

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
1	S. M. and J. M. O'Brien Family Trust <b>S01/1</b>	Policy HH-P11; Rule HH-R28	Oppose	Proposed wording of Policy HH-P11 is too limited and does not provide for the consideration of the relocation of heritage items to be balanced against other relevant resource management issues. The policy has poor alignment with other (existing and unaltered) policies (e.g. HH-P7). Policy HH-P11 would take primacy over Policy HH-P7 and would apply new, more onerous /restrictive provisions to the relocation of buildings than would apply to the full demolition of a heritage building. HH-P11 also restricts the application of HH-P7 as relocation of the item may no longer be viewed as a 'reasonably practicable option' because of the directive nature of HH-P11. The wording of 'imminent danger to natural hazards' is too limited, it does not allow applicants to consider natural hazards that are likely to cause future danger (such as flood plains).	Not specified, but submission outlines opposition to Policy HH-11 as it has poor alignment with other policies such as HH-P7 and is considered to be too limited.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>The intention of HH-P11 is not to provide an easier pathway for demolition over relocation. On reflection the wording of clause c) is more onerous than intended for the applicant to prove that relocation is the only option, which might lead to demolition being a more favourable option. Amendments are recommended to make the policy clearer, recognising that relocation is preferred over demolition, ensuring that the protection of heritage values is considered throughout the policy, and recognising issues associated with a threat of, or damage from natural hazards (which is wider than 'imminent danger').</p> <p>A prehearing meeting was held with the submitter's agent where their concerns with the policy were discussed. Amendments to</p>	Accept in part. Amendments shown in the body of the decision.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<p><i>Opposed by Further Submission FS01/01 (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga)</i></p>		<p>the policy were then provided to the agent for comment, including to clarify that relocation is preferred over demolition, and to recognise threats of, as well as danger from a natural hazard.</p> <p>At the prehearing meeting, the submitter's agent also requested clarity on the consideration of settings and a guidance note is recommended to clarify that the heritage values focus on the built heritage item, not the setting of the heritage items. This is an important distinction.</p> <p>HNZPT (through a separate prehearing meeting) and Ian Bowman support the recommended revised policy.</p> <p>Recommend to change HH-P11 as follows:</p> <p><b><u>“HH-P11 To restrict the relocation of a heritage item in Schedule 4b except where it can be demonstrated that: To only allow relocation of heritage items listed in</u></b></p>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p><u>Schedule 4b where it can be demonstrated that:</u></p> <p>a. The <del>work</del> <u>relocation</u> is necessary to save the heritage item <u>and protect the heritage values from the threat of, or damage from imminent danger</u> to natural hazards; or</p> <p>b. The <del>work</del> <u>relocation</u> will protect the heritage values and significance of the heritage item identified in Schedule 4b, and</p> <p>c. In the case of relocation to another site, <u>alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered a comprehensive alternatives assessment</u> has</p>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>been completed by a suitably qualified heritage expert and relocation is demonstrated to be the only practicable option to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.</p> <p>Add a new Guidance Note at the start of Schedule 4b as follows:</p> <p><u>Guidance Note:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The protection of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b focuses on the heritage building or item rather than the wider site or setting.</u></li> </ol>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
2	Ministry of Education <b>S02/1</b>	Heritage Schedule 4b	Neutral	The six schools listed in the submission are designated by the Ministry of Education. The schools and the Ministry value the heritage item on each site. An education designation will prevail over any rules or listing of heritage items in the Plan (s176, RMA). The Ministry acknowledges the purpose of PC H(a), however the Ministry has a requirement to provide education spaces that can respond to roll changes. Schools value and are interested in protecting heritage items and generally will provide for growth/educational spaces whilst trying to protect these features.	Not provided.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Acknowledge that the school sites are designated and changes to those sites require outline plan processes rather than consent applications. Those heritage items within school sites are valued and provide for growth / educational spaces.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
3	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) <b>S03/1</b>	Definition of Attachment	Support	Supports the definition of attachment in relation to heritage items listed in Schedule 4b.	Retain definition of Attachment.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support for the definition is noted.  Retain definition of 'Attachment'.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/2	Definition of Non-contributing building	Oppose	<p>Concerned that parts of the building which may not be 'original', but still have high heritage value, could be interpreted as 'non-contributing' and therefore might be removed or adversely altered. Refers to the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter which encourages the valuing of differing periods of a building's history. Clear 'non-contributing' parts of a building can be identified specifically in the District Plan schedule. Where there is a situation that part of a building may have a lesser degree of heritage value than the main/original part, proposed alterations can be assessed as part of a resource consent process.</p> <p>This can be assisted by the introduction of a policy encouraging the removal of non-contributing parts of a scheduled heritage building.</p>	Delete definition. Where it is clearly documented in the heritage inventory, amend the heritage schedule to specifically exclude non-contributing parts of the building. This can be recorded in the 'extent of protection' column of schedule 4b.