

Rochelle Waugh

From: Dean Raymond <DRaymond@heritage.org.nz>
Sent: Friday, 5 May 2023 4:12 pm
To: Rochelle Waugh
Subject: RE: Amendments to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of MDC's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. If in doubt contact the MDC IT Team!

Kia ora Rochelle

Our team have looked through the amendments suggested following our meeting, and we are comfortable with all the changes proposed. I think the definition of non-contributing parts of buildings is clearer than the notified version. The other changes to HH-P11 and the guidance note will also be beneficial.

However, we do not agree with your conclusion regarding the Mangaweka Bridge. In our view this is not 'out of scope' of the plan change. The scope of Plan Change H(a) includes consideration of heritage items listed in the operative plan, and identification of additional items for the schedule. 18 new items are recommended to be included in schedule 4b. Mangaweka Bridge is in scope to be considered as part of the current plan change, as HNZPT included a request in the submission that it be added to schedule 4b.

We also note that Manawatū District Council has resolved to retain the bridge as a walking and cycling facility (thank you for confirming this), and there should therefore be no barrier from an ownership point of view (as far as MDC is concerned) with scheduling the structure.

There is strong supporting evidence that the bridge meets the criteria for significance to be included in schedule 4b, in the 2015 Ian Bowman / Val Burr report. The fact that the bridge is not (yet) entered on the New Zealand Heritage / Rārangī Kōrero is not a reason in itself to not include it in the District Plan schedule.

I acknowledge that this place is complicated by spanning two council jurisdictions. It so happens that we are meeting with Rangitīkei District Council next week (in relation to annual plan submissions) and we hope to take the opportunity to raise the topic of the Bridge with them at that time.

In spite of the complication of the bridge spanning both councils, I can see no reason not to include the Mangaweka Bridge in schedule 4b as part of the current plan change process.

Ngā mihi

Dean Raymond | Kaiwhakahaere ā Takiwā / Area Manager | Te Takiwā o Te Pūtahi a Māui / Central Region | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | P O Box 2629 | Level 1, 79 Boulcott St | Wellington 6140 | Ph: (64 4) 494-8320 | Mobile: 027 350 9875 |

Tairangahia ā tua whakarere; Tātakihia ngā reanga o āmuri ake nei – Honouring the past; Inspiring the future

This communication may be a privileged communication. If you are not the intended recipient, then you are not authorised to retain, copy or distribute it. Please notify the sender and delete the message in its entirety.

From: Rochelle Waugh <Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 May 2023 12:38 pm
To: Dean Raymond <DRaymond@heritage.org.nz>
Subject: Amendments to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage

Kia Ora Dean,

I have attached suggested amendments to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage following our pre-hearing meeting last Wednesday.

I look forward to any comments that you might have.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Ngā mihi,

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner
| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |
| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above.

If you are not an intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is prohibited.

If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments.

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Manawatu District Council.

Changes to Notified Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage Manawatu District Plan

The following changes are being considered in response to submissions on Plan Change H(a). These amendments reflect the overall discussions of the pre-hearing meeting held on Wednesday 26 April 2023. Changes are grouped into the following headings:

- Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings
- Relocation Policy
- Other Matters

1. Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings

1.1 Definition

Delete the current definition of 'Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings' and replace with a new definition as follows:

~~*"Non-contributing heritage buildings:*~~

~~*"Non-contributing building: For heritage items listed in Schedule 4b, non-contributing parts of a heritage building are those parts of a building which may have been added to the main heritage building at a later time than original construction of the main building and are not constructed in the same style, finishes or materials as the original building, and includes lean-to's."*~~

"Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings¹:

Parts of heritage items that make little or no contribution to, or detract from, the heritage values for which the heritage item has been listed in Schedule 4b."

1.2 HH-S6 – Standard for Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings:

As requested in the submission by the New Zealand Defence Force on standard HH-S6 (S04/7) which requests the replacement of 'change' with 'increase', make the following changes:

"HH-S6 External Alterations to Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings in Schedule 4b must comply with the following standard:

¹ Amendment to the definition heading as requested by New Zealand Defence Force (S04/9)

i. External alterations to non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b must not result in any change increase to the height and footprint of the non-contributing part of the building.”

