retained with amendments suggested and further amendments are made as the result of other submissions	Yes
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
460.27	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.2- Building or structure (repair & maintenance)	<p>Decision: Supports in part with amendment Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities 2 Standards as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Standard 1. - Amend Standard 2 to delete the text in brackets "(including restoration and reconstruction as defined in the ICOMOS Charter)". <p>Reasons: Standard 2 is amended: 'The work shall not involve alterations, additions, relocation, partial demolition or demolition.' ICOMOS NZ Charter should be used as a non-reg reference document and not as a standard to comply with.</p>	6 and 10	Accept	Amendments are recommended including deleting standard 1, and amendment of standard 2 to remove references to the ICOMOS charter from the standard	Yes
FS177			<i>Support</i>	6 and 10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 and 10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.28	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.3- Place or area (repair &	<p>Decision: Supports in part with amendment Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities 3. Standards as follows: - Delete Standards 3</p>	6 and 10	Accept	Standard 3 is recommended to be deleted	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		maintenance)	and 4. Reasons: Std 3 - ICOMOS NZ Charter should be used as a non-reg reference document and not as a standard to comply with. Std 4 - Historic Places Act 1993 does not authorise maintenance work				
FS177			Support	6 and 10	Accept	As above	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			Oppose in part	6 and 10	Accept in Part	As above	Yes
460.30	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.3- Place or area (repair & maintenance)	Decision: Oppose in part with amendment Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities for Group B, D, 6 and 7 to delete "The maximum extent of land disturbance shall not exceed 10m ³ ". Reasons: The definition of land disturbance is very permissive. HNZ is concerned with the scope of works that are permissible.	6 and 10	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to add a timeframe to the land disturbance standard in Rule 10A.1.6 so that 10m ³ cannot be exceeded in a calendar year as a permitted activity. Regardless of the 10m ³ limit, an archaeological authority will still be required from Heritage NZ where a person "knows, or ought reasonably to have suspected, that the site is an archaeological site".	Yes
FS177			Support	6 and 10	Accept in part	As above	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183,			Oppose in part	6 and 10	Accept in part	As above	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
<i>FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>							
460.31	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.2.1- Building or structure	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Rule 10.A.2. Controlled Activities 1. 'Earthquake strengthening' to add "Alteration for" prior to Earthquake strengthening" and add "and 2" following Category 1" and make consequential amendments made throughout the Plan.</p> <p>Reasons: "Alteration for earthquake strengthening of a historic place (building or structure) with a New Zealand Historic Places Trust Category 1 and 2 classification</p> <p>Barriers to undertaking earthquake strengthening should not be onerous, but must be balanced with ability to apply best practice knowledge and experience. Council should develop clear guidance for assessing such work.</p>	10	Accept	<p>Amendments are recommended including adding 'alterations for' at the start of the rule and adding "and 2" in relation to HNZ listings</p> <p>Further amendments are recommended as the result of other submissions</p>	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
460.34	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.2-	Decision: Supports with amendment Rule 10A.3.2 Restricted Discretionary Activity 2 to replace "modifications" with "addition". Reasons: "Alterations or addition of any historic heritage ... " The PDP does not define 'modification'. The term 'addition' is best practice in terms of historic heritage assessment.	Error! Reference source not found.	Accept	Amendment deleting modification and adding additions is recommended. This is consistent with recommended amendments to other rules.	Yes
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.35	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.3-	Decision: Supports with amendment Rule 10A.3.3 to clarify the phrase "Erection of a new sign...obstructing historic heritage". Reasons: "Obstructing" is not defined and is open to interpretation. Does it refer to preventing access, or preventing viewing of historic place of site?	Error! Reference source not found.	Accept in part	Rule 10A.3.3 is recommended to be deleted as it duplicates provisions in chapter 12	Yes
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.36	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3	Decision: Supports with amendment Rule 10A.3. Restricted discretionary Activities. 5, 6, 7, and 8: supports these Rules, subject to amendments in Permitted Activity rules. Seeks Council adopts Rule 10A.3 -5, 6, 7, 8 subject to amendments in Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities 6, 7, 8. Group B, D, E. Reasons: Supported subject to amendments to permitted activity rules	10	Accept in part	Insofar as the provisions are retained rules recommended to be amended as a result of other submissions.	Yes
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.46	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.1-	Decision: Supports Rule 10A.3.1 Restricted discretionary Activities. 'Subdivision.' and seeks Council to adopt it as proposed. Reasons: Generally,	10	Accept	Insofar as the provisions are retained but amendments recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			inappropriate subdivision will undermine the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of Kapiti Coast. Intensification of land use may exert pressure on historic sites and places of significance to Maori. Changes from subdivision can result in a number of changes that can have a negative impact on historic heritage places.				
			<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.47	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.4.2, Rule 10A.4.3	Decision: Supports Rule 10A.4 Discretionary Activities 2 and 3 and seeks Council to adopt activities 2 and 3 as proposed.	10	Accept in part	Insofar as the provisions are retained but amendments recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
			<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.48	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.5.1 ,Rule 10A.5.5, Rule 10A.5.3, Rule 10A.5.4,	Decision: Supports Rule 10A.5 Non Complying Activities 1, 2,3,4,5 and seeks Council to adopt as proposed.	10	Accept in part	Insofar as the provisions are retained but amendments recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		Rule 10A.5.5					
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
480.45	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.2.1- building or structure (alterations).	Decision: Amend Rules 10A.2.1 Controlled Activities: Standards. In the first line, insert "be" between "work shall not be visible".	10	Accept	Amendments are recommended as they correct grammar.	Yes
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
480.46	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3	Decision: Amend Rules in section 10A.3 where the text says "modifications and alterations to existing buildings does not comply ..." and replace with "do" not comply. Reasons:	10	Accept	Amendments are recommended to these rules to make these corrections	Yes
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
480.47	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.5	Decision: Amend Rules 10A.5 where the references to "significance to lwi" is followed by "***", without any comment on what the stars indicate. Define references to "iwi".	N/A	Reject	This reported anomaly does not appear in the notified version of the PDP- comments may be on an earlier draft.	N/A
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>As above</i>	N/A

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
500.25	Ngatotara Farms Limited and Rod Agar	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.1-	Decision: Amend Rule 10A.3.1. remove standards h), i), j) and k) as requested for Rule 7A.3.2 as well.	N/A	Reject	Relief unclear as there are no such standards.	N/A
Archaeological Alert layer							
216.5	Graham Halstead	Maps: Zone and Features- Arch alert layer	Decision: Map 11B- seek amendment to delete the "Archaeological Alert" on the 1.9ha site on Kapiti Road (as per submission)	8	Accept	Recommend that the Archaeological Alert layer be removed from the DP Maps. The archaeological alert information can be publicly available via the KCDC online geographic information system (GIS) rather than the DP maps.	Yes
319.30	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Maps: Zone and Features- Arch alert layer	Decision: Concerned about the use of the archaeological alert layer. Remove the blanket archaeological alert layer from the PDP and amend to replace with site locations where they are known. Reasons: Concern that layer may trigger requirements for an archaeological authority under the Historic Places Act. Accidental discovery protocol in Sched 10.2 is sufficient for protection of unknown and	6 and 8	Accept in part	Recommend that the Archaeological Alert layer be removed from the DP Maps.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
			unidentified archaeological sites.				