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>As outlined in the body of my evidence, the current definition could be made clearer so that additions that have occurred over time which carry similar or different values but which still contribute to the heritage values do not fall within the definition.</p> <p>The heritage assessments completed for this plan change can not be used to record the extent of non-contributing buildings as sought by the submitter.</p> <p>Recommend to delete the notified definition and insert a new definition as follows (note an amendment to the definition heading is also recommended through S04/9):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Non-contributing <u>parts of heritage buildings</u>:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><del>Non-contributing building: For heritage</del></p>	Accept in part. Amendments shown in the body of the decision.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p><del>items listed in Schedule 4b, non contributing parts of a heritage building are those parts of a building which may have been added to the main heritage building at a later time than original construction of the main building and are not constructed in the same style, finishes or materials as the original building, and includes lean-to's.</del></p> <p><u>Means parts of heritage items that make little or no contribution to, or detract from, the heritage values for which the heritage item has been listed in Schedule 4b.</u></p>	
5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/3</b>	Historic Heritage Introduction : Issues	Support	Acknowledges that the removal of 'issues' is in line with the National Planning Standards.	Retain amendment as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support for the removal of Issues is noted.</p> <p>Retain amendment as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/4</b>	HH-P1 Cultural values	Support	Reference to the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero in this policy.	Retain policy.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support to include reference to the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero in HH-P1 is noted.  Retain HH-P1 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/5</b>	HH-P10	Support	Supports the differentiation of contributing and non-contributing parts of a heritage building, however the distinction of contributing and non-contributing needs to be clear and unambiguous.  Suggests introduction of a policy encouraging the removal of non-contributing parts of a scheduled heritage building (refer S03/2).	Retain policy HH-P10.	Recommend to accept the submission in part.  Support of HH-P10 is noted.  Retain HH-P10 subject to amendment to encourage removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings as follows:  Insert new wording to HH-P10 as follows:  “ <b>HH-P10</b> To enable external alterations to, <u>or the removal of</u> non-contributing parts of heritage buildings listed in Schedule 4b where the changes do not impact negatively on the heritage values of the item listed in Schedule 4b.”	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.



No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>A consequential change is also recommended to HH-R11 to make the rule consistent with the policy as follows:</p> <p>“<b>HH-R11</b> External alterations to, <u>or the removal of</u> non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b.”</p>	
8	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/6</b>	HH-P11	Support	Supports policy to restrict the relocation of heritage items. This policy aligns with HNZPT Guide to the Management of Historic Heritage: District Plans (April 2022).	Retain policy as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>As outlined in the discussion under submission S01/1 changes are recommended to HH-P11. These changes will make the provisions clearer to use and remove the unintended consequence that demolition could be favoured over relocation. This amended policy was discussed with HNZPT at the prehearing and support for the revised HH-P11 was given.</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/7</b>	Explanation (after HH-P11)	Support (partial)	In general supports explanation. However, the explanation does not directly relate to HH-P11, it would be more appropriately located in the District Plan after HH-P1, or as part of the introduction to the heritage chapter.	Retain explanation but locate in a more appropriate place in the heritage chapter.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>This explanation refers to the overall approach to historic heritage in the District Plan and was located at the bottom of the last historic heritage policy that has been reviewed. However, this explanation can be moved to a more appropriate location (at the bottom of the introduction to the chapter). Note this location may change under the new chapter structure as part of the National Planning Standards (NPStds).</p> <p>Recommend that the explanation after HH-P11 be moved to the bottom of the Introduction to the chapter.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
10	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/8</b>	Explanation (after HH-P15)	Support	Supports the amendments to this explanation.	Retain explanation.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support of the amendments to the explanation is noted.</p> <p>Recommend to retain the amendments to the explanation.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
11	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/9	HH-R4	Oppose (partial)	Supports HH-R4, but in line with other submission points, the rule should be amended to refer to HH-S1.	Amend HH-R4 to: " <u>Where compliance with HH-S1 is not achieved. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary. Matters of discretion: Degree of non-compliance with the particular performance standards that the proposed works fails to meet in relation to the relevant heritage values listed in Schedule 4b.</u> "	<p>Recommend to reject the submission.</p> <p>HH-R4 has not been changed as a result of PCH(a) and therefore this request is considered to be outside the scope of the Plan Change.</p> <p>Activities that don't meet the performance standards for Schedule 4a heritage items default to Rule HH-24 or Rule HH-36, while the default for Schedule 4b items is HH-R16. No changes are considered necessary to these rules.</p>	Reject for the reasons given by the officer.
