



# ***Summary of Submissions***

## ***Proposed District Plan Change 58***

**Additions to Heritage Listings**  
11 October 2007

# Proposed District Plan Change 58

Proposed additions to listed heritage buildings, areas and objects.

## Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Mary Macpherson	10 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that it would be an excellent way to preserve the attractive 30's architecture of the cottages, recognise the original impetus for the development and the interesting social history that has evolved since then.</p> <p>The submitter states that without a heritage listing the cottages could easily be developed in a way unsympathetic to their original design, or the area changed in a way that destroys the tranquility of their setting.</p> <p>The submitter also states that historic enclaves such as Salisbury Garden Court within Wellington's suburbs help to make the city a richer and more interesting place to live in. The heritage listing would also showcase the Court and help its profile in the neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
2	Phillip Jones	9 Benares Street, Khandallah, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>In general the submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan but seeks that the rear sections of 121-123 The Parade are excluded from the area and that the boundary lines are amended to reflect this. A map is provided detailing the suggested amended boundary line.</p> <p>The submitter notes that 121-123 The Parade has been granted resource consent to subdivide into 2 lots (one being the historic building and the second being the vacant land behind). The submitter observes that other neighbouring rear sections that have been developed have not been included in the proposed Heritage Area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That if Plan Change 58 is to proceed, that the Island Bay Village Heritage Area excludes the vacant rear site at 121-123 The Parade.</p>			
3	Shirley M Hampton	24 Hudson Street, Island Bay	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan and states that the shops from 121 to 155 The Parade, Island Bay (mostly) are integral to Island Bay Village. The shops mark the lines of the village and should be protected. They give it character and the history that comes with them is invaluable. Once lost: gone forever. Heritage or historic buildings are recognised under the RMA 1991.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
4	Robert Paterson	823 West 63 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue, BC, Canada, V6P 2H3	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace.</p>			

The submitter **supports** the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace.

The submitter is a specialist in Cultural Heritage Law and based on his experience of seeing similar houses elsewhere he would describe the Emeny House as 'Victorian Italianate' and one of the only (and certainly best preserved) examples of such architecture in Wellington, if not New Zealand. The ceiling of the billiard room and other features of the home display a high quality plaster work that is virtually non-existent today.

The submitter was a friend of the former owner (Rene Emeny) and was impressed with how well she maintained her home and her level of concern about its future preservation.

**Decision Requested:**

That the Emeny House at 1 Ranfurly Terrace (including interior and grounds) be added to the current Heritage Listings (Wellington City District Plan).

5	Nigel John Willis	17 Karepa Street, Brooklyn, Wellington	Yes
---	-------------------	--	-----

The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.

The submitter **opposes** the inclusion of 155 The Parade, Island Bay being included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area. The submitter appreciates that the Council wishes to preserve heritage buildings in the Wellington City region, but in adopting this proposal, it is using private funding to achieve its own means, and suggests that the Committee and Councillors would not wish to make a strategic investment only to have it undermined by another party. If Council is enthusiastic about the heritage appeal of the city, it should be purchasing buildings outright.

There is no doubt that the proposed Heritage Area would undermine the value of the building and had the submitter known of the proposal he wouldn't have purchased it. The purchase was made unencumbered by any restriction and to enforce such a significant alteration on the terms of conduct of their properties is untenable.

The submitter believes the building is of no particular architectural merit and no longer reflects the original appearance of the building at the time it was constructed.

The building is at an age where it requires significant maintenance. The value of the land is the location rather than the building. The proposed Heritage Area removes the option of redevelopment or reconstruction.

The submitter notes that the building profile assessment written by the heritage consultant does not mention 155 The Parade, Island Bay in its recommendation. The submitter supports this.

The submitter is also involved with another already listed property and believes that it has not commercially increased in value because of its listing.

**Decision Requested:**

That 155 The Parade, Island Bay is not included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.

6	Tony Nydan	P.O. Box 14-517, Kilbirnie, Wellington	No
---	------------	--	----

This submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street.

The submitter **opposes** the proposed listing, based on the fact that the building has no architectural features at all and has concrete and metal framed windows. The submitter fails to see that this building has the slightest traits of heritage features to qualify as heritage. There are numerous other buildings in Wellington that do have features that qualify, not this glass box.

**Decision Requested:**

That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the heritage list.

7	The Architecture Centre Inc. C/o – Christine McCarthy, President	P.O. Box 24178, Wellington	No
---	---	----------------------------	----

The submission relates to whole of Plan Change 58.

The submitter strongly **supports** the proposed additions to the current heritage listings, especially the Former Church of Christ Building, the Eva Street Building, the Former Hannah Footwear Factory building and Old Wool House. The submitter considers a Heritage Area should be established in the Eva/Dixon Street area, which also details urban pedestrian routes in the area.

The submitter encourages the Council to also list the following: the Hannah Playhouse, the Teachers Training College, the Alington House, the Demonstration House, Freyburg Pool, Thorndon Mews, the Meteorological Office, the Forest and Bird (formerly Wellington City Mission Fielden Taylor Boy's Hotel), Jellicoe Towers, the Sutch House and the Kahn House.

