

**Specialist input for Archaeological Matters, Heritage, Part 7 of Auckland City District Plan:
Hauraki Gulf Islands Section–Proposed 2006**

Prepared by Marion Stuteley, Heritage Policy Analyst, City Planning, Auckland City Council

22 January 2008

Text: Part 7 - Heritage

Figure 7.1

Issue raised: Amend Figure 7.1 so that the box called "Archaeological Maori heritage" reads "archaeological maori and european heritage".

Submission numbers: 2519/1

Comments: Support in part - On reflection, this box does not read how it should. An amendment of Figure 7.1 is supported. The intention would be clearer if the wording were changed to "Archaeological sites" and "Maori Heritage sites", which shows these as two separate disciplines, differentiating between Maori Heritage and Archaeology.

7.2

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.2 to include reference to the blanket protection afforded to all archaeological sites under the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993.

Submission numbers: 3521/58

Comments: Reject - Section 7.2 is specifically about the resource management issues within the broad purpose of the RMA

7.2.2.1

Issue raised: Enumerate ways of achieving listed issues (clause 7.2.2.1), and then ask for comment.

Submission numbers: 3401/2

Comments: There are significant Maori and European archaeological and Maori heritage sites in the islands. Many of these have not been accurately identified in the past in previous planning documents. Also, surface evidence may be obscure, or absent and many sites are fragile and susceptible to damage. Heritage sites have therefore been at risk due to poor identification – Auckland City Council have reviewed as many islands as possible and identified significant archaeological sites. Iwi are identifying Maori Heritage sites, lack of awareness by property owners that their properties may contain heritage resources and their fragile nature we have attempted to contact property owners prior to surveying these sites, although we did not manage to contact all owners. By notifying the proposed plan property owners have the opportunity to see what has been proposed. Once the plan is finalised / operative, property owners will be officially notified. . This means that they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed – the proposed rules and activity tables are designed to protect the scheduled sites.

7.2.2.1

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.2.2.1 to include reference to the blanket protection afforded to all 'archaeological sites' under the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993

Submission numbers: 3521/59

Comments: Reject - The blanket protection afforded to all 'archaeological sites' under the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993 is clearly described in the archaeology section 7.8.1

7.4.4

Issue raised: Concern that the heritage data from the survey carried out by George Farrant et al circa 2000 is not included/referenced.

Submission numbers: 1596/10

Comments: Reject - The archaeological survey carried out by George Farrant et al circa 2000 was the initial trial survey for the whole review. Mr Farrant at that time was Manager, Heritage Division and so in charge of the project overall. However, our consultant archaeologists Clough & Associates Ltd who went on to do the entire survey did the actual trial area survey and assessment. The heritage data reviewed at that time is included in the overall review.

7.8

Issue raised: That further discovered Heritage archaeological sites receive immediate interim protection pending assessment. Include other relevant criteria in the proposal.

Submission numbers: 2910/1

Comments: Reject - all sites are protected automatically by the Historic Places Act 1993. This is the interim protection provided until the territorial local authority assesses the archaeological site and schedules it if significant.

7.8.1

Issue raised: Remove the last sentence from clause 7.8.1 (regarding the Council's proposal to "produce a document containing information about known archaeological sites... which have not been scheduled in the Plan)

Submission numbers: 1243/53

Comments: Reject - It is an ongoing issue that people are often unaware of archaeological sites on their property and expect processing staff at Auckland City Council to have this information and to tell them if there is one. However, the Council does not currently have the means to do this. To meet Auckland City Council's goal of providing the public with information regarding their property, we are producing this document so people know where they stand. All archaeological sites, whether scheduled or not, are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993. Our District Plans provide information regarding scheduled items, but as non-scheduled archaeological sites are still protected, and we believe this is the best way to alert people who can then make good choices regarding the management of their property. We stand by the inclusion of this sentence.

7.8.1

Issue raised: Add the following wording to section 7.8.1:

"An archaeological site is defined under the Historic Places Act 1993 as a place associated with human activity that occurred before 1900, and is or may be able through investigation by archaeological methods ... "

Submission numbers: 2519/4

Comments: Support - the Historic Places Act 1993 does say "and is or may be"

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.1 to state the following or similar:

An archaeological site is defined under the Historic Places Act 1993 as a place associated with human activity that occurred before 1900, or may be able through investigation by archaeological methods to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. All archaeological sites are protected under the provisions of the Historic Places Act.

If any archaeological site is to be damaged, destroyed or modified an authority must be sought from the NZHPT. An authority is required prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any archaeological site, whether scheduled within this Plan or not.

The council intends to produce a document containing information about known archaeological sites in the ~~inner islands~~ Hauraki Gulf Islands which have not been scheduled in the Plan.

Submission numbers: 2641/20

Comments: I support "All archaeological sites are protected under the provisions of the Historic Places Act. If any archaeological site is to be damaged, destroyed or modified an authority must be sought from the NZHPT. An authority is required prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any

archaeological site, whether scheduled within this Plan or not” being added, but do not support it being underlined or otherwise highlighted as it has equal credence to all other clauses or part clauses in the plan, not greater.