12	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/10	HH-R6	Support	Supports the amendment to HH-R6.	Retain rule.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support of the amendments is noted.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-R6 as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
13	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/11	HH-R7	Oppose (partial)	Supports HH-R7 but in line with other submission points, the rule should be amended to refer to HH-S3	Amend HH-R7 to: " <u>Where compliance with HH-S3 is not achieved. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary. Matters of discretion: Degree of non-compliance with the particular performance</u>	<p>Recommend to reject the submission.</p> <p>HH-R7 has not been changed as a result of PCH(a) and therefore this request is considered to be outside the scope of the Plan Change.</p>	Reject for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
					<u>standards that the proposed works fails to meet in relation to the relevant heritage values listed in Schedule 4b."</u>	Where activities don't meet the performance standards existing HH-R29 applies, which is a full discretionary activity. No changes to the rules are considered necessary.	
14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/12</b>	HH-R9	Support	Supports this rule providing for minor external alterations to heritage items.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission as notified.  Support noted for HH-R9.  Recommend to retain HH-R9 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
15	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/13</b>	HH-R10	Support	Supports this rule, subject to the restrictions and recommended amendments in HH-S5.	Retain rule as notified.	Recommend to accept the submission in part in so far as the support for HH-R10.  Support noted for HH-R10.  Refer to comments in <b>S03/24</b> below regarding HH-S5 amendments which are rejected on the grounds of being out of scope of the Plan Change.	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/14</b>	HH-R11	Support	Supports this rule, subject to the comments made in the submission point on the definition of non-contributing buildings. This rule may still be appropriate; however in the absence of a definition it would apply to non-contributing parts specifically identified in the schedule. In addition, the matters referred to in HH-R16 should be integrated into this rule.	Retain rule, subject to recommended changes, including the following: <u>"Where compliance with HH-S6 is not achieved. Activity status: restricted Discretionary. Matters of discretion: Degree of non-compliance with the particular performance standards that the proposed works fails to meet in relation to the relevant heritage values listed in Schedule 4b."</u>	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part in so far as the support for HH-R11.</p> <p>Acknowledge support to HH-R11.</p> <p>Rule HH-R14 already provides for activities where the permitted activity rule is not achieved. No changes to HH-R14 are considered necessary, therefore the part of the submission to change the rules is rejected.</p> <p>A consequential change is recommended to HH-R11 to make consistent with HH-P10 (see S03/5).</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-R11 subject to the following amendment, noting the recommended change to the definition for non-contributing buildings as outlined under S03/2:</p> <p>Insert new wording in HH-R11:</p> <p><b>"HH-R11</b> External alterations to, <u>or the removal of</u> non-contributing parts of a</p>	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the decision.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						heritage building listed in Schedule 4b.”	
17	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/15</b>	HH-R14	Support	Supports this rule for external additions and alterations as a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support to HH-R14 noted.  Recommend to retain HH-R14 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
18	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/16</b>	HH-R15	Support	Supports this rule providing for relocation on the same site of heritage item listed in Schedule 4(b) as a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support to HH-R15 noted.  Recommend to retain HH-R15 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/17</b>	HH-R16	Oppose (partial)	Supports the intent of HH-R16. However, this rule would be better integrated with other rules for which HH-S1, HH-S3 and HH-S6 are relevant (HH-R4, HH-R7 and HH-R11).	Delete rule (HH-R16), but integrate provisions into HH-R4, HH-R7 and HH-R11.	Recommend to reject the submission.  Support of the intent for HH-R16 is noted.  HH-R4 and HH-R7 are outside the scope of the plan change as they are relevant to Schedule 4a. HH-R16 has been drafted to differentiate the plan change amendments	Reject in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>for Schedule 4b as restricted discretionary activities from the existing provisions for Schedule 4a (which are out of scope of this plan change).</p> <p>As part of a pre-hearing meeting held with HNZPT, clarification was sought on submission point for HH-R16. No further action was identified as necessary.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-R16 as notified.</p>	
20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/18</b>	HH-R24	Support	Supports a discretionary activity rule for external additions and alterations to any Category B significant historic built heritage listed in Schedule 4(a).	Retain rule.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support is noted but consideration of HH-R24 is outside the of scope of plan change. The amendment to the existing rule only relates to providing clarity that HH-R24 relates to Schedule 4a and not Schedule 4b.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-R24 as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/19</b>	HH-R25	Support	Supports the amendments to HH-R25.	Retain as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support noted for the amendments to HH-R25</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						which update the existing rule with the new numbering system.  Recommend to retain HH-R25 as notified.	