The submitter recommends that the Council:

- Adopt a stronger, more explicit set of guidelines of listing criteria for evaluating heritage to make the rationale for inclusion public and explicit
- Ensure interiors, and fixtures and fittings are explicitly listed
- Stipulate that the minimum heritage listing for the external façade be designated as “facades and building structure”, meaning front and side elevations are retained as well as spatial, scalar and proportional relationships
- Adopt education strategies or incur appropriate penalties for violation of heritage sites
- Address current lack of modernist architecture in Wellington
- Advise all owners of listed buildings of the Heritage Incentive Fund to encourage uptake
- Recognise and incorporate other organisation's recommendations i.e. NZHPT, Docomomo, NZIA and NZILA
- The unpainted state of a building should be explicitly recognised when it is an integral part of the design of the building
- Recognise contemporary heritage and site-specific sculpture
- Provide incentives for negative heritage buildings to be removed and replaced by more publicly productive architecture

**Decision Requested:**

Approve proposed District Plan Change 58 but also consider other key issues and buildings outlined in this submission.

8	Jessica Khol Johnstone	Apartment 109, 60 Willis Street, Wellington	No
---	------------------------	---	----

This submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street.

The submitter **opposes** the proposed listing as it has no redeeming features of heritage. It looks like glass blocks, one on top of the other. Perhaps the Council should have looked at this building as an alternative for the aquarium debacle of recent times.

**Decision Requested:**

That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the heritage list.

9	Graham Howell	82 Pirie Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
---	---------------	--	----

The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.

The submitter **supports** the inclusion of the building in the District Plan. The submitter has been involved as a user of Crossways since 1982, for several years on its management committee and has lived in the upstairs flat.

The submitter believes that it is a wonderful community facility and has an ambiance that is very special and needs protecting (including the garden). The character of the building is created by the style and nature of the building itself, and as such the building needs protecting from any future commercial development that may destroy the nature and fabric of the building.

Crossways has been used as a community facility since the late 1970s - if well managed will continue to meet the needs of the local and wider Wellington community. Enhancements may be necessary to ensure compliance with health regulations but also needs to recognise the essential character of the building. Development of the site into multi-apartment residential dwellings would not be in character.

**Decision Requested:**

That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.

10	Angelos Argus	P.O. Box 97, Northbridge, New South Wales,	Yes
----	---------------	--	-----

Australia			
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of the former Church of Christ building, 37 Dixon Street and the old brick building 2 Eva Street.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of the buildings on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Eva Street and 37 Dixon Street were purchased in 1980 as an investment for eventual redevelopment - since that time the submitter has purchased 39 Dixon Street, with the intention of developing all properties. The proposed listing would lessen the ability to economically develop the properties</li> <li>• Tenancy leases over the years have included a demolition clause to enable such development</li> <li>• Resource Consent (granted July 2005) was delayed because of the requirement to comply with the Cuba Street Character Area Design Guide and wind assessment</li> <li>• The consent was granted with the approval of the Historic Places Trust who did not place any historic value on the property other than that excavation work should be undertaken carefully in case there are remnants of a Maori Pa</li> <li>• In the past the Council has indicated that the façade will have to be demolished to comply with seismic requirements</li> <li>• 2 Eva Street is located in a private right of way and not a legal street</li> <li>• 2 Eva Street is “ripe for demolition” and any funds expended on it would be un-economical and wasteful. The buildings existence is reliant on substantial sums of money to be expended, well outweighing any heritage value</li> <li>• The Church of Christ building is a ‘hotch potch’ of construction and materials</li> <li>• The rear lean to was not built by the Church of Christ but a previous storekeeper for storage purposes</li> <li>• The profile recognises heritage value because of its association with the Church of Christ. Is the use of a religious group a precedent for future listings?</li> <li>• The rear of the building provides opportunity for criminal activity. The redevelopment of the building would prevent such incidents</li> <li>• The proposal will arbitrarily change the submitters rights and will adversely and unfairly affect him</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That the former Church of Christ building, 37 Dixon Street and the old brick building 2 Eva Street be removed from in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
11	Annette Baier	7 Ranfurly Terrace, Mt Cook, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace. The submitter states that there are very few of these properties left and it has a strong association with Wellington’s early history.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That the Emeny House at 1 Ranfurly Terrace (including interior and grounds) to be listed as a historic house.</p>			
12	Jane Louise Tate	3/85 Warwick Street, Wilton, Wellington	No
<p>This submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing as it has little or no architectural merit.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed as an addition to the current heritage listings.</p>			
13	Harrogate Properties Ltd.	5 Paddington Grove, Karori	Yes.
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Harrogate, 84 Salamanca Road.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Harrogate, 84 Salamanca Road.</p> <p>The submitter does not accept that they were adequately consulted on the proposal or that their wishes will be taken into account. They suspect that this lack of rigorous consultation is because of the level of negativity by property owners. The process has been rushed and the submitter seeks a delay in any decision making.</p> <p>The submitter believes that the listing would restrict their ability to develop or alter the property, and feels that even refurbishment or renovation will be very difficult if the listing is to proceed. The submitter believes that they would not be given fair treatment should resource consent be sought; as owners of the</p>			