I support “inner islands” being changed to Hauraki Gulf islands – again, not highlighted in any way.

7.8.1

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.1 to highlight (i.e. with bolding or underlining) the sentence:

"Notwithstanding this, those archaeological sites that did not have sufficient heritage value to warrant scheduling in the plan are still protected by the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993."

Submission numbers: 3521/63

Comments: Reject - I do not support it being underlined or otherwise highlighted as it has equal credence to all other clauses or part clauses in the plan, not greater which is implied if underlined or otherwise highlighted.

7.8.1

Issue raised: Amend 7.8.1 The archaeological provisions of the Historic Places Act, to specify the timing of the production of the document containing information about known archaeological sites in the inner islands which have not been scheduled in the Plan.

Submission numbers: 3521/64

Comments: Reject - The production of this document is underway, but as many people and processes are involved, I am unable to specify when it will be complete.

7.8.4

Issue raised: Amend 7.8.4 Criteria for scheduling archaeological sites, by adding the following wording at the end of the second paragraph:

‘The council uses a scoring system to rank the visible aspects of archaeological sites against the evaluation criteria. Under this scoring system, sites which rank highly enough to warrant scheduling are given a category A or B status as follows:

- category A - 70 points and over
- category B - 50-69 points.’

Submission numbers: 2091/5

Comments: Support - this provides extra clarification regarding the scoring system

7.8.4

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.4 to state the following or similar:

As noted in clause 7.8.1, all archaeological sites are protected by the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993. An authority is required from the NZHPT prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any archaeological site, whether the site is scheduled within this Plan or not.

Submission numbers: 2641/22

Comments: Reject - this clause, 7.8.4 is specifically regarding the criteria for scheduling archaeological sites by Auckland City Council

7.8.5

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.5 to refer directly to the New Zealand Historic Places Trusts sole power to issue an authority to modify or destroy an archaeological site under ss.11 & 12 of the Historic Places Act 1993

Submission numbers: 3521/65

Comments: Reject - this clause is specifically regarding the rules for archaeological sites scheduled by Auckland City Council.

Table 7.1 and Table 7.2

Issue raised: That planting of trees and digging gardens be permitted activities in these areas (category A scheduled archaeological sites).

Submission numbers: 721/2

Issue raised: That planting of trees and digging gardens be permitted activities in these areas (category B scheduled archaeological sites).

Submission numbers: 721/3

Comments: Support – the rule for Activity 9. *Planting any vegetation on the scheduled site* should have the rider “excluding gardening for domestic purposes, which is permitted” added to it for both Table 7.1: Activity table for category A scheduled archaeological sites and Table 7.2: Activity table for category B scheduled archaeological sites

Table 7.1 and Table 7.2

Issue raised: To amend the Activity Table at 7.1 so that the continued grazing of horses and cattle on Scheduled Area 19-1 (Awaawaroa Bay Pa) is a permitted activity.

Submission numbers: 2643/2

Issue raised: Amend the Activity Table at 7.1 so that the continued grazing of horses and cattle on the Scheduled Area 19-1 is a restricted discretionary activity

Submission numbers: 2643/3

Issue raised: Amend the Activity Table at 7.1 so that the continued grazing of horses and cattle on the Scheduled Area 16-1 is a restricted discretionary activity.

Submission numbers: 2644/4

Issue raised: To amend the Activity Table 7.1 so that the continued grazing of horses and cattle on the Scheduled Area 16-1 is a permitted activity.

Submission numbers: 2644/3

Comments: Reject – Both of these pa sites are Category A archaeological sites in management group A. The proposed rules have grazing on these sites prohibited. Heavy animals are known to create considerable damage to any archaeological site in certain conditions so it would not be supported to alter rules for *Archaeological earthworks - large scale* regarding grazing, 11. *Grazing by heavy animals - ie cattle; horses*; to change grazing on these two sites to a permitted or restricted discretionary activity. This clause could however be reviewed to change grazing to a non-complying activity on Category A archaeological sites rather than prohibited, and should remain as non-complying on category B archaeological sites as it is preferable that we retain the option of declining grazing in certain circumstances.

Table 7.1

Issue raised: To confirm, in writing, that routine maintenance (involving thistle and other weed grubbing, spraying etc) is not captured by heading 2 or 13 on Activity Table 7.1 and that we may continue therefore to undertake routine farm maintenance as we have done in previous, but not recent, years.

Submission numbers: 1274/8

Issue raised: To confirm, in writing, that routine farm maintenance (involving thistle and other weed grubbing) is not captured by activities 2 or 13 on Activity Table 7-1 so that the submitters may continue, therefore, to undertake routine farm maintenance within scheduled area 19-1 as they have done in the past.

Submission numbers: 2643/5

Issue raised: Confirm, in writing, that routine farm maintenance (involving thistle and other is not captured by activities 2 or 13 on Activity Table 7.1 and that the submitters may continue, therefore, to undertake routine farm maintenance within scheduled area 16-1 as they have done in the past.