FS29			<i>Support</i>	8	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
FS175			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
262.22	Bunnings Ltd	Maps: Zone and Features- Arch alert layer	<p>Decision: Amend map 11B to remove the "Archaeological Alert" from lot 1 DP441854 as well as the adjoining Airport zoned land.</p> <p>Reasons: The Airport zoned land nearest Lot 1 DP 441854 is occupied by the Mitre 10 outlet and associated parking and loading. The whole of Lot 1 DP 441854 was modified by earthworks when the subdivision of Milne Drive occurred. The land affected by the 'Archaeological Alert' identification has also been modified by the development of a golf driving range. Submitter holds valid resource consents enabling earthworks on the entire site (Lot 1 DP 441854) including a standard condition relating to accidental archaeological discovery. Questions the need for any additional rules relating to the protection of archaeological remains on this site. Questions</p>	8	Accept in part	Recommend that the Archaeological Alert layer be removed from the DP Maps.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			whether the existence and potential loss of archaeological or historic heritage values is a genuine significant resource management issue on this site.				
276.32	Kapiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd	Maps: Zone and Features- Arch alert layer	<p>Decision: Oppose in part and amend to limit the archaeological alert to the southern end of the primary runway and make consequential amendments including to Rule 6G.2.5, 3.4.</p> <p>Reasons: The airport has the necessary archaeological clearances for all but the area at the southern end of the primary runway and the Proposed Plan provides an Accidental Discovery Protocol which is an appropriate safeguard.</p>	6 & 8	Accept in part.	Recommend that the Archaeological Alert layer be removed from the DP Maps.	Yes
<i>FS51, FS145, FS175</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>6 & 8</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
276.44	Kapiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd	Maps: Zone and Features- Arch alert layer	<p>Decision: Amend planning map 11B to confine the archaeological alert to the southern end of the primary runway.</p> <p>Reasons: See also 276-44.</p>	6 & 8 Error! Reference source not found.	Accept in part	Archaeological Alert layer is recommended to be removed from the DP Maps.	Yes
<i>FS51, FS145</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>6 & 8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
Policies							
232.25	Nga Hapu O Otaki	Chapter 10: General-Policy 10.11	Decision: Support policies that ensure archaeological investigations being undertaken in partnership with tāngata whenua. Reasons: The provisions are consistent with the views of Nga Hapū o Ōtaki, and their collaboration with KCDC during district plan development.	6	Accept in part.	Insofar as policies is retained but amendments recommended as the result of other submissions	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No
263.29	Maypole Environment al Ltd	Chapter 10: Policy 10.2	Decision: Amend Policy 10.2 so the criteria are refined and robust evidence is required on more than one criterion in order to establish significance. Reasons: The criteria are very broad and all encompassing, and the policy currently only requires one of the values to be significant in order to include on the schedule of historic heritage.	6	Reject	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as the criteria align with the RPS (policy 21). RPS refers to one or more of the following criteria.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Accept	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
263.30	Maypole Environmental Ltd.	Chapter 10: Policy 10.10	Decision: Remove Policy 10.10 Reasons: The policy states that waahi tapu is "particularly sensitive" to any change and will be protected from any adverse effects of these activities. This is more onerous than section 6 of the RMA and places unreasonable restrictions on the use of land.	6	Reject	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as section 6 of the RMA, lists the protection of historic heritage as a matter of national importance.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No
280.30	Bryce Wilkinson	Chapter 10- Policy 10.5, Policy 10.6, Policy 10.7, Policy 10.8, Policy 10.9, Policy 10.10	Decision: Opposes policies 10.5-10.10. Reasons: Policies fail to provide for community wellbeing as required by the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits. 10.9 also undermines the rule of law and investment certainty by using fuzzy language "inappropriate subdivision".	6	Reject	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as these provisions protect specific heritage features from inappropriate development. Section 6 RMA establishes historic heritage as a matter of national importance, requiring that it be protected from inappropriate development.	No
<i>FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
319.32	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park	Chapter 10 Policy 10.11	Decision: Oppose in part Policy 10.11 and amend to remove this sentence "areas of high	6	Accept.	Archaeological alert layer is recommended to be removed from DP maps.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Inc (El Rancho)		likelihood of identifying archaeology will be identified as archaeological alert layers from the District Plan maps.				
<i>FS29</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	Accept	<i>As above</i>	Yes
441.58	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Policy 10.1, Policy 10.2, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.5,	Decision: Support policies 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.5.	6	Accept	Insofar as the policies are retained but amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.59	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6	Decision: Support and amend Policy 10.6 to delete the first sentence of the policy, and the words 'in established residential areas. Reasons: Concerned that by referring to "original construction condition" it could be interpreted to apply only to buildings, though	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended as they are useful clarifications to the policy The explanatory text for all policies across the plan is recommended to be deleted	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
			<p>there are also archaeological sites in the schedule. While the criteria in sections A and B are appropriate, the Policy intent should be clarified.</p> <p>Modification of historic heritage to maintain the continuity of use, or for new uses, is appropriate where the modification: ...'</p> <p>Amend 3rd bullet point in explanation also - 'through the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings'</p>				
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
441.60	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Policy 10.8	<p>Decision: Support policy 10.8 and amend clause A to add the words "facadism, relocation" and delete "the complete" before demolition, change "and" to "and/or" and delete clause B.</p> <p>Reasons: 'A. Facadism, relocation, demolition and/or</p>	6	Accept in part	Insofar as support is noted however whilst the use of "façadism" is not recommended we recommend a two- tier approach to demolition, partial demolition and destruction of scheduled items.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			destruction of the following historic heritage will be avoided: a) Class I and II items on the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Rarangi Taonga: the Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu Areas; b) Items listed on the Schedule of Historic Heritage; and c) Waahi tapu and places and areas of significance to iwi.				