<p>property would be waived in the interests of securing a heritage listing.</p> <p>The report refers to the RMA, the Built Heritage Policy and Plan Change 43 but does not disclose other information as why the building why the building has been put forward for proposed listing. Further, who were the “suitably experienced heritage professionals” that assessed the property?</p> <p>The submitter was not aware of the proposed listing when they purchased the property and Council should offer to buy or compensate on buildings it proposes to list.</p> <p>Giving the building a heritage listing will not make it the property of the Council; therefore it does not have the right to dictate what the submitter can do with their property.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Harrogate, 84 Salamanca Road is removed from the proposed District Plan heritage list.</p>			
14	Lesley and William Far	151 The Parade, Island Bay, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter vehemently <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 151 The Parade, Island Bay being included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area. The submitter appreciates that the Council wishes to preserve heritage buildings in the Wellington City region, but in adopting this proposal, it is using private funding to achieve its own means, and suggests that the Committee and Councillors would not wish to make a strategic investment only to have it undermined by another party. If Council is enthusiastic about the heritage appeal of the city, it should be purchasing buildings outright. Council could then use its own resources to maintain the building.</p> <p>The proposed listing will definitely undermine its value and disadvantage the owners of the building(s). Whilst the building is old, it is not of heritage value as the more modern aluminum windows detract from this value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 151 The Parade, Island Bay is not included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p>			
15	John Green and Associates C/o Robyn Green	25 Welland Place, Island Bay, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of 127 The Parade in the proposed Heritage Area in principle but does raise concern with the costs involved in the proposed listing, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the submitter be able to carry out repairs without resource consent? (makes reference to 21 August 2007 article in Dominion Post relating to Emeny House)</li> <li>• With reference to the two rental flats in the building, these are investment properties and the submitter does not want rules and regulations regarding the maintenance schedule, or be obligated to install top of the range fittings or accessories.</li> <li>• Does the Heritage Area preclude the submitter from sourcing another tenant other than a butcher and/or modify the inside of the shop?</li> </ul> <p>The submitter believes that cutting resource fees or giving rates concessions to owners of heritage buildings is an excellent idea and a wonderful sweetener to owners.</p> <p>The submitter also notes the rear proposed development at 121-123 and feels that that development is at odds with the proposed Heritage Area. Further, the little brick fence that houses letterboxes is inherent to the overall effect of the submitter’s property. The proposed development at 121-123 may result in its removal which will affect the heritage values of the area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 127 The Parade is included as part of the Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p>			
16	CentrePort Ltd C/o Neville Hyde	P.O. Box 794, Wellington	Yes
<p>This submission relates to Shed 35 and Maritime House on Waterloo Quay.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of the buildings on the District Plan Heritage List and particularly notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The listing will place a significant restriction on the development of the wider Port Redevelopment</li> </ul>			

Precinct area

- The listing is unnecessary as their protection is adequately provided under the Masterplan for the Port Redevelopment Precinct and the Memorandum of Understanding with the Wellington City Council. This allows for Council control in respect of design, siting, placement of building mass, and public space and structure design
- The definition of the word 'site' under the District Plan means any area of land comprised wholly in one certificate of title. The buildings are located on one title covering 10.5 hectares. Under PC 43 it is a Discretionary Activity (Restricted) to modify an existing building, or construct a new one on the same site as a listed building. This is unacceptable and would place significant restriction on both the Port Redevelopment Precinct and the Operational Port Area which the Plan otherwise promotes
- Under Plan Change 48, development in the Port Redevelopment Precinct and Operational Port Area are Controlled and Permitted Activities respectively. The proposed listings would effectively change the planning status of development, with the Heritage rules over riding the Central Area rules
- The continued use or reuse of buildings with heritage values is important in ensuring their retention. Some alterations are need to the buildings to provide for economically viable uses

**Decision Requested:**

That Shed 35 and Maritime House are removed from the District Plan heritage list. If the buildings are not removed, amend Rule 21A.2.2 (and subsequently 21A2.2.2) providing for an exception within the Port Redevelopment Precinct and Operational Port Area.

17	Brian Bennett C/o Spencer Holmes Limited	Level 6, 8 Willis Street, P.O. Box 588, Wellington	Yes
----	--	---	-----

This submission relates to 233 Willis Street.

The submitter **opposes** the inclusion of the building on the District Plan Heritage List.

The submitter states that while the building is not unattractive, the aesthetic value is not considered to be high and is not of such significance as to warrant heritage listing. The ground floor frontage is not original and was replaced in the 1990's when the ground floor was demolished. This included the replacement of windows and front doors, which undermine the original architectural integrity of the building. Only 2 architectural features remain on the front façade, namely the small horizontal projecting hoods and the vertical triangular oriel window at first and second storey. These are not of sufficient high quality to justify heritage listing. Also, the building is not particularly prominent within the street scene.

The building assessment discusses the connection of the building with former Wellington Mayor, Samuel Brown (1887-1888), the building was built in 1942 and the submitter questions the historical value identified buy the Council.

The listing could cause burden to the owner in terms of maintenance, limitations on how the site could be redeveloped and cost associated with the resource consent process. The proposed listing could also impact on the value of the 3 titles located to the rear of the building all of which are under the same common ownership.

**Decision Requested:**

That 233 Willis Street is deleted from the heritage list of buildings proposed under DPC 58.

18	Braemar Holdings Ltd. C/o – Con Anastasiou Barristers and Solicitors	11 Floor, Novell House, 89 The terrace, Wellington	Yes
----	--	---	-----

This submission relates to The Braemar, 32 The Terrace.

The submitter **opposes** the inclusion of the building on the District Plan Heritage List on the following grounds:

- The section 32 report is inadequate and does not meet the requirements of the RMA
- The heritage assessment made contains inaccuracies and the building does not have heritage values attributed to it by the Council's heritage assessment
- The proposal to add the building to the heritage list is not warranted by the provisions of the Act

and nor by the heritage policies and objectives in the District Plan

- The constraints that the proposed listing would impose are not warranted by the provisions of the RMA. The listing would “freeze frame” the building with its current exterior appearance which would prevent any redevelopment of a valuable inner city site which would be totally inequitable to the submitter
- The heritage provisions of Plan Change 43 would impose severe limitations on the development or redevelopment of the building and the efficient use of the land
- The listing would potentially render the land and building incapable of reasonable use in terms of section 85 of the RMA
- The building may be earthquake prone. The listing would result in severe and unjustifiable financial and practical difficulties
- The building has already been litigated in 1995 for the same issue. Nothing has changed since that time and the listing now proposed is similarly unwarranted

**Decision Requested:**

That The Braemar, 32 The Terrace be removed from the proposed District Plan heritage list.

