

History

Introduction	2
Iwi/Introduction	3
Heritage	24
Heritage Character	46
Active Reserves	53
Natural Hazards	55

Introduction

This document outlines the Commissioners recommended changes to the Proposed Changes to the Ruapehu District Plan (notified June 2010). It also contains the key reasons for these recommended amendments.

This document addresses the following chapters:

- Iwi/Introduction
- Heritage
- Heritage Character
- Active Reserves
- Natural Hazards

Complete Wording of Provisions is provided in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*

Please note, recommended changes may be addressed in a number of different sections of this and the accompanying documents. To see a complete version of any individual changes see the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*.

Principle Document

Every effort has been taken to ensure that the amendments to the plan change text are identical in both this document and the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*. However, should there be any inconsistencies between the two documents, the wording in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)* will be taken as the correct wording.

Numbering Inconsistencies

Due to changes in numbering as a result of submissions we have tended to use the original numbers given to provisions when the Plan Change was notified in this document (however there are examples where the amended reference numbers have been used). However, amended numbers are used in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)* and will therefore be taken as the correct numbering.

IWI/INTRODUCTION

What	Why	Who	Where
4.1 General Submissions: Consultation with Maori			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Inclusion of text from Section 4.1 of the staff Planning Report and include this text in the Tangata Whenua Chapter, under a new Heading: TW1.2 AN UNDERSTANDING OF MAORI VALUES	The inclusion of modified text from the Horizon's One Plan relating to Maori Values will address one of the issues raised by Ngati Haua, and will be one mechanism to try and ensure that there is a greater understanding of Maori Values in relation to resource management issues. This will be especially useful for people applying for resource consents where there is the potential to affect Maori Values, and also for Council when considering these applications.	Keith Barrett (86.1) accepted in part Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.1(a)) accepted in part Ngati Rangī (255.2) accepted in part Federated Farmers (FS 1076.1) accepted in part Guy Smallman (FS. 1083.1&2) accepted in part Ngati Hikairo (FS. 1084.1&2) accepted in part	12

What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 General Submissions: Iwi Management Plans			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
TW1.2 IWI AUTHORITY PLANNING DOCUMENTS <u>A number of Iwi Authority Planning Documents have been prepared by iwi. The RMA specifies that: 'Territory Authority when preparing or changing a district plan, must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.'</u> (Section 74(2A))	The recommended amendments to the text in the Tangata Whenua section will ensure that the text is consistent with Section 74(2A) of the RMA, while the reference to all of the known Iwi and Hapu Authority Planning Documents will provide guidance to both applicants and Council. Should additional Iwi Authority Planning Documents be produced these can be incorporated in subsequent plan changes.	Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.1(b),2) accepted in part Winston Oliver (131.4(a)) rejected Rural Community Group (180.1(b)) accepted John Chuman (181.1(b)) accepted Michael Plowman (211.2(c)) accepted Bryan Finnerty (226.1(b)) accepted Miriam Gillingam (227.1(b)) accepted Ngati Rangī (255.1) accepted Ngati Haua (309.7, 309.8) Guy Smallman (FS 1083.1&2 re:112.1(b)) accepted in part	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.2 General Submissions: Iwi Management Plans</p> <p><u>In addition, Iwi Authority Planning Documents are a very useful reference for both applicants and Council as a first point of reference for determining the key issues for a particular iwi.</u></p> <p><u>As of.....Council is aware of the following Iwi and Hapu Authority Planning Documents:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>He Mahere Taiao – The Maniaport Iwi Environmental Management Plan 2007</u> • <u>Nga Hapu of Uenuku Strategic Plan Nov 2008-12</u> • <u>Ngati Rangī: Waterways Policy Document 2002</u> • <u>Ngati Rangī: Strategic Plan 2009 to A tona Wa</u> • <u>Ruakopiri Strategic Plan Nov 2008-Nov 2011</u> • <u>Strategic Plan for Mana Airki 2007-2012</u> • <u>Tangata Whenua Planning Document – Ruapehu District and the Ngati Haua Iwi Development Plan 2020</u> • <u>Te Awa Tupua Planning Document</u> • <u>Te Runanganui o Ngati Kikairo ki Tongariro Strategic Plan 2010/2020</u> • <u>The Whanganui River Rights Charter</u> • <u>Tuwharetoa Environment Management Plan 2003</u> • <u>Whanganui Iwi Vision 2020</u> <p><u>Council is aware that additional Iwi Authority Planning Documents may be produced by iwi in</u></p>		<p>Ngati Kikairo (FS 1084.1&2, re:112.1(b)) accepted in part Michael Plowman (FS 1058.1 re: 181.1(b)) accepted</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.2	General Submissions: Iwi Management Plans		
<u>the future, and as such, the above list cannot be seen as a complete list of Iwi Authority Planning Documents. It is however, a useful initial reference point.</u>			

What	Why	Who	Where
4.3	Acknowledgement of Tangata Whenua		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	The list above will help to provide some guidance to both applicants and Council in relation to the main iwi and hapu groups that Council currently consults with. During the life of this plan the Waitangi Tribunal claims process may more clearly identify who has tangata whenua status.	Ngati Hari (92.1) rejected Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.1(a)) rejected Ngati Haua (309) rejected Ngati Rangatahi (318.1) rejected Guy Smallman (FS 1083.1&2) rejected Ngati Hikairo (FS 1084.1&2) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.4	Plan Change versus Full District Plan Review		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	The Biodiversity provisions of the Operative District Plan will be reviewed once a decision has been made on the appeal on the Biodiversity section of the One Plan.	Ngati Haua (309.1(c)) rejected	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.5	Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Amend Section Titled 'Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District as follows:</p> <p>District-Wide Introduction</p> <p><u>Introduction to the District</u> <u>The Ruapehu District covers 6,700km² (673,019 ha) and, in early 2009, has 9,700 properties, of which 8,719 are rateable. The land can be divided by type as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>28% Recreational land (mainly Department of Conservation estate).</u> • <u>51% Primary use land (agriculture, forestry etc.).</u> • <u>8% Defence estate.</u> • <u>13% Other (i.e. urban).</u> <p><u>The District is primarily bordered by the Whanganui River in the West, the Hauhungaroa Range in the North East and stretches towards the peaks of Tongariro, Ngauruhoe, and Ruapehu, with the latter rising to 2,797 metres from the surrounding countryside. The District then continues east across State Highway 1 to include Ohakune and the southern-most town of Waiouru and the NZ Defence Force lands.</u></p> <p><u>Within the District there are two National Parks, Whanganui National Park and Tongariro National Park; the latter has dual World Heritage status for culture and landscape. Pureora Forest Park, Kara Forest, Tongariro Forest and Waitaanga Forest are also significant areas of indigenous vegetation.</u></p> <p><u>Early history shows that the Whanganui River and its tributaries were used by Maori to facilitate trade and communication between the Waikato, Taranaki, Taupo, and Bay of Plenty regions. Clusters of archaeological sites are found at the confluences of major rivers such as the Retaruke and the Ohura</u></p>	<p>Additional text has been recommended to ensure that the Introduction to the District Plan provides a broad overview of the social, environmental, economic and cultural situation of the District. This text is predominantly derived from the 2009-19 LTCCP. Minor changes are also recommended to ensure that the meanings of the terms: Maunga and Awa are clarified in the text.</p>	<p>Winston Oliver (131.1 rejected & 131.4(b)) accepted Annie Carmichael (133.4) accepted in part Rural Community Group (180.1(b)) rejected John Chuman (181.1(b)) rejected Michael Plowman (211.1) accepted in part Velma Siemonek (212.1) accepted in part Donald Siemonek (214.1) accepted in part Bryan Finnerty (226.1(b)) rejected Miriam Gillingham (227.1(b)) rejected Ngati Rang (255.2) accepted in part Ruapehu District Council (268.1) accepted Ngati Haua (309.11, 13, 14)</p>	12



What	Why	Who	Where																
<p>4.5 Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <p><u>with the Whanganui, where smoked and dried seafood were consumed in winter after being gathered at the coast during summer months.¹ There are also many early European historic sites in the District such as the flourmills along the Whanganui River, and sites relating to riverboat and railway activities.</u></p> <p><u>The stunning natural beauty means that the traditional agricultural economy is added to by growing tourism.</u></p> <p><u>More information about the Ruapehu District can be found in Council's Ruapehu 2008 State of the District Report and online at www.ruapehudc.govt.nz</u></p> <p><u>Population and Growth</u></p> <p><u>A resident population of 13,572 was recorded for the District in the 2006 Census. The population of the District has been declining over the last two census periods.</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="297 807 1263 1101"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Location</u></th> <th><u>1996 Census</u></th> <th><u>2001 Census</u></th> <th><u>2006 Census</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Owhango</u></td> <td><u>216</u></td> <td><u>207</u></td> <td><u>189</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Ohura</u></td> <td><u>375</u></td> <td><u>222</u></td> <td><u>165</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Rural Ohura</u></td> <td><u>1,128</u></td> <td><u>1,071</u></td> <td><u>930</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Location</u>	<u>1996 Census</u>	<u>2001 Census</u>	<u>2006 Census</u>	<u>Owhango</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>Ohura</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>Rural Ohura</u>	<u>1,128</u>	<u>1,071</u>	<u>930</u>			
<u>Location</u>	<u>1996 Census</u>	<u>2001 Census</u>	<u>2006 Census</u>																
<u>Owhango</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>189</u>																
<u>Ohura</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>165</u>																
<u>Rural Ohura</u>	<u>1,128</u>	<u>1,071</u>	<u>930</u>																

¹ 1991, New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 'Historic Places Inventory, Ruapehu District'.