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
441.61	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Policy 10.11	Decision: Support Policies 10.9 and 10.10	6	Accept	Insofar as the policies are retained but amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	
441.62	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Chapter 10: Policy 10.11	Decision: Support policy 10.11 and amend to add the words "and should be used to inform development" after the words	6	Accept in part	The archaeological alert layer is recommended to be deleted from the maps and the policy is recommended to be amended to reflect this change. Therefore, the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>"district plan maps".</p> <p>Reasons: 'A precautionary approach to protecting unidentified historic heritage will be undertaken. Areas of high likelihood of identifying archaeology will be identified as Archaeological Alert Areas on the District Plan Maps and should be used to inform development...'</p>			<p>suggested wording is not recommended.</p> <p>The explanatory text is recommended to be deleted for all policies in the plan</p>	
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
447.12	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6	<p>Decision: Support policy 10.6.</p> <p>Reasons: There are a number of historic buildings within the rail corridor (B1, 20-24, 111). Support Policy 10.6-Use & modification of HH as it recognises that the modification of these buildings may be necessary to ensure the network</p>	6	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments are recommended as a result from other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			operates effectively.				
460.11	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10- Policy 10.1: Identify HH	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.1 'Identify historic heritage' to clarify which terms is to be used throughout the District Plan- "iwi" or "Maori", when referencing "places or areas of significance...", and that changes are consequential throughout the plan.</p> <p>Reasons: Chapter 1 does not provide a definition of "Places or areas of significance to Iwi". It does however provide a definition of "Places or areas of significance to Maori". The NZHPT does not have a preference, but seek clarification to assist users of the PDP</p>	6 and 8	Accept	<p>Amendments are recommended to use consistent terminology when referring to sites of significance to iwi / Māori. The relevant definition in Chapter 1 notes that "Māori" includes "iwi, hapū and whānau"</p> <p>The recommended definition is "places and areas of significance to Maori".</p>	Yes
<p><i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i></p>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.12	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.5	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.5 'Protection of historic heritage' as follows. Delete "involving" after "...and land use" and replace</p>	6	Accept in part	<p>Amendments are recommended to achieve a similar intent although not the specific wording suggested.</p> <p>The words "and its surroundings"</p>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			with " that effect". Reasons: 'Subdivision, development and land use that effect the District's historic heritage ... '			are recommended to be deleted from the policy as it introduces uncertainty as to how far the policies extend beyond the scheduled item or feature.	
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.13	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6	Decision: Oppose in part Policy 10.6 'Use and modification of historic heritage' and seek amendment as follows. Delete "The continued use and modification of Scheduled historic heritage will be provided for where it is in the original construction condition and intended purpose". Replace the term "modification with "alterations or addition" in Policy 10.6. Delete Clause c) "involves minimum intervention to achieve reasonable use." Reasons: To ensure that the threshold for adaptive re-use is	6	Accept in part	The policy is recommended to be amended to focus this policy (renumbered Policy 10.5) on use repair and maintenance of scheduled historic heritage and remove the assessment criteria from this policy and include them in policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6). References to modification and clause c) are recommended to be removed from the policy however a new clause c) is recommended as follows" will secure the long term viability and retention of the place"	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			not predicated by 'original construction condition and intended purpose'. PDP does not define 'modification'. The term 'alteration or addition' is best practice for historic heritage assessment. Clause (c) does not provide guidance and lacks certainty in terms of 'reasonable use'. Provides a broad scope to achieve Ob 2.7.				
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	
460.14	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6	Decision: supports with amendments Policy 10.6 to give consideration to re-organising the assessment criteria to another standalone section of Chapter 10, and amend "clause A" as follow: delete "of a proposed development involving" and replace with "on". Reasons: 'The following assessment criteria will be considered when assessing the	6	Accept in part	The policy is recommended to be amended to move the assessment criteria to policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6).	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>effects on historic heritage:'</p> <p>The term 'proposed development' does not serve the criteria in any useful way and could be deleted without limiting the generality of the criteria.</p> <p>NZHPT suggest assessment criteria should not be located in a policy.</p>				
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.15	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6A(a)	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.6A(a) to delete "and integrity" following "historic heritage values".</p> <p>Reasons: 'a) The degree to which historic heritage values will be irreversibly lost, damaged, destroyed or enhanced ...'</p> <p>The word 'integrity' is ambiguous when used in the context of assessment criteria. The word does not add value.</p>	6	Accept	The policy is recommended to be amended to move the assessment criteria to policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6).	Yes
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183,</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187							
460.16	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6A(c)	<p>Decision: Supports with amendments Policy 10.6A(c) to add "historic" prior to "heritage", and add "feature" to replace "resource".</p> <p>Reasons: c) the importance attributed to the historic heritage feature by the wider community. Consistent with defined terms.</p>	6	Accept	<p>The policy is recommended to be amended to move the assessment criteria to policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6).</p> <p>The amendment requested is recommended to be made in that policy.</p>	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
460.17	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6A(f)	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.6.A(f) to delete "including the risk to life in the case of earthquake".</p> <p>Reasons: The determination of whether a building poses a "risk to life" in an earthquake is a multi-faceted undertaking. It involves a range of specialist engineering assessments, usually including the preparation of a detailed engineering assessment. The NZHPT is</p>	6	Accept in part	<p>The policy is recommended to be amended to move the assessment criteria to policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6).</p> <p>The amendment requested is recommended to be made in that policy</p> <p>HNZ at meeting on 26 June 2015 has agreed to revised wording: "such as the risk to life in the case of an earthquake".</p>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			concerned this phrase would provide consideration for demolition of heritage buildings without ensuring that Council has all of the specialist information required to make such assessment.				