19	New Zealand Historic Places Trust C/o Rakesh Mistry	Central Region Office, Level 1, Tadox House, 1 Blair Street, Wellington	No
----	--	---	----

This submission relates to the whole of Plan Change 58.

The submitter **supports** the Plan Change, particularly Shed 35 and Maritime House.

NZHPT considers that the section 32 analysis highlights that a regulatory approach is the best means to protect heritage and notes that the position is not a prohibitive measure and it allows for potential development of heritage items to be assessed accordingly.

**Decision Requested:**

That Council adopts Plan Change 58.

20	Peter Cullen	186 Oriental Parade	Yes
----	--------------	---------------------	-----

The submission relates to 186 Oriental Parade.

The submitter **opposes** the inclusion of the building on the District Plan Heritage List on the following grounds:

- The proposal effectively renders the submitters land and property incapable of reasonable use and places unreasonable burden on the submitter (under section 85 of the RMA)
- The Council has failed to comply with, and take into account section 32 of the RMA.
- The proposal does not accord with the purpose and principles of the RMA
- The building does not have sufficient heritage or other merit to justify listing in the District Plan
- The submitter has a legitimate expectation that he would be able to redevelop his property in accordance with the District Plan
- The Council has failed to consult adequately with the submitter and failed to give adequate notice of a Council meeting to enable the submitter to attend

**Decision Requested:**

That 186 Oriental Parade is removed from the District Plan heritage list.

21	Pip Oldam	38 Rawhiti Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington	Yes
----	-----------	---	-----

The submission relates to the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace.

The submitter (on behalf of family related to the former owner) **supports** the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace stating that it has rare and exceptional architectural features and social value.

The house has not been altered since its construction and contains examples ornate plasterwork carried out by Charles Emeny. The house was faithfully maintained by his daughters, keeping it in its original condition inside and out. As a result the house is an excellent example of a late 19<sup>th</sup> century artisan type dwelling in authentic Victorian style, of which there are not many in Wellington.

<p>The continuous occupation of the house by one family has given the house a strong connection with the street and vice versa. Many people in the area have grown up visiting the house and the Emeny's, and latterly Wellington Mayors. As such, the house is an integral part of its neighbourhood, a lynchpin for memory and local history.</p> <p>The submitter recognises that the house will be modernised for 21<sup>st</sup> century living, but believes that there is community interest in preserving certain aspects of the house and grounds. The balance between public and private rights needs to be resolved.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Emeny House at 1 Ranfurly Terrace (including interior and grounds) to be listed as a heritage building.</p>			
22	Tony and Debra DeLorenzo	15 Belmont Terrace, Lower Hutt	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the proposed listing of Emeny House, 1 Ranfurly Terrace but seeks clarification as to what exactly (item specific) will have heritage status.</p> <p>There are many unique features both physical and historical that need to be preserved or maintained, however many parts of the building, its interior and grounds are not historical or of architectural significance. The Council has not inspected the interior or grounds of the house, prior to listing.</p> <p>The submitter's note that such a specific listing would prevent them from upgrading, decorating and enhancing the house and seeks clarification as to what specific features will be listed.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Emeny House at 1 Ranfurly Terrace is listed in the District Plan but clarification is given as to what specific items will be listed.</p>			
23	Ralph and Margaret Pannett	3 Percival Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that it has history in the Mt Victoria setting and has a fine façade on a prominent intersection. The building should be retained to help give Mt Victoria a great sense of place.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
24	James and Sarah Harper	68 Brougham Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan. The submitter has an authenticated photograph from 1886 which shows the building. The building is part of Mt Victoria's streetscape which looks and feels good as the submitter walks by.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
25	Tina Muciuli	78a Majoribanks Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitter strongly <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that it is the heart of the community and has a lot of historical and cultural value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
26	Toni Butcher	90 Austin Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p>			

<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
27	Deborah Tapper	39 Standen Street, Karori, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan as she fears that it will be teared down otherwise. The heritage listing will protect the building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list and it be continued to be used by the community</p>			
28	Caroline Collisan	17 Queen Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change, especially inclusion of Crossways Community house in the District Plan. The submitter states that Crossways is an important building in Mt Victoria and should be protected as a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That District Plan Change 58 is passed.</p>			
29	Anne and Peter Loveridge	35 Hawker Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the Plan Change, particularly the historical preservation of the Crossways Community House.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That District Plan Change 58 is passed.</p>			
30	Janine Kirsten Jameson	56 Hawker Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that, based on its age, design and site, it should have heritage status. The building is a prominent Mt Victoria building, most recently used as a heritage house.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria obtain heritage status.</p>			
31	Mt Victoria Resident's Association Incorporated C/o Rosamund Averton	P.O. Box 19056, Courtenay Place, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The association <b>supports</b> the Plan Change, particularly the inclusion of Crossways in the District Plan. The association applauds the completeness, clarity and narrative style used and notes that the heritage assessments are worthy of separate publication.</p> <p>The association submits that the listing should also cover the building itself and the car park and garage on the site (Lot 9, 10 and 12 DP 9089).</p> <p>The Association encourages Council to list more items in the District Plan and would like to be involved in the identification process to nominate more items in Mt Victoria.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That District Plan Change 58 is adopted.</p>			
32	Crossways Management Committee	46 Brougham Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p>			