What	Why			Who	Where
4.5	Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)				
Taumarunui	<u>5,832</u>	<u>5,139</u>	<u>5,052</u>		
Rural Taumarunui	<u>1,836</u>	<u>1,611</u>	<u>1,584</u>		
National Park Village	<u>237</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>240</u>		
Rural National Park	<u>672</u>	<u>588</u>	<u>555</u>		
Ohakune	<u>1,389</u>	<u>1,293</u>	<u>1,101</u>		
Raetihi	<u>1,167</u>	<u>1,068</u>	<u>1,035</u>		
Waiouru	<u>2,478</u>	<u>1,647</u>	<u>1,380</u>		
Rural Waimarino/Waiouru	<u>1,413</u>	<u>1,218</u>	<u>1,344</u>		
Total	<u>16,743</u>	<u>14,295</u>	<u>13,569</u>		
<p>However, there is still development occurring within the District. Much of this development is driven by demand for holiday home accommodation. The following information, based on Non Resident Ratepayers Surveys in 2008 and 2010, provides some insight into this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The number of holiday homes is growing by almost 2.5% per year.</u> ▪ <u>Over 1/3 of all the District is owned by people living outside the area (38.7%).</u> ▪ <u>1/4 of people who own land in the Ruapehu District live outside the District (24.5%).</u> ▪ <u>The four areas which have the highest number of people who own property living outside the District are:</u> 					



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.5 Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Rangataua (60.9%), near Turoa Ski field.</u> ○ <u>National Park (47.1%), near Whakapapa Ski field.</u> ○ <u>Ohakune (41.4%).</u> ○ <u>Raurimu (41.4%).</u> <p><u>Social Overview</u></p> <p><u>Income levels within the District are lower than the New Zealand average, with the figures for both Median Personal Income and Average Hourly Earnings below the national average (The Median Personal Income for Ruapehu in the 2006 census was \$21,1000, while nationally the median was \$24,400.</u></p> <p><u>The ethnic diversity is less variable than the national population of New Zealand, but contains an above-average percentage of Maori, with 36.5% of the population stating that they were of Maori ethnicity, compared with the national average of 14%. Meanwhile 58.7% of the population said that they were of European ethnicity compared with 64.8% nationally (the census allowed recording of more than one ethnicity per person).</u></p> <p><u>The District's population is young, compared with the rest of New Zealand, with the median age being 32.7 years. 25% of the population is under 15 years compared to the national average of 21.5%. 9.9% are aged 65 and over, compared to the national average of 12.1%.</u></p> <p><u>Other key facts about the District are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The population is made up of 52% males and 48% females.</u> • <u>Overseas migrants represent 7% of people.</u> • <u>84.3% (91.6% nationally) of households have access to a telephone and 47.5% (60.5% nationally) to the internet.</u> • <u>32.3% of the population over the age of 15 has no formal qualifications compared with 28.4% nationally.</u> 			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.5 Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Approximately 47% of householders own their own homes compared with the national average of 54.5%.</u> • <u>42% (same as national figure) of households consist of couples with children and 20% (18.1% nationally) consisted of single parents and children.</u> <p><u>Council services a large geographic area with the costs shared across a relatively small rating base. The larger the rating base or the more prosperous the community, and the more affordable the rate requirement becomes. Council must balance affordability with investment in the future sustainability of the District. This translates into investment to create economic growth, to maintain existing assets to meet community expectations and legislative requirements and to ensure the capacity of infrastructural assets continue to meet the needs of growth in the District.</u></p> <p><u>Economic Overview</u></p> <p><u>Economic indicators such as median personal income and average hourly earnings in the District show steady increases but remain well behind the national averages. This reflects resident families, but around 40% of the District is owned by non-resident ratepayers, with a very different socio-economic profile.</u></p> <p><u>The Ruapehu District is primarily rural and this sector provides 28% of total employment and 23% of total GDP. Taumarunui, the District's largest town is primarily a rural servicing centre. Its location also means there are some tourism activities.</u></p> <p><u>The District is home to a major NZ Army base at Waiouru. Although the base has been scaled back in recent years, it is a major employer for the District.</u></p> <p><u>Tourism-related industries of retail trade and accommodation, cafes and restaurants are also a significant part of the District's economic wellbeing, particularly closer to the Tongariro National Park and the south of the District. Ohakune is an area of significant growth.</u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.5 Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <p><u>Council has planned for increased demand in the areas where growth is anticipated. Its assets must be able to cope with the extra demand placed on its services during the typical peak winter season and the growing summer visitor market. More visitors to the area also create the need to develop infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>Environmental Overview</u></p> <p><u>Abundant natural resources and world-renowned scenery are defining characteristics of the Ruapehu District. Nearly 90% of land value is in the rural sector, which includes farming, forestry and reserve land. The National Parks, rivers and more than 150 other varied reserves in the area provide recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life for residents and draw visitors to the District.</u></p> <p><u>The rural landscape sustains large farming, forestry and horticulture industries. As a result, maintaining the quality of the environment is also essential to economic wellbeing in the District.</u></p> <p><u>Issues surrounding fresh water quality and quantity are growing in importance both nationally and globally. The District is fortunate to have relatively plentiful water sources but growing demands on drinking water supplies, in terms of both health standards and capacity, will present challenges in the future. The overall water quality in the rivers and waterways is still good, but must be protected to ensure it does not become degraded over time. The middle and lower reaches of some of our rivers are affected by human activities such as sewerage, industrial discharges and land use practices.</u></p> <p><u>In comparison to most parts of the country, the District has a relatively large area of indigenous natural habitats remaining under Conservation management. This includes around 20% of land being protected by the Department of Conservation under several different types of protected areas. There are also numerous privately protected areas, with 86 Nga Whenua Rahui covenants on Maori land and 43 Queen Elizabeth II Trust covenants registered in 2007.</u></p> <p><u>Cultural Overview</u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.5 Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <p><u>The Ruapehu District is rich in Maori heritage. Taumarunui was originally a Maori settlement, positioned at the junction of canoe and trade routes linking the central North Island with downstream villages. Taumarunui is where the boundaries of three predominant Maori tribes come together. The area surrounding the town is described as a quiet spiritual place where the four winds meet. European settlement in Taumarunui began in 1874.</u></p> <p><u>Mt Hikurangi, Taumarunui's closest mountain, is historically and spiritually connected to Ngati Maniapoto. Near Taumarunui, are the "White Cliffs", the recognised "friendship gateway" of the Ngati Tuwharetoa tribe. The Whanganui River that flows around Taumarunui contains the ancestral spirit of the Ngati Haua tribe.</u></p> <p><u>The Waimarino's European history began around 1850 with the construction of the Main Trunk Railway Line. Other early industries that have shaped the District's history included timber milling, farming and market gardening. In recent years, tourism has added to the growth of the area, aided by the opening of Turoa and Whakapapa ski fields on Mt Ruapehu.</u></p> <p><u>The Tongariro National Park, surrounding and including the three great volcanic mountains - Ruapehu, Ngauruhoe and Tongariro - is one of New Zealand's most outstanding natural habitats and was gifted by the Tuwharetoa people. The original gifted area of 2,600ha was subsequently extended by acquisition of surrounding lands to the present size of 75,000ha, to become New Zealand's first National Park and the fourth in the world to be granted recognition as a World Heritage Area.</u></p> <p><u>In 2006, the District Plan Working Party held meetings with several iwi and hapu groups throughout the district as a first round of consultation with regard to developing the Proposed District Plan. The Council established the Maori Council in 2009. The Maori Council is to encourage communication between Council and local iwi. Consultation relating to resource consent applications is however undertaken directly with local iwi.</u></p> <p><u>In 2009 two hui were held: one in Taumarunui and one in Ohakune. The key issues that arose from</u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p data-bbox="188 236 226 260">4.5</p> <p data-bbox="495 236 1211 260">Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)</p> <p data-bbox="188 272 394 296"><u>the meetings were:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="237 341 1267 1291" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="237 341 1267 472">• <u>The degree to which maori resource management principles have been addressed in the Proposed District Plan. In the maori worldview, humans are connected physically and spiritually to land, water, air, forests; people are an integral part of ecosystems and ecosystems are an essential part of people’s heritage or genealogy (whakapapa).</u> <li data-bbox="237 512 1267 608">• <u>The ability for iwi and hapu to adequately participate in the resource management process given the resources available to them, and the need for Council to partner with tangata whenua on an ongoing basis to ensure meaningful opportunities for tangata whenua.</u> <li data-bbox="237 647 1267 807">• <u>Concern from iwi and hapu that waahi tapu and other sites of significance should be protected by Council, but that their locations should not be made public through the Proposed District Plan process. This “non-disclosure” approach has been thus been adopted in the Proposed District Plan and does not differ from that of the Operative District Plan.</u> <hr/> <ul data-bbox="237 855 1267 1291" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="237 855 1267 951">• <u>The ability for marae and papakainga housing to be developed to allow for the wellbeing of tangata whenua without hindrance from the District Plan. This is recognised by the Proposed District Plan</u> <li data-bbox="237 991 1267 1291">• <u>The maunga (mountains) and awa (river) of the District should be recognised and protected so that their values are sustained. In this regard the relationship of iwi and hapu with the Wanganui River and the maunga of the District and the ability for iwi and hapu to participate in and have equal rights in management of the maunga and awa were important issues for iwi and hapu. They were also eager to ensure that any controls placed on the activities that could be carried out on the surface of the Wanganui River recognised the existing use rights tangata whenua have for legally established activities on the awa. Iwi and hapu also identified the need for the carrying capacity of the Wanganui to be ascertained before any resource management regime is put in place. In this regard, the relationship of tangata</u> 			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.5	Introduction: Tangata Whenua of the Ruapehu District (TW1.1)		
	<u>whenua to the awa and the lack of identification of its carrying capacity have been recognised in the provisions for the awa in the Proposed District Plan</u>		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.6	Definitions: Maori Cultural Values		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	The plan change provisions do include a range of provisions which address 'Maori Cultural Values'. This term is not defined in the plan change. However, wording a definition appropriately has the potential to create more issues than it would solve.	Ngati Rangī (255.5) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.7	Definitions: Various		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Add the following to the Definitions section: Include the definitions outlined in the following list, along with the wording of the actual definition 'greyed' out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation (reference: Section 166 of the RMA) • Hazardous Substances (reference: Section 2) 	The amendments recommended will help provide greater clarity and certainty to both plan users and Council.	Ross and Christine Wallace (187.2) rejected Ngati Haua (309.16,17,18) accepted in part Rural Community Group (180.3) rejected John Chuman (181.3)rejected Bryan Finnerty (226.3) rejected Miriam Gillingham (227.3) rejected Horticulture NZ (FS 1073.5) Accepted in part	17 onwards and 87