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.18	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.6A(g)	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.6.A(g) to delete "consistency with" and replace with "have regard to".</p> <p>Reasons: 'g) have regard to the conservation principles set out in the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter;'</p> <p>The charter is a best practice document which does not have any statutory bearing and is hence unenforceable. Note that it is periodically reviewed and maybe superseded at any point.</p>	6	Accept in part	<p>This assessment criteria have been recommended to be transferred to Policy 10.8F (to be renumbered as Policy 10.6) and to include consideration will be given to:</p> <p>c) the conservation principles set out in the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 2010.</p>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.19	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.8A	<p>Decision: Oppose in part Policy 10.8A and amend to delete "The complete demolition and destruction of the following" prior to "Historic heritage" and delete "will be avoided." Following "...partial demolition and destruction".</p> <p>Reasons: Historic heritage will be protected from demolition, partial demolition and destruction'. The policy sets a priority list for activities which threaten historic heritage. The term "avoid" does not provide certainty. The NZHPT submits that to be consistent with Objective 2.7 the policy should be more definite in its approach. Partial demolition contributes to the destruction of heritage values, is still considered a serious threat to historic heritage values.</p>	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to include partial demolition in clause A of Policy 10.8 (renumbered Policy 10.6). Policy 10.8 (to be renumbered as Policy 10.6) establishes a hierarchy of approaches and recommends that the highest level of protection (i.e. "avoid" demolition, partial demolition or destruction) is afforded to Category 1 or 2 items on the New Zealand Heritage List Rārangī Kōrero and scheduled historic building or structure, scheduled historic site, scheduled historic area, or waahi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Maori.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>			<i>As above</i>	
460.20	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.8B-Relocation, demolition & destruction of HH features	<p>Decision: Supports in part with amendment Policy 10.8B to delete from "B." the following: "..., partial demolition or deconstruction" following "The relocation" and replace "minimized" with "avoided". And delete (c) "waahi tapu and places and areas of significance to iwi.</p> <p>Reasons: 'B. The relocation of the following historic heritage will be avoided'. Historic heritage items should remain in their historical location, as cultural significance is often derived from the historical relationship of the place with its surrounds. Relocation of a historic place should be a last resort option. Amend policy to avoid relocation of historic heritage. The NZHPT does not support the relocation of wahi tapu or wahi tapu areas.</p>	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to clarify the relocation of HNZ listed features will be avoided	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102,			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187							
460.21	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.8C(b)	<p>Decision: Oppose in part Policy 10.8C (b) and amend clause "C. as follows. Delete "b) Whether the item is of danger to public safety and repair is not the best practicable option".</p> <p>Reasons: The determination of whether a building is of danger to the public is a multi-faceted undertaking. It involves a range of specialist assessments and usually includes the preparation of a detailed engineering assessment. These assessments need to be peer reviewed to ensure consistency. The phrase "is not the most practicable option" is a subjective statement and provides the opportunity to demolish or relocate buildings without regard to a range of other matters.</p>	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to be made to b) (renumbered Policy 10.6 E i) to clarify how the 'best practicable option is determined, including adding assessment criteria previously located in Policy 10.6 (renumbered Policy 10.5) to this policy	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
460.22	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.9- Subdivision involving historic heritage	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.9 to delete "Inappropriate subdivision of" prior to "Historic heritage" and replace "avoided" with "protected from inappropriate subdivision".</p> <p>Reasons: Historic heritage and its surroundings will be protected from inappropriate subdivision avoided.</p> <p>District plans need to provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. Subdivision is a land use and often results in major land use changes. It must be carefully managed and should not compromise the condition or integrity of historic heritage values. Subdivision should be designed to protect any historic place, historic area, historic and archaeological site, and place and area of significance to Maori. In addition, subdivision should be designed to protect the setting or</p>	6	Accept	Amendments are recommended to ensure that historic heritage will be protected from inappropriate subdivision as they better reflect section 6 of the RMA.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			curtilage of historic heritage.				
			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.23	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.10	<p>Decision: Supports with amendment Policy 10.10 to replace "...recognised as particularly sensitive to any" with "protected from inappropriate", and delete "..., and will be protected from any adverse effects of these activities."</p> <p>Reasons: The determination of whether a building is of danger to the public is a multi-faceted undertaking. It involves a range of specialist assessments and usually includes the preparation of a detailed engineering assessment. These assessments need to be peer reviewed to ensure consistency.</p> <p>The phrase "is not the most practicable option" is a subjective statement and provides the opportunity to demolish or relocate buildings without regard to a range of other matters.</p>	6	Accept	We agree that there should be consistency with the RMA and amendments have been recommended to the policy to address this.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.24	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.11- Unidentified historic heritage arch alert layers	<p>Decision: Oppose in part Policy 10.11 and seeks that it be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide clarity of the intent of the policy, and stipulate any methods which will be used to achieve the policy i.e. use of the Archaeological Alert Area map and Advice Note in Schedule 10.2 - Develop clear rules and guidance in regard to archaeological sites in the District. With consideration been given to the types of information that should accompany resource consent applications for earthworks and subdivisions when archaeological sites maybe present. - Includes the Archaeological Alert Area map in their GIS system to inform consent and land use processes. 	6	Accept in part	For the reasons discussed in relation to Archaeological Alert Areas and Accidental Discovery Protocol amendments are recommended to Policy 10.11 (renumbered as Policy 10.9).	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Reasons: Policy is uncertain. Is it aimed solely at unidentified arch sites or is it intended to apply to all historic heritage? It is a method rather than a policy and needs to be clearly labelled as such. It should not replace the responsibility of the applicant to undertake assessment of heritage values before beginning work. Seems to allow for development to take place under an accidental discovery protocol. Support the use of Arch Alert Areas on the DP maps however the PDP needs to provide guidance as to how this will work in a planning framework, and whether there are any rules around areas deemed to be of high significance. See 2012 report by Dodd Predictive Model for Arch: Kapiti Coast.				
		<i>FS29, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>	<i>Oppose/Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.25	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.12-	Decision: Supports in part with amendment Policy 10.12 and	6	Accept in part	Insofar as support is noted and amendments are recommended to Policy 10.6 (renumbered as	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		Voluntary & non-reg methods	<p>seeks that it be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide specific detail regarding the types of voluntary and non-regulatory methods Council intends to provide to achieve Objective 2.7 and 2.1. <p>Reasons: Support the intent of the policy, but need to guidance as to methods and timeframes.</p> <p>Suggested non-reg methods: Conservation lots provide the potential to allow an applicant to subdivide a property below the minimum lot size in order to preserve heritage values.</p> <p>Waivers of zone provisions to provide flexibility for historic heritage in relation to matters such as undertaking a commercial activity in a residential zone, car parking requirements, loading and site access and landscaping.</p> <p>Specified permitted use rules including; adaptive reuse and could include activities such as: Bed and Breakfast accommodation, Small-scale</p>			Policy 10.5) to facilitate economic use of historic heritage where it enables long term viability and retention of the place.	

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			entertainment and wedding related functions, Social functions and public meetings, Specialised small-scale retail activities (i.e. crafts, pottery, merchandising, Devonshire teas, cafe), House museums and art galleries.				