<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that the building was built pre 1890 and is an iconic building in a garden setting with a protected tree, in an important intersection. The owners and occupants of this building have been very significant in the social history of the city.</p> <p>The submitter notes the interior has been much modified but includes items from the Kent Terrace Presbyterian Church.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
33	Nisha and Michael Rauia	9 Queen Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the Plan Change, particularly the inclusion of Crossways in the District Plan stating that the beautiful Crossways house is vital and should be preserved.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That District Plan Change 58 is approved.</p>			
34	Karina Lagreze and Kevin Rumble	58 Elizabeth Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan so that it continues to be the heart of Mt Victoria's community as well as a historical building in this area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Crossways Community House, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
35	Anne Kelly and Karl Wipatene	64 Austin Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that the building is an important historic building within Mt Victoria, both for its aesthetic and community values. It is on a critical corner and is a fine example of the period and should be protected.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That District Plan Change 58 is passed and that the Crossways Community House, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
36	Morgan and Jessica Closson	62 Austin Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitters strongly <b>support</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan stating that it has significant amenity value to the neighbourhood and should be protected. The building forms the heart of Mt Victoria's historic heritage and is used everyday by a variety of cultural and social organisations. The building is located on a critical corner and has architectural, cultural and historic qualities important to Mt Victoria. This grand old building should be preserved and protected for the enjoyment of the community.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>Pass proposed District Plan Change 58 which will afford greater protection to Crossways Community House.</p>			
37	Peter Cowley	96A Mana Esplanade, Mana, Porirua	No
<p>The submission relates to the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the inclusion of the building in the District Plan. The submitter is a member of the St. Andrew's on The Terrace congregation and realises the problems faced if the Crossways building is sold. The submitter cares about the building; its historical value and its value to the Mt Victoria community above the commercial sale value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p>			

That the Crossways building, corner Brougham and Elizabeth Streets, Mt Victoria be included in the District Plan heritage list.			
38	Onslow Historical Society Inc. C/o Murray Pillar	86 Khandallah Road, Khandallah, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the Khandallah Library and Salisbury Garden Court.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the listing of the library and creation of a Heritage Area at Salisbury Garden Court</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Khandallah Library is recognised as a listing building and that Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
39	Tom and Joanne Moyer	2 Salisbury Garden Court, Cecil Road, Wadestown, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has not investigated the insurance risks for owners of heritage listed residential properties. At least one major insurance company (AA Insurance) has clearly stated that it will not insure heritage listed houses. Residents will be unfairly disadvantaged by the proposal or at worst left in a potentially catastrophic situation if they are unable to raise insurance against these properties. Council needs to explore this issue with the major NZ insurers.</li> <li>• Council has been unable to explicitly state what elements of Salisbury Garden Court are of heritage value and what specific proposals in terms of restrictions and regulations are being made. Residents need to know what alterations would be acceptable, what rules and restrictions are being proposed to protect the court setting and rules and restrictions are being proposed to protect the bush setting</li> <li>• The communal use of the whole area cannot be protected through regulation and it is inappropriate to put restrictions on building work which will do nothing to protect the nature of the environment but will inevitably make these already small houses undesirable places to live.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is not included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan and that Council investigate with the major NZ insurers why there is a difficulty around insurance for heritage listed properties.</p>			
40	Inka Andrea Helwig	7 Salisbury Garden Court, Cecil Road, Wadestown, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that the area has a distinctive character nestled into the bush and there is a good community feel. The houses were all built by the same builder in the 1920s and have been carefully renovated to keep the feel of “coziness” and not to destroy the original style.</p> <p>However, the submitter would like to see a waiver of extra fees that might apply for small alterations to heritage buildings. Lowering rates could also help. The submitter would like to be sure that small alterations like building a fence or French doors would still be possible. The submitter would also like the Council to look at protecting the bush reserve land around Salisbury Garden Court to avoid townhouse development on the land.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
41	Stanley William Pillar	7 Aplin Terrace, Ngaio, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that the housing group is an early example of affordable housing in an interesting social situation</p>			

<p>on a piece of land with, in those times, difficult access.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area is extended to include 133-139 Cecil Road as these buildings were built at the same time by the same builder and have similar floor plans (drawings provided).</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan and 133-139 Cecil Road are also included in the Heritage Area.</p>			
42	Kathleen Margaret Ford	14a Salisbury Garden Court, Cecil Road, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>In general, the submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan but does raise reservations with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The buildings are homes which need to be adapted, improved or repaired to meet expectations of change over time. The submitter questions whether the owners will still be able to make changes and what are the costs and restrictions</li> <li>• The submitter would like to see a firm commitment from the Council to contribute to architectural advice, fee waiver and construction costs</li> <li>• The access to the site has protected the buildings over time. They have stayed fairly simple and reasonably original without heritage listing. This will remain so, more or less, whether they are listed or not</li> <li>• The path which all of the householders use is integral and vital to the Salisbury Garden Court set up. The submitter would like assurance that the path is included as part of the listing and will be eligible for funding for maintenance</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan but clear information about what the Council will provide to householders if the houses are listed.</p>			
43	Bronwen Wall	9 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating it will enhance protection of the heritage values of the area, enhance the community atmosphere of the area and limit any developments that would destroy the unique character of the community.</p> <p>The submitter also states that Council should waive cost implications for any resident wishing to make renovations to their homes that do not affect the footprint of the home, such as adding windows, French doors etc.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.</p>			
44	Humphrey Bruce Elton	6 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating there does not seem to be an interest of willingness by Council to tailoring the listing to suit the inhabitants/owners of particular buildings. Once an area is listed the rules may be changed without consent of the affected properties, apart from the mechanism of general public consultation. Once a property is locked into a system where the owners have no more rights than anyone else is dangerous and unfair.</p> <p>The submitter states that the current structure where every proposed change to the dwelling incurs an additional fee is both grossly unfair and punitive. The current fee structure is tuned towards grand re-ramps which is not applicable to the way the houses on Salisbury Garden Court have been changed over the years.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern with insurance companies refusing to renew policies when informed the houses were to be listed and also real estate agencies saying that heritage listing would be a slight</p>			

drawback when trying to sell. So this proposal could be costing house owners somewhere in the region of \$6-10 thousand dollars.

