








APPENDIX ONE – TABLE OF TARGETED CONSULTATION (with opposing land owners) AND PROPOSED WAY FORWARD.

Area	Suburban Centre Review Dec 08 - March 09	Targeted letter November 2009	Main concerns raised	Heritage value of area	Conclusion	Proceed to plan change?
<p>Aro Valley 16 properties</p> 	<p>16 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>3 objections received (19% response rate)</p>	<p>3 objectors contacted with 3 responses received:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One on-site joint meeting with 2 owners 2. One on-site meeting with 1 owner 	<p>General conclusions from the meetings were that the building owners were strongly opposed to any form of heritage protection. The owners felt that proposed heritage area would add another layer of bureaucracy and cost should they wish to redevelop their properties and businesses in the future. They were of the view that owners should have the right to adapt their building to accommodate modern day uses. They also were fearful that the heritage area would result in inconsistent advice and future changes by the Council.</p> <p>Two of the property owners were particularly concerned about the role of the Aro Valley Community Council (AVCC). The building owners considered that the AVCC did not fairly represent community aspirations, for the commercial property owners and neighbouring residences alike. The building owners had strong concern regarding AVCC's involvement in past planning decisions and felt that this involvement was to the detriment of the community. They were fearful that a proposed heritage area would provide further opportunity for AVCC to involve themselves in future development – an outcome which would be strongly opposed by the building owners.</p> <p>One owner was not overly concerned with the potential consenting requirements that a heritage area would bring, rather he simply maintained that the buildings, particularly on the southern side of Aro Street, had been modernised to such an extent that most of the original heritage fabric had been removed. In this regard, the "heritage" identified was actually made up of modern buildings.</p>	<p>Representative, historic, collective streetscape and landmark qualities, aesthetic and architectural, educational and social values.</p> <p>The Aro Valley heritage area covers the core of one of Wellington's iconic inner city suburbs. It is highly regarded for its character, charm and heritage significance. The centre provides a heart to the local community, and contains many of the most visited and prominent buildings in the suburb.</p>	<p>Aro Valley provides a unique example of Wellington's early working class suburbs. The building stock remains relatively intact and the centre provides a strong focal point for the local community. The area warrants further consideration as a possible heritage area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Berhampore (Rintoul St) 6 properties</p> 	<p>6 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>No responses received (0% response rate)</p>	<p>No further letter sent</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Representative historic group of buildings with authentic streetscape value, educational and technological qualities, social, and archaeological values.</p> <p>An example of a small satellite centre that was a result of an early public transport system (the tram).</p> <p>Although a small area it occupies a highly visible corner at the junction of Rintoul and Luxford Streets.</p>	<p>An intact example of an older neighbourhood shopping centre. Warrants proceeding as a possible heritage area due to the intact nature of the area and the lack of opposition expressed by property owners. The area justifies further consideration as a possible heritage area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Hataitai 16 properties</p> 	<p>16 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>5 objections received (31% response rate)</p>	<p>5 objectors contacted with 2 responses received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two separate on-site meetings with owners 	<p>General conclusions from the on-site meetings were that the building owners were strongly opposed to any form of heritage protection.</p> <p>One of the property owners could see the benefits of such a proposal and does not oppose the overall scheme, but he does oppose the inclusion of his residential property in the area. The building has been purpose built as a dwelling and has been private residence for over 70 years. The owner had concerns about the possible impact on property value.</p> <p>The second property owner raised concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional cost and difficulty in gaining resource consent for redevelopment in the future • The impact on private property rights and future redevelopment plans • Right to adapt buildings to accommodate modern day 	<p>Representative, historic authenticity, landmark and streetscape value, architectural and group qualities, social, technological and educational values</p> <p>A representative example of new a suburb in the period from 1910 – 1930. The buildings demonstrate a distinctive similarity of era. The landscape setting and role as a transport node are also significant.</p>	<p>Hataitai is somewhat unique in the Wellington context due to the age of its building stock, many of which date from the 1910s and 1920s. The suburban centre reflects the character of the surrounding residential area and today stands as a good representative example of an inter-war suburban commercial centre.</p> <p>The area has a consistent historic streetscape that is rare in Wellington, particularly so close to the city centre. The variety in type and style of the buildings and the strong historic and visual</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Area	Suburban Centre Review Dec 08 - March 09	Targeted letter November 2009	Main concerns raised	Heritage value of area	Conclusion	Proceed to plan change?
			uses.		contribution that those buildings make to this well known part of Wellington makes the Hataitai suburban centre an important heritage area. The area justifies further consideration as a possible heritage area.	