FS29, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose/Oppose in part</i>	6	Reject	<i>As above</i>	No
460.44	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.2- Criteria for identifying HH	Decision: Supports Policy 10.2 Criteria for identifying historic heritage and seeks Council to adopt it as proposed.	6	Accept in part	A Insofar as the policy is retained but amended as the result of other submissions.	No
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.45	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Policy 10.3- Additional listings for the schedule	Decision: Supports Policy 10.3 Additional listings for the Schedule of Historic heritage and seeks Council to adopt it as proposed.	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to prioritise the inclusion of Category I historic heritage and consideration of Category II and clarify the relationship between policies 10.2 and 10.3	Yes
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Reject in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
480.48	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 10: Policy 10.1, Policy 10.2, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.4, Policy 10.5, Policy 10.6, Policy 10.7, Policy 10.8, Policy 10.9, Policy 10.10, Policy 10.11 & Policy 10.12.	Decision: Support policies.	6	Accept in part	Insofar as the provisions are retained but amendments may result from other submissions.	No
Waahi tapu							
2.1	Waikanae Golf Club	Chapter 10: WTS0318 – Taewapirau	Decision: Oppose the inclusion of WTS0318.	6 & 11	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to the mapping of this WT site to create a two areas one as Wahanga rua and a larger area as Wahanga tahi	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 11	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	Yes
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No
2.2	Waikanae Golf Club	Chapter 10: Policy 10.1 WTS0318 – Taewapirau	Decision: Oppose Policy 10.1 in identifying WTS0318.	6 & 11	Reject	Policy 10.1 is consistent with the RMA and RPS. There is evidence to support the scheduling of Taewapirau waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa. While there is some certainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						that these areas can often not be precisely defined. Amendments are recommended to the mapping of this WT site to create a two areas one as Wahanga rua and a larger area as Wahanga tahi	
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 11	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	No
2.3	Waikanae Golf Club	Chapter 10: Policy 10.2 WTS0318-Taewapirau	Decision: Oppose Policy 10.2 in that there are not tangible criteria defined for the identification of historic heritage [in relation to identifying WTS0318]. Reasons: Lack of evidence. Effect on landowner rights.	6 & 11	Reject.	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as the criteria is considered appropriate to give effect to the RPS and provide for matters in section 6(e) and 6(f) of the RMA. Amendments are recommended to the mapping of this WT site to create a two areas one as Wahanga rua and a larger area as Wahanga tahi	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
2.4	Waikanae Golf Club	Chapter 10: Policy 10.10-WT	Decision: Oppose Policy 10.10 one sided explanation that states "identification of these heritage values rests with iwi, hapū, whānau and marae in	6	Reject.	No amendments are recommended as the policy is considered consistent with that statutory direction in the RMA.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			accordance with their kaitiaki responsibilities". Reasons: No onus to demonstrate objectivity or proof.			The explanation section referred to is also recommended to be deleted throughout the PDP.	
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
25.2	Sara Velasquez	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support tāngata whenua in their endeavours to protect cultural heritage in New Zealand.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	11	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
31.1	Janey Wilson	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Retain the proposed Māori cultural values and waahi tapu as identified in the Proposed District Plan.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
77.11	Louise Trilloe	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove waahi tapu site WTS0137. Reason: 82 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based	6 & 11	Reject	No amendments are recommended as there is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			on inaccurate and incomplete research.			Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	
FS9, FS10, FS142, FS108, FS110, FS175			Support/support in part	11	Reject	As above	No
FS175			Oppose in part	11	Reject	As above	No
78.1	Peter Brownie	Chapter 10: WTS0137- Makahuri	Decision: Remove wahi tapu site WTS0137. Reason: 84 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	11	Reject.	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			Support in part	11	Reject	As above	No
FS175			Oppose in part	11	Reject	As above	No
81.9	Pataka Moore	Chapter 10- WT	Decision- Support the listing of the 40 waahi tapu in the district plan.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			Support in part	11	Accept in part	As above	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS125, FS187, FS175</i>			<i>Oppose/oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
104.9	Declan Graves	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove waahi tapu site WTS0137. Reasons: 82 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS139, FS142, FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
112.1	Monique Lagan	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the inclusion of 40 waahi tapu sites preserving tangata whenua heritage.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
137.4	Caleb Royal	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the inclusion of waahi tapu in the District Plan.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
150.11	Te Rūnanga O Toa Rangatira	Chapter 10: Policy 10.1 Policy 10.2 Policy 10.3 Policy 10.4 Policy 10.5 Policy 10.6 Policy 10.7 Policy 10.8 Policy 10.9 Policy 10.10 Policy 10.11	Decision: Support the following Policies in principle- Policies 10.1-10.11	6	Accept in part.	Insofar as the policies are retained but amended as the result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS229			<i>Oppose</i>	6	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
163.3	Rupene Waaka	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the Ngāti Raukawa waahi tapu.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
171.1	The Brownie Trust	Chapter 10: WTS0137- Makahuri	Decision: Remove waahi tapu WTS0137	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Reasons: 84 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.			Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Opposed in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
193.1	Stephen Johnson	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Seek that the waahi tapu be removed from Derham Road and Paul Faith Lane. Reasons: 39 Paul Faith Lane, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
207.1	Lorraine Brownie	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove waahi tapu are WTS0137. Reasons: 84 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
208.53	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.5(e)-WT 10A.3.6(e)-WT Rule 10A.3.7(c)-WT Rule 10A.3.8(d)-WT	Decision: Support rules 10A.3.5(e), 10A.3.6(e), 10A.3.7(c) and 10A.3.8(d) and retain as notified. Reasons: Supports recognition of network utilities.	10	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Minor amendments are recommended to refer to "network utilities".	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	10	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
225.1	Andrew Melles	Chapter 10: General-WTS0137 Makahuri	Decision: Oppose waahi tapu site WTSD137 and seek the site be deleted from sites in Derham Road and Paul Faith Lane. Reasons: 147 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
232.24	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Chapter 10: General- WT	Decision: Support the inclusion of sites of significance to tāngata whenua in the District Plan.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Support</i>	11	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
232.25	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Chapter 10: General-Policy 10.11 Unidentified HH	Decision: Support policies that ensure archaeological investigations being undertaken in partnership with tāngata whenua.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	11	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
232.26	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Chapter 10: General- WT	Decision: Support policies and rules relating to the protection of identified waahi tapu sites.	11	Accept in part.	Insofar as support is noted and provisions are recommended to be retained but amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
232.27	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Chapter 10: General- WT	Decision: Support policies for the inclusion of Māori and non-Māori heritage in the District Plan and rules to protect heritage.	6	Accept in part.	Insofar as support is noted and provisions are recommended to be retained but amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
232.28	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Chapter 10: General- WT	Decision: Support policies and objectives that identify areas that have a high likelihood of containing waahi tapu are subject to cultural site assessments prior to any excavation work occurring.	6	Accept in part..	Insofar as support is noted and provisions are recommended to be retained but amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
