

Summary of Hearing Statement – Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan 2015
Jane Mary O’Dea 29 June 2016

1. My name is Jane Mary O’Dea. My qualifications and experience are outlined in my written statement. This statement concerns planning matters associated with the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (PDP) 2015 and Heritage New Zealand’s submission on the PDP.
2. The primary matters addressed in my pre-circulated statement are as follows:
 - The statutory framework for the management of historic heritage;
 - The Heritage New Zealand Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series;
 - Matters pertaining to Heritage New Zealand’s submission and the notified and Section 42A Report Recommended Revised Chapter version of the provisions. In some cases I recommend amendments to the provisions;
 - My statement then covers HNZPT’s approach to notifying landowners affected by HNZPT’s submissions on the PDP.
3. I have considered the recommendations in the section 42A report and note the numerous changes to the proposed chapter that are recommended in the report. I generally consider the revised version of the chapter to provide greater clarity and certainty than the notified version. Furthermore, the proposed amendments streamline provisions that have the potential to duplicate provisions in other chapters of the Plan.
4. Overall I am in support of the Section 42A Report recommended revised chapter. For the sake of brevity I will focus this summary on matters where I have recommended changes to the ‘recommended revised chapter’ version of the heritage provisions as set out in the Section 42A Report.
5. I recommend some amendments to the rule framework for archaeological sites scheduled in section 26.10 of the Inventory of Protected Features. The proposed amendments, including an additional rule, are intended to better manage activities which have the potential to adversely affect sites, and their settings or extents. Furthermore they encompass activities which may not necessarily be addressed or considered under the archaeological provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 - for example new buildings and structures within the setting/extent of place of a scheduled archaeological site. In such cases the District Plan has the

potential to perform a role that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act may not necessarily extend to, but where there is the potential for significant adverse effects.

6. The Section 42A Report recommended amendments to the notified version of the explanation of the 'development' activity would mean that new signage within the extent of place or setting of a scheduled heritage item would not specifically require consent. I consider that new signage has the potential to compromise the surroundings of historic heritage and should be controlled. In my written statement I have therefore recommended amendments to the Heritage and Signs chapters to address this matter.
7. I note Ms Jones' (for QLDC) comment in her summary of evidence provided to you on Monday that amending the Signs chapter would be outside the scope of the current process. Whilst I understand the reasoning for Ms Jones' view, it is my opinion that the topic of heritage is intended to be comprehensively dealt with via the current process. There should therefore be scope to consider pertinent matters such as signage within the setting/extent of a scheduled heritage feature. My opinion is reinforced by the knowledge that the District Plan Signs chapter (Chapter 18) was reviewed in 2014, and as I understand it there is no intention to review this chapter again in the near future.
8. Furthermore, I note that signage was a matter that was contemplated in the notified version of the Heritage chapter (section 26.6.7), as a component of 'development within the curtilage or setting,' and accordingly I do not consider that any person would be prejudiced by the inclusion of the provision I have recommended, whether in the Heritage or Signs chapter. I recognise that inclusion in the Heritage chapter would mean that the Signs chapter would no longer be a complete district wide chapter. This is an unfortunate outcome of the staged District Plan review process and the District Plan format and could potentially be remedied through a later plan change.
9. Finally I would like to touch on Heritage New Zealand's approach to informing owners where its submission affects privately owned properties. Heritage New Zealand wrote to the owners of all properties affected by its submission.
10. The letters sent to these parties:
 - Explained how Heritage New Zealand's submission on the Proposed District Plan affects their property;
 - Explained that there is an option to lodge a further submission;
 - Where to find further information on the QLDC website regarding the PDP and how to lodge a further submission.

- Provided contact details of HNZPT staff if there were any queries.

11. Copies of the letters sent, and a summary of responses is contained in section 16 of my written statement. I draw this to your attention so that you are aware that the affected owners have been informed of Heritage New Zealand's submission and the opportunity to lodge further submissions.

Conclusion

12. Overall, subject to the amendments discussed here and expanded upon in my written statement, I consider the proposed provisions as set out in the Section 42A report will provide an appropriate framework for the management of historic heritage in the District.

13. I am happy to answer any questions.

