

Speaking notes for Amanda Mulligan, Wellington Heritage Professionals

1. My name is Amanda Mulligan. I am one of the group of 'Wellington Heritage Professionals' who submitted on the proposed District Plan. In the infrastructure chapter, we submitted on rules 63 and 65.
2. We submitted that rule 63 should be changed so that, within heritage areas and archaeological sites, above ground connections are a controlled activity. We agree with the author of the s42A report that archaeological sites are unlikely to be affected by this rule but our submission remains that above ground connections within heritage areas should also be controlled.
3. We also submitted that rule 65 should be changed so that the upgrading of infrastructure at heritage areas, archaeological sites and SASMs should also have restricted discretionary status.
4. We made these submissions because development at heritage places should be values-based and heritage areas, archaeological sites and SASMs have values that are at least as significant as heritage buildings and structures.
5. I'll now invite Michael Kelly to speak to his expert evidence.

Speaking notes for Michael Kelly

Appearing for Wellington Heritage Professionals

1. My name is Michael Kelly. I am a historian and heritage consultant and I am presenting evidence on behalf of the group of 'Wellington Heritage Professionals' with whom I submitted on the proposed District Plan.
2. My evidence revolves largely around one key point – the relative treatment of heritage areas versus individually listed items.
3. Before I comment on that, please note that, as per my evidence, I agree with the Wellington City Council's assertion that archaeological sites will not be affected by rule IN-OL-R63, which is contrary to the group's original submission.
4. My evidence is in response to infrastructure rules INF-OL-R63 and INF-OL-R65. In both cases the council's recommendation is that individually listed heritage places and heritage areas should be treated differently.
5. With regard to INF-OL-63, Wellington Heritage Professionals are seeking controlled status for heritage areas as well as individual places.
6. With regard to INF-OL-65, I note that this distinction also applies to archaeological sites and SASMs, but the thrust of my evidence is about the treatment of heritage areas.

7. This distinction between individual places and heritage areas is arbitrary and illogical. Heritage places and areas are both listed to protect their heritage values. The values of the latter are just as threatened by poorly designed or located infrastructure as individual places. In fact, as I note in my evidence, the potential harm could be greater given the number of components that make up a heritage area.
8. One notable recent example of infrastructure is the pole immediately adjacent to the Hataitai Heritage Area, as shown in my slides.
9. The objective of this distinction seems to be intended to give applicants more options for siting these structures. The kind of infrastructure we are building in urban areas is getting bigger and more intrusive, which is even more of a reason to give the council discretion over their appearance and location where other important values are at stake.