

Plan Change 39 Archaeological and Other sites – Summary of Submissions

Submitter Name: Wanganui District Council

Submission Number: 1.c39

Summary:

As information and field checking of some sites is still being carried out, adjustments to the maps and Appendix K may be needed.

Decision Sought:

1. Authority to amend Appendix K and planning maps, based on technical site assessment information obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist prior to the hearing for the plan change.

Submitter Name: Powerco Ltd

Submission Number: 2.c39

Summary:

Powerco supports the plan change in general but seeks balance with its needs as an infrastructure provider.

Decisions Sought:

1. Clearer provision for continued and new network utility operations
2. Inclusion of an Accidental discovery protocol
3. Provisions related to previously disturbed land
4. Greater mapped clarity of buffers
5. Removal from appendix K and maps of sites with insufficient information.

Submitter Name: Bill Simmonds

Submission Number: 3.c39

Summary:

Archaeological sites are protected under legislation other than the RMA, and many are still unknown. Landowner goodwill is important for the protection of sites. District Plan provisions are inappropriate and may lead to negative outcomes for sites. Information on sites should not be made public.

Decision Sought:

For the Plan Change to focus on the most representative and significant sites.

Submitter Name: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission Number: 4.c39

Summary:

Heritage New Zealand supports the acknowledgement of relevant legislation and history, the listing of sites, the objectives and policies and the inclusion of Appendix K. It opposes in part the rules.

Decisions Sought:

1. Council to have all Appendix K sites recorded with NZAA, and appropriate buffers for all sites.
2. Minor amendment to the archaeology note elsewhere in Chapter 9 and to the advice note, reflecting legislative changes.
3. That rules 9.10.2 and 9.10.3 only be retained if applied to the most significant sites.
4. The inclusion of a discovery protocol.
5. The possible inclusion of the performance standard in the advice note.
6. That sites on the New Zealand Heritage List Rarangi Korero be subject to rules covering the effect on historic heritage rather than just effects on archaeology.

Submitter Name: Federated Farmers

Submission Number: 5.c39

Summary:

While the significance of heritage is acknowledged, there is concern the provisions will cause difficulties for landowners and farmers.

Decisions Sought:

1. Face to face meetings with individual landowners
2. Significant reduction in the number of listed sites
3. Amend Objective 1: Manage inappropriate subdivisions, etc
4. The full waiving of resource consent fees
5. Cost-sharing for impact assessments
6. Amendments to Objective 3 and 4 to enable routine land uses