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.7 Definitions: Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minerals (reference: Section 2 Crown Minerals Act) • Natural Hazard (reference: Section 2) • Network Utility Operation (Section 166) • Structure (reference: Section 2) • Subdivision (reference: Section 87(b)) • Waterbody (reference: Section 2) <p>Include the following definitions:</p> <p><u>Maori customary land means land that, in terms of Part 6 of the Te Ture Whenua Māori Land Act, has the status of Maori customary land</u></p> <p><u>Maori freehold land means land that, in terms of Part 6 of the Te Ture Whenua Māori Land Act, has the status of Maori freehold land.</u></p> <p><u>Kaitiakitanga means the exercise of guardianship by the tangata whenua of an area in accordance with tikanga Maori in relation to natural and physical resources; and includes the ethic of stewardship</u></p> <p><u>Mana whenua means customary authority exercised by an iwi or hapu in an identified area.</u></p> <p><u>Tangata whenua, in relation to a particular area,</u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.7 Definitions: Various</p> <p><u>means the iwi, or hapu, that holds mana whenua over that area.</u></p> <p>Add the word 'means' to the beginning (after the actual word) of the following definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act • BOD₅ • Boundary Adjustment • Building • Council • Density • Domestic Scale Renewable Energy • Driveway • Dwelling • Exploration Activity • Extraction Activity • Forestry • Gross Floor Area • Hazardous Facility • Home Enterprise Activity • Indigenous Riparian Vegetation (??? See above) • Informal Recreation and Ancillary Buildings • Maori Cultural Education 			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.7 Definitions: Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity • Prospecting Activity • Recreation and Community Activity • Relocated Building • Residential Activity • Residential Care Activity • Rural Activity • Service Court • Service Station Activity • Sign (Including the sub-definitions) • Site • Temporary Military Training Activity • Tino Rangatiratanga (if the definition remains) • Visitor Accommodation Activity • Urban Zone • Yard <p>Amend ML2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies as follows:</p> <p><i>ML2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies</i></p> <p><u><i>The policies seek to provide Tangata Whenua with the opportunity to utilise Maori Land for a</i></u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.7	Definitions: Various		
<p><u>variety of purposes in recognition of tino rangatiratanga.</u> <u>(The exact translation of tino rangatiratanga into English is debated, with some translations defining the term as a guarantee of Maori sovereignty; others a right to self-determination; others again a right of self-management. However, for the purposes of the District Plan, tino rangatiratanga is recognised in the Maori Land Chapter Rules, which provides greater development opportunities on Māori Land than provided for under the general zoning rules).</u></p>			

What	Why	Who	Where
4.8	Maori Land Policy: General		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	This section reflects Section 8 of the RMA	J E Fahey (174.1) rejected Rural Community Group (180.30-32) accepted in part John Chuman (181.30-32) accepted in part Bryan Finnerty (226.30-32) accepted in part Miriam Gillingham (277.30-32) accepted in part	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.9	Maori Land Chapter: Policy on the Treaty		



What	Why	Who	Where
4.9 Maori Land Chapter: Policy on the Treaty			
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend the Chapter Title as follows:</p> <p><u>Tangata Whenua Values, and Māori Land - Policy</u></p> <p>Add the following policy stream:</p> <p><i>ML2.2 Issue</i></p> <p>(a) <u>Ensuring section 6 (e) of the RMA is recognised and provided for and the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi are taken into account in resource management decision-making by Council.</u></p> <p><i>ML2.2.1 Objective</i></p> <p>(a) <u>To ensure that section 6 (e) of the RMA is recognised and provided for and that the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi are taken into account in resource management decision-making by Council.</u></p> <p><i>ML2.2.2 Policies</i></p>	<p>Reasons</p> <p>The recommended amendments re-iterate Council's requirements under section 6(e) and 8 of the RMA, and expand on the importance of effective consultation. Other amendments are proposed which are intended to clarify the text of the policies.</p>	<p>Submitters</p> <p>Ngati Haua (309.4) accepted in part</p>	<p>DP Page No</p> <p>86</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.9 Maori Land Chapter: Policy on the Treaty</p> <p>(a) <u>To take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) in the management of the natural and physical resources</u></p> <p>(b) <u>To consult with Tangata Whenua, where appropriate, actively, early and in good faith.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>To recognise Tangata Whenua and their relationship to the natural and physical resources in the area which they have mana whenua status.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>To further develop consultation processes with Tangata Whenua.</u></p> <p>Amend policies ML2.2.3(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) <i>To recognise tino rangatiratanga of nga iwi <u>Tangata Whenua</u> of the District in the development of thier own resources, consistent with Council's exercise of its functions under the Act.</i></p> <p>(b) <i>To require that a cultural activity To ensure that the development of Maori</i></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.9	Maori Land Chapter: Policy on the Treaty		
	<i>Land does not create adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties.'</i>		
ML2.2.3.1	<u>Explanation of Policies</u>		
	<u>The policies seek to provide Tangata Whenua with the opportunity to utilise Maori Land for a variety of</u>		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.10	Maori Land Rules: Underlying Zone Rules		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	The submitter supports the proposed provision. No submissions have been received in opposition	Mighty River Power (75.32) accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.11	Maori Land Rules: Papakainga Housing		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No amendments recommended.	The Papakainga Housing provisions are considered to provide an appropriate balance between enabling development on traditional Maori Land while still ensuring that the broader sustainable management principles of the Act are adhered.	Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.6) rejected Ngati Rangi (255.10) rejected Guy Small man (FS1083.6 re:112.6) rejected Ngati Hikairo (FS1084.6 re 112.6) rejected	