Submission numbers: 2644/6

Comments: An individual response to an individual regarding specific activities on a heritage item on their property is outside of the scope of the Proposed District Plan. Submission 1274/8 relates to

a Category B archaeological site which correlates to Activity Table 7.2 rather than Activity Table 7.1. Also, none of the specific sites mentioned are within a scheduled site surrounds (activity 13). However, we can confirm that routine maintenance (involving thistle and other weed grubbing, spraying) is not captured by heading 2 or 13 on Activity Table 7.1 nor Activity Table 7.2. The submitters have not specified the activities involved in routine farm maintenance; these must be in accordance with the rules regarding activities in Activity Table 7.1 and Activity Table 7.2.

Table 7.1 and 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.1: Activity table for category A scheduled archaeological sites (in part 7 - Heritage), by deleting row 1 ('Erecting buildings or structures...') and row 13 ('Works or activities within the scheduled site surrounds') in their entirety.

Consequential renumbering of the other rows will be required.

Submission numbers: 2091/2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2: Activity table for category B scheduled archaeological sites (in part 7 - Heritage), by deleting row 1 ('Erecting buildings or structures,...') and row 13 'Works or activities within the scheduled site surrounds') in their entirety.

Consequential renumbering of the other rows will be required.

Submission numbers: 2091/4

Comments: Support – Tables 1 and 2 apply to scheduled archaeological sites only. These activities in rows 1 and 13 apply to scheduled site surrounds so need to be removed from this table and a new section of rules for scheduled site surrounds will be formulated to cover these issues

Table 7.1

Issue raised: Add a note to table 7.1 which reads

3. As noted in section 7.8.1, all archaeological sites are protected by the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993. An authority is required from the NZHPT prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any archaeological site, whether the site is scheduled within this Plan or not.

4. Additionally, the area containing the extent of the scheduled site is indicative of visual assessment only and further sub surface archaeological remains may be located outside of this area.

Submission numbers: 2641/24

Issue raised: Add a note to table 7.2 which needs

3. As noted in section 7.8.1, all archaeological sites are protected by the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993. An authority is required from the NZHPT prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any archaeological site, whether the site is scheduled within this Plan or not.

4. Additionally, the area containing the extent of the scheduled site is indicative of visual assessment only and further sub surface archaeological remains may be located outside of this area.

Submission numbers: 2641/25

Comments: Support in part - I support note 3 being added to both table 7.1 and 7.2. I agree that note three serves as a reminder that the provisions of the HPA 1993 stand in addition to our rules and NZHPT are to be consulted. Note 4 is not accurate as the extent of the site as mapped may include subsurface archaeology detected through probing of other archaeological investigative methods during the survey; the extent is not necessarily indicative of visual assessment only so I oppose note 4 being included as it stands.

I do not support a note advising that further subsurface archaeological remains may be located outside of the mapped area as subsurface archaeological remains may be located anywhere and specifying outside the mapped area suggests this is the only place they may be suspected.

Table 7.1 and Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend the Plan to ensure the consideration of the impact on (potential) Maori heritage sites or cultural values for activities affecting scheduled archaeological sites. This could be achieved, for example, through amending the status of all 'restricted discretionary' activities identified within Table 7.1 to full 'discretionary' activities.

Submission numbers: 2641/26

Issue raised: Amend the Plan to ensure the consideration of the impact on (potential) Maori heritage sites or cultural values for activities affecting scheduled archaeological sites. This could be achieved, for example, through amending the status of all ‘restricted discretionary’ activities identified within Table 7.2 to full ‘discretionary’ activities.

Submission numbers: 2641/27

Comments: Reject in part – I do not support changing ‘restricted discretionary’ to full ‘discretionary’ activities in the archaeological section of the proposed plan. The omission of the consideration of Maori heritage or cultural values in the matters for discretion for scheduled archaeological sites was because those matters would be covered in the Maori heritage section. Unfortunately, we were unable to provide a schedule of Maori Heritage sites at the time of notification of the plan. As per clause 7.13 Maori Heritage, we intend to put forward a variation or change to the proposed plan once iwi have identified their significant cultural sites. This would then cover the matters raised in this submission. However, I would support a clause being added to section 7.8 Archaeological sites referring people to the Maori Heritage section and advising that this must be taken into account also.

Table 7.1 and Table 7.2

Issue raised: Delete all reference to prohibited activities in table 7.1

Submission numbers: 526/18, 527/18, 528/18, 529/18, 539/18

Issue raised: Delete all reference to prohibited activities in table 7.2

Submission numbers: 526/19, 527/19, 528/19, 529/19, 539/19

Comments: Reject - Table 7.1 pertains to category A archaeological sites and Table 7.2 pertains to category B archaeological sites and the prohibited activities are grazing by heavy animals – in table 7.1 this affects archaeological earthworks large and small scale and archaeological deposits, and in Table 7.2 it only affects archaeological deposits. Heavy animals are known to create considerable damage to any archaeological site in certain conditions, therefore, grazing by heavy animals should remain prohibited as per the activity table as it would be detrimental to the integrity of these highly valued archaeological sites.

Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2 to enable the right to plant vegetation or trees suitable for the site without consent

Submission numbers: 892/1

Comments: Support in part – the rule for Activity 9. *Planting any vegetation on the scheduled site* should have the rider “excluding gardening for domestic purposes, which is permitted” added to it for both Table 7.1: Activity table for category A scheduled archaeological sites and Table 7.2: Activity table for category B scheduled archaeological sites

Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2 to enable the right to alter and add necessary building to my property

Submission numbers: 892/2

Comments: Reject – This activity is either discretionary or restricted discretionary for all types of archaeological sites. These regulations apply to scheduled archaeological sites in order to protect those sites and their context. The activities associated with alterations and additions to buildings such as heavy equipment or trucks can damage or destroy sites and 7.8.3 Objectives, Policy 3 states that our objective is to protect significant archaeological sites *By ensuring that land use and development does not result in the damage or destruction of scheduled archaeological sites and their scheduled site surrounds*. Some alterations can be inappropriate for scheduled archaeological sites and their context as per 7.8.3 Objectives, Policy 4. *By avoiding a reduction in the heritage*

values associated with scheduled archaeological sites and their scheduled site surrounds. In order to uphold our policies we need to retain the options of declining any works which may damage a scheduled archaeological site or negotiating alternative ways of meeting the property owner's needs whilst ensuring our overall heritage objectives are met.

Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2 to enable the right to construct a fence or post on the property.

Submission numbers: 892/3

Comment: Reject - These activities are either discretionary or restricted discretionary for all types of archaeological sites. These regulations apply to scheduled archaeological sites in order to protect those sites and their context. Fences require posts to hold them up and this involves digging postholes which could destroy archaeology and removing soil which could include archaeological material. This is why we need to retain the options of declining any works which may damage a scheduled archaeological site or negotiating alternative ways of meeting the property owner's needs whilst ensuring our overall heritage objectives are met.

Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2 to enable the right to relocate or build a new home in the future.

Submission numbers: 892/4

Comments: Reject – This activity is either discretionary or restricted discretionary for all types of archaeological sites. These regulations apply to scheduled archaeological sites in order to protect those sites and their context. The activities associated with relocating or building new homes such as earthworks, heavy equipment or trucks can damage or destroy sites and 7.8.3 Objectives, Policy 3 states that our objective is to protect significant archaeological sites *By ensuring that land use and development does not result in the damage or destruction of scheduled archaeological sites and their scheduled site surrounds.* Relocating or building a new home onto an archaeological site may be inappropriate for scheduled archaeological sites and their context as per 7.8.3 Objectives, Policy 4. *By avoiding a reduction in the heritage values associated with scheduled archaeological sites and their scheduled site surrounds.* In order to uphold our policies we need to retain the options of declining any works which may damage a scheduled archaeological site or negotiating alternative ways of meeting the property owner's needs whilst ensuring our overall heritage objectives are met.

Table 7.2

Issue raised: Amend table 7.2 to enable the right to replace or upgrade utility services without consent

Submission numbers: 892/5

Comments: This activity is restricted discretionary for all archaeological sites. Clearly, earthworks involved in 8. *Construction, replacement or upgrading of utility services by trenching, underground thrusting or directional drilling* have the potential to damage archaeological sites. We need to retain the options of declining any works that may damage a scheduled archaeological site or negotiating alternative ways of meeting the property owner's needs whilst ensuring our overall heritage objectives are met.

7.8.5

Issue raised: Insert the following new clauses immediately before existing clause 7.8.6

7.8.5A Rules for scheduled site surrounds

7.8.5A.1 Permitted activities

The following are permitted activities within the scheduled site surrounds of archaeological sites:

1. Additions and alterations to existing buildings.
2. Routine maintenance, including all normal work required to use, maintain, and enjoy existing garden or landscape features.
3. The planting of vegetation that does not include forestry or horticulture.
4. The grazing of stock.
5. Archaeological investigation.
6. The construction, replacement or upgrading of utility services by trenching, underground thrusting or directional drilling.
7. The construction of post and wire fences.

7.8.5A.2 Restricted discretionary activities

The following are restricted discretionary activities within the scheduled site surrounds of archaeological sites:

1. The construction and / or relocation of buildings.
2. Earthworks (excluding gardening for domestic purposes, which is permitted).
3. Forestry.
4. Horticulture.
5. The construction of fences or walls other than post or wire fences.
6. Road and footpath construction or modification.'

Or alternative wording to like effect.

Submission numbers: 2091/6

Comments: Support in part – under section 7.15 Interpretations and definitions scheduled site surrounds, is the following statement *The site surrounds are identified to protect the context of an item (or items) from effects that detract from the inherent heritage significance and value of the scheduled item.*

I propose the following rules:

7.8.5A Rules for scheduled site surrounds

Archaeological site surrounds are additionally significant as they are calculated by a spatial programme which incorporates other archaeological sites, whether scheduled or not, within an expanding distance from category A archaeological sites. This indicates that the area scheduled as an archaeological site surround contains at least one other archaeological site and this raises the possibility that the area may contain other as yet unrecorded archaeology. This is in addition to protecting the context of the scheduled item. Therefore, activities that involve disturbance of subsurface material need to be restricted discretionary activities.

7.8.5A.1 Permitted activities

The following are permitted activities within the scheduled site surrounds of archaeological sites:

1. Additions and alterations to existing buildings.
2. Routine maintenance, including all normal work required to use, maintain, and enjoy existing garden or landscape features.
3. The planting of vegetation that does not include forestry or horticulture.
4. The grazing of stock.
5. The construction of post and wire fences.

