

BEFORE Kapiti Coast District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

and

In the matter of Proposed District Plan – Chapter 10 – Historic Heritage

Date 21 April 2016

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY CAROLINE WATSON ON BEHALF OF THE SUBMISSION MADE BY GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Introduction

My name is Caroline Watson. I am a policy advisor for Greater Wellington Regional Council. I have been employed by Greater Wellington Regional Council in this capacity since 2009.

I have a Bachelor of geography and environmental studies and a Masters of Environmental Studies from Victoria University, Wellington. I have processed resource consents, provided regional policy advice on notified resource consents and district plan changes, presented evidence at hearings and have resource management policy development experience.

I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert in resource management planning are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, and where my evidence relies on evidence provided by others this is expressly referenced.

1. Scope of evidence and Greater Wellington Regional Council's submission

- 1.1.1 The following evidence relates to a submission from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) on 01 March, 2013 on the Proposed Kapiti Coast District Plan (PDP).
- 1.1.2 GWRC's submission assessed the PDP for consistency with the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (2013) (RPS). The assessment

focussed on how the PDP fits within the regional policy framework for historic heritage and whether these issues have been adequately addressed through the PDP process.

1.1.3 The purpose of this evidence is to provide responses to the recommendations in the Officer's Report.

1.1.4 My evidence today will:

- (a) outline the policy and strategic context of this evidence,
- (b) summarise GWRC's submission,
- (c) respond to the Officer's Report recommendations on the matters covered in GWRC's submission, and
- (d) requests decisions on the PDP.

2. Policy and strategic context

2.1.1 The RPS is a regional document that identifies significant resource management issues within the region and sets out the objectives, policies, and methods to achieve the integrated management of natural and physical resources for the Wellington region.

2.1.2 The RPS sets out objectives and policies that provide local authorities with direction and guidance on resource management issues that must be given effect to when making changes to district and regional plans (in accordance with section 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA)) (policies 1-34). The RPS also provides direction on policies that must be considered as part of resource consent application (policies 35-60).

2.1.3 GWRC is particularly interested in how the PDP will support and contribute to achieving the integrated management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region.

3. Summary of submission

3.1.1 GWRC made a submission largely in support for the provisions on historic heritage in the PDP.

3.1.2 The submission made comments and sought amendments on some of the objectives, policies and rules related to historic heritage in the PDP.

4. Response to the Officer's Report recommendations

4.1 Policy 10.1 – Identify historic heritage, Policy 10.2 – Criteria for identifying historic heritage, Policy 10.3 – Additional listings for the schedule of Historic Heritage and Policy 10.5 Protection of historic heritage

4.1.1 GWRC supported policies 10.1, 10.2 , 10.3 and 10.5

4.1.2 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to accept our points on Policies 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.5 and ask that the recommendations be accepted.

4.1.3 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:

(a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and

(b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically policies 21 and 22.

4.2 Policy 10.6 – Use and modification of historic heritage

4.2.1 GWRC sought that the first sentence of Policy 10.6 be deleted as we were concerned that it could be interpreted to apply only to buildings and not the archaeological sites also on the Schedule of Historic Heritage.

4.2.2 GWRC also sought that the third bullet point in the explanation of Policy 10.6 be amended. I note that all explanations have been deleted.

4.2.3 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to accept in part our points on Policy 10.6 and ask that the recommendations be accepted.

4.2.4 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:

(a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and

(b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically policies 22 and 46.

4.3 Policy 10.8 – Relocation, demolition, destruction and removal of the Schedule of Historic Heritage

4.3.1 GWRC generally supported the intent of Policy 10.8 but was concerned regarding the use of the term "partial demolition" as it could be confused with alterations. GWRC considered that the definition of 'partial demolition' in the PDP described façadism and that this term should be used instead.

4.3.2 I agree with the recommendations in the Officer's Report that the existing definition of 'partial demolition' adequately covers façadism and that 'partial demolition' is a term more easily understood by the public.