<p>Island Bay Terminus (Shorland Park Shops)</p> <p>5 properties</p> 	<p>5 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>5 objections received (100% response rate)</p> <p>On-site meeting with objecting owners or interested parties</p>	<p>No further letter sent</p>	<p>The general conclusion from the meeting was that the building owners were strongly opposed to any form of heritage protection. Particular concerns for the owners were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the buildings had been passed from generation to generation and the families did not want to limit redevelopment opportunities for future generations. • Additional cost and difficulty in gaining resource consent. • The impact on private property rights. • Right to adapt buildings to accommodate modern day uses. 	<p>Streetscape and landmark value, architectural and aesthetic interest, historic and social, technical values.</p> <p>Area provides a suitable conclusion to the end of The Parade.</p> <p>Strong connections with Italian community.</p> <p>While the area is of historical significance, it is relatively small in size and the uniformity of the group is compromised an incongruous single storey building which is set back from the street edge.</p> <p>The area is not in a key location and does not serve as a heart for the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Given the small size of the area, the presence of 2 marginal buildings and the level of opposition expressed, it is recommended that on balance Council should not proceed with Island Bay Terminus as a heritage area.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>John Street (Newtown)</p> <p>23 properties</p> 	<p>23 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>13 objections received (57% response rate)</p>	<p>7 objectors/ representatives contacted with 6 responses received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One on-site joint meeting with 2 owners/ representatives, plus one interested party • One separate on-site meeting with objector and tenant • One Council-based meeting with objector • Email correspondence with two separate objectors 	<p>The building owners in this particular area have expressed the most concern of all the areas consulted on. All parties remain very strongly opposed to the inclusion of their properties in the proposed area. Particular concerns for the owners were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Road has already undergone a lot of change that had been poorly managed by Council – a proposed heritage area would create more stress and burden to property owners. • Small business owners were being unfairly targeted by Council. Such businesses require certainty, amenities and low cost of compliance – something that the proposed heritage area cannot offer. • The buildings are difficult to maintain and attracting tenants is already difficult. The location of the buildings next to a busy road, the lack of adequate parking and foot traffic is impacting on the profitability of the buildings and businesses. • Changes to the road layout and removal of on-street parking have had a negative impact on businesses in the area. A proposed heritage area would compound this. • The heritage value of the buildings identified is questionable i.e. not particularly old, unremarkable history etc. • The Built Heritage Incentive Fund was not nearly enough money for heritage assistance for the city. • In more recent years there had been an influx of more medically orientated businesses coming into the area that may not necessarily have a retail/service component to attract customers. These activities have tended to adapt the shop fronts to offices thereby creating barriers to attract customers and other retailing to the area. The precarious nature of retailing was having an impact on the viability of the area which correlates to the long-term future of the buildings. Because of this unsteady viability, owners need flexibility to adapt to changing needs of the area and were fearful that a proposed heritage area would hinder the ability to make such changes. • This part of Adelaide Road was changing and the value of the area had been compromised by larger scale 	<p>Considerable rarity value, visual landmark and authenticity, representative, architectural, streetscape value. Historic, social and archaeological, educational, technological values</p> <p>Largely unaltered Victorian and Edwardian buildings that are located on prominent and strategically important corner. The buildings are the first centre on the Adelaide Road-Riddiford Street axis and include several landmark buildings.</p> <p>The area has high landmark values due to its prominent location at a busy intersection.</p>	<p>This was the most strongly opposed of all of the proposed heritage areas. While the level of opposition is acknowledged, officers consider that the area's high heritage values, prominent location at the entrance to Newtown, and the presence of a number of landmark buildings justify its consideration as a heritage area.</p> <p>The owner of 163 Adelaide Road has requested that the rear of his property be excluded from any proposed heritage area to enable future re-development. Officers have reviewed the property and agree that the building at the front of the site is the key contributor to the heritage values of the wider area. Due to the depth of the site, future development at the rear of the property is unlikely to impact significantly on the heritage values of the Adelaide Road frontage and wider area. Officers therefore propose to amend the boundary of the heritage area in the vicinity of 163 Adelaide Road.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Boundary change to exclude 2 Hospital Road and rear sections of 163, 169 and 171 Adelaide Road.</p>

Area	Suburban Centre Review Dec 08 - March 09	Targeted letter November 2009	Main concerns raised	Heritage value of area	Conclusion	Proceed to plan change?