7.8.5A.2 Restricted discretionary activities

The following are restricted discretionary activities within the scheduled site surrounds of archaeological sites:

1. The construction and / or relocation of buildings.
2. Earthworks (excluding gardening for domestic purposes, which is permitted).
3. Forestry.

4. Horticulture.
5. The construction of fences or walls other than post or wire fences.
6. Road and footpath construction or modification.
7. Archaeological investigation.
8. The construction, replacement or upgrading of utility services by trenching, underground thrusting or directional drilling.

7.8.6

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.6 Matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities, as outlined below.

Immediately after the heading 7.8.6 Matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities, add a new heading '7.8.6.1 Scheduled sites' and amend the existing text as follows (deletions to existing text shown with strikethrough, insertions with underlining):

7.8.6.1 Scheduled sites

For restricted discretionary activities identified in table 7.1 Activity table for category A scheduled archaeological sites, and table 7.2 Activity table for category B scheduled archaeological sites, ~~the council has restricted its discretion for restricted discretionary activities~~ to considering the following matters:

Immediately after item (6) ('The extent to which the application is consistent with the provisions of the ICOMOS NZ ...'), add a new heading and text as follows:

7.8.6.2 Scheduled sites surrounds

For restricted discretionary activities identified in clause 7.8.5A.2, the council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matter:

- The extent to which the works or activities detract from the visual or physical context of the archaeological sites contained within the site surrounds.

Or alternative wording to like effect.

Submission numbers: 2091/7

Comments: Support in part – I support the rewording of the introductory sentence. I also support a new heading, and text as follows:

7.8.6.2 Scheduled site surrounds

For restricted discretionary activities identified in clause 7.8.5A.2, the council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matter:

The extent to which the works or activities detract from, or damage, the visual or physical context of the archaeological sites contained within the site surrounds.

7.8.6

Issue raised: Amend clause 7.8.6 to refer directly to the New Zealand Historic Places Trusts sole power to issue an authority to modify or destroy an archaeological site under ss 11 & 12 of the Historic Places Act 1993.

Submission numbers: 3521/66

Comments: Reject - this clause is specifically regarding council matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities for scheduled archaeological sites, the protection through the district plan

Annexure

An1a.8

Issue raised: That any such rewrite be referred to the communities involved before publication for correction and/or amendment

Submission numbers: 1707/2, 1708/2, 1709/2, 1710/2, 1711/2, 1712/2, 1713/2, 1714/2, 1715/2, 1716/2, 1717/2, 1718/2, 1719/2, 2122/2, 2125/2, 2774/2, 2786/2, 2845/2, 1296/2, 843/2, 818/2,

810/2, 933/2, 1021/2, 1195/2, 801/2, 587/2, 379/2, 827/2, 3194/2, 3008/2, 3018/2, 3195/2, 3247/2, 3390/2, 3627/2

An1a.8

Issue raised: That section 8 Recreation of annexure 1a be rewritten to give a comprehensive historical background to the reasons for the recreational development both of Waiheke Island and Hauraki Gulf in general.

Submission numbers: 1707/1, 1708/1, 1709/1, 1710/1, 1711/1, 1712/1, 1713/1, 1714/1, 1715/1, 1716/1, 1717/1, 1718/1, 1719/1, 2122/1, 2125/1, 2774/1, 2786/1, 2845/1, 1296/1, 843/1, 818/1, 827/1, 933/1, 1021/1, 1195/1, 587/1, 801/1, 379/1, 3195/1, 3008/1, 3018/1, 3194/1, 3247/1, 3390/1, 3627/1

An1b.8

Issue raised: The description of the history of recreation on the island in the Plan is considered to be distorted and inadequate.

Submission numbers: 3061/107

Comments: The history was commissioned from Paul Monin historian but edited by Heritage Division staff. I cannot see that anyone has provided a rewrite - just asking for a one on the history of recreation. Maybe we could put a call out for people to send in what they want included and we could get a historian to verify and collate it all.

Additional limitations–inner islands

DP Ref 9-10

Issue raised: Any additional changes which are required in the text and maps to give effect to this submission. (regarding map ref 9-10)

Submission numbers: 36/3

Comments: Support - Once the site has been reviewed we will make any changes if there are any

DP Ref 16-1

Issue raised: To note that it would be impractical for the Scheduled Area 16-1 to be fenced off.

Submission numbers: 2644/2

Comments: Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan

DP Ref 16-1

Issue raised: To provide the submitters with confirmation, in writing, that they can continue to farm Scheduled Area 16-1 as they have done for many decades.

Submission numbers: 2644/5

Comments: Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan

DP Ref 16-5

Issue raised: Move the boundary of the site surrounds for archaeological site (map ref 16-5) very slightly north to avoid 339 Gordons Road (Lot 3 DP66657)

Submission numbers: 488/1

Comments: Reject - Archaeological site surrounds are calculated by a spatial programme that incorporates other archaeological sites, whether scheduled or not, within an expanding distance from category A archaeological sites. This indicates that the area scheduled as an archaeological site surround contains at least one other archaeological site and this raises the possibility that the area may contain other as yet unrecorded archaeology. As such, the boundary of the site surrounds should remain as calculated.

