

Notice of appeal to Environment Court against decision on proposed plan

Clause 14(1) of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To the Registrar
Environment Court
Auckland

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) appeals against parts of a decision of the Thames Coromandel District Council on the following plan:

The Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

HNZPT made a submission on that proposed plan.

HNZPT is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991.

HNZPT received notice of the decision on 29 April 2016.

The decision was made by Thames Coromandel District Council.

The parts of the decision that HNZPT is appealing and the reasons for the appeal are detailed on the attached **Schedule One**.

The relief sought is to amend the plan provisions in the manner specified in **Schedule One**.

I attach the following documents to this notice:

- (a) a copy of my submission (**Attachment One**);
- (b) a copy of the relevant decision (or part of the decision) (**Attachment Two**);
- (c) a copy of sections of the decisions version of the plan (**Attachment Three**);
- (d) a list of names and addresses of persons to be served with a copy of this notice (**Attachment Four**).

.....
Signature of appellant (or person authorised to sign on behalf of appellant)
G Baumann
Senior Legal Advisor
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

13 June 2016

Address for service of appellant:

Heritage New Zealand
Antrim House, 63 Boulcott Street,
PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140
Telephone: (04) 472-4341,
Facsimile: (04) 499 0669.
Email: gbaumann@heritage.org.nz

Contact person:
Geraldine Baumann
Senior Legal Advisor

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of appeal

How to become party to proceedings

You may be a party to the appeal if you made a submission or a further submission on the matter of this appeal.

To become a party to the appeal, you must, —

- within 15 working days after the period for lodging a notice of appeal ends, lodge a notice of your wish to be a party to the proceedings (in form 33) with the Environment Court and serve copies of your notice on the relevant local authority and the appellant; and
- within 20 working days after the period for lodging a notice of appeal ends, serve copies of your notice on all other parties.

Your right to be a party to the proceedings in the court may be limited by the trade competition provisions in section 274(1) and Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

You may apply to the Environment Court under section 281 of the Resource Management Act 1991 for a waiver of the above timing or service requirements (see form 38).

How to obtain copies of documents relating to appeal

The copy of this notice served on you does not attach a copy of the appellant's submission or part of the decision appealed. These documents may be obtained, on request, from the appellant.

SCHEDULE ONE:

TABLE OF APPEAL MATTERS AND RELIEF SOUGHT

Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal References are to originally notified plan provisions	The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan	Reasons	Relief sought Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u> Specific deletions sought are struck through
All of Plan	References to “HNZ” as the abbreviation for “Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga”	The abbreviation could be confused with that for “Housing New Zealand”	Replace abbreviation with “HNZPT” where it is intended to refer to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
Provisions of plan relating to heritage incentives Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.4. This recommendation purports to accept the submission point in part, by including reference to a “heritage strategy” as a non-plan method.	The decision excludes specific provisions for incentives for heritage protection, either as plan provisions or as non-regulatory methods	The protection of historic heritage provides a community benefit which however can come at some cost to individual owners. Incentives (both non-plan incentives and those contained within the plan) can help mitigate some of those costs. The plan does not adequately recognise or provide for incentives.	Provisions that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to specific non-plan methods of incentivising heritage protection • A rule framework that incentivises heritage protection, including relaxation of standards, providing for a wider range of activities, and specific assessment criteria, where that would encourage the retention of heritage • Policy in respect of incentives that supports that rule framework The types of incentives that may be appropriate are outlined in the Heritage NZ publication <i>Incentives for Historic Heritage Toolkit</i> (2013).
Section 4 Information Requirements – Subdivision 4.4 -1 (m) Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 2 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s1 2 4 5 in respect of Submission point 531.7	The decision includes a provision that requires an applicant for subdivision consent to show the location and extent of any known archaeological sites. (emphasis added).	Further qualification of the word “known” is desirable, as it is unclear what it means in this context.	Amendment of the clause is sought to read: The location and extent of any known archaeological sites <u>that are recorded on the NZAA Database, or scheduled by the Council, or otherwise known.</u>