22	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/20</b>	HH-R27	Support	Supports a discretionary activity rule for relocation on the same site of Category A heritage item listed in Schedule 4b.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-R27.  Recommend to retain HH-R27 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/21</b>	HH-R29	Support	Supports the proposed amendments to HH-R29.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-R29.  Recommend to retain HH-R29 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
24	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/22</b>	HH-R30	Support	Supports a discretionary activity for any activity not provided for in relation to Category B heritage items in Schedule 4b.	Retain rule.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-R30.  Recommend to retain HH-R30 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
25	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/23</b>	HH-S2	Support	Supports this standard for when buildings need to be demolished due to fire, earthquake, or other disaster.	Retain standard as notified.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-S2.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.



No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						Recommend to retain HH-S2 as notified.	
26	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/24	HH-S5	Oppose (partial)	HH-S5 refers to Rules 3E.4.1 and 3E.4.2 relate to permitted activities. 3E.4.2 is the list of permitted activity standards, including that there be only one sign per site, and that the maximum sign size is 0.6m <sup>2</sup> . While these standards are generally appropriate, additional standards should be introduced for signs on heritage buildings. It is important that signs on heritage buildings do not obscure significant architectural features, and are not attached in a way that damages the heritage fabric.	Include the following standard for signs on heritage buildings in Schedule 4a and 4b: " <u>Signs must not obscure significant architectural features, and must be attached to the building in a way that minimises damage to heritage fabric.</u> "	<p>Recommend to reject the submission.</p> <p>Schedule 4a is out of scope of the plan change. Any change can only apply to Schedule 4b. Most items in Schedule 4b are private homes and war memorials, and the need for signage on these items is likely to be low. If a sign does not meet permitted activity standards (including more than one sign, 0.6m<sup>2</sup> in size), a discretionary consent is required.</p> <p>Existing HH-P9 provides policy guidance for signs on heritage buildings as follows:  <i>HH-P9 To ensure that any signage located on significant historic built heritage is of a size, location, colour and style that is compatible with the character of the heritage item and does not detract from, compete with or dominate the heritage values for which the heritage item is significant.</i></p>	Reject for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>Chapter 3E Signs also contains a relevant policy for assessing signs on heritage buildings as follows:  <i>Policy 1.6 To ensure signage is in keeping with the character of the area or building where it is located.</i></p> <p>Following the pre-hearing meeting, HNZPT have confirmed support with the notified provisions for signs, given the plan change only relates to items outside of the Feilding Town Centre. The concerns raised relate predominately to commercial areas.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-S5 as notified.</p>	
27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga S03/25	HH-S6	Support	Supports that external alterations should not result in any change to the height and footprint of the non-contributing part of the building. However, as referred to in other submission points, there should be more clarity around the definition of a 'non-contributing' building.	Retain HH-S6.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>The submission lodged by NZDF (S04/7) requests replacing the term “change” with “increase” in HH-S6. Mr Bowman has confirmed in his evidence (paragraph 23) that allowing a reduction in height or footprint of non-</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>contributing parts of heritage buildings can reduce their negative effects and allows for restoration.</p> <p>On that basis changing HH-S6 to reference an increase in the height or footprint is recommended. This was discussed with HNZPT at the prehearing meeting and was supported.</p> <p>Refer to SO3/2 for recommendations relating to the definition of non-contributing parts to heritage buildings.</p> <p>Recommend to amend HH-S6 as outlined under S04/7.</p>	
28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/26</b>	Schedule 4b - reference to non-contributing parts of buildings	Oppose (partial)	The schedule includes comments on levels of authenticity, including 'high', 'moderate' and 'low'. Some of the places with 'low' authenticity because of changes over time may need to have 'non-contributing' components specifically identified, either with a specific reference in the 'extent of protection'	Amend schedule 4b to include explicit identification of non-contributing parts of buildings, either by a specific description, or by delineating the non-contributing parts on a plan or diagram.	<p>Recommend to reject the submission.</p> <p>The heritage reports completed to inform the plan change do not contain the detail as sought by the submitter.</p> <p>Just because a building has been identified as having low authenticity, doesn't mean that it has clearly identifiable</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer, subject to the amendment.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				column, or by delineating the non-contributing parts on a plan or diagram. An example of where this may be appropriate is 'The Pines'.		<p>non-contributing parts. The low authenticity ranking may be because of many changes to the architectural style over time, but not discernible 'add ons' that could be defined as "non-contributing", e.g. The Pines is identified as having low levels of authenticity as it is a mixture of architectural styles from alterations over the years.</p> <p>At the prehearing meeting with HNZPT it was agreed that no change was necessary to the Schedule in the way sought by the submitter. Rather a new guidance note should be added to Schedule 4b to make it clear that the heritage reports, which contain a lot of information, are available on request from Council. Over time it is envisaged that the reports will be available online.</p> <p>Recommend that a new guidance note is added to Schedule 4b as follows:</p> <p><u>Guidance Note:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Complete heritage reports which provide greater</u></li> </ol>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<u>detail on each heritage item identified in Schedule 4b are available on request from the Council.</u>	
29	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/27</b>	Additional item to be added to Schedule 4b - Okahupokia Pā	Oppose (partial)	Okahupokia Pā, on the eastern bank of the Rangitikei River near Ōhingaiti, is included in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero: List No. 7611, as a Category 2 historic place. Subject to advice from mana whenua, it should be included in Schedule 4b, or within an alternative schedule of sites of significance to Māori.	Include Okahupokia Pā in Schedule 4b or other appropriate District Plan schedule.	Accept the submission in part in so far that this heritage item is retained in Appendix 1E.  Okahupokia Pā has not been assessed as part of PCH(a). Marae were not part of the scope. Direction is needed from iwi and landowners as to whether the site should be listed in the District Plan in the future, through a separate plan change.  Recommend to retain Schedule 4b as notified, noting recommended changes in this report.	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.