239.1	Deborah	Chapter 10:	Decision: Submission seeks the	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Laing	WTS0137-Makahuri	removal of waahi tapu site WTS0137. Reasons: 98 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.			scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
245.1	Stephan Titze	Chapter 10: General - WT	Decision: Submission supports the protection of historic heritage including the proposed waahi tapu sites shown on the planning maps. Reasons:	6 & 11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
263.31	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Chapter 10: WTS0318-Taewapirau	Decision: Remove item WTS0318 from the schedule 10.1. Reasons: See also 263-38. Map 6B.	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Taewapirau waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa. While there is some certainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas can often not be precisely defined. Two areas defined, one as Waahi	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						Tapu and a larger area as waahi tupuna	
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
263.32	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.6-WT	<p>Decision: Amend Rule 10A.1.6 to ensure activities in Ngarara Zone are exempt from the permitted activity standards if located within an identified Neighbourhood Development that is in accordance with a Council-approved Neighbourhood Development Plan granted under Rule 5C.4.2.</p> <p>Reasons: Sub refers to 10A.3.6 also. As the trigger for consent under these provisions is small (10m³ of land disturbance), it would be more appropriate to consider the effects on the area, other than management of archaeological finds, at the NDP stage, as outlined in submission point 9. This would be more efficient and appropriate than repeating the process of consulting with iwi whenever smaller scale developments are proposed.</p>	10	Reject	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission as the NDP approach has been identified as ultra vires and therefore this request cannot be accommodated.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	10	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
263.38	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Maps: Zones and Features-WT0318	<p>Decision: Delete the following from Map series 6, 7 and 9 (and any associated references in the Proposed District Plan), insofar as they are not identified in the existing District Plan:</p> <p>a) Waahi Tapu WT0318; b) Sensitive Natural Features Overlay;</p> <p>as they relate to the areas in the Ngarara zone and/or Ngarara Precinct (G.P.5).</p> <p>Reasons: Conflicts with a cultural assessment undertaken as part of the plan change, which did not determine that the area had a significance that would categorise it as waahi tapu. No robust evidence. Significant infringement of private property rights.</p> <p>Note: Maypole is pursuing development opportunities on this site and has been in consultation with Te Ati Awa. An expert (Kevin Jones) is / will be undertaking some test pitting. Map 6B</p>	6 & 11	Reject.	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Taewapirau waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa. While there is some certainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas can often not be precisely defined. Two areas have been defined, one as Waahi Tapu and the larger area as waahi tupuna	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
272.3	Te Anau Trust	Chapter 01: Definitions- Land Disturbance	Decision: Amend the definition of 'land disturbance' to exclude minor gardening/landscaping activities and allow for boundary fences.	10	Accept in part	"land disturbance" definition is recommended to be amended to make it clear the threshold volume applies across the site for a full calendar year.	Yes
272.5	Te Anau Trust	Chapter 10: WTS0318- Taewapirau, Policy 10.1- Identify HH, Policy 10.2- Criteria for identifying HH, Policy 10.6- Use and modification of HH, Policy 10.8- Relocation, demolition & destruction of HH features, Policy 10.9- Subdivision involving HH, Policy 10.10- WT, Policy 10.11- Unidentified HH, Rule 10A.1.6-WT, Rule 10A.3.6-	<p>Decision: Remove the waahi tapu 'Taewapirau' (WTS0318) from Schedule 10.1 and the area of the waahi tapu be removed from submitter's land. Or, the following amendments to address the issues set out in the submission:</p> <p>Amend Policies 10.1, 10.2, 10.6, 10.8, 10.9, 10.10, 10.11 (including the introduction of a section explaining each of the waahi tapu groups)</p> <p>Amend Rule 10A.1.6, 10A.3.6, 10A.4 and 10A.5 relating to land use, development and subdivision in areas identified in the Schedule of Historic Heritage as waahi tapu and Other Places and Areas of Significance to Iwi - Group B, including the following amendments:</p> <p>- Amend Rule 10A.1.6 to allow for boundary fences and clarify</p>	6, 10, 11	Accept in part	<p>Recommend Taewapirau is retained in PDP. Two areas have been defined, one as Waahi Tapu and the larger area as waahi tupuna</p> <p>New definition of "land disturbance" is recommended to be amended along with other amendments to make it clear that the threshold volume applies across the site for a full calendar year to clarify the land disturbance rules.</p> <p>Amendments are recommended to the waahi tapu rules including deleting notification clauses</p> <p>Amendments are recommended to the matters of discretion for waahi tapu for restricted discretionary activities in rule 10A.3 to refine them.</p>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		WT, Rule 10A.4, Rule 10A.5, Definitions, Land Disturbance, Modification	<p>the volume of land disturbance permitted.</p> <p>- Oppose the requirement for all resource consents to be publically notified.</p> <p>Reasons: 99 Te Moana Road, Waikanae Beach.</p> <p>Lack of consultation, and information. History of use and development does not support the listing. Rules are restrictive. Map 6B</p>				
<i>FS125, FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	<i>6, 10, 11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>6, 10, 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
319.33	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Chapter 10: WT	<p>Decision: Oppose provisions relating to waahi tapu sites including controls restricting earthworks, new buildings and subdivisions across an entire lot.</p> <p>Reasons: Sub mentions the Heritage NZ review of the Takamore Waahi Tapu.</p> <p>Oppose controls restricting earthworks, new buildings and subdivision across an entire lot when a wahi tapu may only affect a certain area. Propose amended wording.</p>	6, 10, 11	Reject.	<p>No amendments are recommended as a result of the submission as waahi tapu rules were developed to manage key threats to waahi tapu values, including land disturbance, the location of new buildings and subdivisions. These restrictions are considered appropriate to implement Policy 10.10 and to provide for the protection of waahi tapu.</p> <p>Note that rules only apply within identified waahi tapu areas not the entire lot.</p> <p>Two areas have been defined,</p>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						one as Waahi Tapu site (W1) and the larger area as waahi tapu area (W4) with less restrictive rules applying to the latter	
<i>FS108, FS110</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>6, 10, 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
319.34	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.7-WT and Rule 10A.2.2-WT	Decision: Amend Rule 10A.1.7 and 10A.2 to remove the volume limit from the land disturbance standard, instead require compliance with the permitted activity standard for earthworks in the respective zones as set out in the submission. Reasons: Control restricts earthworks, new buildings and subdivision across an entire lot when a wahi tapu may only affect a certain area.	10	Reject	Amendment to the land disturbance threshold or activity status is not recommended as land disturbance is a key concern for identified waahi tapu site. The Waahi tapu area has new rules which are less restrictive	No
319.35	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.3.7-WT	Decision: Amend Rule 10A.3.7a) and f) to apply controlled activity standards rather than permitted activity standards and amend c) to add "new" and amend criteria for notification so that only limited notification is required as set out in the submission.	10	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to rule 10A.3.7(f)) to the extent that public notification of applications on scheduled waahi tapu will not be required. Minor amendments recommended to rules to refer to controlled activity standards where appropriate.	Yes
344.07	John Rice	Chapter 10: WTS0206-Kaiwarehou	Decision: Amend the proposed waahi tapu site based on robust analysis and assessments.	6 & 11	Reject	No amendment to the extent of the WT site are recommended as there is evidence to support the	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			Reasons: 68 Tieko Street, Otaihanga. Map 9B Concerns re: The accuracy of the Pā location. The lack of a transparent and fair process to manage the designation of land as Waahi Tapu. The designation imposing restrictions on heavily modified land. The impact to property valuation.			scheduling of Kaiwaharehou due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the pā, the scheduled area is seen by Te Ātiawa to be an appropriate symbol of Kaiwarehou. This site is recommended to be grouped as wahanga rua.	