What						Why	Who	Where																								
4.12	Maori Land Rules: Bulk and Location																															
Recommendation						Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No																								
<p>Ruapehu District Council requests the following corrections to Table Two: Bulk and Location Conditions:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rural Zone</th> <th>Residential Zone</th> <th>Urban Settlement Zone</th> <th>Commercial Zone</th> <th>Protected Areas Zone</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Front Yard Setbacks</td> <td>RU3.3.1</td> <td>RE3.3.4</td> <td>US3.3.5</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>RU3.3.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side and Rear Yard Setbacks</td> <td>RU3.3.2</td> <td>RE3.3.4</td> <td>US3.3.5</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>RU3.3.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maximum Height</td> <td>RU3.3.54</td> <td>RE3.3.3</td> <td>US3.3.4</td> <td>CM3.3.1</td> <td>RU3.3.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							Rural Zone	Residential Zone	Urban Settlement Zone	Commercial Zone	Protected Areas Zone	Front Yard Setbacks	RU3.3.1	RE3.3.4	US3.3.5	N/A	RU3.3.1	Side and Rear Yard Setbacks	RU3.3.2	RE3.3.4	US3.3.5	N/A	RU3.3.2	Maximum Height	RU3.3.5 4	RE3.3.3	US3.3.4	CM3.3.1	RU3.3.5	The amendment will simply ensure that the table refers to the correct Rural Zone Condition	Ruapehu District Council (268.17) accepted	245
	Rural Zone	Residential Zone	Urban Settlement Zone	Commercial Zone	Protected Areas Zone																											
Front Yard Setbacks	RU3.3.1	RE3.3.4	US3.3.5	N/A	RU3.3.1																											
Side and Rear Yard Setbacks	RU3.3.2	RE3.3.4	US3.3.5	N/A	RU3.3.2																											
Maximum Height	RU3.3.5 4	RE3.3.3	US3.3.4	CM3.3.1	RU3.3.5																											



What						Why				Who	Where
4.12		Maori Land Rules: Bulk and Location									
	Maximum Site Coverage	N/A	RE3.3.1	US3.3.1	N/A	N/A					
	Noise Standards	RU3.3.6 ₅	RE3.3.7	US3.3.7	CM3.3.3	RU3.3.6					
Table one: Activity Status for Maori Land – Clause 3(b) Recommended to read FVor 5- 10 residential Units.							The amendment will ensure that the provisions also address Papakainga developments for 5 units	Ruapehu District Council (268.17) accepted	244		
.3	Papakainga Housing Activity:										
(a)	For up to 4 residential units				P	P				D	P
(b)	For 5 to 10 residential units				C	P				D	D
(c)	For more than 10 residential units				D	P	D	D			



HERITAGE

What	Why	Who	Where
4.1			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>1. The Information Requirement: IR1.2.1(h)(i)2. are amended as follows:</p> <p>a. <u>known archaeological sites (information available from the New Zealand Archaeological Association – see www.archsite.org.nz/), any listed heritage place, area or item and its location in relation to the proposed development;</u></p> <p>2. The Archaeological Advice Note is included in the following chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ District-wide Rules ➤ Protected Areas (all sections – the note is currently only at the end of the Chapter) ➤ Road Transport ➤ Subdivision (all sections – the note is currently only in the Rural and Residential Sections) ➤ Network Utilities 	<p>Both of the proposed changes will increase the likelihood that both Council and developers are aware of archaeological sites potentially affected by development, and will therefore increase the likelihood that these sites are protected.</p> <p>The inclusion of archaeological sites in the District Plan at this stage would not give affected parties adequate opportunity to comment on the proposal.</p>	<p>NZ Historic Places Trust (258.14, rejected 258.15 258.21, 1087.27 accepted in part DOC (1050.30) accepted in part</p>	<p>39</p>

What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 General: Incentives			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 General: Incentives			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>T13.4.1(c) Parking</p> <p>(i) Numbers</p> <p>9. Whether a proposed reduction in car parking spaces will provide greater protection for the setting of a heritage building or site, or allow for the adaptive re-use of the building, while ensuring the safe and efficient functioning of the road network.</p> <p>And that Policy RT2.3.3 is amended as follows:</p> <p>(e) To require the provision for parking, loading and access to service the development, <u>while allowing for a more flexible approach to car parking in relation to heritage buildings and sites where this will protect the heritage values of the building/site.</u></p>	<p>The Exceptions Annual Plan is the most appropriate forum for consideration of financial issues. The recommended amendments to the road transport chapter will provide more flexibility for land owners of heritage buildings, while also protecting heritage values.</p>	<p>NZ Historic Places Trust (258.20) accepted in part rest dealt with in the EAP process David and Carla Benefield (150.1) reject as dealt with in the EAP process</p>	<p>90 and 258</p>

What	Why	Who	Where
4.3 Heritage Policy: HE2.2.3(d) – Assessment Criteria			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.3 Heritage Policy: HE2.2.3(d) – Assessment Criteria			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>HE2.2.3:</p> <p><u>'(d) Rules in the district plan shall protect significant historic heritage listed in the heritage schedule from the adverse effects of land use and development. The assessment of adverse effects of subdivision, use and development will be guided by the principles set out below: ...</u></p> <p>Respect Values see NZHPT submission</p>	<p>The inclusion of these policies will assist Council in protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision use and development (in relation to Section 6 of the RMA).</p>	<p>NZ Historic Places Trust (258.9) accepted in part. DOC (1050.31) accept</p>	<p>From 136</p>

What	Why	Who	Where
4.4			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Include a new policy under HE2.2.3(g) as follows:<u>The council shall also have regard to the functional requirements of infrastructure providers (i.e. design life, safety, practicable options) when assessing applications in relation to any nationally significant operational infrastructure identified in the heritage schedules;</u></p>	<p>This will provide a balanced policy framework in relation to heritage values and sustaining the potential of physical resources.</p>	<p>New Zealand Railways Corporation (Kiwirail) (292.15) accepted Meridian (1045.94) accepted NZ Historic Places Trust (1087.20) accepted</p>	<p>137</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
4.5 Heritage Policy Chapter: HE2.4 Maori Heritage - Commissioner T.Smith abstention.			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
HE2.4 Issue as follows: <u>Maori heritage sites are accessed, modified or damaged in such a way that detracts or destroys their cultural and heritage values.'</u>	The proposed amendments will improve the readability of the District Plan.	Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.7) accepted NZ Historic Places Trust (258.10) accepted Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (1083.7) accepted Guy Smallman (1084.7) accepted	138

What	Why	Who	Where
4.6 Heritage Policy Chapter: HE2.4.3 Consultation re:Maori Heritage Sites			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
None	Inclusion of the policy could act as a disincentive to the protection of wahi tapu and other heritage items of significance to iwi. If a site were to be listed on a schedule for protection, the landowner would be consulted.	Federated Farmers (284.40) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.7 Heritage Rules: HE 3.2.1(a) – Maintenance and Repair			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
That the following note is added to HE3.2.1(a) <u>Please contact Council should you require advice as to whether proposed works fall into this category.</u>	The recommended alterations are intended to provide greater clarity, and refine the rules, while ensuring the protection of heritage values.	The Parish of the Immaculate Conception (245.2) accepted in part Ken Hill (1094.1) accepted in part	346



What	Why	Who	Where
4.8 Heritage Rules: HE 3.2.4 Non-Complying Activities/Demolition			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
None	The classification of an activity as non-complying gives an indication that demolition or removal is not anticipated to occur, and that if consent is sought its assessment will be subject to significant rigour.	The Parish of the Immaculate Conception (245.3) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.9 Heritage Sites (HE3.2.1(c)) – Maintenance and Repair			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>That the following amendments are undertaken:</p> <p><u>HE3.2.1 (c) Maintenance and repair of any heritage site listed in Schedule B of appendix four</u></p> <p><u>Definition: Maintenance and repair as it relates to a heritage site means any works necessary to ensure the ongoing viability or functioning of the site provided that the works do not detract from or negate the historic value of the site and will be guided by the standards for the maintenance of any historic place (site) and place and area of significance to Māori as outlined in Appendix Five of this plan.</u></p> <p><u>HE3.2.2 (c) Modification of a heritage site listed in schedule B (see Appendix 4 and the standards for the maintenance of any historic place (site) and place and area of significance to Māori as outlined in Appendix Five of this plan).</u></p>	The amendments will provide greater clarity as to which activities to heritage sites are permitted or require consent and other reasons as outlined in the Planner's report.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.12) accepted in part Meridian (225.32) accepted DOC (1050.32) accepted in part	347



What	Why	Who	Where
4.9	Heritage Sites (HE3.2.1(c)) – Maintenance and Repair		
That a new Appendix Five is included with the wording provided in the NZHPT submission, but that the second bullet point is amended as follows:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The work will not involve any land disturbance likely to affect the heritage values of the site. 			

