



HAURAKI GULF ISLANDS BUILDINGS: RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO SCHEDULED BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

Brief

Barnes & Associates Ltd have been commissioned by the Heritage Division of City Planning to provide responses to the submissions relating to heritage buildings identified in the Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands section of the Auckland City District Plan. These responses are to be included in the submissions report which will be used for the District Plan Hearings.

The responses are based on assessments of individual assessments provided by the Heritage Division. Individual scores have only been reconsidered where these have been challenged by submission. A very small number are recommended to be revised, based on new and relevant information that can be imported into the assessment.

In the years prior to the notification of the Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section of the Plan, the Heritage Division consulted people in the inner islands community with a particular with a knowledge of the history of the Gulf Islands. A list of candidate buildings was compiled, and buildings in the inner islands were visited and photographed. They were also subjected to detailed research to enable a formal assessment (using the Councils evaluation system modified for the Hauraki Gulf Islands section) to take place.

After the evaluation was completed, subsequent visits took place to most buildings on Waiheke Island which had scored 50 points or more, to confirm the buildings still existed in a similar condition to that observed previously, and confirm the results of the evaluations. Buildings on other inner islands, such as Rangitoto, were not visited again. Unfortunately, time and resources did not allow this.

Some submissions, particularly in regard to the Rangitoto baches, have made the Council aware that the information held by the Heritage Division is incomplete and also dated in regard to some buildings. It appears that it will be necessary to undertake further work to establish the locations and significance of various buildings and constructed elements outside but associated with the baches, and to verify the present condition and heritage significance of some of the bach interiors, prior to considering formal protection of additional site surrounds and interiors. This will need to be undertaken through a plan

change process, after appropriate consideration and approval by the City Development Committee.

Similarly, a number of additional buildings and structures, throughout the Gulf Islands, have been submitted on. For these, the City Development Committee will need to approve a further scoping exercise with a view to a plan change process, to include appropriate consultation and research. This will need to include consideration of the many military installations, which have greater value when considered as an overall network than when considered as individual elements. Most of these installations are already actively conserved by virtue of their location on the Department of Conservation estate.

It may well be that a better mechanism to protect some buildings and structures (such as those within the Rangitoto bach communities) may be an area based control, rather than the scheduling (only) of individual items. This will be able to be considered as part of the scoping exercise

Notes in a red font are for guidance or information, not for inclusion in the final report.

This report is written by Tony Barnes, as Director of Barnes and Associates Ltd.

Submissions which may impact on content of Schedule

Submissions to Rules other than 'Additional Limitations'

To 7.9:

Recreation of historic village at Islington Bay.
(1036/1 and 1038/1)

Sites 71, 72, 75, 78, 79, 80, 92, 93, 114 rebuilt as baches
(2047/1)

Bach 92 faithfully rebuilt by descendants.
(2557/1)

The creation of an historical village on Rangitoto
(2557/2)

Baches 71, 72, 75, 78, 79 and 93 to be faithfully rebuilt as true to original and cared for by original family descendants.
(2558/1)

Provision for previous bach holders on Rangitoto to replace a bach of similar plan to that which was there.

Formal request to ARC to schedule the Rock Bay Boat Sheds (below MHWS)
(3719/1)

To 10a.18:

Retain Alison homestead, and allow no further buildings on this site at Matiatia.
(554/1)

In clause 10a.18, retain Alison Homestead; future buildings (1 storey only), public car-parking and transport infrastructure.
(680/4)

To 10.18.5.3

In clause 10a.18.5.3 keep Alison Homestead. Future buildings 1 storey only. Keep car parking monuments etc.
(2570/6, 2576/6)

To 10a.25

Supports the submission of the Director-General of Conservation with regard to the classification of Department of Conservation facilities on the Hauraki Gulf Islands, in particular Motutapu Island.
(3574/1)

Comment: *Have not responded.*

To 10.26 – Pakatoa

Deletion of all relevant provisions in the proposed Plan that apply to Pakatoa Island and their replacement. (Precinct plan attached to submission identifies the location of precincts 1, 2 and 3).

Comment: *Have not responded.*

Submissions to ‘Additional Limitations’

Man O’ War Bay Rd, Waiheke

The Ngati Paoa Whanua Trust supports the protection of the scheduled items in the HGI Plan (**submission 31/1**), and specifically Maori heritage/archaeological sites. As owners and managers of the station at 23 Man O’ War Bay Rd acknowledges and supports the protection of the heritage items (**submission 31/2**). (Maps 6, 13, 18, 23, 25, 26).

Comment: This report supports the retention of all heritage items, with some minor changes to site surrounds definitions that do not diminish the level of protection afforded. In relation to its support for identified built heritage, it is recommended that **submissions 31/1 and 31/2 are accepted.**

Seaview Rd 372, Waiheke

Colin de Lambert (submission 1097/1) requests clarification of heritage site notation related to this address (Map 10).

Comment: Analysis of this submission has not revealed the exact concerns of the submitter. One matter appears to relate to nomenclature, but this may not be the only matter requiring clarification. It would be helpful if the submitter could provide additional evidence to be considered at the hearing, to ensure all areas of concern can be addressed.

Waiheke Heritage Items

C M Henderson (submission 709/5) and **Community Board members Harvey, Romanuik, Sears and Evans (Submission 1055/38)** support the scheduling of the 12 heritage items on Waiheke Island listed in Appendix 1b (Maps 1-31 inclusive). **Submission 1055/38** explicitly requests that this schedule is retained, with additions assessed according to a modified system which includes the value to the community as an assessment category. This submitter and **Anja Zillig (submission 1232)** specifically requests that the Matiatia Kayak Sheds are scheduled, and that flowing full consultation with owners, remnants of maritime culture such as the wreck of the Patiki at the Causeway, old boatsheds such as the Matiatia Kayak Sheds, and those at Oneroa, Surfdale and Ostend (Wharf Rd) and the community halls at Oneroa (MORRA), Blackpool, Surfdale, Ostend including the ORRA Hall, Palm Beach, Onetangi. Also the special/significant places and buildings such as the Alison Homestead and Coach house – Matiatia, Janet Frames’s cottage (if it still exists), the Red Cross (Oneroa), the Red Shed (Palm Beach), and the Library and Artworks. Submission 1232 also requests that the Harbour Master’s Homestead, plus other examples of cottages and baches are protected (after consultation with the owners).

Note: Add other submitters page 1 of 8 for schedule summary, and similar lists following.

Comment: The submitters support for the identified built heritage (in Appendix A) is acknowledged and supported and it is recommended that **submissions 709/5 and 1055/38** are accepted. The submitter also requests the consideration of additional buildings, through a process of full consultation. The suggestions are buildings principally with a ‘public’ function. A number of buildings of this type have already been assessed by the Council, but received an assessed score less than the 50 points required. These buildings, and their assessed scores, are as follows:

- Insley’s Police Station (Cowes Bay Rd) - 21
- Rocky Bay Boatsheds (Insufficient information available to evaluate)
- Kissling House (used as an early Post Office) – 44
- Palm Beach Hall – 35
- Ascot Picture Theatre (later Red Cross) – 33
- Stoney Batter Hall – 15
- Ahern’s/ Billings Dance Hall – 15
- Waiheke War Memorial Hall – 25
- Ostend Post Office – 26
- Little Oneroa Beach Store – 20
- Ratepayers’ Building – 24

Therefore, many of the buildings submitted on have been assessed and do not have sufficient heritage value to warrant consideration for scheduling. In relation to other buildings that have not been assessed Council has not, as part of the Plan review process, assessed additional items for scheduling. However, it is noted that items can be added to the heritage schedule through a plan change process.

In relation to the assessment system, the Council has adopted a numerical assessment approach, initially used for the Isthmus section of the District Plan notified in 1993, modified for the Central Area section in 1997, and fine-tuned for this Hauraki Gulf Islands section in 2006. This system ascribes value according to a number of attributes, including physical attributes and historic associations. The system attempts to quantify heritage value in a dispassionate manner, for present and also future generations. Although further modification of the system is not supported, the submitters will be able to further express their concerns at the hearing, especially in relation to the public esteem attributable to buildings in the Hauraki Gulf Islands that have not been scheduled. At this stage, the modification of the assessment system is not supported, and it is recommended that the **submission 1232 is not accepted**.

Rangitoto baches:

Bach 8

Ailsa M West (Submission 2586/1) supports the heritage provisions (Part 7) and Appendix 1b, particularly in relation to Bach 8 Matthews/Eagles on Rangitoto Island.

Comment: This submission is supported to the extent of its support for Appendix 1b generally, and in particular Bach 8 Matthews/Eagles, which score 53 points. It is recommended that it is **accepted**. (The support for Part 7 is to be noted in the relevant report.)

Note: Included later under buildings.

Delamore Drive, 168, Waiheke

The NZ Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/41) requests that the interior of the Alison woolshed is considered for scheduling.

Comment: The Council files reveal that, at the time of inspection some years ago, the interior of the Alison woolshed was fitted out to reflect its function as a woolshed. While the interior is considered to be integral to its heritage significance, and an important aspect of the building that should be protected, the Council has not been able to confirm that this interior still exists in its former state. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2641/41 is accepted**, and the interior is scheduled for protection if it can be confirmed that it remains original.