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
<p>This recommendation rejects the submission point.</p>			
<p>Section 8.1.1 Background – Archaeological sites:</p> <p>Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.6.</p> <p>The recommendation partially accepts the submission point.</p>	<p>The decision includes the following sentence</p> <p>“The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 provides ‘blanket’ protection to all pre-1900 archaeological sites simply by virtue of their age, not their archaeological significance”,</p>	<p>Further clarification of what is meant by “all pre-1900 archaeological sites” is desirable.</p> <p>The word ‘blanket’ is unnecessary. It is more accurate to say that the legislation provides a management regime for the sites in question.</p> <p>The words “simply by virtue ... significance” are not necessary.</p>	<p>Change the sentence to read:</p> <p>“The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 provides ‘blanket’ protection to a <u>management regime for all pre-1900 archaeological sites, whether listed, scheduled, recorded or unrecorded.</u> simply by virtue of their age, not their archaeological significance”.</p>
	<p>The retention of the sentence that reads:</p> <p>“The heritage values associated with these sites are explained on Archaeological Sites record forms and information in the Heritage New Zealand List of wāhi tapu sites and areas.”</p> <p>[bolding added]</p>	<p>The explanation of heritage values associated with scheduled archaeological sites is contained in a number of locations which the bolded words do not accurately explain.</p>	<p>The replacement of the sentence with the following:</p> <p>“The heritage values associated with these sites are explained on Archaeological Sites record forms and information in the Heritage New Zealand List of wāhi tapu sites and areas. <u>in the following locations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Council files associated with the sites,</u> • <u>archaeological sites record forms that are associated with the NZAA database, and</u> • <u>where the places are entries on the NZ Heritage List (as historic places, historic areas, wahi tupuna, wahi tapu or wahi tapu areas, the list entry and associated files.”</u>
<p>Section 8.3 Objectives and Policies for archaeological sites and Maori cultural sites</p>	<p>The decision to continue to combine objectives and policies for archaeological sites and Maori</p>	<p>There is a fundamental distinction between the purposes for protecting archaeological sites and</p>	<p>Present objectives and policies for archaeological sites separately from those for sites of significance to Maori, along the following lines:</p>

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
<p>Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.20.</p> <p>The recommendation rejects the submission point.</p>	<p>cultural sites (now called sites of significance to Maori).</p>	<p>sites of significance to Maori. The protection of archaeological sites is intended to protect the information on early occupation that site can provide. The protection of sites of significance to Maori is intended to respect and protect cultural and spiritual associations between tangata whenua and the sites. Presenting the objectives and policies separately for archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori would help clarify that distinction</p>	<p>Archaeological Sites</p> <p>Objective 1</p> <p>Significant archaeological sites should be identified and protected to retain the identity of the District’s history and culture.</p> <p>Policy 1a</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development shall be managed to provide for the protection of, and minimise the risk to, significant archaeological sites as identified in the plan, or where they exist.</p> <p>Policy 1b</p> <p>Land disturbance activities, including planting, removal of vegetation and excavation, shall be managed to avoid or minimise adverse effects on significant archaeological sites.</p> <p>Sites of significance to Maori</p> <p>Objective 2</p> <p>Significant Maori cultural sites should be protected from damage and destruction so as to maintain the relationship of Maori with their cultural and heritage values.</p> <p>Policy 2a</p> <p>Land disturbance activities shall be managed to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values of significant Maori cultural sites and the relationship of iwi and hapu with those sites.</p> <p>Policy 2b</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development on significant Maori cultural sites shall maintain the relationship of iwi and hapu and their culture and traditions with those sites.</p>

Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal References are to originally notified plan provisions	The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan	Reasons	Relief sought Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u> Specific deletions sought are struck through
<p>8.3 Objectives and Policies for Heritage Items and Areas: Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.21.</p> <p>The recommendation accepts the submission point in part.</p>	<p>The decision does not include policy on the process of identifying, evaluating and scheduling historic heritage, instead apparently leaving any such consideration to a non-Plan “Heritage Strategy” .</p>	<p>The plan should make the process for the identification, evaluation and scheduling of historic heritage more clear through appropriate policy.</p>	<p>Inclusion of a policy along the following lines: <u>“Potential historic heritage items, once identified through the Council Heritage Strategy, shall be evaluated in accordance with the criteria of the regional policy statement and, where appropriate, included on the District Plan overlay and schedule in accordance with the process of the RMA.”</u></p>
<p>8.3 Objectives and Policies for Heritage Items and Areas. Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.21 and 531.22.</p> <p>The recommendation rejects these specific submission points.</p>	<p>The decision does not include reference to the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, revised 2010, (the ICOMOS Charter) either in the form of a policy or an explanatory note</p>	<p>The ICOMOS Charter provides valuable guidance for persons undertaking work that may affect historic heritage. While it is not a “referenced document” , it nevertheless merits reference in historic heritage policy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Include a policy along the following lines: <u>Development on the site of, or modifications to, a historic heritage item shall be guided by the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, revised 2010.</u> 2 Include a note on the application of the ICOMOS Charter along the following lines: <u>Refer to the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, revised 2010 which is widely used in the New Zealand heritage sector and forms a recognised benchmark for conservation standards and practice.</u>

Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal References are to originally notified plan provisions	The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan	Reasons	Relief sought Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u> Specific deletions sought are struck through
Section 16 Subdivision Objectives and Policies: Objective 1. Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 12 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s16 in respect of Submission point 531.25. The recommendation rejects the submission point.	The decision has not included more specific reference to historic heritage in Objective 1.	It is a matter of national importance to protect historic heritage (and other resources) from inappropriate subdivision and development, and this is not adequately recognised in the objective and policies, which tend to concentrate on “amenity” and “character”.	Amend objective 1 to read: “Subdivision benefits the District by being located and designed to provide for activities anticipated in the zone while maintaining <u>protecting and enhancing</u> the amenity values of the surrounding landscape, <u>biodiversity, natural character and historic heritage.</u> ”
Section 16 Subdivision Objectives and Policies: Policy 1a Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 12 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s16 in respect of Submission point 531.26. The recommendation purports to accept the submission point in part.	The decision has not strengthened the proposed Policy 1a in the manner requested in the submission, and in fact removes that policy altogether	It is a matter of national importance to protect historic heritage (and other resources) from inappropriate subdivision and development, and this is not adequately recognised in the objective and policies, which tend to concentrate on “amenity” and “character”. It is important to have policy that discourages the fragmentation of archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori.	Retain the original Policy 1a. Add a further policy that reads: “ <u>Significant archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori shall be protected from damage and fragmentation through subdivision.</u> ”

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
<p>Section 16 Subdivision Objectives and Policies: Policy 3a</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 12 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s16 in respect of Submission point 531.27.</p> <p>The recommendation purports to accept the submission point in part.</p>	<p>The decision declines to make the amendment sought to policy 3a (seeking inclusion of the maintenance and management of significant historic heritage as a reason for providing public reserves) and in fact removes the entire suite of objective and policies that deal with the circumstances when public reserves are appropriate.</p>	<p>There is a range of circumstances when it is appropriate to acquire public reserves on subdivision, including as a means of securing, maintaining and managing historic heritage. These merit recognition in a policy sense in the Plan.</p>	<p>The reinstatement of Policy 3a, and its amendment to indicate a public reserve may also be acquired on subdivision so that:</p> <p><u>“significant historic heritage is maintained and managed.”</u></p>
<p>Section 16 Subdivision Objectives and Policies: Policy 5a</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 12 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s16 in respect of Submission point 531.28</p> <p>The recommendation purports to accept the submission point in part.</p>	<p>The decision to not only not amend clause d) of the policy in the manner sought in the submission, but to remove the entire policy.</p>	<p>The policy as originally proposed sought the protection of important landscape features, including Maori cultural sites or other historic heritage sites. The submission, while supporting this, sought a rewording of the clause to specifically include archaeological sites.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy ought to be retained and amended in the manner sought.</p>	<p>Retain the original Policy 5a (renumbered as necessary) with an amended Clause d), reading as follows:</p> <p>d) <u>Historic heritage sites (including sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites).</u></p>