1.3 Guidance Note Relating to Accessibility of Heritage Reports

The following guidance note to be inserted at the top of Schedule 4b (to be located below the list of codes and above the table):

“Guidance Note:

1. Complete heritage reports which provide greater detail on each heritage item identified in Schedule 4b are available on request from the Council.”

1.4 Removal of Non-Contributing Parts

As discussed under submission point S03/2, amend Policy 10 to include ‘or the removal of’ non-contributing parts of heritage buildings as follows:

“HH-P10: To enable external alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings listed in Schedule 4b where the changes do not impact negatively on the heritage values of the item listed in Schedule 4b.”

A consequential amendment also needs to be made to make Rule 11 (HH-R11) consistent with Policy 10, as follows:

“**HH-R11** External alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b.”

2. Relocation Policy: HH-P11

Following the submission lodged by SM and JM O’Brien Family Trust to the relocation policy (HH-P11), the following amendments have been drafted to remove any unintended consequence where demolition could be seen as a more favourable option than relocation in terms of policy direction. HNZPT made a further submission in opposition to this submission.

The SM and JM O’Brien Family Trust submits that there are limitations of the notified policy in that the current wording does not provide for the consideration of the relocation of heritage items to be balanced against other relevant resource management issues (existing Policy 7). The submission also raised issues with the wording of ‘imminent danger’.

The changes below seek to make the policy clearer, including to avoid demolition, and ensure that the protection of heritage values is provided for in each clause (a. and b.):

~~“HH-P11 To restrict the relocation of a heritage item in Schedule 4b except where it can be demonstrated that:~~

To only allow relocation of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b where it can be demonstrated that:

- a. ~~The work relocation is necessary to save the heritage item and protect the heritage values from the threat of, or damage from imminent danger to natural hazards; or~~
- b. ~~The work relocation will protect the heritage values and significance of the heritage item identified in Schedule 4b, and~~
- c. ~~In the case of relocation to another site, alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered a comprehensive alternatives assessment has been completed by a suitably qualified heritage expert and relocation is demonstrated to be the only practicable option. to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.”~~

3. Other Matters

The following other matters were discussed during the pre-hearing meeting where an action for the Council was identified. These are discussed below.

3.1 Mangaweka Bridge (S03/28)

An action from the pre-hearing meeting was to confirm the Council resolutions regarding Mangaweka Bridge. The following resolutions are from the Manawātū District Council meetings. We note that as the bridge also spans into the Rangitikei District Council jurisdiction other resolutions may also apply.

Council meeting held 22 August 2019:

“That the Council retains the Mangaweka Bridge as a walking and cycling facility”.

Council meeting held 17 December 2020:

“That the Council enters into the “Memorandum of Understanding in respect of the prospective management and adaptive re-use of the Historic Mangaweka Bridge”.

The MoU referenced above sets out the roles and responsibilities of the Manawatu and Rangitikei District Councils and Mangaweka Heritage Incorporation in terms of management of the Mangaweka Bridge, and how potential rights and management obligations of the bridge maybe transferred to the Mangaweka Heritage Incorporation.

Heritage NZ has clarified since the pre-hearing meeting that the listing of the bridge has not been completed. At this time, inclusion of the Mangaweka Bridge is considered to be out of scope of Plan Change H(a). Given the bridge spans the jurisdiction of two Councils a more considered and consistent approach is recommended. A separate plan change to consider the Mangaweka Bridge as a heritage item is the preferred option.

3.2 Signage (Submission point S03/24)

We have reviewed the signage provisions following the pre-hearing meeting. Given Schedule 4b mostly relates to private houses, objects/memorials and churches, there is low risk of signs being placed on these items. The issue of signage is more a commercial/business zone issue which is outside the scope of this plan change (as noted in your email dated 28 April 2023). The existing rules already restrict the number and size of signs, which if not met the proposal then falls to a discretionary activity. On that basis no change to the signage provisions are considered necessary.

3.3 Rule HH-16 (S03/17)

Following the pre-hearing meeting another review has been done of Rule HH-16. The rule correctly identifies those standards that if aren't met, require a restricted discretionary activity consent. No changes are identified for these rules.

Rochelle Waugh

From: Rochelle Waugh
Sent: Tuesday, 2 May 2023 11:41 am
To: Ryan O'Leary
Subject: FW: Plan Change H(a) submission: Relocation

Hi Ryan,

Just wondering if you have any comments on the amendments to the Relocation Policy in Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage, as outlined below.