DP Ref 19-1

Issue raised: To provide the submitter with confirmation, in writing, that they can continue to farm the Scheduled Area 19-1 as they have done for many decades.

Submission numbers: 2643/4

Comments: Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan

DP Ref 19-2

Issue raised: If the archaeological reassessment of Awaawaroa Wharf results in a score of less than 50, to remove the Wharf as a Scheduled Heritage Item from the plan before it becomes operative.

Submission numbers: 2642/2

Comments: Support - Once reviewed, changes if any, will be processed.

DP Ref 19-2

Issue raised: If the archaeological reassessment of the Awaawaroa Wharf results in a score in excess of 50 reassess the Wharf for removal as a Scheduled Heritage Item prior to the next 10 year District Plan Review (due 2016/2017) given the further deterioration in the remnant structure that is likely to have resulted in the intervening period.

Submission numbers: 2642/3

Comments: Reject - All heritage items will be reviewed in the future prior to the next District Plan. We are not able to reassess the wharf for removal from the schedule, but will reassess it without prejudice and process it accordingly.

DP Ref 25-8

Issue raised: For Council to provide the Property Owners with advice on site maintenance so as to mitigate against continued deterioration of the site and to advise the property owners in writing that no resource consent is required to remove native trees (including those in excess of 3m) and old fence posts from within the scheduled area (map ref 25-8).

Submission numbers: 1274/2

Comments: Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan

DP Ref 25-8

Issue raised: Assuming the HGI.22 once reassessed results in a score of less than 50, to remove the site (map ref 25-8) as a scheduled heritage item from the proposed Plan before it becomes operative.

Submission numbers: 1274/4

Comments: Support - once reviewed, changes if any will be processed

DP Ref 25-8

Issue raised: If the reassessment results in a score in excess of 50 points, to reassess the site (map ref 25-8) for removal as a scheduled heritage item prior to the next 10 year District Plan Review (due 2016/2017) given the further deterioration that is likely to result without intervention on the part of Council or the property owners in the interim.

Submission numbers: 1274/5

Comments: Reject - All heritage items will be reviewed in the future prior to the next District Plan. We are not able to reassess this site for removal from the schedule, but will reassess it without prejudice and process it accordingly.

DP Ref 25-8

Issue raised: For Council staff to mark (peg), on the ground, the boundaries of the scheduled area (map ref 25-8).

Submission numbers: 1274/6

Comments: Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan

DP Ref 31-19

Issue raised: Amend sheet 31, map 2 by changing the symbol used for scheduled item 31-19 on Browns Island so that it is identified with a pink square as an 'archaeological site' rather than a black square as a 'building, object, property or place of special value'

Submission numbers: 2103/12

Comments: Support - This item is actually on Motuihe, not Brown's Islands, but it is an archaeological site and I agree it should be identified with the pink square of an archaeological site.

DP Ref 33-3

Issue raised: The ability to continue to manage environmental aspects of scheduled archaeological site 33-3 without seeking Council permission (e.g. self-initiated environmental work - revegetation, weed and rodent control).

Submission numbers: 1248/5, 1249/5

Comments:

NB: Submissions 1248 and 1249 are the same; this appears to be a duplication by Auckland City Council.

Reject - individual responses regarding individual sites are outside of the scope of the plan. However, the submitter has provided much documentation showing the historical use of the land around the bay indicating it has previously been modified. The applicant has also advised that he has considerably cleaned up the beachfront vegetation, clearing it of weeds and rubbish. This is to be commended but recommend professional input to ensure the ecology and archaeology are protected.

DP Ref 33-3

Issue raised: Management of the heritage area (scheduled archaeological site 33-3) by Council to stop excessive vehicle use on the beach

Submission numbers: 1248/6, 1249/6

Comments:

NB: Submissions 1248 and 1249 are the same; this appears to be a duplication by Auckland City Council.

The area of the beach that vehicles use is predominantly below the mean high water mark. This falls into the coastal marine area that is managed by the Auckland Regional Council. We have designated the area as an archaeological site as part of the site is above the mean high water mark. It is agreed that excessive vehicle use on the beach is to be discouraged but how this is to be put in to action needs further investigation. It is agreed that beach access is required for those properties with no road access.

Appendices

A1

Issue raised: Heritage items and archaeological sites on Waiheke should / must not be included in the Plan, until the following key points are considered, determined and clarified:

1. Proof applying to all sites as to what there is in the way of archaeological findings in comparison to Incas in South America, Greece, Egypt, Rome,
2. Carbon dating and identification of any actual findings by qualified and certified independent archaeologists.
3. The indigenous people should have the most important say in heritage and spiritual values of any site.

Submission numbers: 294/1

Comments:

- Reject - 1. New Zealand archaeology is unique to New Zealand. Its value is not established by comparing it to archaeology of other countries.
2. All and any New Zealand archaeology is protected. Carbon dating of artefacts or other deposits may give further information but does not necessarily increase the value of a site. The form of artefacts is frequently a guide to age. Much of our archaeology is remnant earthworks which carbon dating is not pertinent to. All sites surveyed for this review were identified and evaluated by qualified independent archaeologists.
3. Iwi will be identifying their Maori Heritage sites independently from archaeological sites which are based on physical remains, and they will be protected under the Maori Heritage schedule in due course.