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.08	John Rice	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Amend the provisions associated with waahi tapu sites to: - clarify what can/cannot be done within the Waahi Tapu sites. - where significant disturbance has already occurred, that further modification should be allowed. - delete district wide Waahi Tapu rules and replace them with rules specific to each site, a site specific plan being established and agreed to the satisfaction of all affected parties.	10 & 11	Accept in part.	No amendments are recommended as a result of this submission however the modification of the site has resulted in a change of category for the site to wahanga rua	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	10 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	10 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.09	John Rice	Chapter 10:	Decision: Concerned whether	6 & 11	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the work of Dr Kahotea provides a better	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		WTS0206-Kaiwarehou Map 9B	Kaiwarehou Pā was in fact located as designated and that if there is any doubt about this ridgeline (see pages 17-20 of submission) being part of Kaiwarehou Pā, then urgent and detailed archaeological assessments should be carried out to investigate it further.			understanding of the history and cultural significance of the area. However no amendments are recommended to the provisions as a result of this submission.	
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.10	John Rice	Chapter 10: WTS0206-Kaiwarehou Map 9B	Decision: There is evidence to support the Pā on this ridgeline but the current proposed designation is, in our view, too small. Only around 20% of the ridge is to be designated when it would seem that the whole ridge was used as a pa site. Reasons:	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Kaiwarehou due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the pā, the scheduled area is seen by Te Ātiawa to be an appropriate symbol of Kaiwarehou.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support/support in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.11	John Rice	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Seek clarity on whether submitter would be able to subdivide their property due to the significant disturbance to the waahi tapu designation that would be required to gain access to all the lots.	6 & 10	Accept in part	No provisions are recommended to be amended as subdivisions will either be a restricted discretionary to a non-complying activity based on the number of lots and proposed subdivision boundary in relation to the waahi tapu site.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 10	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 10	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.112	John Rice	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support historical sites (waahi tapu) being located, designated and protected and support local iwi in identification of these areas.	6 & 11	Accept in part	Insofar as sites are identified with the best available information.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
344.113	John Rice	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the Waahi Tapu designations been subject to individual assessment and restrictions imposed as a result of this analysis, rather than global restrictions.	6 and 11	Reject	It would be overly complex to develop site specific plans and specific rule sets for each of the waahi tapu sites in the PDP. There is also nothing preventing landowners and iwi forming their own agreements about the use and development of the site which would inform any resource consent process required.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support/support in part</i>	6 and 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6 and 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.04	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WTS0206-Kaiwarehou	Decision: We seek to have the proposed waahi tapu site amended based on robust analysis and assessments. Reasons: 68 Tieko Street, Otaihanga. Map 9B Concerns re: The accuracy of	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Kaiwarehou due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the pā, the scheduled area is seen by Te Ātiawa to be an appropriate	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			the Pā location. The lack of a transparent and fair process to manage the designation of land as Waahi Tapu. The designation imposing restrictions on heavily modified land. The impact to property valuation.			symbol of Kaiwarehou.	