Kind regards,

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner
| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |
| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

From: Rochelle Waugh
Sent: Monday, 17 April 2023 8:47 am
To: Ryan O'Leary <roleary@propertygroup.co.nz>
Subject: Plan Change H(a) submission: Relocation

Hi Ryan

Thank you for meeting to discuss the submission lodged on behalf of SM and JM O'Brien Family Trust to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage.

As discussed with you, I have drafted some amendments to HH-P11 which outline my current thinking, as follows:

Policy 11

"HH-P11 To restrict the relocation of a heritage item in Schedule 4b except where it can be demonstrated that:

To only allow relocation of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b where it can be demonstrated that:

- a. The ~~work~~ relocation is necessary to save the heritage item and protect the heritage values from the threat of, or damage from imminent danger to natural hazards; or*
- b. The ~~work~~ relocation will protect the heritage values and significance of the heritage item identified in Schedule 4b, and*
- c. In the case of relocation to another site, ~~a comprehensive alternatives assessment has been completed by a suitably qualified heritage expert and relocation is demonstrated to be the only practicable option.~~ alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition."*

The intention of these changes is to make the policy clearer and to provide a clearer pathway for relocation. The changes outlined in clause c) have also been drafted to provide a less onerous pathway where relocation is not the only practicable option but is considered to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.

Setting

In relation to our discussion on 'setting', my current thinking is that a guidance note could be added at the start of Schedule 4b (this plan change only relates to the items contained in Schedule 4b, not Schedule 4a).

As discussed at our meeting, the historic heritage chapter focuses on 'built heritage' and has not included the identification of settings for each heritage item.

Current thinking for the Guidance Note (to be located at the start of Schedule 4b) is as follows:

"Guidance Note:

1. *The protection of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b focuses on the heritage building or item rather than the wider site or setting.*

This statement has been extracted from the Section 32 Report.

I'm interested in your feedback on these draft amendments and would like to meet with you this week (week starting 17th April) if that suited you?

Ngā mihi,

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner

| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |

| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

Rochelle Waugh

From: Rochelle Waugh
Sent: Thursday, 11 May 2023 10:08 am
To: Ryan O'Leary
Subject: RE: Plan Change H(a) submission: Relocation

Hi Ryan,

Thank you for your email and comments.

Is there any specific wording that you were thinking of for HH-P11 c)?

Thank you,

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner
| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |
| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

From: Ryan O'Leary <roleary@propertygroup.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 11 May 2023 7:27 am
To: Rochelle Waugh <Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Plan Change H(a) submission: Relocation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of MDC's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. If in doubt contact the MDC IT Team!

Hello Rochelle,

Thank you for your email on this, apologies for the delay in reply.

I think your suggested changes to Policy 11 are much clearer and improved. Thank you for the time taken to meet, discuss and prepare revised provisions for discussion.

I consider those additions/clarifications etc to be generally positive. I am happy with the text generally within Policy HH-11(a) and (b). My remaining comment relates to HH-11 (c), noting that this requirement is conjunctive (to be met in addition to either Policy HH-11(a) or (b)). My concern is that (c) limits relocation to **only** where it avoids demolition. Have you given thought to other reasons as to whether the heritage building or object may be relocated to another site. Seemingly, HH-P11 (c) may require an evidential basis to determine that demolition is *likely*, therefore relocation will ensure this is avoided. In contrast Policy HH-P7 takes a more balanced approach. It outlines the need to consider and balance other resource management issues, public safety concerns etc. I think Policy HH-11(c) could reasonably be

expanded on as the changes still seems to be more limiting than HH-P7 of the Operative District Plan. I include this policy for your reference.

Policy HH-P7

To balance the protection of significant historic heritage values with other resource management issues and public safety concerns and in making an assessment under this policy to have regard to, without limitation:

- a. Market conditions affecting the feasibility of adaptive reuse;
- b. The economics of a range of reasonably practicable options;
- c. The contribution that any replacement building might make to the vitality and vibrancy of the Feilding Town Centre.

Happy to discuss this further.