<p>Newtown 48 properties</p> 	<p>48 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>2 objections received (4% response rate)</p>	<p>2 objectors contacted with 2 responses received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One meeting with one objector • Email correspondence with one objector 	<p>buildings. The central part of Newtown had the real heritage value and Council should concentrate its energy on that area.</p> <p>General conclusions from the correspondence were that the building owners were opposed to any form of heritage protection. The owners felt that the proposed heritage area would have a detrimental impact on the value of their investments and create a barrier to on-selling property, especially in the current economic climate. They were of the view that the proposed heritage area would create additional obstacles for redeveloping their properties and they need flexibility to adapt to changing markets and tenant requirements. The proposed heritage area could potentially stifle growth in Newtown as owners would be reluctant to alter their buildings and potentially undertake “patch-up” maintenance which would be to the detriment of the area. They also considered that the Built Heritage Incentive Fund is inadequate.</p> <p>One owner considered that the area does have a certain streetscape presence but was not noteworthy and did not warrant this form of protection. In this regard the owner considered that the existing consenting provisions provide enough scope for Council to ensure the streetscape is sympathetically maintained.</p>	<p>Of great historical significance with rare streetscape values. Visual landmarks, authenticity, representative and architectural values. Social, technological and educational values.</p> <p>Covers the heart of one of Wellington’s most distinctive suburbs, with a rare section of continuous streetscape, reflective of its 1920’s origins. An excellent example of the impact of mass transport on expanding the city’s boundaries.</p>	<p>The proposed Newtown heritage area is located at the heart of one of Wellington’s most diverse and vibrant suburbs. The area is highly visible and contains a significant number of landmark buildings. The area justifies further consideration as a possible heritage area.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Boundary change to include 179 and 193a Riddiford Street and 8, 8a, 10, 12 and 14 Constable Street.</p>
<p>Thorndon 54 properties</p> 	<p>54 letters sent to property owners</p> <p>1 objection received (2% response rate)</p>	<p>1 objector contacted with 1 response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email correspondence with objector 	<p>One building owner was strongly opposed to any form of heritage protection in Thorndon. The owner considered that the Thorndon Character Area is sufficient to ensure that the character of the commercial part of Tinakori Road is not threatened. The additional heritage provisions would create onerous requirements for building owners and would have a detrimental impact on the value of the buildings as a commercial investment. The owner felt that the proposal unnecessarily impacts on private property rights and considered that owners would be forced to recreate original appearances. The owner considered that his buildings had little heritage value.</p>	<p>Very special historic, architectural and streetscape character, a strong sense of place, and is of very high heritage value. Authentic streetscape. Archaeological, technical, education and social values.</p> <p>The city’s oldest suburb with buildings of considerable age and historic importance. Buildings designed by prominent local architects that show a high degree of care and attention to their design.</p> <p>Has a distinctive charm with its speciality shopping and eating places.</p>	<p>Thorndon has long been recognised as having significant heritage values, and is the only one of the proposed areas to already enjoy a degree of protection for the existing buildings. This is possibly reflected by the fact that only one submission in opposition was received in the largest of the proposed heritage areas. The area warrants further consideration as a possible heritage area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>