30	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/28</b>	Additional item to be added in Schedule 4b - Mangaweka Bridge	Oppose (partial)	Mangaweka Bridge, spanning the Rangitikei River at Mangaweka, is included in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero: (List No. 9746), as a Category 2 historic place.	Include the Mangaweka Bridge in Schedule 4b	Recommend to reject the submission.  As outlined in my evidence, the Council was informed in 2022 that the listing of the	Submission point withdrawn. No decision required.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<p>This structure should be included in Schedule 4b.</p> <p><i>Neutral Further Submission FS02/01 Horizons Regional Council</i></p>		<p>Mangaweka Bridge was put on hold.</p> <p>As the bridge spans both Rangitikei and Manawatu District Council jurisdictions further discussion and consultation with both councils and their respective communities is required to ensure an appropriate planning framework is provided to manage heritage values of the bridge structure.</p> <p>Acknowledge that Horizons has a hydro station located on the old Mangaweka Bridge on the true right bank. This provides vital information on river flows and is one of the early warning triggers for evacuation of Tangimoana. This hydro station is technically within the Rangitikei District jurisdiction, further supporting that this structure should be assessed via a joint planning process between Manawatū and Rangitikei district councils.</p> <p>Recommend to retain Schedule 4b as notified,</p>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>noting changes recommended in this report.</p> <p>Recommend that future scheduling of the Mangaweka Bridge be part of a future joint plan change between both Rangitikei and Manawatu District Councils recognising and providing for the critical hydro infrastructure that current exists.</p>	
31	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga <b>S03/29</b>	Consequential changes to other plan chapters, including information requirements, earthworks, subdivisions, signs, and relocated buildings	Support	HNZPT supports the consequential changes identified as part of Plan Change H.	Retain amendments as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support noted for the consequential changes identified as part of PPCH(a).</p> <p>Recommend to retain the consequential changes as notified, including information requirements, earthworks, subdivisions, signs, and relocated buildings identified as part of PPCH(a).</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
32	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/1</b>	Inclusion of RNZAF hangars Nos. 2 and 3 in Schedule 4b	Support in part	The buildings are identified as a Category 1 listing by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, and NZDF recognises that the inclusion of the buildings as a	Amend Appendix 4 RB1-8 Rural Buildings as follows: "Today number 2 hanger houses No. <del>3</del> <u>4</u> Squadron <del>of helicopters</del> and number 3 hanger houses no. <del>75</del> <u>5</u>	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Note support to the inclusion of the RNZAF hangars Nos 2 and 3 in Schedule 4b.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<p>heritage feature within the Proposed Plan is consistent with this listing. No.2 hangar houses 42 squadron and No.3 hangar houses 5 squadron. This requires an amendment to Appendix 4 RB1-8 Rural Buildings.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/02 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	squadron of fixed wing aircraft."	<p>The recommended changes correct the use of the heritage buildings and are therefore appropriate. These amendments are considered to be a minor correction to the heritage report.</p> <p>Recommend that the reference in the <i>heritage report</i> for RB1 RNZAF Hangars Nos. 2 and 3 is amended as follows:</p> <p>"Today number 2 hangar houses No. <del>3</del> <u>42</u> Squadron <del>of helicopters</del> and number 3 hangar houses no. <del>75</del> <u>5</u> squadron of fixed wing aircraft."</p> <p>Recommend to retain Schedule 4b as notified where it refers to the RNZAF Hangars Nos. 2 and 3 in Schedule 4b.</p>	
33	New Zealand Defence Force S04/2	Policy HH-P10	Support	It is appropriate that the policy framework enables minor alterations to non-contributing parts of heritage buildings.	Retain as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part noting the changes recommended to HH-P10 in S03/5.</p> <p>Support for HH-P10 is noted. Amendments requested by</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.