A1a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on Browns Island in appendix 1a and amend the maps accordingly :

Browns Island – Archaeological sites

DOC ref	Easting	Northing	Description of site	Location
R11/124	2679755	6483782	Headland Pa	Eastern coast
R11/127	2679530	6483800	Stonefield garden system	SE of central cone
R11/1092	2679400	6484250	Stonefield garden system	SE of central cone
R11/1095	2679620	6483950	Stonefield garden system	E of central cone
R11/1500	2679000	6484200	Midden & Stoneworking	NW Flat
R11/1570	2679237	6484208	Stone enclosure	S of central cone

Submission numbers: 2503/1

Comments: Support - Archaeological sites on Motukorea were surveyed and assessed as part of our review in mid 2006. Unfortunately, the data was not processed in time for sites on Motukorea to be included in the proposed plan. These six sites were evaluated and scored highly enough to be scheduled. I therefore support them being included in the plan.

A1a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on Motuihe Island in appendix 1a and amend the maps accordingly :

Motuihe Island – Archaeological sites

<i>DOC ref</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description of site</i>	<i>Location</i>
R11/148	2682930	6486712	Headland Pa-Mangoparerua	Headland
R11/151	2684514	6486383	Headland Pa- Te Rae o Kahu	Northern coast
R11/872	2683755	6484705	Flaking floor & midden	Southern coast
R11/876	2683620	6485264	Open settlement	Orchard Bush
R11/1890	2684029	6484840	Flaking floor & midden	Southern coast
R11/1891	2683995	6484819	Flaking floor & midden	Southern coast
R11/1784	2683100	6487000	Quarantine Station	Headland

Submission numbers: 2503/2

Comments: Support in part - Archaeological sites on Motuihe were surveyed and assessed as part of our review in early 2006. Unfortunately, the data was not processed in time for sites on Motuihe to be included in the proposed plan. Site R11/1891 did not score highly enough to be scheduled in the District Plan. The other six sites mentioned did score highly and I support them being included in the plan.

A1a

Issue raised: Amend appendix 1a of the Plan to provide for the protection of all archaeological sites of significance. In particular those on Ponui, Motuihe, Pakihi, Rangitoto, Motutapu, the Noises, Browns Island (Motukorea) and Karamuramu.

Submission numbers: 2641/31

Comments: Reject - Motuihe and Motukorea were surveyed and assessed in 2006. Unfortunately, they were not processed in time to be included in the proposed plan. They are now complete and ready to be included. Motutapu was partially surveyed and those sites reviewed that scored highly enough to be scheduled could be added to the plan. We have said in the plan that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.

A1a

Issue raised: Amend Appendix 1a of the Plan to provide reference to the NZAA site numbers

Submission numbers: 2641/33

Issue raised: Amend Appendix 2a of the Plan to provide reference to the NZAA site numbers.

Submission numbers: 2641/34

Comments: Support - The archaeological sites listed in Appendix 1a and Appendix 2a are sites which were scheduled in the 1996 HGI plan but are on the islands which were not surveyed for the proposed plan and therefore carried over. I support their NZAA site numbers being included in the list as an identifier.

A1a.3

Issue raised: Amend 3.0, Appendix 1a to state the following or similar:

As noted in section 7.8.1, all archaeological sites are protected by the provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993. An authority is required from the NZHPT prior to damaging, destroying or modifying any archaeological site, whether the site is scheduled within this Plan or not.

Submission numbers: 2641/28

Comments: The last sentence of the clause 3.0 The New Zealand Historic Places Trust could be replaced with this wording. I do not support it being underlined.

A1a.3

Issue raised: Amend Appendix 1a-3.0 Notes and disclaimers to highlight (i.e. with bolding or underlining) the last sentence:

"All archaeological sites in New Zealand are protected by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, whether listed or not".

Submission numbers: 3521/148

Comments: Reject - I do not support highlighting this sentence as highlighting indicates it is more important than other sentences.

A2a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on **Little Barrier** Island in appendix 2a and amend the maps accordingly: **Archaeological sites**

<i>DOC ref</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description of site</i>	<i>Location</i>
S8/3	2696510	6550773	Headland Pa-Tirikakawa	Tirikakawa
S8/4	2695127	6552095	Headland Pa-Parihakoakoa	Parihakoakoa
S8/5	2696619	6551842	Headland Pa	Hamilton track
S8/73	2695600	6551320	Garden system	Te Waikohare Stream
S8/74	2695773	6551401	Headland Pa	Hamilton track
S8/116	2696600	6551010	Garden system	Tirikakawa Stream
S8/121	2697863	6550213	Headland Pa	Awaroa
S8/126	2698292	6550128	Headland Pa	Southern coast
S8/132	2695100	6554900	Stonework complex	Te Hue
S8/133	2695100	6554900	Stonework complex	Te Hue
S8/138	2695685	6551488	Garden system	Te Waikohare
S8/303	2696945	6550515	Headland Pa	Lamb Bay

Submission numbers: 2503/4

Comments: Reject - Clause 7.4.4 states which islands have or have not been reviewed, as at the time of notification of the Plan it was not possible to identify and assess the heritage items for all the islands. It also states that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.