The submitter states that no carrot has been offered for example, rates rebates. Why should heritage owners be saddled with additional fees?

The submitter believes that the houses were built on a shoestring budget and are little different from other small houses in Wellington of similar vintage. The sizes of changes over the years have been defined by the bad access – heritage listing will add no more protection than the access has done for the last 75 years. The listing will not benefit the majority of owners who would like to change their houses (i.e. for growing households). The listing will only be suitable for people whose personal circumstances are not changing and unlikely to change. If adopted the listing will actually ruin this slightly special cluster of houses by destroying the circumstances that allowed its character to become what it is.

**Decision Requested:**

That Salisbury Garden Court is not included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.

45	Jonty Ritchie and Tessa Meek	11 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	No
----	------------------------------	--	----

The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.

The submitters **oppose** the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that while the Court has an interesting history, the houses themselves are not of particular historical significance. There are very many of this style of house echoed throughout New Zealand. The community aspect of the Court would change with the listing, causing people to move due to added cost and complication of building housing additions. Young families may be put off from living in the Court, attracting and completely different populations, forever changing the very community aspect that was initially set out to preserve. Salisbury Garden Court is under threat from the sale of the surrounding bush (private reserve) which would spoil the rare urban/rural feel of the area.

The submitter's house is under sized and the wait and costs involved in the consent process could force them to move. Additional complications would result in unnecessary stress.

**Decision Requested:**

That Salisbury Garden Court is not included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.

46	Jonathan Kennett	9 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	Yes
----	------------------	---	-----

The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.

The submitter **supports** the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that the listing will recognise the heritage values of this unique area and will promote their protection. The heritage values of the area will increase with time. Effective protection requires a regulatory approach from Council. A city without heritage is a city without soul.

**Decision Requested:**

That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.

47	Clair MacDonald	8 Salisbury Garden Court, Wadestown, Wellington	Yes
----	-----------------	---	-----

The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.

The submitter **supports** the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan and considers that the area has a unique historic, architectural and historic heritage value that is worthy of protection. The obscurity of Salisbury Garden Court has significantly helped to maintain the heritage value, but it is changing and the risk of the heritage value being lost is now quite high.

The submitter believes that Council should work with the house owners to clarify and document the restrictions and incentives as there is currently no common understanding of the consequences of the listing among the residents. Further, the Council should waive resource consent fees, at least for projects costing less than \$10,000. Rates relief should also be considered. The Council should provide a list of things that do not require consent and provide assurance that a cable car could also be installed in the future.

The surrounding bush should also be protected.

**Decision Requested:**

That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.

48	Murray Pillar and Jane Kelly	291c Tinakori Road, Thorndon, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan stating that the Court is a unique living community concept.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Salisbury Garden Court is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan.</p>			
49	Dean Knight, Rhys Knight and Alan Wendt	P.O. Box 25466, Panama Street, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area.</p> <p>In principle, the submitters support the creation of a Heritage Area for Salisbury Garden Court in the District Plan but believe that the controls are too restrictive and go beyond what is necessary to preserve any heritage values. Therefore the submitters <b>oppose</b> the Plan Change and/or seek amendments. The following concerns have been raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is limited only to Plan Change 58 when Plan Change 43 rules are also applicable. The uncertainty of DPC 43 makes it difficult to form a view on the merits of heritage listing and the proposed controls. The submitters participation rights have been undermined and seek that Council allow them to make a submission on the substance of DPC 43</li> <li>• The section 32 report is cursory and flawed as it fails to adequately recognise the costs imposed on property owners though increased development costs, resource consent fees and potential loss in value</li> <li>• The heritage report overstates the values of the area</li> <li>• The original generic houses of Salisbury Garden Court have been incrementally modified over time. The proposal listing prevents owners of largely unaltered houses from continuing that tradition of modification. The traditional incremental changes are likely to continue and the need to obtain a resource consent is disproportionate to the nature of the works</li> <li>• The usefulness of the Heritage Incentive Fund is overstated and potentially over-allocated. It may not be feasible to apply for funding for all incremental changes</li> <li>• The listing would potentially remove owners ability to regularise cross lease properties as of right and minimise the amount of permissible earthworks</li> <li>• The proposed area goes beyond what is necessary to protect the values of the area (i.e. includes the lower gully and path). The heritage area includes a derelict shed on submitter's property that should not be included in the boundaries of the proposed area. A map is provided detailing the suggested amended boundary line</li> <li>• The uncertainty of the proposed control make it difficult to form a view on the merits of listing, e.g. the difference between the significance of Salisbury Garden Court v Cuba Street</li> <li>• Council should explore mechanisms for waiving resource consent fees</li> <li>• Specific controls for Salisbury Garden Court could be introduced. Submitter has provided specific permitted, controlled and discretionary activities tailored for Salisbury Garden Court.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That site specific controls are introduced, an amendment is made to the proposed boundaries and an explicit provision for the waiver of resource consent fees is adopted for Salisbury Garden Court. Alternately, the removal of Salisbury Garden Court from the current heritage listings.</p>			
50	Hamish Groves	27 Milton Street, Berhampore, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 121 The Parade, Island Bay being included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area. The submitter appreciates the architectural nature of the property and recognises its historic importance. However, the submitter is concerned that the proposal will add significant additional time and costs to the consent process unnecessarily restrict the ability for the property to be enhanced; and cause financial detriment by destroying some of the potential capital value of property.</p>			