What	Why	Who	Where
4.10	Heritage Rules: HE 3.3.1 Assessment Criteria		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
(xi) <u>The ability of applicants to derive reasonable economic benefit from the site without demolition, alteration or relocation of the heritage item.</u>	The amended wording will enable a balanced approach when assessing heritage applications for demolition, alteration and relocation of heritage items.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.13) accepted	330

What	Why	Who	Where
4.11	Heritage Schedule: Features of Interest Column		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
The Note at the bottom of the 1 st page of the Heritage Schedule is amended as follows:	The proposed amendment will help to ensure that all heritage features of a building are considered when	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.6) accepted DOC (FS 1050.34) accepted	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.11 Heritage Schedule: Features of Interest Column			
Note: All features of interest relate only to the exterior of the building unless otherwise specified. The features outlined are intended to give a brief indication of the heritage values of the listings. The features outlined are not necessarily a definitive list of the heritage values possessed by the listing or the reasons for its listing or protection in the district plan.	consent applications are assessed.		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.12 Heritage Schedule: Map References			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Map references added to Heritage Schedule	Proposed changes will improve usability of the District Plan.	Ruapehu District Council (268.7) accepted DOC (FS 1050.35) accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.13 RU 3.3.7 – Human Remains and Archaeological Items			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
It is recommended that Condition RU3.3.7 (Human Remains or Archaeological items) is added as an <i>Advice Note</i> to the following Rule Chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Residential ➤ Commercial ➤ Industrial 	It will provide useful guidance to users of the District Plan.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.16) accepted in part	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.13	RU 3.3.7 – Human Remains and Archaeological Items		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Urban Settlement ➤ Protected Areas ➤ Active Reserve. 		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.14	Definitions: ‘Historic Heritage’ and Archaeological Site’		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>It is recommended that the introduction to the Definitions Chapter is amended as follows:</p> <p>Definitions All words used in this Plan which are defined in the Act have the definitions given to them in the Act as it was on (9 December 2011). <u>Some of the more common terms from the RMA and other relevant pieces of legislation have been included in this Chapter. These terms have been included for reference only, and are shown as ‘greyed out’ text. Readers may wish to check to ensure that the definitions remains the same and has not been changed. An online revision of the Resource Management Act 1991 and other legislation is available at: www.legislation.govt.nz</u></p> <p>It is also recommended that the above definitions for Archaeological Site and Historic Heritage are included in the Definitions (as detailed above) for reference purposes.</p>	<p>The recommended changes would add clarity to the District Plan.</p>	<p>NZ Historic Places Trust (258.19) accepted in part</p>	<p>17</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
4.15 Definitions: Maintenance and Repair			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
For the purpose of this rule heritage rules HE 3.2.1(a)(c)	To aid readability of the Plan.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.19) accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.16 Definitions: Heritage Item			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes	The proposed definition is consistent with the definition of Historic Heritage in the RMA. The inclusion of a record of any pre-application consultation with NZHPT is important information for Council to have when considering resource consent applications, as it aids in the assessment of an application for notification purposes and in considering whether further information is required under section 92 of the RMA.	Rural Community Group (180.2&6) rejected John Chuman (181.2&6) rejected Bryan Finnerty (226.2&6) rejected Miriam Gillingham (227.2&6) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text Appendix Four – Schedule A – Heritage Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Ref: 5: Horopito School – Group 	It is considered the additions and amendments to the Heritage Schedule more accurately reflect the Heritage Values of these buildings and sites, and will thereby allow for more appropriate levels of protection.	Wendy Pettigrew (91.1 Accepted&2 rejected) Errol Vincent (220.1) Accepted NZ Historic Places Trust (258.2-3 Accepted & 4 Accepted in part) Ruapehu District Council (268.23-25) Accepted	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 <u>Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</u></p> <p><u>⊖ B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Ref: 118: National Park Railway Station – Group <u>⊖ B</u> <u>Add: Ohakune – Horopito Old Coach Road – Group A</u> <u>Features of Interest²: By 1906 the northern railhead had reached Raurimu, and the southern railhead had reached Turangarere. The mountainous terrain between these two points caused logistical difficulties for those constructing the railway line, and work was temporarily halted.</u> <p><u>To allow passengers travelling between Auckland and Wellington to cross the 39 km gap between the two railheads, the government upgraded a bridle track that John Rochfort had mapped out while surveying the NIMT route in the 1880s. Constructed to accommodate heavy coach traffic, and to withstand the extreme weather conditions of the Ruapehu region, the road was continuously paved with a layer of hand-</u></p>	<p>Waihohunu Hut is in the Taupo District Council and is already protected as Cat A and therefore outside the Ruapehu District Council area</p> <p>The Raurimu Spiral is already in the Heritage schedule</p> <p>As there has been no consultation with the hapu (Ngati Rangi-Ngati Tamakana) nor a heritage assessment Mangamingi Pa will not be classified at this stage. However the Hearings Panel will be recommending that Council undertake further consultation with iwi/hapu regarding recognition of marae buildings</p>	<p>Rail Heritage Trust of NZ (276.1) Accepted Ronald Rhodes (57.1,58.1,59.1) Accepted Bernice Frost (308.2) Accepted Dorothy Battersby (11.2 rejected&3 Accepted) Lodge Naumai No. 177 (42.2) Accepted Meridian Energy (225.32) Accepted NZ Historic Places Trust (FS1087.8rejected 9-11Accepted,13rejected,15Accepted-17,19&24,26)Accepted DOC (1050.33)Accepted NZ Fire Service (1095.2) Accepted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> submission 91.1 (re: Horopito School) and further submission 1087.24 are both accepted; submission 91.1 (re: National Park Railway Station) and further submission 1087.24 are both accepted; submissions 91.2 and 258.2 (re: Waihohunu Hut) and further submission 1087.13 are rejected; and further submission 1050.33 is accepted; submissions No. 91.1, 220.1, 258.2, 	

² This information, along with that for the Tangiwai Scenic Reserve, has been taken from NZHPT Register.