A2a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on **Great Barrier** Island in appendix 2a and amend the maps accordingly: **Archaeological sites**

<i>DOC ref</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description of site</i>	<i>Location</i>
T9/130	2734200	6540500	Headland Pa	Tryphena
T8/8	2733800	6552200	Headland Pa	Awana
S8/295	2721450	6566950	Headland Pa	Miners Head
S8/316	2721497	6564542	Tuahu Stone	Ahuriri
S9/36	2723300	6547900	Ridge Pa	Wairahi
S8/292	2728300	6561300	Stonework complex	Whangapoua
T8/50	2730900	6555100	KTC tramway	Great Barrier SF
S8/397	2727623	6550720	KTC tramway & associated sites	Great Barrier SF
S9165	2726450	6549850	KTC tramway & associated sites	Great Barrier SF
T8/101	2730950	655455	KTC tramway & associated	Great Barrier

		0	sites	SF
T8/102	2730365	655493 7	KTC tramway & associated sites	Great Barrier SF
T8/103	2730032	655299 8	KTC tramway & associated sites	Great Barrier SF
T8/71	2737200	653640 0	Stonework complex	Cape Barrier
T8/73	2736900	653600 0	Stonework complex	Cape Barrier
S8/100	2723100	655600 0	Warren Homestead	Akapoua
S8/19	2725400	656040 0	Ridge Pa	Great Barrier SF
S8/33	2721600	655325 0	Headland Pa	Kiwiriki Bay
S8/34	2727600	655670 0	Ridge Pa	Okiwi
S8/35	2726980	655648 0	Ridge Pa	Okiwi
S8/49	2722200	655450 0	Headland Pa	Kaiarara Bay
S8/56	2722709	655167 8	Stone enclosure & chimney	Kiwiriki Bay
S9/1	2725400	654780 0	Headland Pa	Whangaparapar a
S9/2	2725600	654690 0	Headland Pa	Whangaparapar a
S9/18	2725800	654820 0	Hilltop Pa	Whangaparapar a
T8/2	2733734	655608 7	Headland Pa	Harataonga
T8/5	2734041	655590 6	Archaic midden	Harataonga
T8/6	2734686	655601 5	Ridge Pa	Harataonga
T8/12	2733474	655646 4	Headland Pa	Harataonga
S8/64	2721500	655262 0	Headland Pa	Wairahi

Submission numbers: 2503/5

Comments: Reject - Clause 7.4.4 states which islands have or have not been reviewed, as at the time of notification of the Plan it was not possible to identify and assess the heritage items for all the islands. It also states that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.

A2a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on **Kaikoura** Island in appendix 2a and amend the maps accordingly: **Archaeological sites**

<i>DOC ref</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description of site</i>	<i>Location</i>
S8/433			Hilltop Pa	Mount Overlook
S8/437			Headland Pa	Bradshaw Cove
S8/424			Stonework complex	Western ridge

Submission numbers: 2503/6

Comments: Reject - Clause 7.4.4 states which islands have or have not been reviewed, as at the time of notification of the Plan it was not possible to identify and assess the heritage items for all the islands. It also states that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.

A2a

Issue raised: Undertake the relevant assessments under the criteria contained in Appendix 4, and on that basis include the following identified archaeological sites on **Rakitu** Island in appendix 2a and amend the maps accordingly: **Archaeological sites**

<i>DOC ref</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description of site</i>	<i>Location</i>
T8/57	2734861	6561274	Headland Pa	Arid Cove
T8/84	2734408	6560423	Headland Pa	Shag Bay

Submission numbers: 2503/7

Comments: Reject - Clause 7.4.4 states which islands have or have not been reviewed, as at the time of notification of the Plan it was not possible to identify and assess the heritage items for all the islands. It also states that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.

A2a

Issue raised: A comprehensive study be undertaken to produce a further Planning Maps that shows all known archaeological sites as currently recorded by ARC and the Archaeological Association.

Submission numbers: 2547/6

Comments: Support in part - In section 7.8.1 we state we intend to produce a document showing the location of all known archaeological sites in the inner islands which have not been scheduled in the plan. This is underway, but now we intend to increase the scope of the document to show all sites including scheduled sites and site surrounds for all of the Hauraki Gulf islands. Where we have not resurveyed the sites, we intend to use the NZAA map grid reference, where we have, we will be showing the location using GPS positions and polygons to show the extent of the site.

Issue raised: Amend Appendix 2a of the Plan to provide for the protection of all archaeological sites of significance

Submission numbers: 2641/32

Comments: Reject - Clause 7.4.4 states which islands have or have not been reviewed, as at the time of notification of the Plan it was not possible to identify and assess the heritage items for all the islands. It also states that a variation or plan change will be introduced to the Plan so that additional heritage resources on these islands will be recognised and protected in the future. Meanwhile, all archaeological sites are protected under the Historic Places Act 1993.