<p>The submitter is proposing to redevelop the rear of the property for residential purposes. The development will provide funding for the upkeep of the building, but if it is not permitted the shops will potentially cease to become a financially viable proposition.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 121 The Parade, Island Bay is not included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area or that Council provide assurance the proposal will not incur additional time and costs under the consent process and not restrict the scope of the building.</p>			
51	Barbara Louise Hoskins	3 Valley Road, Island Bay, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan and states that there are not many commercial areas such as this remaining in Wellington and should be preserved for future generations to enable them to gain a greater understanding of the way people lived in the earlier part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
52	Patricia Mary Hutchinson	285 The Parade, Island Bay, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan and considers the proposal as a serious appointment to preserve the village atmosphere that exists in the Bay. The proposal is perhaps the one and only opportunity to protect the historic facades of the buildings that remain unchanged. Let's salute the past.</p> <p>The submitter also provides extended historic information, particularly on people who have been associated with the buildings to add to the Area's assessment profile.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
53	Brian and Cynthia Coomber	179 The Parade, Island Bay, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitters strongly <b>support</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan stating that there is strong community interest in recording and preserving what is left of the early days of Island Bay. The buildings remaining in the village are fine examples of early commercial architecture and provide vivid memories of the owners and suppliers to this community for many older residents. It is important these buildings are protected for future generations.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
54	Wellington Southern Bays Historical Society Inc. C/o Cynthia Coomber	179 The Parade, Island Bay, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter strongly <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan stating that Island Bay has a long and proud history in Wellington and there is strong community interest in recording and preserving what is left of the early days of Island Bay. The buildings remaining in the village are fine examples of early commercial architecture and provide vivid memories of the owners and suppliers to this community for many older residents. It is important these buildings are protected for future generations.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
55	Raj Patel	147 The Parade, Island Bay, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter vehemently <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 147 The Parade, Island Bay being included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area. The submitter appreciates that the Council wishes to preserve</p>			

<p>heritage buildings in the Wellington City region, but in adopting this proposal, it is using private funding to achieve its own means, and suggests that the Committee and Councillors would not wish to make a strategic investment only to have it undermined by another party. If Council is enthusiastic about the heritage appeal of the city, it should be purchasing buildings outright. Council could then use its own resources to maintain the building. To expect private citizens to use their own funds to advance the Councils agenda is reprehensible.</p> <p>The proposed listing will definitely undermine its value and disadvantage the owners of the building(s). There is no doubt that the proposed Heritage Area would undermine the value of the building and had the submitter known of the proposal he wouldn't have purchased it. The purchase was made unencumbered by any restriction and to enforce such a significant alteration on the terms of conduct of their properties is untenable.</p> <p>The submitter believes the building is of no particular architectural merit and no longer reflects the original appearance of the building at the time it was constructed.</p> <p>The building is at an age where it requires significant maintenance. The value of the land is the location rather than the building. The proposed Heritage Area removes the option of redevelopment or reconstruction.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That 147 The Parade, Island Bay is not included in the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p>			
56	Maggie Edwards	39 Clyde Street, Island Bay, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Island Bay Village Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Island Bay in the District Plan stating that Wellington seems to be keen to get rid of its history. 'Ordinary' suburban centres are just as important as central city buildings when it comes to recording or architectural heritage and the history of the area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Island Bay Village is included as a Heritage Area in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
57	Ross and Vicky Hughson	100 Hobson Street, Thorndon, Island Bay	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of 100 Hobson Street.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the proposed listing of their house as it has imposed a severe penalty on them. Not only does the listing mean a financial penalty for their family but it also impacts emotionally. Their rights to a family home have been severely diminished.</p> <p>The listing is prejudicial to the submitter's rights as homeowners.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That 100 Hobson Street is not listed on the District Plan and that Council undertakes a review of its processes in advising owners of potential heritage listing of properties.</p>			
58	The Thorndon Society Inc. C/o Bruce Paul Lynch	22 Burnell Avenue, Thorndon, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of 100 Hobson Street.</p> <p>The Society <b>support</b> the listing of the building stating that it is an 1883 building on an important corner site neighbouring the Katherine Mansfield birthplace. The listing will help ensure that the building and the site are protected in future, should ownership of the property change, to maintain it's residential and heritage character.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That 100 Hobson Street is included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
59	Wellington Heritage and Conservation Trust C/o James A Beard	17 Talavera Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of 100 Hobson Street.</p> <p>The Trust <b>supports</b> the listing of the building. Built in 1883, the property is an important part of North Thorndon and has special historic, social, cultural and architectural values. The House has pseudo-Georgian detailing, an unusual feature in late 1800's north Thorndon, where Tuscan style houses were more generally used. The aesthetic value of its architecture is of a high order with appealing proportions.</p>			