Ryan O'Leary
Planning Manager – Central



Mobile: 027 469 8992
Reception: 06 834 1232

Level 7, TSB Bank Tower, 7 - 21 Fitzherbert Ave, Palmerston North 4410
PO Box 12066, Palmerston North 4444

Proud supporters of KidsCan Charitable Trust

Our office locations: [Whangarei](#) | [Auckland](#) | [Hamilton](#) | [Tauranga](#) | [Rotorua](#) | [New Plymouth](#)
[Napier](#) | [Palmerston North](#) | [Wellington](#) | [Nelson](#) | [Christchurch](#) | [Dunedin](#) | [Queenstown](#)

All of our emails and attachments are subject to [terms and conditions](#).

From: Rochelle Waugh <Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 8:47 AM
To: Ryan O'Leary <roleary@propertygroup.co.nz>
Subject: Plan Change H(a) submission: Relocation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Ryan

Thank you for meeting to discuss the submission lodged on behalf of SM and JM O'Brien Family Trust to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage.

As discussed with you, I have drafted some amendments to HH-P11 which outline my current thinking, as follows:

Policy 11

~~“HH-P11 To restrict the relocation of a heritage item in Schedule 4b except where it can be demonstrated that:~~

~~To only allow relocation of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b where it can be demonstrated that:~~

- ~~a. The work relocation is necessary to save the heritage item and protect the heritage values from the threat of, or damage from imminent danger to natural hazards; or~~
- ~~b. The work relocation will protect the heritage values and significance of the heritage item identified in Schedule 4b, and~~
- ~~c. In the case of relocation to another site, a comprehensive alternatives assessment has been completed by a suitably qualified heritage expert and relocation is demonstrated to be the only practicable option. alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.”~~

The intention of these changes is to make the policy clearer and to provide a clearer pathway for relocation. The changes outlined in clause c) have also been drafted to provide a less onerous pathway where relocation is not the only practicable option but is considered to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.

Setting

In relation to our discussion on ‘setting’, my current thinking is that a guidance note could be added at the start of Schedule 4b (this plan change only relates to the items contained in Schedule 4b, not Schedule 4a).

As discussed at our meeting, the historic heritage chapter focuses on ‘built heritage’ and has not included the identification of settings for each heritage item.

Current thinking for the Guidance Note (to be located at the start of Schedule 4b) is as follows:

“Guidance Note:

1. *The protection of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b focuses on the heritage building or item rather than the wider site or setting.*”

This statement has been extracted from the Section 32 Report.

I’m interested in your feedback on these draft amendments and would like to meet with you this week (week starting 17th April) if that suited you?

Ngā mihi,

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner
| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |
| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

“Our people delivering great service to our community.”

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above.

If you are not an intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is prohibited.

If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments.

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Manawatu District Council.

Rochelle Waugh

From: Edwards, Lucy <Lucy.Edwards@nzdf.mil.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 11 May 2023 11:11 am
To: Rochelle Waugh
Subject: RE: Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage unclassified

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of MDC's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. If in doubt contact the MDC IT Team!

Great, thanks Rochelle.

Ngā mihi o te rā ki a koe

Lucy Edwards

M: 0221215440
Senior Statutory Planner
Defence Estate and Infrastructure
Te Ope Kātua o Aotearoa | New Zealand Defence Force
www.nzdf.mil.nz



A FORCE FOR
NEW ZEALAND

From: Rochelle Waugh [mailto:Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 11 May 2023 11:10 a.m.
To: Edwards, Lucy <Lucy.Edwards@nzdf.mil.nz>
Cc: Leydon, Kate <KATE.LEYDON@nzdf.mil.nz>; AGifford@tonkintaylor.co.nz
Subject: RE: Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage unclassified

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do **not** follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If in any doubt please forward the email to spam@nzdf.mil.nz and then delete the email from your inbox. Thank you.

Hi Lucy,

Thank you for your email.

Yes, the s42A report will be uploaded to the Council website by 4pm 23 May. The Hearing Panel Minute which will be sent to you outlines the relevant dates. The Minute is currently available to view on the Council website under 'Have Your Say'.

Ngā mihi

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner

| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |

| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

From: Edwards, Lucy <Lucy.Edwards@nzdf.mil.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 11 May 2023 11:01 am

To: Rochelle Waugh <Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz>

Cc: Leydon, Kate <KATE.LEYDON@nzdf.mil.nz>; AGifford@tonkintaylor.co.nz

Subject: RE: Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage unclassified

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of MDC's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. If in doubt contact the MDC IT Team!

Hi Rochelle

Thank you for this update, much appreciated.

This all looks okay on the face of it – will there be a s42A Report released prior to the hearing?