Nikau Rd, 23-25, Waiheke

The NZ Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/42) submits that the interiors of the Blackpool (Surfdale) School classroom and library buildings (Map 8-2) should be considered for scheduling in Appendix 1b.

Comment: The Council records suggest that the interiors of both the scheduled buildings are generally intact. Little change (to the interiors) appeared to have occurred when the building was inspected in 2006. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2642/42 is accepted**, and the interiors are scheduled for protection.

Glen Brook Road, 3-5, Waiheke

Donald Mitchell McKenzie (submission 1228/4) supports the submission of the Omiha Welfare Recreation Society which seeks heritage and conservation status for the Rocky Bay Store. **Phee Phansell (submission 1234/1)** supports the scheduling of the 15-2 items.

Comment: These submissions support entries on Appendix 1A, and are therefore supported. It is recommended that **submission 1228/4** and **submission 1234/1** are **accepted**.

Glen Brook Road, 2, Waiheke

Donald Mitchell McKenzie (submission 1228/2) supports the submissions of the Omiha Welfare Recreation Society which seeks heritage and conservation status for the Rocky Bay Hall. **Phee Phansell (submission 1234/2)** supports the scheduling of 15-3 items.

Comment: It is recommended that **submission 1228/2** and **submission 1234/2** are **accepted**.

The NZ Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/43) submits that the interior of the Omiha Welfare Recreation Society Memorial Hall (15-3) should be considered for scheduling in Appendix 1b.

Comment: The Council can not find evidence of the nature of the interior of this building. The Trust may be able to provide evidence at the hearing. At this stage, the protection of the interior of this building is not supported, and it recommended that **submission 2641/43 is not accepted** until the matter can be investigated further.

McMillan Road (cnr Glen Brook Rd)

Donald Mitchell McKenzie (submission 1228/3) supports the submission of the Omiha Welfare Recreation Society which seeks heritage and conservation status for the Monumental Flag Pole at Rocky Bay. **Phee Phansell (submission 1234/3)** supports the scheduling of 15-4 items.

Comment: These submissions support entries on Appendix 1A, and are therefore supported. It is recommended that **submission 1228/3** and **submission 1234/3** are **accepted**.

Rangitoto

Bach 11

Kevin Andrew (submission 2068/1) supports the scheduling of Bach 11 on Rangitoto (map ref 30-19), requesting the boatshed-ramp and pathway to bach rear of Bach Road access to Back Rd, general storage shed, ablution block and outside fish smoke, outside mosaic's, garden backs, retaining wall and outside BBQ area. **Glenda Pardington (submission 2593/2)** submits that the outbuildings and the foundations for Bach 11 should be protected. In **submission 2593/3**, this submitter seeks that the mosaic artefacts near the beach are protected. This submitter (**submission 2593/4**) also requests that the map reference lines for the defined site surrounds for bach 11 (30-19) are amended to include the associated boat shed and boat ramp. **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2900/1)** submits that the defined site surrounds for scheduled site 30-19 (Bach 11) should be increased to include the road entrance, with ferry chain gate, "Launville" mosaic and food safe, other mosaics, wallaby, fish and deer, party dell, prison camp toilet, laundry, water tank, smokehouse, bach itself, garden, fences, BBQ area, garden ornaments, paths, flagpole, boatshed, ramp and changes to foreshore for boat access.

Comment: The existing scheduled site surround extend 10 metres from each of four buildings identified, including three out-buildings. This is the standard approach that has been taken on Rangitoto Island. Extension of the site surrounds to include the other associated features may be appropriate, but this would require a site visit and further research. It would be helpful if the submitter could supply (at the hearing) information to positively identify the location of these features, to enable work to be done towards a plan

change that includes a refinement of the provisions. It is recommended that **submission 2068/1, submission 2593/2, submission 2593/3, submission 2593/4 and submission 2900/1** are not **accepted**.

Glenda Pardington (submission 2593/1) submits that the interior of Bach 11 should be protected. **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2900/2)** submits that the interior of Bach 11 should be scheduled because of the significant inbuilt furniture, including ironing board and cupboards, kitchen and cooking nook and colours.

Comment: The Council's records indicate that the interior of this bach is of at least moderate significant, and generally consistent with the age and style of the building. These records are now dated however, and the matter needs to be addressed in the context of a site visit and further research, by way of a plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2593/1 and submission 2900/2** are not **accepted**.

Glenda Pardington (submission 2593/5) submits that the name of Bach 11 is modified to Andrew/ Pardington.

Comment: The Council has attempted to maintain a consistency of nomenclature in relation to the Rangitoto baches, based on the early leaseholders associated with them, relying on information provided when they were first assessed in the 1990s. If the naming of Bach 11 is incorrect in relation to this approach, the submitter can provide the correct information. In the absence of such evidence, a change in name is not supported. At this point, it is recommended that **submission 2593/5** is **not accepted**.

Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2877/1 and 2900/3) submits that Bach 11 should be scheduled in Category A.

Comment: Bach 11 has achieved a total of 71 points as a result of its heritage assessment. It is therefore a few points short of the 75 points required if it is to be scheduled in Category A. The evaluations for all the Rangitoto baches have been undertaken in a consistent manner, according to the information available. In order to maintain this consistency, the score can only be increased if new and relevant information is brought to hand, to justify a revision. The submitter may be able to supply this at the hearing. In the absence of such information, the submission can not be supported, and it is recommended that **submissions 2877/1 and 2900/3** are **not accepted**.

Rangitoto Hall, Tennis Court and Swimming Pool

Gerard Elwell (submission 434/1), Isobel Harriet Conning, (submission 435/1), Oscar Patrick Wilhelm van Cuylenborg (submission 436/1), Bernice Anne Elwell-van Cuylenborg (submission 438/1) and Mervyn Desmond Conning (submission 2111/1) support the scheduling of the Rangitoto Hall, including the tennis court (scheduled item 30-20).

Comment: The Rangitoto Hall and tennis courts are scheduled in Category A, having achieved a total of 78 points. It is therefore recommended that **submission 434/1, submission 435/1, submission 436/1, submission 438/1 and submission 2111/1** are **accepted**.

Christine Margaret Cutler (submission 521/1), in supporting the heritage provisions, specifically refers to item 30-49 and requests that the ‘swimming pool’ and ‘tennis courts’ are scheduled.

Andrew Sharp (submission 981/1), Margaret Sharp (submission 982/1), Ann Bohan (submission 983/1), Paul Sharp (submission 984/1) and Rachel Sharp (submission 985/1) submit that the tennis courts at the wharf should be scheduled.

Comment: The ‘tennis courts’ may refer to those scheduled in association with the Rangitoto Hall, which are scheduled in Category A, but is more likely to refer to the courts at Rangitoto Wharf, referred to by other submitters. Unfortunately the Council has not identified the significance of the courts at Rangitoto Wharf, and has therefore not undertaken further research. The Council does not have the resources to undertake further research at present. The submitter will be able to clarify the matter at the hearing, and may be able to provide information that will assist the Council to identify the significance of the tennis courts referred to, in order for an evaluation to take place. The submission **can not be recommended for acceptance until the issues are clarified, and dealt with through a subsequent plan change**.

It is presumed that the ‘swimming pool’ refers to the swimming pool at Rangitoto Wharf, which has been assessed at 54 points, and is therefore scheduled in Category B. If this interpretation is correct, because these items are already scheduled, it is recommended that the submission **is accepted as one in support**. If not, the issue will need to be dealt with through a subsequent plan change, and **can not be recommended for acceptance**. Until there is clarification at the hearing, a specific recommendation can not be made in regard to these submissions.

Andrew Sharp (submission 981/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 982/2), Ann Bohan (submission 983/1), Paul Sharp (submission 984/1) and Rachel Sharp (submission 985/1) support the heritage protection of the bach community and request that the tennis court at Rangitoto Wharf is scheduled.

Comment: Unfortunately the Council had not previously identified the significance of the courts at Rangitoto Wharf, and has therefore not undertaken further research. The tennis courts will need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 981/1, submission 982/1, submission 983/1, submission 984/1 and submission 985/1** are **not accepted at this stage**.

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2877/12) seeks amendments to the hall.

Comment: It is unclear what amendments are sought. The submitter will be able to clarify this at the hearing

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2888/1) submits that the digitised points defining the site surrounds of item 30-20 be extended to include the 'long drop'.

Comment: It would be helpful if the submitter could clarify (at the hearing) whether there is a historical association between the hall and the toilets. The toilets will need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2888/1 is not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2888/2) submits that the associated (loose) items currently in the hall, especially the piano and benches, are included in the scheduling, because of their pivotal associations with the building.

Comment: In the past, the Council has not adopted the practice of scheduling loose furniture and other moveable items because of practical difficulties. While the significance of the items in the Rangitoto Hall is not in question, the requirement to obtain resource consent for moving loose furniture. The types of difficulties that might arise include the need for a resource consent to move furniture out of a building in order to clean the floor. It is questionable whether such matters fit within the framework of the District Plan and Resource Management Act. It might be that agreed stakeholder management procedures are more efficient and effective in this regard. It is recommended that **submission 2888/2 is not accepted.**

Bach 38

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2877/2) submits that Bach 38 is upgraded to a Category A building.

Comment: The building has been assessed and received a score of 72 points, three points short of what is required for it to be identified as a Category A building. The Council is willing to reconsider the assessments in relation to any new evidence that when entered on the assessment sheet, increases the score. If the submitter can bring new information to the hearing then the building can be reassessed. However, in the absence of any appropriate information in the submission, it is provisionally recommended that **submission 2877/2 is not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2899/1) submits that the Council should ensure that the digitized site surrounds should include the path, walls, workshop/shed, toilet shed, bach itself, steps, concreted area and retaining walls.

Comment: It is unclear whether the standard approach that the Council has adopted has extended the site surrounds sufficiently to include all these items. The submitter may be

able to give their view of this at the hearing. In principle, it is accepted that all related structures and features should be included that are part of the heritage significance of the place. This bach may need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that the submission is **not accepted**, on the basis that any extension of the site surrounds will need to take place as part of a separate process.

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2899/2) submits that the interior of Bach 38 should be protected.

Comment: The proposed District Plan has not protected any interiors in the Rangitoto baches. This is seen as a significant omission. It appears that the interior of Bach 38 may be significant and integral to the integrity and significance of the place, but the Council's records are now very dated. The bach will need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. At this stage it is therefore recommended that submission **2899/2** is **not accepted**.

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2899/3) submits Bach 38 should be scheduled in Category A.

Comment: The information supplied to support this submission, however, appears to already have been taken in to account in the assessment, which arrived at a score of 72 points. If new information is brought to the hearing, this may be able to be reconsidered. At this stage, it is recommended that **submission 2899/3** is **not accepted**.

Bach 12

Andrew Sharp (submission 414/2), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 415/2), Rachel Sharp (submission 416/2) and Paul Sharp (submission 417/2) seek the inclusion of the outhouse/long-drop with specific reference to Bach 12.

Comment: It would be helpful if the submitters could supply information (to the hearing) to ultimately ensure that the site surrounds are sufficiently large to allow inclusion of this feature. The bach will need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 414/2, submission 415/2, submission 416/2 and submission 417/2** are **not accepted**.

John Walsh (submission 2582/1) supports the scheduling of Bach 12, reference 30/22.

Comment: This item scored 73 points, and is registered in Category B. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2582/1** is **accepted**.

John Walsh (submission 2582/2) submits that the name reference of the Bach should be changed from Eric Hart to John Walsh.

Comment: The Council has adopted the practice of referring to the baches in terms of the names of the earliest owners, as indicated in research supplied to the Council. This approach is consistent with other sections of the District Plan. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2582/2 is not accepted**, on the basis that it would create an inconsistency with the Council's standard practice.

John Walsh (submission 2582/3) submits that the northern-most boatshed on map 30-22 be removed from this map and identified as part of Bach 11, map reference 30-19.

Comment: It is presumed that the submitter has evidence of an historic association between this boatshed and Bach 11. This information, if provided, may require further research and evaluation, which is best achieved through a subsequent plan change. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2582/3 is not accepted**.

Bach 36

Shirley June Collins (submission 2546/1) submits that the name of Bach 36 (scheduled item 30-24) should be 'Jones/ Parker/ Collins', not 'Jones/ Parkes /Collins'.

Comment: The submitter has recognized that there is a typographical error in the plan. It is recommended that **submission 2546/1 is accepted**, and the correction made.

Shirley June Collins (submission 2546/2) submits that the evaluation sheet for Bach 36 should be revised to include a reference to the construction using 12 inch x 1.5 inch timber boards and battens. The same submitter (**submission 2546/3**) submits that the interior decoration in pink and grey, dating from the 1920s, should be formally recognized in a similar way, and (**submission 2546/3**) that the score sheet should acknowledge the fact that the same family has occupied the house since its construction in 1911, the fact that Mr Jones was secretary of the Auckland Working Men's Club, the fact that Mr Parker was Government Analyst for Auckland when he lived in the bach in the 1920s-1930s, and that Mr Collins was an 1935 All Black who toured England/Scotland/France.

Comment: The assessment sheets have two important functions. Primarily, the completed sheets determine which buildings are to be scheduled for protection, and if so, in which category. Secondly, after completion, the sheets record a brief summary of the heritage values associated with a place, and can assist in the on-going management of a place by having this relevant information in a readily accessible form. The evaluation has been reviewed. Subject to supporting evidence that will need to be provided at the hearing, the building may attain another two points for its construction, three points for its interior (if it is original and has not been repainted) and eight points for the family associations. It would then attain a score of 70 points. At this stage it is recommended that **submissions 2546/2, 2546/3 and 2546/4 are not accepted** until further work has been undertaken.

Shirley June Collins (submission 2546/5) seeks the inclusion of the long-drop and path to the public track (within the defined site surrounds of the scheduled item), and in **submission 2546/6** seeks the inclusion of the boat-ramp between Baches 34 and 36, which is currently not included with either bach.

Comment: The increase in the defined site to include all these items may be appropriate, but will require an additional site visit and research. This will need to be achieved through a subsequent plan change. It is therefore recommended that **submissions 2546/5** and **2546/6** are **not accepted**.

Bach 86

David Leo Hickey (submission 481/1) submits that the store shed, toilet out-house and steps to the water, all at the rear of Bach 86 (map reference 30-25), should be included within the site surrounds definition.

Comment: These structures are accepted as being significant to Bach 38. The bach will, however, need to be visited and researched prior to assessment as part of a subsequent plan change process. The submitter may be able to indicate precise locations at the hearing to assist this process. It is therefore recommended that the **submission 481/1** is **not accepted**.

David Leo Hickey (submission 580/1) submits the boat ramp some seventy metres to the right of Bach 86 is included as a scheduled item.

Comment: The Council does not have sufficient information to schedule the boat-ramp as a structure in its own right. If the submitter is able to provide information to the hearing about a more specific association to a particular bach, this structure may be able to be included within the site surrounds information after further verification and assessment, through a plan change process. It should also be noted that all or part of the boat ramp may be below the mean high water spring tide mark (and therefore outside the Council's jurisdiction. At this time, scheduling of the structure is not recommended. It is therefore recommended that **submission 580/1** is **not accepted**.

Bach 20

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2894/1) submits that the site surrounds of Bach 20 (map reference 30-26) should be extended to include the path and some typical Rangitoto kitsch objects.

Comment: The increase in the defined site to include all these items is supported in principle, subject to evidence of the location of these items being researched and assessed through a further plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2894/1** is **not accepted**.

Bach 118

Stephen Francis Penk (submission 3517/1) supports the heritage schedule and in particular the inclusion of Bach 118, as part of the Rangitoto Bach community.

Comment: It is recommended that **submission 3517/1 is accepted.**

Bach 78

Kevin and Bobbe Free (submissions 143/1 and 522/1) submit that the boat skid, the site of the 'honey shed' outbuilding, the site of the original long-drop, the engine shed, outdoor washbasin and bench associated with Bach 78 (map reference 30-27) should be specifically protected. **Bernard F. Fraser and Gabrielle W. Fraser (submission 2550/1)** submit that the boat skid, the site of the honey shed, the site of the long drop and the site of the engine shed are included as part of the scheduled item. **Daniel F. Arrowsmith (submission 480/1)** submits that the boat skid should be specifically protected. **The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2889/1)** submits that the site surrounds should include the bach itself, the path & boatshed and ramp, toilet outbuilding, sleep-out and generator shed and the built-up concrete water stand.

Comment: The increase in the defined site to include all these items may be appropriate, subject evidence of the location of these items being provided at the hearing. A site visit and further verification and research may be required, however, and this will need to be achieved through a plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 143/1, submission 522/1, submission 2550/1, submission 480/1 and submission 2889/1 are not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2889/2) submits that Bach 78 is currently under restoration and will include a 12 volt electrical system including a solar panel, composting toilet, shower and gas cooker, and that these should be included in appendix 1b.

Comment: It is unclear whether the submitter is suggesting that these new items will become part of the heritage value of the bach when they are installed, or whether a provision is sought to enable the works to continue without a further consent. The submitter may be able to clarify this at the hearing. Provisionally, it is recommended that **submission 2889/2 is not accepted.**

Bernard F. Fraser and Gabrielle W. Fraser (submission 2550/2) and **Kevin and Bobbe Free (submission 557/1)** submit that the interior of Bach 78 should be protected. **The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2889/3)** submits that the interior, which contains special items of significance such as linos, kitchen cupboards,

and windows and cupboards in the lounge which are pre-1900, is considered integral to the significance of this bach and should be protected.

Comment: The interior of Bach 78 appears to be integral to its significance. It is noted, however, that the Council's information is very dated, and it will be necessary to visit this bach, and possibly undertake further research on the interior. This will need to occur through a further plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2550/2, submission 557/1 and submission 2889/3 are not accepted.**

Bach 65

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2877/3 and 2898/3) submits that that Bach 65 (map reference 30-29) is upgraded from Category B, to be scheduled in Category A. Information supplied includes the association with the 'Wallaby Lady', significance of bach architecture (interior and exterior) and colour, and association with quarry.

Comment: Bach 65 was originally assessed at 55 points, which determined its Category B status. Of the information supplied, it appears that the association with the 'Wallaby Lady' has not been taken into account. It is recommended that the submitter explains the significance of this association at the hearing, but it would appear that any points attributable would be well short of those required to schedule the building in Category A. Provisionally, it is recommended that submissions **2877/3 and 2898/3 are not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2898/2) submits that the interior of Bach 65 should be protected.

Comment: The submission indicates that the interior is in poor condition. It remains unclear whether it will retain its heritage significance if repaired or restored. The submitter may be able to clarify this at the hearing. Provisionally it is recommended that **submission 2898/2 is not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2898/1) submits that the site surrounds (as defined by the digitized points) include the bach, its outbuildings, and the wooden boat ramp on the foreshore.

Comment: All structures directly associated with the bach can be considered to be integral to its significance. The increase in the defined site to include all these items may be appropriate, but will require a further site visit and research. Evidence of the location of these items that is provided at the hearing may assist, but further verification will be required. It will be necessary to do this through a further plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2898/1 is not accepted.**

Bach 14

Allan Godsall (submission 2069/1) submits that the scheduled site of Bach 14 (map reference 30-30) should include the three outbuildings (the toolshed, toilet and generator/battery shed), the rock walls, and the paths down to the bay and around the bach.

Comment: The three outbuildings can be considered to be integral to the significance of Bach 14. The increase in the defined site to include all these items may therefore be appropriate, subject a site visit and further research. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2069/1 is not accepted.**

Allan Godsall (submission 2069/2) submits that the size of the toilet should be increased to include a self-composting type.

Comment: It is unclear whether the submitter is suggesting that this modification will become part of the heritage value of the bach when completed, or whether a provision is sought to enable the works to continue without a further consent. The submitter may be able to clarify this at the hearing. Provisionally, it is recommended that **submission 2069/2 is not accepted.**

Allan Godsall (submission 2069/3) submits that the bach has had a solar panel operating since 1993, and requests the inclusion of this if need be.

Comment: It is unclear whether the submitter is suggesting that this item is part of the heritage value of the bach, or whether a provision is sought to formally establish this use. The submitter may be able to clarify this at the hearing. Provisionally, it is recommended that **submission 2069/3 is not accepted.**

Allan Godsall (submission 2069/4) submits that the bach has permanent built-in furniture, and had drop blinds on the verandah, which should be listed.

Comment: The purpose of this submission is unclear. It is assumed that the submitter wishes this information to be recorded on the assessment sheet. The submitter may wish to explain his intentions further at the hearing, but based on this assumption, it is provisionally recommended that **submission 2069/4 is rejected.**

Allan Godsall (submission 2069/5) submits that the scheduled site of Bach 14 should include the chip heater currently in use.

Comment: It is unclear whether the submitter is suggesting that this item is part of the heritage value of the bach, or whether a provision is sought to formally establish this use. The submitter may be able to clarify this at the hearing. Provisionally, it is recommended that **submission 2069/5 is not accepted.**

Bach 2

Eleanor Anne Burns & Richard William Burns (submission 1404/1) and **Betty Jacqueline & Sidney Barry Tricklebank (submission 2658/1)** submit that the Category B Scheduling of Bach 2 (map reference 30-31) is appropriate. **Raewyn Mary Cook (submission 2622/1)** supports the Category B scheduling of Bach 2.

Comment: This building scored 56 points when evaluated. It is recommended that **submission 1404/1, submission 2658/1 and submission 2622/1 are accepted.**

Bach 8

Ailsa M West (Submission 2586/1) supports the heritage provisions (Part 7) and Appendix 1b, particularly in relation to Bach 8 Matthews/Eagles on Rangitoto Island.

Comment: This submission is supported to the extent of its support for Appendix 1b generally, and in particular Bach 8 Matthews/Eagles, which score 53 points. It is recommended that it is **accepted**. (The support for Part 7 is to be noted in the relevant report.)

James Allan and Richard Allen (submission 2057/1) and **Lois Eagles and Peter Eagles (submission 2058/1)** submit that the interior of Bach 8 (map reference 30-32) should be scheduled.

Comment: The Council has no information to suggest that the interior of this bach has particular heritage qualities. The submitter may be able to provide evidence relating to the interior at the hearing. In the absence of such information, it is provisionally recommended that **submissions 2057/1 and 2058/1 are not accepted.**

James Allan and Richard Allen (submission 2057/2), Lois Eagles and Peter Eagles (submission 2058/2), Russell Dennison Williams (submission 2623/2) and Stacey Ann Hurrell (submission 2621/2) submit that the outhouse toilet of Bach 8 should be included in the scheduled item (map ref 30-32).

Comment: The outhouse toilet associated with the bach can be considered to be integral to its significance. An increase in the defined site to include all these items may be appropriate. This will need to be achieved through a site visit as part of another plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2057/2, submission 2058/2 and submission 2621/2 are not accepted.**

Stacey Ann Hurrell (submission 2621/2) and Russell Dennison Williams (submission 2623/1) submit that the interior of Bach 8 should be scheduled.

Comment: The Council does not at present have sufficient information to consider scheduling this interior. To consider this issue it will be necessary to visit this bach and

inspect the interior, and undertake an evaluation as part of the plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 2621/2** and **submission 2623/1** are **not accepted**.

Colin E. West (submission 2567/1) submits that the evaluation sheet for Bach 8 should be revised, and the buildings scheduled in Category A, as having attained 93 points rather than the 53 allocated. The submitter considers, as a retired architect, that the points should be as follows:

A	significant/few	8
B	significant/some	4
E	significant/national	12
F	low/national	3
G	significant/local	8
L	significant/national	6
M	significant/moderate	12
O	form	4
	design	4
	interior	1

Comment: In the absence of supporting evidence in the submission, it is recommended that the submitter explain his reasoning to the hearing. Provisionally, without this further evidence, it is recommended that **submission 1576/1** is **not accepted**.

Joanne West (submission 2589/2) questions the land allotted to Bach 8.

Comment: The submitter is free to raise this question at the hearing. No relief has been suggested in the submission, therefore no recommendation can be made.

Bach 96

Liam Callaghan (submission 116/1) submits that the shed and long drop should be included in the surrounds definition of Bach 96 (map reference 30-34), and that the interior is protected. **Robert Christopher Ellis** submits that the shed and toilet is included (**submission 122/1**) and that the interior is protected (**submission 122/2**). **Carolyn Meale (submission 144/1)** and **Bryce William Ellis (submission 268/1)** submit that the interior of Bach 96 should be protected, and that the shed and toilet included for protection.

Comment: It is considered that the ancillary buildings form an integral part of the heritage significance of the bach, and should ultimately be included in its scheduled site surrounds. According to Council files the interior was both significant and intact in the mid-1990s, but a further site visit is necessary. These matters will need to be addressed through a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 116/1, submission 122/1, submission 122/2, submission 144/1** and **submission 268/1** are **not accepted**.

Bach 76

Bernice Anne Elwell van Cuylenborg (submission 431/1), Isobel Harriet Conning nee Simmons (submission 432/1), Gerard Elwell (submission 433/1), Oscar Patrick Wilhelm van Cuylenborg (submission 437/1) and Mervyn Desmond Conning (submission 2110/1) submit that the interior of Bach 76 (map reference 30-35) is scheduled.

Comment: The Council does not have any evidence that the interior of this bach has particular value. An inspection and evaluation of the interior may be undertaken as part of a further review and plan change process. The submitters may be able to provide evidence (at the hearing) which will assist in this later process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 431/1, submission 432/1, submission 433/1, submission 437/1 and submission 2110/1 are not accepted.**

Bach 53

Stephen Pearce (submission 149/1) and Frances Buchanan (submission 2568/1) submit that for Bach 53 (map reference 30-36) there should be special provision for allowing solar power, protection of the interior, exterior, rock walls surrounding the property (built by prisoners), preservation/protection of the pohutukawa entranceway (dating from the 1940s), the shell pathway, the hand made water tank, the outhouse/longdrop, the boat ramp immediately in front of the bach, and protection of the native trees surrounding the bach.

Comment: It is not considered appropriate to provide for specific works (such as the installation of solar power) in the schedule. Tree protection mechanisms are also outside the scope of the rules relating to scheduled buildings, and it is not regarded as appropriate to identify trees associated with a single bach for protection. It is considered appropriate to extend the site surrounds to include all constructed features associated with Bach 53, but this will need to be done through a subsequent plan change process, as will consideration of interior protection. For this reason, it is recommended that **submission 149/1 and submission 2568/1 are not accepted.**

Bach 27

Andrew Sharp (submission 423/1), Ann Bohan (submission 424/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp, (submission 425/1), Rachel Sharp (submission 426/1) and Paul Sharp (submission 427/1) submit that the outhouses belonging to Bach 27 (map reference 30-37) should be scheduled. Janet and Stuart Diamond (submission 946/1) and Don Linden (submission 950/1) submit that the site surrounds of Bach 27 are extended to include the long-drop, generator shed, boat and kayak sites and two boat ramps in front of the bach.

Comment: It is considered that all remaining ancillary buildings and structures associated with this bach contribute to its heritage value, and should ultimately be included in its site surrounds. It will be necessary to visit the site, research and evaluate

these items in terms of their association to the bach itself. Evidence of the location of these items that can be provided at the hearing would assist in addressing this issue through a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 432/1, submission 424/1, submission 425/1, submission 426/1 and submission 427/1** are **not accepted**.

Don Linden (submission 950/1) submits that the boat ramps (one immediately in front of Bach 27 and one slightly to the east) are included within the scheduled area of Bach 27, as well as the long-drop toilet and generator shed which is just outside the northern boundary.

Comment: The site surrounds have been set to a distance from which each bach can be fully appreciated within its bush setting. In some cases, the site surrounds have not included all constructed items. In this instance, it appears that a boat ramp associated with this bach, and the generator shed, has been omitted. The submitter has also requested that another adjacent boat ramp, apparently not directly related to Bach 27, is also included in the site surrounds of Bach 27. These issues will require further research and assessment, which will need to be undertaken during another plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 950/1** is **not accepted**.

Bach 16

Anthony Stewart (submission 2046/1) submits that Bach 16 (map reference 30-38) should 'become Schedule B', and that (**submission 2046/2**) the scheduled item should include the boat shed and adjacent boat ramp.

Comment: Bach 16 attained 51 points when evaluated, and has been scheduled in Category B. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2046/1** is **accepted**. The site surrounds have been set to a distance from which each bach can be fully appreciated within its bush setting. In some cases, the site surrounds have not included all constructed items. In this instance, it appears that although that toilet outhouse has been specifically scheduled, a boat ramp associated with this bach, and a boat shed, has been omitted. It would be helpful if the submitter could supply information about the exact location of these items (to the hearing) to enable the site surrounds to be expanded accordingly. To resolve this particular issue, it will be necessary to visit the site and undertake further research or assessment, as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 2046/2** is **not accepted**.

Bach 22

Rick Shore (submission 525/1) submits that the site surrounds (digital points) should include the old smoke house, the grotto, and the boat ramp built in 1955.

Comment: The site surrounds have been set to a distance from which each bach can be fully appreciated within its bush setting. In some cases, the site surrounds have not included all constructed items. It is considered appropriate to include the old smoke

house, the grotto and the boat ramp. It would be helpful if the submitter could supply information on the exact location of these items (to the hearing), to enable the site surrounds to be expanded. To resolve this particular issue, it will be necessary to visit the site and undertake further research or assessment, as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 525/1 is not accepted.**

Bach 19

Archibald Ross Blackwood (submission 393/2), Glenys Blackwood (submission 394/2), Kathryn Anne Mason (submission 395/2), Ann Bohan (submission 396/2), Andrew Sharp (submission 397/2), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 398/2), Jacky Groves (submission 399/2), Aileen Coppolli (submission 400/2), Philip David Austin (submission 401/2), Helen L. Walker (submission 402/2), Rachel Sharp (submission 403/2) and Paul Sharp (submission 404/2) submit that the outhouse/long-drop should be included as part of Bach 19 (map reference 404/2).

Comment: Bach 19 is scheduled in Category B. The schedule entry already includes an outhouse. It is unclear why the submitters are asking for this item to be included, when it already is included. If the submission is referring to another structure, the submitters will need to make this clear at the hearing. No recommendation (to accept or decline the submission) can be made until it is clarified whether this is a submission in support, or seeking an alternative relief.

Paul Sharp (submission 405/1), Rachel Sharp (submission 406/1), Jacky Groves (submission 407/1), Aileen Coppolli (submission 408/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 409/1), Philip David Austin (submission 410/1), Andrew Sharp (submission 411/1) and Ann Bohan (submission 412/1) submit that the boat shed and boat ramp to the west of Bach 19 is included as part of the scheduled item.

Comment: It is unclear whether the boat shed and boat ramp has a direct association with Bach 19. At present, the Council does not have sufficient evidence to support this view. The submitters may be able to bring such evidence to the hearing. Provisionally, it is recommended that **submission 405/1, submission 406/1, submission 407/1, submission 408/1, submission 409/1, submission 410/1, submission 411/1 and 412/1 are not accepted.**

Andrew Sharp (submission 971/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 972/1), Ann Bohan (submission 973/1), Helen L. Walker (submission 974/1), Philip David Austin (submission 975/1), Aileen Coppolli (submission 976/1), Jacky Groves (submission 977/1), Paul Sharp (submission 978/1), and Rachel Sharp (submission 979/1) submit that the fuel storage shed, smokehouse, outhouse and generator and gear shed should be scheduled.

Comments: The site surrounds have been set to a distance from which each bach can be fully appreciated within its bush setting. In some cases, the site surrounds have not included all constructed items. In relation to the outhouse, the comment immediately

above applies. In relation to the other listed structures (the fuel storage shed, smokehouse, generator and gear shed), it is considered that the site surrounds should encompass these items. It would be helpful if the submitters could provide information as to the exact location of these structures (to the hearing). To resolve this particular issue, it will be necessary to visit the site and undertake further research, as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that submission **971/1, 972/1, 973/1, 974/1, 975/1, 976/1, 977/1, 978/1 and 979/1** are **not accepted**.

Bach 108

Coral Malcolm (submissions 543/1 and 3812/1) submits that the Girls Brigade North Shore, which has used Bach 108 (map reference 30-41) for some years for nearly 40 years to allow young people to experience the unique qualities of Rangitoto, should be allowed to have guardianship of the bach, also allowing other organizations to use the Bach 108 at its discretion.

Comment: It is widely accepted that historic buildings receive care and attention through retaining an appropriate use. Unfortunately, the Council does not own this building, and under the Resource Management Act (or any other Act or regulation) has no discretion in respect of its tenure. Given that the Council has no jurisdiction in this matter, it must be recommended that **submissions 543/1 and 3812/1** are **not accepted**.

Robyn Margaret Holt (submission 952/1) submits that the boat shed, boat ramp and interior of Bach 108 should be scheduled in Appendix 1b. **Judith-Anne Scheffer (submission 967/1)** submits that Bach 108 should be scheduled in Category A, and **(submission 967/2)** that the interior of the bach, which retains its 1930s design qualities, should be protected. **Robyn Dianne Allen Goudge (submission 1042/1)** submits that Bach 108 and its site surrounds (including the boat shed and boat ramp) should be scheduled in Category A (and notes that she has further information to support this), and **(submission 1042/2)** that the interior should be protected. **Geoffrey Mark Allen (submission 1045/1)** submits that Bach 108 and its site surrounds (including the boat shed and boat ramp) should be scheduled in Category A and **(submission 1045/1)** that the interior should be protected. **Graeme Bruce Wilton (submission 3659/1), Jennifer Helen Goodwin (submission 3600/1), Tegwyn Francis Griffiths (submission 3601/1)** and **Maree Joy Wilton (submission 3602/1), and Marion Callagher (submission 3809/1)** submit that the bach, its interior, the boat shed, boat ramp and outbuildings are scheduled in Category A. **Maree Joy Wilton (submission 3602/2)** submits that the long association with the Girl's Brigade, and the thousand of girls that have stayed at the place to experience 'life as it was', should be taken into account in the evaluation. **Vern Scheffer (submission 3603/1)** submits that Bach 108 should be scheduled in Category A. **Ev Scheffer (submission 3604/1)** submits that Bach 108 should be scheduled in Category A, and **(submission 3604/2)** that the boat shed, only a few metres away, should be scheduled.

Comment: The evaluation of Bach 108 did not take into account the long-term association with the Girls' Brigade. If this is taken into account, it will achieve sufficient

points to be scheduled in Category A. Evidence that can be provided by the submitters (at the hearing) to support the association of the boat shed and boat ramp with the bach, and the indicate the exact location of outbuildings , will assist the Council to examine this issue as part of a subsequent review and plan change process. . It may be appropriate to schedule the interior, based on its apparent originality. A site visit and further research will be necessary, however, to verify the condition and originality of the interior, as part of a subsequent plan change process. Accordingly, it is recommended that **submission 952/1, submission 967/1, submission 967/2, submission 1042/1, submission 1045/1, submission 1042/2, submission 1045/2, submission 3599/1, submission 3600/1, submission 3601/1, submission 3602/1, submission 3602/2, submission 3603/1, submission 3604/1, submission 3604/2 and submission 3809/1** are **not accepted**.

Bach 60

Rachel Sharp (submission 418/1), Paul Sharp (submission 419/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 420/1), Ann Bohan (submission 421/1) and Andrew Sharp (submission 422/1) submit that the foreshore path in front of Bach 60 (map reference 30-42) is scheduled.

Comment: It is considered that scheduling a small part of the foreshore path in front of this Bach would be inconsistent with the approach taken in other areas, and would create unnecessary confusion. It is recommended that **submission 418/1, submission 419/1, submission 420/1 and submission 421/1** are **not accepted**.

Rachel Sharp (submission 428/1), Paul Sharp (submission 429/1), Glenys Blackwood (submission 1006/1), Archibald Ross Blackwood (submission 1007/1), Andrew Sharp (submission 1008/1), Ann Bohan (submission 1009/1) and Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 1010/1) submit that the boat ramp and boat shed to the west of Bach 60 should be scheduled.

Comment: The submissions do not suggest that there is any particular association with Bach 60 (as opposed to other baches or former bach sites in the general vicinity), and it is assumed that this request is to protect the boat shed and ramp as an item in its own right. The Council has little information on the boat shed and boat ramp. Any information made available at the hearing may be able to be used in a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 428/1, submission 429/1, submission 1006/1, submission 1007/1, submission 1008/1, submission 1009/1** and **submission 1010/1** are **not accepted**.

Archibald Ross Blackwood (submission 996/2), Glenys Blackwood (submission 997/2), Rachel Sharp (submission 998/2), Paul Sharp (submission 999/2), Ann Bohan (submission 1000/2), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 1002/2), Susan Wilson (submission 1003/2) and Andrew Sharp (submission 1004/2) submit that the outhouse/long-drop should be protected.

Comment: Three outbuildings are protected within the scheduled site surrounds of Bach 60. It appears that the outhouse/long-drop may not have been specifically identified. If the Council has omitted this building, the submitters will be able to clarify this at the hearing, and indicate the exact location. To resolve this particular issue, it will be necessary to visit the site and undertake further research or assessment, as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 996/2, submission 997/2, submission 998/2, submission 999/2, submission 1000/2, submission 1003/2 and submission 1004/2 are not accepted.**

Bach 34

Laurie North (submission 2580/1) submits that the outhouse/long-drop associated with Bach 34 (map reference 30-42) should be included, and that **(submission 2580/2)** the ramp-way should be included. The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust **(submission 2895/1)** submits that the digitized points are wrong, and should include the bach itself, the bach shed (ex prison hut), BBQ area, toilet building, fences and gate, significant rock wall at front, old bath, boat shed with wooden launch ramp and paths, and **(submission 2895/2)** that the interior should be protected.

Comment: It appears that the digitized points may not cover all the structures directly relating to Bach 34, and should be expanded accordingly. However, this will need to take place as part of a subsequent plan change process, as will a further assessment of the interior. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2580/1, submission 2580/2, submission 2895/1 and submission 2895/2 are not accepted.**

Bach 101

Ngairé Harris (submission 107/1) submits that the title of Bach 101 (map reference 30-43) is incorrect and out of date.

Comment: In all sections of the District Plan, the Council has adopted the practice of referring to the original names of buildings, or their originators. To change the reference to this bach would be inconsistent and confusing. It is therefore recommended that **submission 107/1 is not accepted.**

Deodar Anne Meggitt (submission 145/1) submits that the solar panel and long-drop should be included with Bach 101.

Comment: In respect of the solar panel, it is not clear whether the submitter is attempting to establish a right to have the panel in place, or recognize some heritage value. It is unlikely that this structure can be considered to have any particular heritage value. In respect of the long-drop, it is unclear whether the submitter is suggesting this structure is outside the site surrounds, or is within the site surrounds, but possessing such heritage value to be scheduled in its own right. The submitter may be able to clarify these issues at the hearing. Provisionally, in the absence of sufficient information, it is recommended that **submission 145/1 is not accepted.**

Bach 97

Alwyn Rae (submission 114/1) submits in relation to Bach 97 (map reference 30-45) that the boundary of the site surrounds should be redefined to exclude the public foreshore stack, include the toilet , and include a flat area leveled to the west/left hand side of the bach.

Comment: It would be helpful if the submitter could attend the hearing, indicate the site boundaries required, clarify whether the existing toilet is within the site surrounds, and explain why the part of the site surrounds that extends over the public track should be removed. This information will be able to be used as part of a subsequent plan change process to address any outstanding issues. It is therefore recommended that **submission 114/1 is not accepted.**

Alwyn Rae (submission 114/2) submits that Bach 97 should be referred to as Rae/Goodwin to reflect its current ownership.

Comment: The current reference to Rae is in fact inconsistent with the Council's approach of referring to buildings by their original name or the name of their original owner or originator. If this submission is accepted, it will reinforce the inconsistent nomenclature relating to this building. It is recommended that **submission 114/2 is not accepted.**

Bach 52

Steve Pearce (submission 140/1) submits that Bach 52 (map reference 30-46) and the associated boat shed should be scheduled.

Comment: Bach 52 is already scheduled in Category B. The Council does not have specific evidence of the association with a boat shed. If the submitter can supply evidence of a direct and exclusive association with the boat shed, this information may be useful for a subsequent review and plan change process, which will need to include a visit to this site and further research. It is recommended that **submission 140/1 is accepted in part**, in that it supports the scheduling of Bach 52.

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2896/1) submits that the digitised points are not correct, and should be changed to include: the bach itself, laundry lean-to, concrete capped stone water tank stands, a boat shed in the bay with step and wooden ramp and an outside bench supported by a tree.

Comment: It is considered that the site surrounds should include all features directly associated with the bach, but not necessarily other features, such as a boat ramp constructed for use by other bach users. It will be necessary to undertake further field work and research to enable the site surrounds to be reviewed, and part of a further plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2896/1 is not accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2896/1) submits that the interior of Bach 52 should be protected.

Comment: The Council does not have any information to suggest that interior of this bach has any notable qualities. The submitter may be able to provide evidence at the hearing to assist in the necessary assessment of this interior, as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 2896/1 is not accepted.**

Bach 25

Bruce Theodore Trezise (submission 128/1) supports the scheduling of Bach 25 (map reference 30-47).

Comment: It is recommended that **submission 128/1 is accepted.**

Bach 103

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2893/1) submits that the digitised points for Bach 103 (map reference 30-48) are apparently correct, but should include the bach itself, including the back door verandah to large outbuildings, toilet and retaining wall at the front.

Comment: This submission is taken as one in support of the current site surrounds boundaries. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2893/1 is accepted.**

The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2893/2) submits that the interior of Bach 103 should be scheduled, as well as the furniture and the sign 'Flounder Inn' on the exterior of the bach.

Comment: The Council has no information to suggest that the interior of this bach has any notable characteristics. The submitter may be able to provide additional information at the hearing. The bach could then be visited and the value of the interior assessed as part of a subsequent plan change process. In respect of the furniture, the Council does not adopt the practice of scheduling loose furniture. In respect of the exterior sign, removal of the sign would be treated as an alteration, and assessed accordingly. It is recommended that **submission 2893/2 is not accepted.**

Bach 114

Christine Margaret Cutler (submission 544/1) and the **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2890/2)** submit that the interior of Bach 114 (map reference 30-48) should be scheduled. **Barbara Ellen Turner (submission 485/1)** seeks the inclusion (scheduling) of the interior of the bach and the outhouse/long-drop.

Christine Margaret Cutler (submission 544/2) submits that the long-drop should be scheduled. **Allan Godsall (submission 2066/1)** submits that the generator tower, outer

shed and a toilet block is scheduled. The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2890/1)** submit that the scheduled item in map reference 30-49 include the path, generator tower/windmill, laundry workshop/implement shed, old toilet, remains of the chicken shed, outside perimeter, path to the hall, steps, bach itself, concrete in places, and old boiler water tank.

Comment: The Council was not aware that the interior of this bach has any notable characteristics. The Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust has supplied photographs apparently showing some interesting interior windows, including windows now enclosed in the interior (by an addition). The expansion of the defined site surrounds, to include all the items directly associated with Bach 114 is also supported, will assist in the protection of the heritage values of the place, but will require another site visit to ensure that all relevant features are included. It would be helpful if the submitters could supply evidence (to the hearing) of the exact location of these items, and direct association with Bach 114, so that all these issues could be addressed through a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that **submissions 544/1 & 544/2, submissions 2890/1 & 2890/2, submission 485/1, and submission 2066/1 are not accepted.**

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2890/3)** submit that the district plan should recognize that Bach 114 is being restored/renovated by the Trust and will include upgrading the electrical system to 12v with solar panel, composting toilet, shower and gas cooker.

Comment: Changes to the plan to allow for this type of work in respect of a specific bach or baches are not supported. Any additions or alterations need to be subject to the rules of the plan, to ensure that heritage values are maintained. It is recommended that **submission 2890/3 is not accepted.**

Bach 54

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2897/1)** submits that the digitized points for Bach 54 (map reference 30-50) appear to be correct, but must include the hand-tooled fence to the side of the bach.

Comment: It appears that no change is being requested. It may be that the fence is close to the defined edge of the site surrounds, and it is not totally clear if it is included. At the hearing, the submitter may be able to explain the reason for the submission. A recommendation can not be made at this stage, because the intent of the submission is unclear.

Dawn Frances Mae Burton (submission 3582/1) submits that the outhouse/long-drop and two sheds in the scheduled area of bach 54 (map reference 30-50) is included in the scheduled area of Bach 54.

Comment: This submission appears to be at odds with the view expressed by the Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (that the digitized points appear to be correct). If any change is required, the submitter will be able to explain this at the hearing. No recommendation can be made because of the lack of clarity evident.

Bach 95

Peter & Margaret Morrison (submission 555/1) submit that the required upkeep of Bach 95 (map reference 30/51) on Rangitoto will continue.

Comment: The plan contains provisions to permit maintenance activities. Having said that, there is no statutory ability for the Council to require the upkeep of any scheduled building. It is therefore recommended that **submission 555/1** is **not accepted**.

Bach 5

Darien Graham Boswell (submission 833/1) and **Alois Schatzdorfer & Sue Schatzdorfer nee Boswell (submission 2637/1)** support the Category 'B' scheduling of Bach 5 (map reference 30-52).

Comment: This bach achieved a total of 51 points when evaluated. It is therefore recommended that **submission 833/1** and **submission 2637/1** are accepted.

Swimming Pool at Rangitoto Wharf

Steve Pearce (submission 139/1) submits that the swimming pool (map reference 30-54), the concrete pad and adjacent changing rooms (all of which were constructed by the residents of the Rangitoto Bach Community) should be included within the boundaries on the map. **Andrew Sharp (submission 388/1)**, **Anne Bohan (submission 389/1)**, **Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 390/1)**, **Rachel Sharp (submission 391/1)**, and **Paul Sharp (submission 392/1)** submit that the swimming pool, changing sheds and toilets at Rangitoto Wharf should be scheduled. **Anthony Stewart (submission 493/1)** supports the scheduling of the swimming pool in Category B, but submits that the changing sheds and toilets should also be scheduled, and submits (**submission 495/2**) that the archway at the back of the pools should be scheduled in Category B. **Christine Margaret Cutler (submission 521/2)** supports the inclusion of the swimming pool (in the schedule). **Laurie North (submission 2580/3)** requests the inclusion (in the schedule) of the Rangitoto Wharf swimming pool. **Peter Walton and D.H. Cox/Trainer (submission 2599/4)** requests that the swimming pool is 'upgraded'. The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2877/13 and 2892/1)** seeks amendments to the swimming pool scheduling, for the digitized points to include all associated buildings and structures (including the changing sheds and the site of the original playground).

Comment: It is considered that the site surrounds should include all associated structures. To ensure that this occurs, it will be necessary to undertake additional field

work and research, which will need to be undertaken as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 139/1, submission 388/1, submission 389/1, submission 390/1, submission 391/1, submission 392/1, submission 493/1, submission 495/2, submission 521/2, submission 2580/3, submission 2599/4, submission 2877/13 and submission 2892/1** are not accepted.

Rangitoto Summit Structures and Related Sites, and Other Potentially Notable Sites

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2877/14 & 2891/1)** submits that the digitised points do not appear to cover all structures and places associated with the summit's history, and submits that these should be revised to cover all areas associated with the summit, and in particular with the military camp.

Submissions 2503/8, 2305/9 and 2305/10 submit that the following structures should be scheduled):

- Fire command post
- Wireless room
- RDF station
- WAAC's guard room
- Engine Room
- Fortress observation post
- Fire command post camp structures
- Searchlight emplacement
- 12 pounder gun emplacement
- Observation post
- Controlled mine base

Submission 2070/1 seeks the inclusion of the following in Appendix B1:

- The prison camp and five tennis courts;
- running green and old BBQ picnic area;
- kiosk area and water tanks; all existing tracks and paths;
- mountain water tank and caves, Islington Bay;
- CM Base - yankee wharf – paths and roading around old bach areas, hall and tennis courts, tracks to boulder bay and those around McKenzie Bay and quarries.

Submissions 2877/5, 2877/6 and 2877/7, submit that Wilson Park, the prison camp and wharf are scheduled.

Submission 2877/17 submits that the controlled mine base at Islington Bay Should be scheduled.

Submission 2877/18 submits that the pill boxes along Motukorea Channel on the Rangitoto foreshores should be scheduled.

Submission 2883/1 submits that Wilson Park and water tanks should be scheduled.

Submission 2884/1 submits that all objects, artefacts and structures associated with the era of the prison camp and workforce should be scheduled.

Submission 2884/3 submits that both wharfs at Islington Bay and Rangitoto (built prior to WWI) should be scheduled.

Submission 2884/4 submits that the causeway from Islington Bay to Motutapu should be scheduled.

Submission 141/1 submits that the Rangitoto Wharf should be scheduled.

Comment: In relation to wharf structures, it should be noted that structures existing below the Mean High Water Spring Tide mark fall under the jurisdiction of the Auckland Regional Council. Only the very small landward components of the structures could be scheduled in the district plan. In relation to all other structures, the Council will need to undertake a review of the issues and further research work, with a view to another plan change process. Unfortunately, this work can not be undertaken as part of the current process. It is therefore recommended that **submissions 2877/14 & 2891/1, submissions 2503/8, 2305/9 and 2305/10, submission 2070/1, submissions 2877/5, 2877/6 and 2877/7, submissions 2877/17 and 2877/18, submission 2883/1, submissions 2884/1, 2884/3, and 2884/4, and submission 141/1** are not accepted.

Browns Island, Map Reference 30-19

Auckland City Council (submission 2103/12) wishes to correct a mapping error by way of submission.

Comment: A cemetery, scheduled in the operative plan as a building, now appears in the proposed plan as an archaeological site. As the result of an error, it has been mapped as a building. The submission is that an archaeological site symbol is used. To correct this error, it is recommended that **submission 2103/12** is accepted.

Schedule Summary

Bach 58

Laurie North (submission 2580/5) submits that Bach 58 (Walton Cox Trainer) be included in Appendix 1b (the Schedule). **Peter Walton and D.H. Cox Trainer (submission 2599/3)** note that Bach 58 was built prior to 1930, and submit that it should be included in Appendix 1b, that **(submission 2599/1)** the outhouse/long-drop should be included, and that **(submission 2599/2)** the ramp directly in front of the bach is scheduled. The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2885/1)** submits that Bach 58 should be scheduled, as contributing to a string of baches.

Comment: This bach achieved a total of 47 points when evaluated. No new information has been provided to enable the score to be increased. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2580/5, submissions 2599/1, 2599/2, 2599/3 and submission 2885/1 are not accepted.**

Bach 45

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2886/1 and 2877/8)** submits that Bach 45 should be included in the heritage area in Appendix 1b.

Comment: The Council does not have any records relating to Bach 45. The submitters may be able to bring information to the hearing to enable an evaluation. In the absence of this information, it is recommended that **submissions 2886/1 and 2877/8 are not accepted.**

Bach 57

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2877/9)** submits that Bach 57 should be included in the heritage area in Appendix 1b.

Bach 80

The **New Zealand Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/48)** submits that Bach 80 should be considered for inclusion in Appendix 1b. The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submissions 2887/10)** submits that Bach 45 should be included in the heritage area in Appendix 1b. Christine Margaret Cutler (submission 524/1) submits that the kiosk previously known as Gemmell's bach should be scheduled.

Comment: This bach achieved a total of 35 points when evaluated. No new information has been provided to enable the score to be increased. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2641/48, submission 2887/1 and submission 524/1 are not accepted.**

Rangitoto Bach Interiors

The **New Zealand Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/45)** submits that the interiors of the Rangitoto baches should be protected. The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2877/11 and 2879/1)** submits that all bach interiors should be protected.

Comment: Prior to scheduling any bach interiors, it will be necessary to visit each bach, evaluate the value of the interiors, and assess the current condition (given that the Council's information is now dated). This will need to be done as part of another review and subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2641/45 and submissions 2877/11 and 2879/1 are not accepted.**

Rangitoto Long-drops and other accessory buildings

Andrew Sharp (submission 387/2), Paul Sharp (submission 969/2) and Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 970/2) submit that outhouses/long-drops should be included in the Plan.

Comment: This report has recommended (on a case by case basis) that the site surrounds are extended, because current information about these baches has been provided with submissions indicates they are insufficiently large to include related outbuildings. None of these structures, however, would receive sufficient points for individual scheduling. It is recommended that **submission 387/2, submission 969/2 and submission 970/2 are not accepted**. The issue may, however, be able to be considered as part of a subsequent review and plan change process.

Scheduling of all baches/Bach communities

Robyn Margaret Holt (submissions 952/2 and 491/1) submits that the bach community should be scheduled. **Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 980/1)** submits that the bach community should be placed on Schedule B under the Plan. **Deodar Anne Meggitt (submission 264/1)** submits that the bach communities should be scheduled, and specifically identifies the Islington Bay community, and its status under the *Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000*. The same submitter (submission 965/1) requests that the Islington Bay community is scheduled.

Comment: The Council's evaluation system has been designed to assess the heritage value of individual buildings. The system takes into account the contribution to groups and streetscapes. All baches have been assessed individually as part of the development of the district plan, leading to the vast majority being protected. The assessment system does not lend itself to the assessment of cultural landscapes such as those on Rangitoto. It is therefore recommended that **submission 952/2, submission 491/1, submission 980/1, submission 264/1 and submission 965/1 are not accepted**.

'Absentee' baches

The **Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (submission 2877/16)** submits amendments for all 'absentee' baches that may not be correctly listed.

Comment: This submission is not sufficient explicit of detailed to respond to. It is recommended that **submission 2877/16 is not accepted**.

Rock Archway behind Men's Toilets at Rangitoto

Paul Sharp (submission 986/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 992/1), Ann Bohan (submission 993/1), Andrew Sharp (submission 994/1) and Rachel Sharp (submission 995/1) submit that the rock archway to the previous men's toilets should be scheduled.

Comment: The Council does not have any information regarding the archway, and even if fully assessed, is most unlikely to achieve sufficient points to be scheduled in its own right. The issue may be able to be considered, however, as part of a subsequent review and plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 986/1, submission 992/1, submission 993/1, submission 994/1 and submission 995/1** are **not accepted**.

Changing sheds and toilets

Andrew Sharp (submission 388/2) and **Ann Bohan (submission 389/1)** submits that the changing sheds and toilets at Rangitoto Wharf should be scheduled.

Submission 2888/1 submits that the public toilet structures further down the road towards the Rangitoto Wharf, and their access path, should be scheduled.

Comment: The Council does not have any information regarding the changing sheds and toilets. More research and field work will be required to enable an assessment of this area as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is therefore recommended that **submission 388/2, submission 389/1 and submission 2888/1** are **not accepted**.

Bach Sites

Laurie North (submission 2580/4) submits that the Scouts bach/site should be scheduled. **Kevin and Bobbe Free (submission 501/2)** note that there is useful historical and planning information (together with significant family interest for bach sites 71 (Franklin), 72 (Fairey), 75 (Briggs), 79 (Price), 92 (Crocker) and 93 (Davis), and submit that all the 'currently' empty bach sites are scheduled in Appendix 1b. **Steven James Davis (submission 1126/1)** submits that the site of Bach 93 should be preserved. **Jacqueline Todd (submission 1034/1)** submits that the site of Bach 72, including the original bath, bottom step of path to the house, steps to boatshed site and boatshed concrete winch block, as well as the concrete ramp (below MHWS tide mark). **Deodar Anne Meggitt (submission 145/2)** submits that remnants of bach site 100 (Horner) including the steps should be protected. **Jacqueline Gael Norstrand (submission 3075/1)** wishes to see each bach site preserved.

Comment: Bach sites have not been researched as part of this work. Even if significant information was to come to hand, these sites could not achieve the points required to be scheduled. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2580/4, submission 501/2, submission 1126/1, submission 1034/1, submission 145/2 and submission 3075/1** are **not accepted**.

Paths and Roads

Rachel Sharp (submission 987/1), Paul Sharp (submission 988/1), Ann Bohan (submission 989/1), Margaret Ellen Sharp (submission 990/1), Andrew Sharp (submission 991/1) submit that all the paths and all the roads on Rangitoto should be scheduled.

Submission 2884/2 submits that the summit track should be scheduled.

Comment: The submitters have not provided any information to support their submission. While it is accepted that many paths and roads on Rangitoto may have some historic value, a blanket provision applied indiscriminately is not considered appropriate. It would require a significant amount of administration, and may not be necessary to protect the historic values. There may be scope, however, to reconsider this issue as part of the review that will lead to another plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 987/1, submission 988/1, submission 989/1, submission 990/1, submission 991/1 and submission 2884/2** are **not accepted**.

Historical Village/ Islington Bay Community

Steven James Davis (submission 1126/2) and Jacqueline Anne Adele Todd (submission 262/1) submit that there should be provision for rebuilding the bach (to be faithful to the original) as part of an historical village at Islington Bay, including (former) baches 71 (Franklin), 72 (Fairey), 75 (Briggs), 79 (Price), 92 (Crocker) and 93 (Davis). The descendants of the former owner's would be 'caretakers'. **Jacqueline Gael Norstrand (submission 3075/1)** supports the idea of an historic village at Islington Bay.

Comment: Any baches that are recreated will need to comply with the current Building Act and Building Code, which would preclude the make-shift and quirky construction which characterizes the remaining baches. It is considered that the construction of such buildings would dilute the heritage significance of the groups of remaining baches. It is recommended that **submission 1126/2, submission 262/1 and submission 3075/1** are **not accepted**.

Other Islands

Waiheke:

Kissling Homestead, Woodside Bay

Paul Derek Monin (submission 2056/1) challenges the Council's score for the former Kissling homestead, within a wider context of concern about the assessment system, and the few buildings that have been scheduled on Waiheke. Mr Monin has applied his own local knowledge and expertise as an historian to the evaluation of this building, and believes it should achieve 64 points, and be scheduled in Category B accordingly. The **New Zealand Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/47)** submits that the building

should be considered for scheduling. **Michael Lee (submission 3080/1)**, requests that the Council re-evaluate the building according to its system, and **(submission 3080/2)** schedules it.

Comment: The Council has attempted to apply its system evenly across all buildings. The submissions relating to this building raise important issues in regard to the evaluation of the buildings on Waiheke. It would be helpful if Mr Monin, a locally resident historian, could further explain his application of the Council's system (in relation to this building) and his wider concerns expressed in his submission (and echoed by another submitter), so that both matters can be attended to. No recommendation can be made until these issues are examined in more detail.

Old Onetangi Hotel

The **New Zealand Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/48)** submits that the Old Onetangi Hotel should be considered for inclusion in Appendix 1b.

Comment: The Old Onetangi Hotel achieved a total of 45 points when evaluated. It is recommended that **submission 2641/48 is not accepted.**

Te Huruhi Native School

The **New Zealand Historic Places Trust (submission 2641/49)** submits that the Te Huruhi Native School should be considered for inclusion in Appendix 1b.

Comment: The Te Huruhi Native School achieved a total of 23 points when evaluated. It is recommended that **submission 2641/49 is not accepted.**

Cowes Bay Police Station/Oyster Inspector's House

Submission 56/1 request the removal of the 'false heritage listing' from their cottage. This building was assessed according to the Council's valuation system, based on the Council's. The submitter's knowledge of the building, derived from nearly a century of ownership within their family, raises questions about both the history and amount of original fabric in the house. It may be that a further site visit (by the Council) is required to examine the building in detail, to enable another assessment. At this point, and before such as assessment, it is recommended that **submission 56/1 is not accepted.**

Items in Omiha (Rocky Bay) Conservation Area

John Neville Watson (submission 154/4) seeks heritage status for appropriate houses within the proposed Omiha (Rocky Bay) conservation area. e.g. house in Pohutukawa Avenue built for S. Henderson and G. Buddle; two houses in Omiha Road built by R. Beadnell; house built for F. Gregory in Omiha Road; A. O'Briens cottage in Glenbrook Road; A Gouk's cottage in Glenbrook Road.

Comment: The house known as the Dorothy O'Brien bach in Glenbrook Road was evaluated and scored 16 points. Other houses will need to be assessed as part of a subsequent plan change process. It is recommended that **submission 154/4** is **not accepted**.

Rotoroa

The Hauraki Gulf Planing Group (submission 947/24) submits that the cultural and heritage provisions of the Plan need to include the existing chapel and the ex-army accommodation block and Rotoroa Island.

Comment: The 'ex-army accommodation block' is presumed to be the dormitory block which was not assessed because it burned down. However, the Council does not have the resources to schedule more buildings at the present time. A survey of what is likely to reach the threshold for scheduling has already taken place on Rotoroa Island, and it is most unlikely that other buildings will reach the threshold for scheduling. It is recommended that **submission 947/24** is **not accepted**.

Submission 2641/44 seeks that the interiors of the detention cells are considered for scheduling.

Comment: The interior of this building will need to be assessed as part of a subsequent review and plan change process. It is therefore recommended that submission **2641/44** is **not accepted**.

Motuihi

Submissions 2503/8, 2305/9 and 2305/10 submit that the following structures should be scheduled):

- Water tower (HMNZS Tamaki)
- Wharf shed (HMNZS Tamaki)
- WWII gun emplacements
- Cemetery (1870-1918)

In relation to all other structures, the Council will need to undertake a review of the issues and further research work, with a view to another plan change process. Unfortunately, this work can not be undertaken as part of the current process. It is therefore recommended that these submissions are not accepted.

Motutapu

Submissions 2503/8, 2305/9 and 2305/10 submit that the following structures should be scheduled):

- Motutapu Outdoor Education Camp
- 6 inch gun battery
- Battery command post
- Battery observation post and radar room
- Emu observation post
- Engine rooms
- Plotting rooms
- Miniature range
- Plotting room building
- Underground plotting rooms
- Above ground wireless room
- Billy goat point searchlight station
- Pill boxes (17)
- US Navy magazines
- Home Bay Wharf
- Reid Homestead
- Reid family grave site

The Council will need to undertake a site visit and further research work, with a view to another plan change process. Unfortunately, this work can not be undertaken as part of the current process. It is therefore recommended that these submissions are not accepted.

Great Barrier

Submissions 2503/11 and 2503/12 submits that the following sites and structures should be scheduled:

- SS Wairarapa graves – Onepoto
- SS Wairarapa graves – Whangapoura
- Sawmill site – Whangaparapara
- Whaling station - Whangaparapara
- Oreville Stamping Battery – Oreville
- Harataonga Homestead – Harataonga
- Harataonga Settlers Graves - Harataonga
- Observation post – Bradshaw Cove
- Military bunkers and barracks – Bradshaw Cove

Comment: The extent to which these sites are extant structures or archaeological sites will require further consideration. This issue is another that will require further research, site visits and assessments. Consideration will also need to be given to the most appropriate protection mechanism, if any are to be scheduled. This will need to be done as part of a subsequent review and plan change. It is therefore recommended that **submission 2501/11 and submission 2503/12 are not accepted.**

Submission 3713/1 seeks that when a variation or plan change is introduced, the Old House built by George Blackwell at 12 Medland Road, Tryhena, is identified as a new heritage item and added to the list.

Comment, while the Council can research and evaluate this building as part of a subsequent plan change, the outcome of scheduling can not be guaranteed. It is therefore recommended that **submission 3713/1** is **accepted in part**.

Barnes & Associates Ltd

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'A. C. Barnes', is centered within a light blue rectangular box.

A. C. Barnes
Director