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.05	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: We seek to have the provisions associated with waahi tapu sites amended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •clarify what can/cannot be done within the Waahi Tapu sites. •where significant disturbance has already occurred, that further modification should be allowed. •Delete district wide Waahi Tapu rules and replace them with rules specific to each site, a site specific plan being established and agreed to the satisfaction of all affected parties. 	11	Accept in part.	Accept to the extent that this report helps to clarify what can be done on waahi tapu. However, consider that it would be overly complex to develop site specific plans and specific rule sets for each of the waahi tapu sites in the PDP. There is also nothing preventing landowners and iwi forming their own agreements about the use and development of the site which would inform any resource consent process required.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.06	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WTS0206- Kaiwarehou	Decision: We believe it is highly questionable whether Kaiwharehou Pā was in fact located as designated. We also believe that if there is any doubt	11	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the work of Dr Kahotea provides a better understanding of the history and cultural significance of the area.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			about this ridgeline (see pages 17-20 of submission) being part of Kaiwharehou Pā, then urgent and detailed archaeological assessments should be carried out to investigate it further. Reasons: Map 9B				
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.07	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WTS0206-Kaiwarehou	Decision: There is evidence to support the Pā on this ridgeline but the current proposed designation is, in our view, too small. Only around 20% of the ridge is to be designated when it would seem that the whole ridge was used as a pā site. Reasons: Map 9B	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Kaiwaharehou due to its historical and cultural significance to Te Ātiawa While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the pā, the scheduled area is seen by Te Ātiawa to be an appropriate symbol of Kaiwarehou.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.08	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WTS0206-Kaiwarehou	Decision: Seek clarity on what effects the application of Waahi Tapu on submitter's land will have on submitter's ability to subdivide their land. Reasons: Map 9B	11	Accept in part	Subdivisions will either be a restricted discretionary to a non-complying activity based on the number of lots and proposed subdivision boundary in relation to the waahi tapu site.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.09	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: We fully support historical sites (waahi tapu) being located, designated and protected. We support local iwi in identification of these areas.	11	Accept.	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
350.10	Paula Keene	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: We support the Waahi Tapu designations been subject to individual assessment and restrictions imposed as a result of this analysis, rather than global restrictions.	11	Accept in Part	It would be overly complex to develop site specific plans and specific rule sets for each of the waahi tapu sites in the PDP. There is also nothing preventing landowners and iwi forming their own agreements about the use and development of the site which would inform any resource consent process required.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
414.5	David Moore	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support recognition and protection of waahi tapu and other significant sites.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form.	No
FS125			<i>Oppose</i>	11	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
414.6	David Moore	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support involvement of iwi in decisions regarding waahi	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			tapu identification and related matters.			submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	
<i>FS125</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
423.1	Chris Harrington	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove waahi tapu WTS0137. Reasons: 47 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research.	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
433.1	Katihiku X Trust	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the inclusion of waahi tapu sites in the District Plan.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
435.1	Mary-Anne Wirihana Te Rei	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the inclusion of waahi tapu sites in the District Plan.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
438.1	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki - Ngāti Koroki	Chapter 10-WT	Decision: Support the waahi tapu work and request the support continues after 2014.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
440.66	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.6.2- WT	Decision: Correct numbering in 10A.1.6.2 so that 2.1), 2.b) and 2.c) are individual standards (i.e. change a, b and c to 1, 2 and 3.	10	Accept	Minor correction	Yes
445.1	Miriam Selby-Rickit	Chapter 10-WT	Decision: Support the protection of waahi tapu in the District Plan, in particular the Ngāti Raukawa sites suggested by Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki and researched by Pataka Moore.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part</i>	11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.29	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.1.6-WT, 10A.1.7-WT, Rule	Decision: Supports in part with amendment Rule 10.A.1. Permitted Activities for 6, 7 and 8. Group B, D, and E as follows:	10	Reject	No amendments are recommended as if the waahi tapu sites contain a scheduled building with a Category 1 or 2 classification then there are other	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		10A.1.8-WT	<p>Following "Modification and alterations to existing buildings," add "excluding Category 1 or Category 2 items on the NZHPT register." And that consequential amendments are made throughout the Chapter.</p> <p>Reasons: Modification and alterations to existing buildings, excluding Category 1 or Category 2 items on the NZHPT register.</p>			rules which apply.	
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
460.30	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10.A.1.6-WT and Rule 10A.1.7-WT	<p>Decision: Oppose in part with amendment Rule 10A.1. permitted activities for Group B, D, 6 and 7 to delete "The maximum extent of land disturbance shall not exceed 10m³".</p> <p>Reasons: 10m³ is too significant a volume of work as a permitted activity, especially when the land is also a significant arch site. The rule also does not provide clear guidance on the frequency with which the land disturbance can</p>	10	Reject	No change to the land disturbance threshold or activity status is recommended.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			occur. Could result in drastic changes to the landscape.				
FS177			Support	10	Reject	As above	No
FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187			Oppose in part	10	Accept in Part	As above	No
FS177			Oppose	10	Accept	As above	No
460.39	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Misc	<p>Decision: Amend District Plan to include acknowledge of all hapū groups in Kāpiti Coast including Muaūpuko.</p> <p>Reasons: Muaūpuko sites and pre 1820 sites are missing from waahi tapu listings. The NZHPT note that investigation and listings have focussed on post 1820 occupation of the Coast.</p>	11	Reject	The waahi tapu sites in the PDP have been identified by three main iwi who have mana whenua in our rohe. It is the role of iwi to identify and prioritise the protection of waahi tapu sites in the first instance.	No
460.48	Heritage New Zealand	Chapter 10: Rule 10A.5.1-building or structure, site, tree, area, WT (partial demolition, demolition or destruction), Rule 10A.5.5-building or structure, site, area, WT	Decision: Supports Rule 10A.5 Non Complying Activities 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and seeks Council to adopt as proposed.	10	Accept	Insofar as the provisions are retained in their current form noting that amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		(relocation), Rule 10A.5.3-WT, Rule 10A.5.4- WT, Rule 10A.5.5-WT					
<i>FS42, FS57, FS58, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS187</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
488.1	Colin Mowbray	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove Waahi Tapu site WTS0137 Reasons: 6 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175, FS125</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
515.1	Katihiku Marae Committee	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support the current 40 waahi tapu sites, including those identified within the submitter's whenua boundaries.		Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
516.1	Sacha Kenny	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove WTS0137 from the District Plan. Reasons: 635 State Highway 1, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
517.1	The MacDonald Group	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove WTS0137 from the District Plan. Reasons: 80 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
518.1	Rita Toney	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove WTS0137 from the District Plan. Reasons: 107 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research			boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
519.1	Mark Watson	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove WTS0137 from the District Plan. Reasons: 76 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
FS175			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
520.1	Stuart Becker	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Remove WTS0137 from the District Plan. Reasons: 55 Derham Road, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
FS108, FS110, FS175			<i>Support in part</i>	6 & 11	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
539.1	Robert Isted	Chapter 10: WTS0137-Makahuri	Decision: Amend planning maps and schedule of historic heritage by deleting waahi tapu site WTS0137. Reasons: 63 Paul Faith Lane, Te Horo Map 18B. Effect on future use, and property values. Based on inaccurate and incomplete research	6 & 11	Reject	There is evidence to support the scheduling of Makahuri waahi tapu due to its historical and cultural significance to Ngāti Raukawa. While there may be some uncertainty on the exact boundary of the waahi tapu, the nature of pā on the Kāpiti Coast means that these areas often cannot be precisely defined.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>6 & 11</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
557.1	Daniel Castle	Chapter 10: WTS0127B-Taumānuka 3F	Decision: Amend the waahi tapu site WTS0127B to exclude the submitters land. Reasons: Lots 8 & 9, DP 15133, 55 Kāpiti Lane, Ōtaki. Effect on property values. Inaccurate and incomplete research. Map 2B	11	Accept	Recommend that his property removed from the waahi tapu.	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
559.2	Whakarongotai Marae - Te Āti Awa	Chapter 10: WT	Decision: Support District Plan and waahi tapu work of Pataka Moore etc.	11	Accept	The PDP provides for improved protection of waahi tapu. Accept submission to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments have been recommended as a	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendm ents to PDP?
						result of other submissions.	
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>FS175</i>			<i>Oppose in part.</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