Ngā mihi o te rā ki a koe

Lucy Edwards

M: 0221215440

Senior Statutory Planner

Defence Estate and Infrastructure

Te Ope Kātua o Aotearoa | New Zealand Defence Force

www.nzdf.mil.nz



**A FORCE FOR
NEW ZEALAND**

From: Rochelle Waugh [<mailto:Rochelle.Waugh@mdc.govt.nz>]

Sent: Wednesday, 10 May 2023 12:17 p.m.

To: Edwards, Lucy <Lucy.Edwards@nzdf.mil.nz>

Cc: Leydon, Kate <KATE.LEYDON@nzdf.mil.nz>; AGifford@tonkintaylor.co.nz

Subject: Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do **not** follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If in any doubt please forward the email to spam@nzdf.mil.nz and then delete the email from your Inbox. Thank you.

Hi Lucy,

Thank you for the submission from NZDF to Plan Change H(a) Historic Heritage to the Manawatū District Plan. I thought I would give you an update of where we are at with the submission analysis.

The submission points that were made in the NZDF submission have been useful for making the plan provisions clearer, and I am recommending to accept the relief sought in your submission. The NZDF submission also signalled support to the 'non-contributing parts of heritage buildings' definition (with a minor amendment to the heading which is supported).

Definition of 'non-contributing parts of heritage buildings'

You may be aware that Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submitted in opposition to the definition of 'non-contributing parts to heritage buildings' as they thought that the way the definition was worded might lead to a situation where parts of a building, which may or may not be 'original' but nevertheless have high heritage value, being removed or adversely affected.

I note that there are a large number of private houses proposed for inclusion to Schedule 4b that are relevant to these rules.

Following discussions and a pre-hearing meeting with HNZPT and Ian Bowman, I am now recommending to replace the definition that was notified with a clearer definition, as follows:

~~*"Non-contributing heritage buildings:*~~

~~*"Non-contributing building: For heritage items listed in Schedule 4b, non-contributing parts of a heritage building are those parts of a building which may have been added to the main heritage building at a later time than original construction of the main building and are not constructed in the same style, finishes or materials as the original building, and includes lean-to's."*~~

"Non-contributing parts of heritage buildings:

Parts of heritage items that make little or no contribution to, or detract from, the heritage values for which the heritage item has been listed in Schedule 4b."

This new definition recognises that:

- Parts of heritage buildings may not be original but still contain heritage significance (this enables the valuing of differing periods of a building's history);
- Lean-to's can contribute to the heritage significance of a building as many early heritage buildings included lean-to's;
- While parts of buildings may not be constructed in the same style, finishes or materials as the original building, those parts may still hold heritage significance, e.g. the private dwelling at 7 Pines Court (The Pines) is made up of several architectural styles but is still considered significant.

This revised definition is currently in use in Auckland's Unitary Plan.

'Removal of' Non-Contributing Parts to Heritage Buildings

HNZPT has also requested the inclusion of a policy which encourages the 'removal' of non-contributing parts of a heritage building. In response, I am recommending an amendment to Policy 11 and a consequential change to Rule 11 as follows:

Policy 11

"HH-P10: To enable external alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings listed in Schedule 4b where the changes do not impact negatively on the heritage values of the item listed in Schedule 4b."

Rule 11:

"**HH-R11** External alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b."

These changes are consistent with the relief sought in NZDF's submission where the term 'change' is replaced with 'increase' in Standard 6 (HH-S6) of the plan change. These changes recognise that a reduction in the size of a non-contributing part, or its removal, is unlikely to have negative effects on the heritage values of the main heritage building.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this recommendation further, please let me know.

The hearing is scheduled for Wednesday 7th June. A Minute prepared by the Hearing Panel is about to be sent out.

Ngā mihi

Rochelle.

ROCHELLE WAUGH | Contracted Policy Planner

| Manawatu District Council | Private Bag 10001 | Feilding 4743 |
| P: (06) 323 0000 | M: +64 (027) 2448898 | www.mdc.govt.nz |

"Our people delivering great service to our community."

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above.

If you are not an intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is prohibited.

If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments.

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Manawatu District Council.

The information contained in this Internet Email message is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged information, but not necessarily the official views or opinions of the New Zealand Defence Force. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this message or the information in it. If you have received this message in error, please Email or telephone the sender immediately.

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above.

If you are not an intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination,