

Submission on Proposed District Plan Change 81: Rezoning 320 The Terrace and Delisting Gordon Wilson Flats

Roland Sapsford
23 Epuni Street
Aro Valley
Wellington 6021

Tel 021 651105
Email: roland@actrix.gen.nz

I could not gain advantage in trade competition through this submission.

My submission relates to the following parts of the Proposed District Plan Change

- 1 The proposal to remove Gordon Wilson flats at 320 The Terrace from the Heritage List
- 2 The proposal to rezone 320 The Terrace to Institutional Precinct
- 3 Changes to the Institutional Precinct Provision

My submission is that I **oppose** the changes proposed in District Plan Change 81 points 1 and 2 above in their entirety

My submission is that, if points 1 and 2 are approved, I **support in part** the changes proposed in 3 to the Institutional Precinct Provisions and submit

- (i) that the Council's control change to Discretionary (Unrestricted) or at least that the matters considered as discretionary (Restricted) be extended to more fully encompass the importance of the site eg to include amenity and landscape values;
- (ii) that these matters ought to apply to the whole Institutional Precinct rather than simply the Gordon Wilson Flats
- (iii) that the non-notification provision be removed and that they are replaced with a guarantee of public notification, reflecting the importance of the site.

Reasons for submission

1 In respect of 1, the proposal is in fact to demolish the Gordon Wilson Flats and this ought to be dealt with as matter under the existing District Plan Heritage Provisions. Delisting implies the building lacks heritage merit; in fact it has considerable heritage merit. The issue is whether demolition is appropriate and that is a matter able to be considered in respect of the existing District Plan provisions. In respect of this point, I submit that the building may in fact be capable of restoration and redevelopment in a manner consistent with its heritage values.

2 In respect of 2, rezoning the land as Institutional Precinct largely removes the ability for public input and indeed Council control over its use. This is inappropriate for such a large and significant site, especially when there are no defined plans for its use. The Institutional Precinct provides the University with near carte blanche to do as it wishes; this is fundamentally at odds

with the importance of the site to the city and the potential impact on nearby residents. The best thing that can be said of the proposed change is that it premature! Specific proposals for landscaping in the interim could be dealt with under the existing plan provisions. A more considered review may even lead to some aspects of the site being classed as open space or reserve land for example.

3 In respect of 3, the importance of the site suggests both that the Council's discretion ought to be unrestricted or at least extended to more fully encompass the range of possible effects of development. Furthermore it is inappropriate to exclude public input to such an important site. A more appropriate course of action would be to seek public input and when there was a reasonable degree of support for a proposal to then present it to Council for consideration.

The decision I seek from Council is to decline the proposals in 1 and 2. In the alternate, if 1 and 2 are accepted then I seek the modification of 3 to provide for more comprehensive control on development and a higher degree of public input.

I do wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing.

Roland Sapsford
25 September 2015