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</p> <p><u>carved, tightly fitted setts.</u></p> <p><u>Cobb & Co. coaches were used on the road to transport train passengers over the 'rail gap'. This practice continued until 1908, when the NIMT was officially completed. After 1908 part of the road was asphalted, and now forms part of State Highway 4. However, an alternative route was developed between Horopito and Ohakune, and the Coach Road between these two towns remained untouched.</u></p> <p><u>The Ohakune to Horopito Coach Road is of national significance as an example of a well-preserved, hand-made road that is intimately linked with the final stages of the construction of the NIMT.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Add: Tangiwai Scenic Reserve – Group A</u> <u>Features of Interest: The Tangiwai Disaster, the worst railway accident in New Zealand's history, occurred on Christmas Eve 1953.</u> <p><u>A lahar caused by the collapse of the walls containing the crater-lake on Mt Ruapehu. This lahar reached Tangiwai</u></p>		<p>276.1 (re: Ohakune – Horopito Old Coach Road and Tangiwai Scenic Reserve); and further submissions 1087.15, 19, & 24 are all accepted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submission 91.2 (re: Taonui Viaduct) and further submission 1087.24 are accepted; • submission 91.2 (re: Raurimu Spiral) and further submission 1087.13 are rejected; • submission 91.1 (re: Whakahoro School) and further submission 1087.24 are accepted; • submission 258.3 (re: Waimarino Brass Band Room) is accepted • Submission 258.3 and 308.2 (re: Waimarino A&P Grandstand) and further submission 1087.21 • submission 258.4 (re: Tongariro National Park) is accepted in part;(to revisit with protected area) • submission 268.25 (re: Water Trough 	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</p> <p><u>in the form of a dense wave of water, sand and boulders, which weaken a pillar of the rail-bridge over the river. Five minutes later, when the Wellington-to-Auckland Express train attempted to cross the bridge, its locomotive and six front carriages were plunged into the flooded Whangaehu River, causing the bridge to collapse. The lives of 151 people were lost as a result.</u></p> <p><u>On the tenth anniversary of the disaster a memorial ceremony was held at Tangiwai. A small white cross was erected at the site for the occasion. In response to the need for a permanent focal point for grief, the Tangiwai Memorial obelisk was erected in place of the cross in 1989. The obelisk was designed by the New Zealand Master Monumental Masons Association Inc and erected by Anderson Memorials, Wanganui.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Ref:114: Taonui Viaduct – NZHPT Reference: <u>9266 9926</u> • <u>Add: Whakahoro School – Group B Features of Interest: Built 1946, example</u> 		<p>– Ohura Mokau Road) is accepted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submission 58.1 (re: Krupp's Feldcannon) and further submission 1087.10 are accepted; • submission 11.3 (re: Karioi Native School) and further submission 1087.26 are accepted; • submission 11.2 (re: Mangamingi Pa) and further submission 1087.8 are rejected; • submission 268.23 (re: Wesleyan Church) is accepted; • submission 59.1 (re: Sewerage Vent Poles) and further submission 1087.11 are accepted; • submission 42.2 (re: Masonic Lodge, Taumarunui) is accepted, and submission 91.1 is accepted in part; • submission 57.1 (re: cast iron lighting standards) and further submission 1087.9 are accepted. • submission 268.24 (re: Taumarunui 	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</p> <p><u>of a post war school building.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Add: Waimarino Brass Band Room – Group C</u> <u>Features of Interest: The band room (and associated band rotunda – now removed) were an important focal point for the local community.</u> • <u>Waimarino A&P Grandstand -Group C</u> <u>Features of Interest</u> • <u>Add: Tongariro National Park – Group A</u> <u>Features of Interest: Significant historical and cultural landscape. The TNP has a dual World Heritage status (one of only 24 sites in the world). The park plays an important cultural role, both in the traditions of the Maori people and, more recently, to Europeans. It is of outstanding cultural importance as a spiritual home to the Maori people and the gifting of this sacred land, providing the initial focus for the creation of the NZ national parks system.</u> <p><u>Note: Works within the Tongariro National Park do not need to comply with the Heritage Rules (as addressed by other rules and legislation).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Add: Water Trough – Ohura Mokau</u> 		<p>Fire Station) and further submission 1095.2 are accepted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submission 225.32 & 225.33 (re: Waiu Pa) and further submission 1087.16 & .17 are accepted. 	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</p> <p><u>Road – Group B</u> <u>Features of Interest: Historic Horse Trough</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: <u>Krupps ‘Feldcannon’ – Group C</u> <u>Features of Interest: Feldcannon donated by the NZ Defence Force ‘in memory of those who served’.</u> • Amend: Karioi Native School Features of Interest: Built <u>1898</u>. • <u>Mangamingi Pa – Group C</u> • Wesleyan Church, Raetihi – Group <u>C</u> • Add: Sewerage Vent Poles at <u>13 Harvey Street</u>; and 44 North Street Features of Interest: (as per other Sewerage Vent Poles) • Amend: Sewerage Vent Poles (Ref: 70) to include the address: Outside 30 Taumarunui Street. • Amend: Masonic Lodge, Taumarunui – Group <u>B C</u> • Amend: Features of Interest re: Light Standards (Ref: 75), <u>‘Eight original gas</u> 			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.17 Heritage Schedule: Additions, Amendments and Corrections</p> <p>light standards transferred to current location’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: <u>Light Standard, Chanwai Lane, Taumarunui – Group C.</u> <u>Features of Interest: Original gas light standards transferred to current location.</u> • Amend: Taumarunui Fire Station – Group <u>B C</u> • Amend Maps re: <u>Waiu Pa to the following co-ordinates: NZTOPO50 sheet BJ35 ref 404240, and include a 500m radius around the Pa to clarify the extent of the site.</u> <p>It is also recommended that all items to be added to the Heritage Schedule are also shown on the Heritage maps, and all items to be removed from the heritage Schedule are also removed from the maps.</p> <p>It is also requested that the Heritage Buildings and Sites are all re-numbered to ensure logical numbering of the additional buildings and sites, with gaps left in the numbering system to allow logical numbering of new heritage buildings listed in the future.</p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.18	Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – St Joseph’s Catholic Church		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Amend Schedule A – Heritage Buildings as follows: Ref 18: St Joseph’s Catholic Church as follows: <i>Built c. 1930</i>	<p>Listing of the St Joseph’s Catholic Church will provide greater protection for the heritage values of the church.</p> <p>The Hearings Panel during the course of the hearings, requested additional information from the NZHPT on the durability of historic timber buildings. The hearings panel have chosen to quote the information provided as part of it’s rationale for the decision.</p> <p><i>Heritage timber buildings are highly prevalent today because of the worth of timber as a construction material. What is clear is that the longevity of heritage timber buildings is a combination of factors.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Timber acts well in an earthquake and heritage buildings have usually experienced many earthquakes. Historically in New Zealand, building materials were modeled on the ‘old country’ brick or stone – until earthquakes cracked or toppled them. Timber came to be seen as an ideal material because it could ‘move’ with an earthquake. Appropriately chosen for size, clear lengths and variety and well maintained, timber constructions have lasted well.</i> <i>• Timber historic buildings are now less susceptible to fire as fire alarms and sprinkler systems able to be fitted successfully. Alarms</i> 	<p>Roman Catholic Diocese of Palmerston North (50.1) rejected JE Fahey (176.1) rejected Dorothy Battersby (11.1) accepted Elaine Goldfinch (26.1) accepted Wendy Pettigrew (91.1) accepted Carol Pala (117.1) accepted Bernard Thomas & Karen Elizabeth Joyce (118.1) accepted LRW King (119.1) accepted YM Powell (124.1) accepted Maureen Jesen-Mischewski (143.1) accepted Lesley Mischewski (145.1) accepted Anthony Joyce (283.1) accepted Patrick O’Sullivan (295.1) accepted Jefferine O’Sullivan (296.1) accepted Bernice Frost (308.1) accepted Ruapehu District Council accepted</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.18	Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – St Joseph’s Catholic Church		
	<p><i>and sprinkler systems are widely promoted and reduce fires. Linings and finishes are now chosen for their low levels of flammability. There is a small scale sprinkler system now being promoted by Fire Services which has reduced the costs for small sized buildings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Timber lasts well when it is maintained. Overseas in parts of Asia and Europe, it is common to see heritage buildings nearly 1000 years old. The key to the longevity is good maintenance – keeping the nails and bolts in good order, keeping the paint coating secure, avoiding soaking up moisture from the ground, and having a good roof with secure flashings to take the rain away.</i> <i>• When timber does get damaged – either by water or physical damage – the repairs are simple. Replacement of timber with timber is a more straightforward matter than some other materials, both old and new. Even where irreplaceable timbers are lost or damaged – such as kauri – the repairs can be done, minimising loss of heritage value.</i> <p><i>Timber remains a resilient building material. Heritage timber buildings will last for hundreds of years when well maintained. If there is a period of low or deferred maintenance, a timber building can be retrieved without loss of heritage value.</i></p>		



What	Why	Who	Where
4.19 Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – Old Power House (Ref:24)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
It is recommended that the Old Power House (Ref: 24) is deleted from the Heritage Schedule, along with the reference on Urban Map 13.	<p>Given that there has been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no heritage assessment of the building, • no community support for the listing, • and that the listing is opposed by the landowner • it is not considered appropriate to list the building. <p>Only part of the original power generation complex is on this site.</p>	Daniel Foley (36.1) accepted Diana Booth (61.1) accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.20 Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – Kings Court, Ohakune(Ref:33)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended	The building is proposed as a Category C Building – the submitter raises concerns about the restrictions this would place on works to the building. Category C classification places no restrictions on works to the building. The building itself is historically relevant in relation to the development of Ohakune, especially associated with the Railway.	4 Kings Group Ltd (7.1) rejected	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.21 Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – Punch Family Home, Raetihi (Ref:51)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
It is recommended that the Punch Family House (Ref: 51) is deleted from the Heritage Schedule, along with the reference on Urban Map 11.	The Heritage Values of the property are not sufficient to warrant regulation.	L J Pope (22.1) accepted NZ Historic Places Trust (FS 1087.23) rejected	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.22 Heritage Schedule: Requests for removing items from list – Old Catholic Church(Ref: 77) and St Josephs Convent (Ref:78) Rangaroa			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes to the listing of the buildings. Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text Heritage Schedule (Ref: 78) The former St Joseph's Convent	The listing of these buildings will provide greater protection for their heritage values. Note that the late submission is accepted submission 1094.1	The Parish of the Immaculate Conception (245.1) rejected Ken Hill (FS 1094.1) accepted in part NZ Historic Places Trust (FS1087.18&19) Accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.23 Heritage Trees – Additions			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<u>Wording underlined</u> HE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities: (e) <u>Activities which do not comply with Rule:</u> <u>(i) HE3.2.1(d) – relating to the minor trimming,</u>	<u>Listing of Additional Trees</u> The listing of additional trees at this stage in the process would not provide sufficient opportunity for consultation. <u>Works undertaken by Arborist</u> The proposed amendments to the rules will help to ensure that when works are undertaken to scheduled	Richard Hoadley (66.18) accepted in part Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (257.12) accepted in part NZ Historic Places Trust (258.5 & FS 1087.28) accepted in part	348



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.23 Heritage Trees – Additions</p> <p><u>pruning or maintenance of scheduled trees; and</u> or (ii) <u>HE3.2.1(e) – relating to the removal of limbs from a scheduled tree</u></p> <p><u>where these works are undertaken or certified by a qualified arborist.</u></p> <p>HE3.2.4 Non-Complying Activities (e) <u>Activities which do not comply with Rule:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>HE3.2.1(d) – relating to the minor trimming, pruning or maintenance of scheduled trees; and</u> or (ii) <u>HE3.2.1(e) – relating to the removal of limbs from a scheduled tree</u></p> <p><u>where these works are not undertaken or certified by a qualified arborist.</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - HE2.3</u></p>	<p>trees these works will be undertaken by people with appropriate skills, thereby minimising the risk to these trees.</p>		



What	Why	Who	Where
4.24 Heritage Tress – Specific Additions: Totara at 25 Taumarunui Street			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Add the following to Appendix Five – Schedule of Heritage Trees: Ref: <u>80 E2706197 N6255037</u> <u>Outside 25 Taumarunui Street, Taumarunui, (the tree is purported to have been planted by local Maori as a token to the surveyor John Rochfort 'of the promise of safe conduct'. There are questions however, whether this story is correct).</u> <u>Podocarpus Totara, Totara, No evaluation undertaken</u>	The listing of the tree will provide greater protection for the heritage values associated with the tree.	Ronald Rhodes (56.1) accepted	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.25 Heritage Trees – Specific Additions: Kahikatea, SH4 Taumarunui			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
It is recommended that Appendix Five – Schedule A – Notable Trees is corrected as follows in relation to Ref: 30: Location Main South Highway 4, <u>Taumarunui</u>	The tree has been identified as a Heritage Tree worthy of protection.	Stuart Shaw (73.1) accepted in part	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.26 Heritage Trees – Totara Crescent, Taumarunui (Ref:66-73 and O'Reilly Crescent, Matapuna (Ref: 79-119)).			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Insert the following Assessment Criteria HE3.3.1(b) and (c):	Both sets of trees have heritage values, making them	Stuart Shaw (73.2, 73.3) accepted in part	351



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.26 Heritage Trees – Totara Crescent, Taumarunui (Ref:66-73 and O’Reilly Crescent, Matapuna (Ref: 79-119).</p> <p><u>The impact of the scheduled tree/s on light levels to adjoining properties, in relation to shading of habitable rooms (Note: this is one criteria to be considered in weighing up an application)</u></p> <p>Appendix Five – Schedule A – Notable Trees is corrected as follows in relation to Ref: 79 - 119:</p> <p>Botanical Name: Podocarpus totara, <u>and Dacrycarpus dacrydioides</u></p> <p>Common Name: Stand of Totara <u>and Kahikatea</u> (and that one reference number is given to the entire stand of trees)</p>	<p>worthy of protection. The proposed assessment criteria will enable a balanced assessment to be made with future applications.</p>		



HERITAGE CHARACTER

What	Why	Who	Where
4.1 General			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
None	<p>Reasons for Recommendation</p> <p>Incentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Jewett Family Trust submission is accepted insofar as incentives under the Exception Annual Plan process are being considered by the Council. On the whole the incentives sought were outside the Plan Change process. <p>Subdivision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The railway cottages in Ruapehu Road are set within a rural landscape. Infill development would detract from, and would be incongruous with, the surrounding low density, rural character. The original character of both the buildings and the street has been retained in part because of the density provisions of the past. The approach in Ruapehu Road and Egmont Street also reflects that these sites have not had significant development potential in the past (the current District Plan rules limit subdivision to 600m² as a Controlled Activity, defaulting to Discretionary for smaller allotments). 	<p>Jewett Family Trust (94.1) accepted in part Tongariro Crossing Lodge (272.2) accepted in part NZ Historic Places Trust (258.20) accepted in part Velma Siemonek (212.13) rejected Vivien Pohl (219.4) accepted Ngati Rangī (255.9) rejected Castle (271.1) accepted in part NZ Historic Places Trust (FS1087.4&5) accepted</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.1	General		
	<p>As a consequence, no changes are made to the density/subdivision rules for Ruapehu Road,</p> <p>Subdivision in Railway Row has been provided for in the Proposed Plan Change, with a minimum lot size of 450m². This is the same density as is proposed throughout the new 'Residential Zone'. Therefore the heritage character area has no impact on subdivision.</p> <p>Devaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential devaluation of properties is not a resource management consideration, and no evidence was produced that devaluation would occur. NZHPT presented evidence that heritage character areas can increase the value of properties due to certainty for protection of amenity. <p>Prejudice development opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arguments raised by Ngati Rangī Trust are very similar to those expressed above in relation to the devaluation of properties. The proposed Heritage Character Area provisions will place some limitations on what can be done on a site, but at the same time will 		



What	Why	Who	Where
4.1	General		
		protect the character of these areas.	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.2	Heritage Character Area Policies (CA2.2.3)		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
CA2.2.3: (a) <u>To protect the heritage values of the railway cottages and their setting through:</u> (i) <u>Ensuring the design of any new buildings and structures is compatible with the form, materials and scale of buildings in the surrounding heritage character area and is within keeping with the character of the heritage character area.</u> (iii) <u>Ensuring that structures i.e. fences and walls within the front yard allows houses to be seen from the road and maintain a positive street presence and relationship to the streetscape.</u> (iv) <u>Ensuring that alterations and additions are undertaken in a way that maintains the form and style of the railway cottages and will not detract from the heritage values and character of the</u>	The proposed amendments to the policies help to clarify the intent of the policies, enabling better and more consistent decision-making, and helping to achieve the protection of historic heritage, for the reasons outlined in the Planner's report.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.8) accepted in part Futher Submission: RDC (1085.3 re: 258.8) accept in part	134



What	Why	Who	Where
4.2	Heritage Character Area Policies (CA2.2.3)		
<u>streetscape.</u>			
(c) <u>To provide for subdivision within Railway Row where it does not detract from the heritage values and character of the streetscape.</u>			

What	Why	Who	Where
4.3	Permitted Activity Rules: Side Extensions/Streetscape (CA3.2.1(c))		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
Definitions Chapter Alteration (in relation to the Heritage/Heritage Character Area Rules) CA3.2.1 Permitted Activities (c) <u>Any alteration to the side elevation of any building, but excludes side additions;</u> (d) <u>Any alterations or additions to the rear of any building.</u> CA3.2.4 Discretionary Activity Rule (a) <u>Any additions to the side elevation of any building when viewed from the road the site gains principle access from.</u>	The proposed amendments to the Heritage Character Area provisions in relation to side extensions will better achieve the intent of the proposed Objectives and Policies of the Plan Change in relation to protecting heritage values.	Jeffery and Susan Wesley (23.1) accepted	341, 342



What	Why	Who	Where
4.3	Permitted Activity Rules: Side Extensions/Streetscape (CA3.2.1(c))		
	(b)		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.4	List of Controlled Activities: Accessory Buildings to Rear (CA3.2.2)		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>CA3.2.1 Permitted Activities:</p> <p>(e) <u>Accessory buildings located to the rear of a railway house.</u></p> <p>CA3.2.2 Controlled Activities:</p> <p>(a) Accessory Buildings (except those permitted under Rule CA3.2.1 above).</p> <p>CA3.3 General Conditions</p> <p>CA3.3.5 Accessory Buildings</p> <p>(a) <u>The maximum floor area of an accessory building is 45m².</u></p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: CA 3.4.1 and CA3.4.2(a)</p>	<p>The proposed alterations will provide greater flexibility for land owners while still protecting historic heritage.</p>	<p>Janice Burns (158.1) accepted Ruapehu District Council (268.20) accepted in part NZ Historic Places Trust (1087.4) accepted</p>	<p>343</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
4.5 List of Discretionary Activities (CA3.2.4)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Policies: CA2.2.3:</p> <p>(a) <u>To protect the heritage values of the railway cottages and their setting, through:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(iv) <u>Ensuring that the Railway cottages are retained within their existing sites.</u></p> <p>Rules: CA3.2.4 Discretionary Activities:</p> <p>Delete the references to demolition and relocation CA3.2.4</p> <p>Add the following to Rules: CA3.2.5 Non-Complying Activities:</p> <p>(c) <u>Demolition of any Railway House</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Relocation of any railway house within the Heritage Character Area to an area outside of the Heritage Character Area;</u></p> <p>Rules: CA3.4 Assessment Criteria</p> <p>CA3.4.2(a) General Criteria</p> <p>(iv) Whether the proposed work is necessary,</p>	<p>In relation to the demolition of a railway cottage or the removal of a railway cottage it is considered that a Non-Complying consent category is appropriate given the potential of these activities to undermine heritage values. However, both alterations and additions; and relocation of a dwelling into the heritage character area are more appropriately classed as a Discretionary Activity.</p>	<p>Wesley (23.2) accepted in part</p>	<p>134, 342; 344</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
4.5	List of Discretionary Activities (CA3.2.4) considering available <u>and feasible</u> alternatives.		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.6	Hirtage Schedule: Railway Cottages		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
i. It is recommended that all references to the Heritage Characters Areas (Ref: 22, 29, 35, and 79) are removed from Schedule A – Heritage Buildings, and that a new Schedule: <i>Schedule C – Heritage Character Areas</i> is created as detailed above.	The proposed changes will help to clarify the rules.	NZ Historic Places Trust (258.7) accepted	
ii. It is also recommended that the introduction to CA3.1 is amended as follows: CA3.1 <u>RULE STATEMENT</u> The following rules, shall apply to all land <u>shown as being within a Heritage Character Area in the District Plan Maps, except the Sunshine Settlement in Taumarunui which has been identified for information purposes only</u> .			
iii. Finally, it is recommended that consequential changes are made to the maps.			