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
<p>Section 16 Subdivision Objectives and Policies: Policies 8a and 8c</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1 of Decision Report 12 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s16 in respect of Submission point 531.29 and 531.30.</p> <p>The recommendation rejects both these submission points.</p>	<p>Policy 8a outlined the circumstances when an esplanade reserve or strip shall be established.</p> <p>Policy 8c outlines the circumstances when the esplanade reserve or strip may be greater than 20m.</p> <p>The decision declined to include reference to the protection of historic heritage in these policies as a circumstance when the reserve or strip may be required or widened.</p>	<p>It is considered that esplanade reserves or strips are a useful mechanism for protecting historic heritage, and further, that the boundaries of these reserves or strips should be located so as not to fragment those resources.</p> <p>It is considered that policy should reflect this</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8a clause c) (renumbered as necessary) to read:</p> <p><u>“Maintain or, protect and enhance aquatic habitats and, ecosystem and historic heritage; or”</u></p> <p>Amend Policy 8a clause f) (renumbered as necessary) to read:</p> <p><u>“Protect the natural character, historic heritage, and/or amenity values associated with a riparian area.”</u></p> <p>Amend Policy 8c clause a) to read</p> <p><u>“The area has special values (including historic heritage) that require protection greater than a 20 m reserve /strip can provide; or...”</u></p>
<p>Section 31.1 Background – 4th and 5th paragraphs - the explanation of the role of HNZPT.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.37.</p> <p>The recommendation rejects the submission point.</p>	<p>The inclusion of the explanation without amendment along the lines sought by HNZPT</p>	<p>The provisions of the decision are factually and legally inaccurate – in that HNZPT is not required to authorise works on listed sites (other than archaeological sites);</p> <p>Since the submission was lodged, various references to NZHPT and its legislation as contained in that submission require updating.</p>	<p>Amend the two paragraphs as follow:</p> <p><u>“Some of the historic heritage items scheduled in the Plan are also entered on the New Zealand Heritage List listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).</u></p> <p><u>“Where a historic heritage item is listed with HNZ, an authorisation is required from HNZ to undertake consultation is recommended with HNZPT prior to applying for consent for works affecting the heritage values of that item. HNZPT also seeks to be considered an affected party in respect of any resource consent application affecting any Historic Place, Historic Area, Wahi Tupuna, Wahi Tapu or Wahi Tapu Area that is an</u></p>

Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal References are to originally notified plan provisions	The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan	Reasons	Relief sought Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u> Specific deletions sought are struck through
			entry on the <u>New Zealand Heritage List</u> The Historic Heritage items, sites and areas have a Historic Heritage Item Record summarising the heritage values that apply to them. <u>Information on those items that are entries on the New Zealand Heritage List can also be sourced from HNZPT.</u> These This information may be used when assessing resource consent applications under rules in this section. Information on Sites of Significance to Māori is held by HNZPT as part of the New Zealand Heritage List.”
8.1.1 References to Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP). Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.17. The recommendation rejects the submission point.	The inclusion of a final sentence that reads: “Where sites have not been identified on the Planning Maps or have not yet been discovered, the Accidental Discovery Protocol applies.”	HNZPT acknowledges that an ADP contained in the Plan is a useful provision that can assist landowners meet their legal obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, in situations where an archaeological authority under that Act has not been obtained. However the ADP is not an alternative to obtaining an archaeological authority where there is a reasonable probability that archaeological sites would be modified or destroyed by the works.	The original relief sought either the deletion of that sentence, or its replacement with a more general provision that requires HNZPT to be contacted. The current position is to retain the provision but to be more specific about the circumstances in which an ADP would be applied. That would involve replacing the sentence with the following: “Where the existence of an archaeological site is known or suspected and there is a reasonable likelihood that works would damage or destroy that site, an applicant is advised to discuss with HNZPT the need for an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Where an archaeological authority has not been obtained(which may be the case if there is considered to be a low likelihood of encountering archaeological remains), and any