No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/03 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>		HNZPT relating to enabling removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings are recommended under S03/5 above.	
34	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/3</b>	Rule HH-R9	Support	It is appropriate that minor external alterations of heritage buildings are a permitted activity, subject to compliance with standards.  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/04 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Retain as notified.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-R9.  Recommend to retain HH-R9 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
35	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/4</b>	Rule HH-R10	Support	It is appropriate that signage on heritage buildings is provided for as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with standards.  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/05 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Retain as notified.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for HH-R10.  Recommend to retain HH-R10 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
36	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/5</b>	Rule HH-R11	Support	It is appropriate that minor external alterations to non-contributing parts of heritage buildings is provided for as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with standards.	Retain as notified. We note that the defined term 'non-contributing parts' should be in bold at all locations within the plan so the reader knows the term is defined.	Recommend to accept the submission in part noting recommended changes under submission S03/14.  Support noted for HH-R11. Refer to amendments recommended in S03/14 to	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>include reference to 'removal of' non-contributing parts of heritage buildings in HH-R11. The recommended change to HH-R11 will enable the removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings.</p> <p>Note that definitions are not being bolded as part of the new District Plan format. Defined terms will instead be italicised.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-R11 as notified with the amendments recommended in S03/5 and definitions of Attachment and Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings to be italicised throughout the chapter.</p>	
37	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/6</b>	Standard HH-S5	Support	The proposed standard requires compliance with the existing permitted activity rule 3E.4.1 and standards 3E.4.2 within the operative District Plan. Consistency across Plan chapters is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support is noted for HH-S5.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-S5 as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
38	New Zealand Defence Force <b>S04/7</b>	Standard HH-S6	Support with	The proposed standard is generally supported. However, as currently	Amend Standard HH-S6 as follows: " <b><i>External Alterations to Non-</i></b>	Recommend to accept the submission.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
			amendments	<p>worded, no change in the height or footprint of non-contributing parts is permitted by the standard. Even a decrease in height or footprint would require a resource consent. We assume the intent is to prevent increases in height or footprint which could further visually detract from the heritage building. Therefore, we suggest the replacement of the word 'change' with 'increase'.</p> <p><i>Opposed by Further Submission Further Submission FS01/06 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	<p><b><i>Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings in Schedule 4b must comply with the following standard: i. External alterations to non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b must not result in any <del>change</del> increase to the height and footprint of the non-contributing part of the building.</i></b></p>	<p>Support noted for HH-S6. The intention of rule (HH-R11) and standard (HH-S6) is to manage changes to non-contributing parts of buildings where there is the potential for a change to impact negatively on the heritage values of the heritage item. As outlined by Ian Bowman in his evidence, a change that allows a reduction in height or footprint of a non-contributing part of a heritage building would unlikely impact on the heritage values and allows for restoration.</p> <p>An increase in height or footprint has the potential to impact on the heritage values of the main building and should be considered as part of a consent process. The suggested changes are therefore supported.</p> <p>Recommend the following amendment to HH-S6:  <b><i>"HH-S6: External Alterations to Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings in Schedule 4b must</i></b></p>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<b>comply with the following standard: i.</b> External alterations to non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b must not result in any <del>change</del> increase to the height and footprint of the non-contributing part of the building.	