ACTIVE RESERVES

What	Why	Who	Where
4.1 Permitted Activity Rules			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>It is recommended that the following text is added:</p> <p>AR3.2 <u>RULES</u></p> <p>AR3.2.1 <u>Permitted Activities</u></p> <p>The following activities are Permitted Activities provided they comply with the General Conditions outlined in section AR3.3 below.</p> <p>(f) <u>Where land is classed as a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977, all activities or land uses in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977 approved by the administering body, and the Minister of Conservation where required.</u></p>	<p>The proposed changes will enable the efficient management of active reserves within the District.</p>	<p>Ruapehu District Council (268.16) accepted</p>	<p>237</p>

What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 Administrative Changes			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Amend the Planning Maps to include the Ohakune Swimming Pool within the Active Reserve Zone.</p>	<p>Administrative Changes Only.</p>		<p>237</p>



What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 Administrative Changes			
Amend the Introduction to the Chapter to accurately describe the areas within the Active Reserve Zone.			



NATURAL HAZARDS

What	Why	Who	Where
4.1 Introduction: Earthquakes			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>NH2.1 Introduction (as a new paragraph five):</p> <p><u>Earthquakes are also a natural hazard which poses a risk within the district. Earthquakes can raise issues in term of fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides.</u></p> <p><u>There are a number of active fault traces within the district, especially between Raetihi and Raurimu. These faults include the Raurimu Fault, the National Park Fault, the Ohakune Fault, the Raetihi Faults (north and south), the Oruakukuru Fault, the Shawcroft Road Fault, the Rangipo (Desert Road) Fault, and the Snowgrass Fault.</u></p>	<p>The amended text will highlight the risk associated with earthquakes, which will help to ensure that both developers and council consider earthquake hazards when assessing applications (especially subdivision applications, under s106 of the RMA).</p>	<p>Horizons (280.14(a)) accepted</p>	<p>130</p>

What	Why	Who	Where
4.2 Community Resilience – Objective NH2.2.2(b)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>No changes recommended</p>	<p>The objective is considered to be consistent with Council's functions under section 31 of the RMA.</p>	<p>DOC (191.24) accepted</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.3 Responsibilities for Natural Hazard Management			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
It is recommended that the following policy is added to NH2.2.3: (b) <u>To control the use of land subject to, or at risk from, natural hazards</u> .	The additional policy will ensure that the approach taken in the plan change better reflects Council's functions under section 31, and will be consistent with Policy 10-1 of the One Plan.	Horizons (280.14(b)) accepted in part	131

What	Why	Who	Where
4.4 Policy NH2.2.3(f) (new policy) re: flooding			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
(g) <u>In Ohakune and Taumarunui, to identify areas known to be inundated by a 0.5% annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood event on planning maps and controlling Subdivision and land use activities in these areas.</u> (i) <u>Controlling Subdivision and land use activities in all areas known to be inundated by 0.5% annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood event.</u>	The proposed policy provides a clear indication of the future plan change Council is anticipating undertaking in relation to flooding. It also helps to fulfill Council's functions under section 31 of the RMA, and will provide consistency between the One Plan and gives due regard to the natural hazard policies of the One Plan.	Horizons (280.14(c)) accepted in part	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.5 Public Awareness – Policy NH2.2.3(b)			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No changes recommended.	Although the intent of Horizons submission is supported, Council has not opted for the inclusion of methods in the Plan Change. As such, the change requested is not supported.	Horizons (280(d)) rejected	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.6 Activities within Hazard Areas			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>It is recommended that the following policy is added to NH2.2.3:</p> <p><i>(h) <u>To take into account the operational, technical and functional constraints of an activity and the susceptibility to a natural hazard when considering any resource consent activity.</u></i></p>	<p>The policy will provide some recognition for activities that need to locate within areas affected by natural hazards, which when considered alongside policies NH2.2.3(a) and (d) will ensure a balanced assessment of applications.</p>	<p>Mighty River Power (75.24) accepted Further Submissions: Ernslaw One (FS 1044.14) accepted Meridan Energy (FS 1045.93) accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (FS 1106.19 re: 75.24) accepted</p>	

What	Why	Who	Where
4.7 Natural Hazard Rules: Ohura Flood Overlay			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Assessment Criteria are amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) <i>The extent to which any habitable building within the Flood Hazard Overlay:</i></p> <p><i>a. will or may result in damage to property or harm to people;</i></p> <p><i>b. will result in the floor level of any habitable building being no less than 0.5 metres above the 1 in 200 0.5% AEP flood level</i></p>	<p>The proposed flood overlay and amended provisions will enable Council to fulfill its functions under sections 5 and 31 of the RMA in relation to flooding in Ohura.</p>	<p>John and Maree Howard (144.2) accepted in part. Note: the submission states they are members of OVARS.</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
4.8 Natural Hazard Rules: All Rules			
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
<p>Add the following definition to the Definitions Section:</p> <p><u>Critical Infrastructure means infrastructure necessary to provide services which, if interrupted, would have a serious effect on the people within the Region or a wider population, and which would require immediate reinstatement. Critical infrastructure* includes infrastructure for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>electricity substations</u> • <u>the treatment and storage of water for public supply (excluding the distribution network)</u> • <u>the management of human sewage treatment (excluding the reticulation system)</u> • <u>strategic road and rail networks (as defined in the Regional Land Transport Strategy)</u> • <u>health care institutions including hospitals.</u> <p>Add the following to the Rural Zone Rules Chapter:</p> <p>RU3.3.3 Minimum building setback from Rivers</p>	<p>All of the proposed changes are intended to address Council's functions under the Act, and have been proposed having regard to the proposed provisions of the One Plan.</p> <p>The proposed minimum building set backs from rivers have been proposed in relation to Horizons submission re: Policy 10-6 of the POP. The setbacks, if approved, will ensure that there is a greater separation between rivers and new buildings than is currently required. This will help to minimise the risks to people and property associated with flooding.</p> <p>The proposed changes in relation to critical infrastructure relate to Horizons submission in relation to Policy 10-4. The proposed amendments will act to discourage development, such as hospitals, significant road and rail connections, and electricity substations from locating in areas that are subject to natural hazards.</p>	<p>Horizons (280.29) accepted in part</p>	



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.8 Natural Hazard Rules: All Rules</p> <p>(a) <u>20m from the banks of a river where the river has an average width of 3m or greater.</u></p> <p><u>For the purposes of this condition, the bank of the river is taken to be the outer edge of the river bed. The river bed is defined as the space of land which the waters of the river cover at its annual fullest flow without overtopping its banks.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>10m from any river less than 3 metres wide</u></p> <p><u>Except Flood mitigation structures and bridges can be erected within the set back area from a water body.</u></p> <p><u>For purposes of clarification, where a site, or part of a site, is already identified as being within a flood hazard area, the setback required under this rule will be overridden by the relevant rule in the Natural Hazards Chapter.</u></p> <p>RU3.5 Assessment Criteria</p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.8 Natural Hazard Rules: All Rules</p> <p>(a) General</p> <p>(xvii) <u>The extent to which the location of the building is likely to create a risk to either people or property from either flooding and/or associated land slippage.</u></p> <p>And the following is added to the Natural Hazards Rules:</p> <p>NH3.2.2 Non-Complying Activities</p> <p>The following activities are Non-Complying <u>Activities.</u></p> <p><u>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to the Assessment Criteria noted below in section NH3.3.</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Any new critical infrastructure located on land which is identified on the Planning Maps as either a Natural Hazard, or as being within a Flood Hazard Overlay.</u></p> <p>Relevant Objectives and Policies:</p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
<p>4.8 Natural Hazard Rules: All Rules <u>NH2.2.2(a), NH2.2.3(a) and (e).</u></p> <p>And finally it is recommended that the Assessment Criteria are amended as follows:</p> <p>NH3.3 Assessment Criteria</p> <p>(b) <u>Where a habitable building can not practicably avoid being located within a flood hazard overlay, consideration will be given to the extent to which any habitable building within the Flood Hazard Overlay:</u></p> <p>a. <u>will or may result in damage to property or harm to people</u></p> <p>b. <u>will result in the floor level of any habitable building being less than 0.5 metres above the 1 in 200 (0.5% AEP) flood level.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Critical Infrastructure</u></p> <p>a. <u>Whether evidence has been provided to show that the critical infrastructure will not be adversely affected by floodwaters or another type of natural hazard.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Whether evidence has been provided to show that the critical infrastructure will not cause more</u></p>			



What	Why	Who	Where
4.8	Natural Hazard Rules: All Rules		
	<p><u>than minor adverse effects on the environment in the event of a flood or another type of natural hazard.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Whether evidence has been provided to show that the critical infrastructure is unlikely to cause a significant increase in the scale or intensity of natural hazard events.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Whether evidence has been provided to show that the critical infrastructure can not reasonably be located in an alternative location.</u></p>		

What	Why	Who	Where
4.9	Natural Hazard Rules: Whangaehu River (NH3.2.1(b))		
Recommendation	Reasons	Submitters	DP Page No
No Changes recommended	The submitter proposes a valid alternative to that proposed by Council. However, without more information on lahar flows and terrain it is difficult to determine what an appropriate distance above normal water level is.	Velma Siemonek (212.18) rejected	