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
			<p>archaeological site is discovered during works, then the Accidental Discovery Protocol applies.”</p>
<p>Section 31.4.2 Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP). Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.43. The recommendation purports to accept in part the submission point.</p>	<p>The Accidental Discovery Protocol as included in the plan, in its entirety</p>	<p>This ADP has inaccuracies in its assignment of responsibilities, definition of terms, etc. Particular issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1100 sites referred to are recorded, • As proposed, there is confusion between the words “site”, “artefact” etc. <p>The amended version avoids these errors.</p>	<p>Replace to ADP provisions with the following:</p> <p>Accidental Discovery Protocol.</p> <p>In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works the following applies;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Work shall cease immediately at that place. 2 The contractor must shut down all machinery, secure the area and advise the Site Manager. 3 The Site Manager shall notify the Auckland Regional Archaeologist at HNZPT. Further assessment by a qualified archaeologist may be required. 4 If the site is of Maori origin the Site Manager shall also notify the appropriate iwi group(s)/ Kaitiaki representative of the discovery and ensure site access, to enable appropriate cultural procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, in so long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (Heritage New Zealand Act 2014, Protected Objects Act 1975). 5 If skeletal remains are uncovered the Site Manager shall advise the NZ Police and HNZPT Regional Archaeologist and the appropriate iwi group (s) and the above process under 4 shall apply. Remains are not to be moved/removed until such time as iwi <u>and</u> HNZPT have responded. 6. Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find (s) such as a description of location and content, is to be provided for their

<p>Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal</p> <p>References are to originally notified plan provisions</p>	<p>The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan</p>	<p>Reasons</p>	<p>Relief sought</p> <p>Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Specific deletions sought are struck through</p>
			<p>records.</p> <p>7 HNZPT will determine if a consent (authority) under the Heritage New Zealand Act 2014 is required for works to continue.</p> <p>8. No works that may affect the archaeological site are to resume until HNZPT has given approval.</p> <p>Where an authority is required in respect of an archaeological site, it is an offence under s 87 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 to modify or destroy that site without that authority irrespective of whether the works are permitted or a consent has been issued under the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Accidental Discovery Protocol is not a default mechanism for the lack of appropriate identification of archaeological sites, where there is reasonable cause to suspect that unrecorded sites may exist and be affected by works. Nor should it be referenced in lieu of professional archaeological advice.</p>
<p>Section 31.5 Rules for archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori overlay</p> <p>Rule 1.1 b): (standards relating to permitted grazing).</p> <p>Rule 1.2; (provision for maintenance that is not a permitted activity).</p> <p>Rule 1.1 c) (reference to conservation management plan)</p>	<p>Rule 1.1 b) contains standards for maintenance that is a permitted activity. This includes all grazing of stock, but omits to qualify that.</p> <p>Rule 1.2 provides for maintenance that does not meet permitted activity standards to be a discretionary activity but does not include the grazing of heavy cattle.</p> <p>Rule 1.1 c) permits works in</p>	<p>The grazing of heavy cattle has the potential to adversely affect these sites and therefore requires greater control.</p> <p>Such activity should be explicitly excluded from maintenance as a permitted activity and included in maintenance as a discretionary activity.</p> <p>Because a conservation management plan has the</p>	<p>Amend the provision to exclude the grazing of heavy cattle as a permitted activity by changing Rule 1. 1 b) iii) to read:</p> <p>iii) <u>Grazing of stock (including sheep and goats, but excluding heavy cattle)</u></p> <p>Amend Rule 1.2 to read:</p> <p>2. Maintenance (<u>including grazing of heavy cattle</u>) that is not permitted under Rule 1.1 is a discretionary activity.”</p> <p>Amend rule 1.1 c) to read:</p>

Summary of the part of the decision subject to appeal References are to originally notified plan provisions	The specific provision or matter that the decision includes in, or excludes from, the plan	Reasons	Relief sought Specific insertions sought are <u>underlined</u> Specific deletions sought are struck through
Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report s8 s31 in respect of Submission point 531.44. The recommendation rejects the submission point.	accordance with a conservation management plan, but omits to specify the process of preparing and approving that plan.	potential to regulate activities on archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori overlay, it is important that a process is included for the approval of such plans. While the original submission sought a discretionary activity consent, a restricted discretionary activity would achieve a similar objective.	c) The work is permitted in a conservation management plan approved by the Council <u>through the restricted discretionary activity consent process</u> .
Appendix 1.3 Table 3 Schedule (Coromandel-Colville) Paragraph 7.1 of Decision Report 5 adopts, with some amendments, the discussion and recommendation of Hearing Report App1 in respect of Submission point 531.52. In particular, the submission point's request to include on table 3 the "Methodist Church (Former) Rings Road Coromandel", is rejected.	The exclusion of "Methodist Church (Former) Rings Road Coromandel" from the schedule.	The place has heritage value, meets appropriate criteria, and is listed by Heritage NZ.	Include "Methodist Church (Former) Rings Road Coromandel" on the schedule.