<p>The Corner site building has a significant townscape value.</p> <p>The Trust believes that 100 Hobson Street and the area bounded by Park Street, Grant Road, Thorndon Quay and Fitzherbert Terrace should be incorporated in a Mansfield Conservation Precinct. The Trust references Open Space Society Monthly Opinions Suppositions Issues Statements 57, 61 and 63.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 100 Hobson Street is included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
60	Katherine Mansfield Birthplace Society Inc C/o Greg Thomas	25 Tinakori Road	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of 100 Hobson Street.</p> <p>The Society <b>supports</b> the inclusion of 100 Hobson Street on the heritage list.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 100 Hobson Street is included in the District Plan heritage inventory.</p>			
61	Oroya Day	6 Pinelands Avenue, Seatoun, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of 100 Hobson Street.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the whole of the Plan Change, particularly the inclusion of 100 Hobson Street, stating that the building speaks for itself with its social, architectural and business history. It is a key position in the cultural heritage of New Zealand. The past is Wellington's identity. History makes nationhood.</p> <p>The submitter provides detailed information on the land history and evidence for the date of the building, subdivision of the land and information on the first owner Walter Nathan (1846-1922). The submitter also discusses the building, the architect and townscape value. The submitter elaborates on the parliamentary, business and social links, especially the vital link to Katherine Mansfield New Zealand short stories (where the house acts as the background in the stories Prelude and The Aloe). The submitter also discusses the community value of the building and the notable home plaque.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 100 Hobson Street is included in the District Plan heritage list.</p>			
62	Hong Nguyen	5 North, 267 Wakefield Street, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House stating that the building has no architectural features, just a plain box with holes in the concrete walls. The submitter cannot see any hallmarks that this building has to qualify its heritage. It has no decorative features and has been wrongly recommended to be listed as a heritage building.</p> <p>The building is old, tired and desperately in need of a lot of money to be spent on it to bring it up to standards. The listing would have serious financial impacts on the economic on the value of the land. The financial burdens the listing would impose would be unfair to the owner, whose family live in Vietnam and rely heavily on the building's income to survive.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
63	Douglas John Foster	62 Weld Street, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House stating that the building façade is not meritorious and the interior of the building and roofline are unexceptional. The surrounding buildings are not heritage either.</p> <p>The building has no special intrinsic qualities and it does no warrant heritage status</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
64	John Roger Kerswill	30 Arika Road, Hataitai, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.</p>			

<p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House stating that the building has no architectural merit and the fact that the wool board built it does really make it a heritage building. They deserted it and built another building near by.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
65	Sarah Beckford	28 Derry Hill, Churton Park, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter strongly <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it does not come up to the standard of a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
66	Graeme Welch	143 Featherston Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it does not have architectural significance.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
67	Claudia Vu	8 Doncaster Terrace, Ascot Park, Porirua	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it has no hallmark architecturally. It is unfair.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
68	Ty Dallas	23 Paddington Grove, Karori, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is insignificant and does nothing for the city.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
69	Phoumy Sythong	8 Doncaster Terrace, Ascot Park, Porirua	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it would impose a financial burden on the owners and its people could not financially upkeep the building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
70	Amanda Legge	Duddings Line, RD 1, Featherston, 5771	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is so simple, plain and has no architectural features to be listed as heritage.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
71	Bounthanh Sythong	8 Doncaster Terrace, Ascot Park, Porirua	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is looks like a plain concrete building as has not special architectural merit and is not worth adding to the heritage list.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p>			

That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.			
72	Mark Dunastchik	9 Wilkinson Street, Oriental Parade, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it shows no architectural value whatsoever and is of no significance to the city.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
73	Nicholas Lee Olsen-Jame	Flat 9/781 Fergusson Drive, Trentham, Upper Hutt	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it doesn't look that old with new looking windows and all square – no heritage traits. The listing will impose financial hardship.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
74	Gerald Thomas Moore	17 Manuka Street, Stokes valley, Lower Hutt	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it has no architectural appeal and should not be listed. The listing will impose financial hardship on the owner.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
75	Grant Williams	87c Overton Terrace, Hataitai, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it looks far too modern to be considered a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
76	Peter Graeme Johnstone	1/70 Webb Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as there are more deserving cases for protection and its retention adds to the 'ad hoc' nature of development in that area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
77	Leah Bradley	4 Brooklyn Terrace, Brooklyn, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it has no architectural merit or features that would put this onto a list as a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
78	Everard Aspell	34 Bayview Terrace, Oriental Parade, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is a modern building and has no decorative value interest. It is better to conserve actual old buildings of value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			

79	Ruth Mallon	267 Wakefield Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it does not look heritage as the building looks too modern.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
80	Richard Voss	267 Wakefield Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it has no special architectural value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
81	Charlotte Emma McGrath	63 Wilkie Crescent, Naenae, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it has no special architectural value.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
82	Alexis Davidson-Johnstone	1/70 Webb Street, Te Aro, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it shows no sign or character of coming into the category of being a heritage building. There are buildings that have been erected in Wellington city with the same boring character – does the Council intend to turn these into heritage also?</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
83	V & R Consultants Limited.	P.O. Box 3510, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is of a very plain appearance and does not provide visually a character of heritage quality. Plain concrete with an average glass façade is a nothing look.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
84	Christine Roberts	53 Palliser Road, Roseneath, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it does not warrant such a listing.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
85	Grant Leigh Hodgson	82 Hobson Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is not of sufficient architectural, aesthetic or historic importance compared to other buildings which are listed.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.</p>			
86	Jonathan Crawford	P.O. Box 10535, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington. The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is simply an ordinary 1950's commercial building with no historic value and should not be given heritage status. Just look at the drab</p>			

side elevation!			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.			
87	Grant Young	26 Para Street, Miramar, Wellington	No
The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.			
The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it is not worthy of recognition as a heritage building. A heritage listing would inhibit future leasing prospects and restrict any owner from fully utilising the asset			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.			
88	Brent Dewhurst	67 Waiuta Street, Titahi Bay	No
The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.			
The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it devalues the term 'heritage' as applied to buildings which deserve the listing. Old Wool house does definitely not merit being described as a heritage building.			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.			
89	Deb Watkins	67 Waiuta Street, Titahi bay	No
The submission relates to the proposed listing of Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street, Wellington.			
The submitter <b>opposes</b> the proposed listing of Old Wool House as it still looks modern and has no heritage value. It also unfairly imposes financial burden on the owner.			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
That Old Wool House, 139-141 Featherston Street is removed from the proposed heritage list.			