- 4.3.3 I accept the recommendations in the Officer's Report to reject this point (441.3) on Policy 10.8.
- 4.3.4 GWRC also sought that the policy framework for relocation and façadism (partial demolition) should be the avoidance, rather than minimisation for category 1 and 2 items on the NZ Heritage List Rarangi Korero in order to protect significant historic heritage.
- 4.3.5 I note that the management of historic heritage in the PDP now includes a two-tier rule and policy approach for the demolition, partial demolition or destruction of historic heritage.
- 4.3.6 If an item is both a Category 1 or 2 item on the Heritage NZ list and listed in the Schedule of Historic Heritage, then the policy approach is to avoid demolition, partial demolition and destruction with a non-complying rule status. If the item is only on the Schedule of Historic Heritage, the policy approach is to "minimise" demolition, partial demolition and destruction with a discretionary rule status.
- 4.3.7 I consider that this two-tier approach is consistent with the direction provided in the RPS to protect historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The assessment criteria provided in Policy 10.6 offers appropriate guidance when assessing effects on historic heritage whether the activity has a discretionary or non-complying rule status. The option remains to decline consent which can provide protection on an individual basis when necessary.
- 4.3.8 I assume the assessment criteria in Policy 10.6.A are intended to be used to assess the effects of other activities such as partial demolition, demolition and destruction on historic heritage, not just activities involving use and modification, as described in Policy 10.8.
- 4.3.9 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to accept in part this point (441.60) on Policy 10.8 and ask that the recommendations be accepted.
- 4.3.10 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:
- (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
 - (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically policies 22 and 46.

4.4 Policy 10.9 – Subdivision involving historic heritage and Policy 10.10 – Waahi Tapu

- 4.4.1 GWRC supported policies 10.9 and 10.10.
- 4.4.2 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to accept our points on Policies 10.9 and 10.10 and ask that the recommendations be accepted.
- 4.4.3 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:

- (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
- (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically Policy 21.

4.5 Policy 10.11 – Unidentified historic heritage

- 4.5.1 GWRC supported Policy 10.11 and the use of the archaeological alert layer. I note from the Officer's Report that it is proposed that this alert layer be available on the Council's public GIS system instead.
- 4.5.2 I am satisfied that having information available to the public along with the policy approach in Policy 10.6 and the Archaeological discovery protocol in Schedule 10.2 referred to in permitted activity conditions, provides a robust approach to avoiding the destruction of unidentified archaeological sites which is consistent with RPS Policy 22.
- 4.5.3 GWRC also sought an amendment to the wording of Policy 10.11, which has been deleted in the Officer's Report along with the rest of the sentence.
- 4.5.4 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report and ask that the recommendations be accepted.
- 4.5.5 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:
 - (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
 - (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically Policy 22.

4.6 10.1.2 Rules and Standards

Permitted activities

- 4.6.1 GWRC sought that standard 4 be deleted in 10A.1 Permitted Activities Rule 2.
- 4.6.2 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to accept our points on 10A.1 permitted activities and ask that the recommendations be accepted.
- 4.6.3 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:
 - (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
 - (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically Policy 22.

Discretionary activities

- 4.6.4 GWRC sought that additions to historic heritage be a discretionary activity by being added to section 10A.4 Discretionary Activities.
- 4.6.5 I support the recommendations in the Officer's Report to add a rule for additions to historic heritage as a restricted discretionary activity because of the

policy support offered in Policy 10.6 and ask that the recommendations be accepted.

4.6.6 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:

- (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
- (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically policies 22 and 46

Non-complying activities

4.6.7 GWRC sought that non-complying rules 10A.5.1 and 10A.5.2 be amended to include all scheduled historic heritage.

4.6.8 As above under our comments on Policy 10.8, I note the rationale for a two-tier policy and rule approach for the management of historic heritage. While RPS Policy 21 does not provide for a classification of significance (e.g. more or less significant), the assessment criteria provided in Policy 10.6A and 10.6B offers suitable guidance as to what is appropriate for the different activities covered in the rules.

4.6.9 I accept the recommendations in the Officer's Report to reject this point.

4.6.10 The reason for my response is that the recommendations:

- (a) Support the purpose and principles of the RMA, specifically section 6, and
- (b) Give effect to the RPS, specifically Policy 22.

5. Decisions requested

5.1.1 I request that KCDC notes our support for the recommendations related to historic heritage in this Officer's Report and asks that the recommendations are included in the decision.



Caroline Watson