ATTACHMENT FOUR

Names and addresses of persons to be served with a copy of this notice

Thames Coromandel District Council
Private Bag 1001
Thames 3540
Email: customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz

and the following submitters

Number	Name	Address	email
24	Patricia M Hishon	PO Box 27001, Garnett Avenue, Hamilton 3257	hishon@wave.co.nz
298	Dean Glen, Claire Elliot, Sol Glen, Roy Glen and Black Jack Farms Dean Glen	400 Black Jack Rd RD 2 Whitianga 3592	dean.glen@gmail.com
320	Environmental Defence Society Ltd	Madeleine Wright PO Box 91736, Victoria St West, Auckland 1142	madeleine@eds.org.nz
350	Chris Stark	180 Glenfern Drive RD 1 Coromandel Town 3581	chrisstark@farmside.co.nz
416	Murray Edens	822 Black Jack Road RD 2 Whitianga 3595	sue.edens@xtra.co.nz
421	Tasman Buildings Limited	Martin Williams Shakespeare Chambers PO Box 754 Napier 4140	martin@shakespearechambers.co.nz
533	The General Trust Board of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland	Amber Tsang Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited P O Box 5760 Wellesley Street Auckland 1141	a.tsang@harrisingrierson.com
534	Waikato Regional Council	Greg Morton Private Bag 3038 Waikato Mail centre Hamilton 3240	greg.morton@waikatoregion.govt.nz
547	Sue Wright	Sue Wright 147 Woollams Ave Coromandel Town 3506	longveiw@ihug.co.nz
578	Christine Vickerman	10 Elliot Rd RD 4 Paeroa 3674	seehigh@slingshot.co.nz
759	Russell Skeet	106 Victoria Street Tarau Thames 3500	rskeet@xtra.co.nz

Number	Name	Address	email
775	Thames Heritage Collective	Frances Burton PO Box 312 Thames 3540	
790	Ngaati Whanaunga Environment Unit	Nathan Kennedy Ngaati Whanaunga Incorporated Society P.O. Box 160, Coromandel 3543	nkennedy@ngaatiwhanaunga.maori.nz
791	Sue Edens and Others	822 Black Jack Road RD 2 Whitianga 3595	sue.edens@xtra.co.nz
794	Surveying Services Ltd	Debbie Waterhouse PO Box 201 Paeroa 3640	btrail@surveyingservices.co.nz
797	The Vela Trust	Richard Forbes Boffa Miskell Limited PO Box 91 250 Auckland 1142	richard.forbes@boffamiskell.co.nz
799	Gloria and Graeme Ready	57 Woods Road South RD4 COROMANDEL 3544	ready@farmside.co.nz
815	Carol Margaret Isdale	PO Box 79 Thames 3540	cjisdale@xtra.co.nz
817	Ngati Tamatera	Liane Ngamane PO Box 116 Paeroa 3640	liane.ngamane@hotmail.com
910	John David Isdale	PO Box 79 Thames 3540	cjisdale@xtra.co.nz
911	David Nikorima Robson	33 Lincoln Street Ponsonby Auckland 1021	dave.robson@clear.net.nz
935	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Sally Millar P O Box 447 Hamilton 3240	smillar@fedfarm.org.nz
1193	Ross Edens and others	844 Black Jack Road RD2 Whitianga 3595	blacksinglet@hotmail.com
1199	Surfbreak Protection Society	Michael Gunson P.O Box 20717 Glen Eden Auckland 0641	info@surfbreak.org.nz
1357	Coromandel Property Owners Alliance Incorporated	Christine Vickerman 10 Elliot Road, RD4 Paeroa 3584	seehigh@slingshot.co.nz