

# Te Tai o Poutini Plan

## Introductory Planning Statement

### Historic Heritage - Ngā Tuku Ihotanga



## Procedural Matters

1. There are three procedural matters that I need to cover off.
2. Firstly the evidence of Manawa Energy was not uploaded to the website until a few days ago. I have checked the further submissions and identified there is one further submission in support of a Manawa Energy submission point – this was on their submission point on HH – P4 (S438.063). The further submission was from Birchfield Goldmines (FS232.017) in support of the Manawa Energy position. On this basis I consider that the late release of information has not been prejudicial to the process.
3. Secondly the pre-hearing meeting notes from the pre-hearing meeting with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga had not been uploaded to the website 5 days prior to this hearing. They have now been uploaded. I have however referred to the content of the pre-hearing meeting in my s42A report which was informed by that meeting.
4. And finally Appendix Four, which I refer to in my report was not uploaded to the website. This has just been done in the last 15 minutes. This appendix is relevant to the first speaker Laura Mills and I apologise that she did not receive this information prior to the hearing. The information is the full historic heritage records prepared for the sites recommended to be included in the Historic Heritage schedule. While this is important information that outlines the detailed historic heritage values of these sites, I included them for completeness in my report. I do not consider that this information being unavailable has been prejudicial to the submitter.

## Introduction to the Historic Heritage Topic

5. Tēnā koutou. My name is Lois Margaret Easton. I have been the principal planner during the period of development of Te Tai o Poutini Plan. I have been the lead planner for all but four of the topics within Te Tai o Poutini Plan. My credentials are outlined in the relevant s42A reports and I will not repeat these here.
6. I have been advised on this topic by Dr Anne McEwan, a heritage consultant and her report and heritage item assessments have been included in the appendices to my report.
7. The West Coast is exceedingly rich in historic heritage resources. The region has a diversity of significant places – historic buildings and structures, archaeological sites, historic settlements and sites, coastal sites and Māori heritage.
8. New Zealand's system of management of historic heritage involves shared responsibility between central and local government.
9. In terms of the development of Te Tai o Poutini Plan there has been significant engagement with the other agencies involved in historic heritage management, and in particular Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
10. There are also a large number of heritage interest and community groups across the West Coast, and specific consultation was undertaken with these groups in developing plan provisions.
11. Historic Heritage, as defined in the RMA includes Sites of significance to Māori, including wahi tapu.
12. However the National Planning Standards give direction that 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' be included in a separate chapter and this hearing topic will be the subject of a hearing to occur in April next year.
13. When developing the TTPP provisions for historic heritage a number of key issues were identified. Heritage features are important to the sense of place and identity for West Coast Communities but there was a lack of clear objective and policy framework in their management.
14. All three operative plans were developed before the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision use and development was made a matter of national importance in 2003. They also predate the introduction of the HNZPT Act in 2014. There were also significant issues in rule interpretation identified, as the rules were loosely drafted and difficult to interpret.
15. Heritage items were identified in all three operative district plans, but Westland District Plan had no historic heritage objectives. Ad hoc approaches to heritage management were a significant concern of the community.
16. There are significant financial implications for maintaining heritage items and buildings in particular with the requirements around earthquake strengthening. It was recognised that "demolition by neglect" was a significant problem in parts of the West Coast. Greymouth is

- unusual in that many of the oldest buildings are on leasehold land, and this creates further constraints around funding their maintenance, repair and upgrade to enable ongoing use.
17. During the lifetime of the operative Grey District Plan many heritage buildings have fallen into disrepair. There have been some demolitions, notably Remingtons Hotel and Waitaki House.
  18. It was therefore important that TTPP not create barriers to necessary earthquake strengthening and repair and support adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. This had to be balanced with sensitivity to the heritage values of the feature.
  19. A key issue that arose within Westland and Grey Districts was the matter of relocation of heritage buildings and items such as memorials. The operative Plans did not well manage the issue of relocation, and the impacts this has on heritage value, and also the effects on the connection that these heritage items have with the communities in which they are located. This was a significant matter TTPP needs to resolve.
  20. In terms of identification and assessment of heritage items, the operative plans contained only some of the items that were included on the HNZPT register. New items have also been added to the register during the life of the operative district plans.
  21. On the HNZPT register, currently there are 113 historic places on the West Coast, 7 historic areas and 2 wāhi tapu areas.
  22. Alongside the built heritage, there are a large number of archaeological sites on the West Coast.
  23. The operative plans took a variable approach to archaeology. The operative Grey District Plan contains no provisions around archaeological sites, though a list of known sites is provided for information. The Westland District Plan included a handful of items in its heritage schedule, but did not differentiate them from other items. The operative Buller District Plan had a mix of archaeological sites, Māori cultural heritage sites, historic heritage buildings and items and some replica items. While a list of archaeological sites from the New Zealand Archaeological Association site recording scheme was included, they were not explicitly identified as archaeological sites.
  24. A key part of developing the TTPP provisions has been therefore a review of the schedule. In this there has been a large degree of assistance from HNZPT, because there was limited financial capacity and no heritage planning capability on the West Coast.
  25. While nominations for new heritage items were sought from the community, ultimately very few items, other than those on the HNZPT register have been included in the TTPP Schedule.
  26. I will now turn to the s42A report on the Historic Heritage Topic
  27. The submissions received were largely supportive of the resource management approach, and the majority of submissions were focussed on the matters of detail in relation to the wording of the objectives, policies and rules.
  28. I have supported a number of amendments to the chapter. The most significant of these are as follows:
    - a. Changes to the overview section to explain the linkages between the chapter and the list of archaeological sites in Schedule Ten.
    - b. Adding a new Policy HH – P10 specifically providing for new infrastructure within a heritage site or item.
    - c. Adding an Advice Note to Rule HH – R1 clarifying that interiors of buildings are not protected unless they are part of the scheduled extent
    - d. Amending the Permitted Activity Rule HH – R3 to allow for maintenance and repair of regionally significant infrastructure
    - e. Changing relocation and repositioning to be a Restricted Discretionary rather than Controlled Activity where the need arises due to a Natural Hazard, and from Restricted Discretionary to Discretionary Activity for all other reasons
    - f. Changing Demolition and Destruction of Heritage Items from a Discretionary to a Non – complying Activity.
    - g. Inclusion of a further six heritage items in the schedule.

### Close

29. This is the key context and matters for the Section 42A report.
30. Thank you