39	New Zealand Defence Force S04/8	Attachment' definition	Support	Definition is (sic) appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support is noted for the definition of 'Attachment'.  Recommend to retain the definition of 'Attachment' as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
40	New Zealand Defence Force S04/9	Non-contributing building' definition	Support	The definition is supported. A minor amendment is proposed to be consistent with the wording used in the rules and standards.  <i>Opposed by Further Submission FS01/07 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Amend definition as follows: <b><i>“Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings:</i></b> For heritage items listed in Schedule 4b, non-contributing parts of a heritage building are those parts of a building which may have been added to the main heritage building at a later time than original construction	Recommend to accept the submission in part.  Support is noted for the definition of 'Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings', however, following other submissions and a prehearing meeting with HNZPT, a new definition is recommended to replace the notified definition. NZDF have advised via email (see	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
					of the main building and are not constructed in the same style, finishes or materials as the original building, and includes lean-to's.	<p>Appendix 7) that the changes to the definition are acceptable.</p> <p>Recommend to amend the heading of the definition to make wording consistent, as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>“Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings:</u></b> ...”</p> <p>Recommend deletion of notified definition and replace with definition as discussed and outlined in S03/2 above.</p>	
41	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/1</b>	Policy: Categories for heritage places (HH-P2)	Support	Support the change reducing categories from A, B and C to A and B only. Category C places only needed to be recorded before their demolition.	Change current category listing A - B - C to a two-part listing, A and B only.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-P2 as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
42	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/2</b>	HH-S2 Demolition Guidance Note	Support with amendments	Suggest that the proposed guidance note that a photographic record MUST, not just will be encouraged in the case of demolition of any historic place, Category A or B. Otherwise, places of 'lesser interest' can be lost with no physical record of	Add guidance note requiring photography of any historic place to be demolished.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>Note support of the requirement for a photographic record in HH-S2. However, the clause proposed is a guidance note which states 'where it is safe to do</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<p>the features which saw them initially listed on the plan.</p> <p><i>Opposed by Further Submission FS01/08 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>		<p>so' and applies after emergency situations (fire, flooding, earthquake). The statement is not a rule but a guidance note so cannot include 'must'. The heritage rules only protect the external parts of heritage items, not internal parts. Every heritage report contains at least one photo of the heritage item and a number of reports contain several photos of each heritage item.</p> <p>Recommend to retain HH-S2 guidance note as notified.</p>	
43	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/3</b>	Archaeological consent required by HNZPT Act	New provision	<p>Ask that the plan includes the guidance note that under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, any place demolished which pre-dates 1900 requires archaeological consent and assessment by Heritage NZ.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/09 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	Add guidance note requiring archaeological assessment of any historic place pre-1900 in age.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>The requested amendment will provide information in the District Plan about the requirement for archaeological consent and assessment by HNZPT. The wording of the guidance note recommended reflects wording used elsewhere in the District Plan therefore ensuring wider Plan consistency.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p>Recommend to insert the following guidance note above the heading of 'Permitted Activities' in Chapter 4 Historic Heritage:</p> <p><u>Guidance Note:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Demolition of any heritage item listed in Schedule 4b which pre-dates 1900 requires an Archaeological Authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (2014). It is an offence to modify or destroy an archaeological site or destroy an archaeological site or demolish/ destroy a whole building if the person knows or reasonably suspects it to be an archaeological site. An archaeological site is any place, including any building or</u></li> </ol>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p><u>structure (or part of), that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>was associated with human activity or the site of a wreck of a vessel that occurred before 1900; and</u></li> <li>• <u>provides or may provide, through archaeological investigation, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.</u></li> </ul>	
44	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/4</b>	Minor alterations to more modern parts of existing heritage buildings (Non Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings) HH-P10 HH-R11 HH-S6	Support	<p>Support the change which will permit minor changes to more modern parts of existing heritage buildings where they are not constructed in the same style, materials or finishes as the original.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/10 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	Add policy permitting changes to external features.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission in part.</p> <p>Support for these provisions is noted. As discussed above in this report the definition and provisions relating to non-contributing parts of buildings are recommended to be amended to provide greater clarity for plan users. Refer to S03/2 and S03/5, S03/14, S04/7.</p> <p>Recommend to amend the notified provisions for non-contributing parts of heritage</p>	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.



No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						buildings as outlined in S03/2 and S03/5, S03/14, S04/7.	
45	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/5</b>	Definition of 'Attachments'; HH-R9	Support	Support the change which will permit solar panels, heat pumps and infrastructure to be added where they are not visible from a road or public space.  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/11 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Add policy permitting attachments to non-essential sections of a historic structure.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for definition of 'Attachments' and HH-R9.  Recommend to retain definition of 'Attachment' and HH-R9 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
46	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/6</b>	Section 32 Report: Appendix 3 Recommendations for Schedule 4b: Table 1	Support	Support listings in Table 1 and the new proposed categories. In particular, in favour of change from Category C to A for Opiki Toll Bridge, reflecting Heritage NZ rating of Category 1.  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/12 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Approve of Table 1 with the proposed categories.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted for the items recommended and changes to categories for items in Proposed Schedule 4b.  Recommend to retain Schedule 4b noting recommended changes outlined in this report.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
47	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/7</b>	Section 32 Report: Appendix 3 Recommendations for Schedule 4b: Table 2	Support	<p>Support Table 2 listings and the recommended categories for these places. In particular, support the inclusion of the Ohakea Air Force hangars and Highden as Category A, which both have Category 1 ratings by Heritage NZ but are not on the District Plan list. Also support inclusion of the RNZAF Operations Room for its national rarity as a historic place. In the next review (or this one) would like to see the investigation and inclusion of post World War II modernist places as heritage should not be confined to the colonial era. The lack of modernist buildings or places would be to neglect over 70 years of history, in particular the late Betty Williamson's Group Architects house at Cheltenham, or the house that architect Sir Michael Fowler built for his parents in Feilding.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/13</i></p>	Approve Table 2 with the proposed categories.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Comments and support noted. Submission points on new items including post World War II modernist places are to be noted for future plan changes as these are considered to be outside the scope of this Plan Change.</p> <p>Recommend to retain Schedule 4b noting recommended changes outlined in this report.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>			
48	Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua <b>S05/8</b>	Section 32 Report: Appendix 3 Recommendations for Schedule 4b: Table 3	Support	<p>Appreciate that some have been demolished, moved from their sites or now are part of the Palmerston North City Council area due to boundary changes. We support the changes made in this list.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/14 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	Approve of Table 3 and the removal of these heritage places for various reasons from the Manawatu District Plan.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Comments and support noted for removal of items from Appendix 1E.</p> <p>Recommend to remove heritage items from Appendix 1E from the District Plan as proposed in Section 32 Report: Appendix 3 Table 3.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
49	Horizons Regional Council <b>S06/1</b>	Plan Change H(a)	Support	Changes proposed through Plan Change H(a) align with the requirements of the One Plan Objective 6-3 (Historic Heritage) and Policies 6-11 (territorial authorities to include provisions in District Plans to protect historic heritage of national significance) and 6-12 (territorial authorities to develop and maintain schedule of known historic heritage, with a statement	Supports proposed changes in Plan Change H(a) as they align with the One Plan RPS. Seeks relief set out in the submission or any further alternative or consequential relief that achieves the outcomes sought.	Recommend to accept the submission in part noting recommended changes as outlined in this report.	Accept in part for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				of the qualities applying to each site).  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/15 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>			
50	Horizons Regional Council <b>S06/2</b>	HH-R9: Minor External Alterations	Support	The proposed changes to enable solar panels, heat pumps, and infrastructure connections where they are not visible from a road or public space align with One Plan provisions in policy 3-7 relating to energy efficiency (encouraging energy-efficient house design and access to solar energy).  <i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/16 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	Supports proposed changes for HH-R9. Seeks relief set out in the submission or any further alternative or consequential relief that achieves the outcomes sought.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Support noted to HH-R9.  Recommend to retain HH-R9 as notified.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.
51	Horizons Regional Council (HRC) <b>S06/3</b>	Schedule 4b: Opiki Toll Bridge	Support	Land adjacent to the bridge is owned by HRC and functions as a floodway as part of the Lower Manawatu flood control and drainage scheme. Understands that HRC does not own the bridge or the land it is located on (part of river parcel). HRC engineers do not undertake works on	Information noted.	Recommend to accept the submission.  Information is noted. The addition of a guidance note to the District Plan to reflect the regional council requirements would add clarity and certainty for plan users. HRC have reviewed the proposed wording below.	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
				<p>the bridge or any abutments and as such, understand works in this area will not require a resource consent. Given the bridge is located within a flood control and drainage scheme, HRC request that any party undertaking works on the bridge structure advise HRC's river management department in advance to ensure risks to flood protection structures are avoided. Advise that certain works in the riparian margin (10 metres from the river bed) may require resource consent from HRC.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/17 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>		<p>Recommend a new Guidance Note above the heading of 'Permitted Activities' in Chapter 4 as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Guidance Note:</u></b></p> <p><u>Opiki Toll Bridge, Schedule 4b: Ref O14, Category A:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>The Opiki Toll Bridge is located within the Lower Manawatu Flood Control and Drainage Scheme area. Earthworks, bed disturbance and other activities on or near this heritage item may require resource consent and approval from Horizons Regional Council. Any party undertaking works on or adjacent to the Opiki Toll Bridge structure are to advise Horizons Regional Council's</u></li> </ol>	

No.	Submitter Name and No.	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Officer Comment and Recommendation	Decision
						<p><u>river management department and Area Engineer Central at least 5 working days prior to works commencing to ensure risks to any flood protection structures are avoided.</u></p>	
52	Horizons Regional Council <b>S06/4</b>	Liquefaction susceptibility (Opiki Toll Bridge)	Support	<p>Liquefaction risk at the location of the Opiki Toll bridge has been identified as 'moderate' according to the regional scale liquefaction susceptibility mapping by GNS Science. Refer to Horizons Regional Natural Hazard map profile on Horizons Maps/Public Viewer to view the liquefaction map. Further questions about liquefaction at the Opiki Toll Bridge location should be directed to GNS Science.</p> <p><i>Supported by Further Submission FS01/18 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i></p>	Information noted.	<p>Recommend to accept the submission.</p> <p>Information noted about the liquefaction risk at the Opiki Toll Bridge location. No change recommended.</p> <p>Retain the listing of the Opiki Toll Bridge in Schedule 4b: Ref O14, Category A, as notified.</p>	Accept for the reasons given by the officer.