

# ***Summary of Submissions***

## ***Proposed District Plan Change 75***

**Centres Heritage Areas**  
7 September 2010



**Absolutely**

**POSITIVELY**

ME HEKE KI PŌNEKE  
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL

**Wellington**



# Proposed District Plan Change 75

## Centres Heritage Areas.

### Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Gin Young	6 Rewa Road, Hataitai, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the heritage listing of 318 Tinakori Road, Thorndon. The submitter's building was built in 2007 and is not a heritage building. The proposed plan change is anti-change, anti-business, anti-progress and adds more bureaucracy which will contribute to the decline of the Tinakori Village. The resource consent process is too slow and costly for most people.</p> <p>The submitter wants more positive changes to make Tinakori Village more appealing and to tackle parking and traffic problems. Suggested changes include the introduction of judder bars, the removal of coupon parking and introduction of short term or residents parking.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Maintain the status quo for 318 Tinakori Road, i.e. the same as now.</p>			
2	Perry Lark	29 Rimu Road, Kelburn, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 273 Tinakori Road as part of the proposed heritage area. The building does not warrant heritage status. The building is a mish-mash of two buildings with limited importance. The heritage area will restrict the owner's ability to apply for consents to do building work to extend.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> To exclude 273 Tinakori Road from being part of the heritage area.</p>			
3	Jeremy Smith The Realm Tavern and Bottle Store	17B Moxham Avenue, Hataitai, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a heritage area for Hataitai in the District Plan. There is no logical reason why the Hataitai shopping area is remotely historic. The shops are uninspiring, scruffy and tired.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That Council spends money upgrading the shopping centre. There will be no benefit in declaring the area a historic area.</p>			
4	Gwyneth Trevor Bright & Timothy H.R. Bright	5 Ocean Parade, Pukerua Bay 5026	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitters <b>support</b> the provisions in proposed District Plan Change 75 "to further recognise and protect the Aro Street heritage buildings and environs".</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That the Aro Valley shops are recognised as a heritage area in the District Plan.</p>			
5	Francesca Brice	1 Epuni Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a heritage area in Aro Street. The heritage area would give Council</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
and individuals associated with the Council too much power.			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
To revoke this proposal for Aro Valley.			
6	Peter Frater	90 Britomart Street, Berhampore, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p>			
<p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a heritage area on the eastern side of Adelaide Road and Riddiford Street in the District Plan. Apart from the collective owners of this group of shops wishing to retain the right to redevelop their buildings, this area is required for road widening. The John Street intersection has a confluence of four main traffic streams and needs an additional lane on the eastern side to allow for turning hospital traffic or southern bound traffic. Road widening will allow for a clear lane of parking. The heritage area will maintain the current traffic imbroglio and WCC should look at moving all the buildings eastward.</p>			
<p>Most of the land is owned by Capital Coast District Health Board and has previously been designated for road widening. The John Street intersection needs to be workable and suitable as an entrance to Newtown, providing a transition from the redeveloped Adelaide Road.</p>			
<p>Architecturally, a lot of the buildings have been greatly modified. There will be a large modernist building on the diagonally opposite corner leaving the intersection totally modified. The only architecturally unique building is the triangular building on the western corner.</p>			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			
<p>That a historic designation is not placed on the buildings on the eastern side of the junction of Adelaide Road and Riddiford Street.</p>			
7	Newtown Residents' Association (NRA) C/O Martin Hanley	PO Box 7021, Wellington South	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Berhampore (Rintoul Street) Shopping Centre Heritage Area, the John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area and the Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p>			
<p>The submitter <b>strongly supports</b> the creation of heritage areas for Berhampore and Newtown in the District Plan. Heritage is a significant underlying characteristic that contributes to the unique atmosphere of these suburbs. Preserving existing building stock is a sustainable use of existing resources and is to be encouraged. Sense of place and sense of history is preserved through the conservation and adaptation of the existing building fabric.</p>			
<p>The NRA wants the local built environment to make sense historically and does not want Newtown, Berhampore and Mt Cook to become a historical freeze frame. Newtown buildings are from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with renovated and infill buildings embodying materials and styles of their time. Having all those times represented in our building stock is an important characteristic of the local sense of place. A building should be chronologically readable and “of its time”.</p>			
<p>The fundamental principle of the use of past and present Newtown design guides is to identify the important characteristics of the existing built context and require these to be used when designing new buildings.</p>			
<p>NRA recommends the following amendments:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wording to clearly confirm the initiative established in DPC 40 and 73 that new construction is not about fake reproduction of heritage</li> <li>• Include 184, 211-221, 247-249 and 257 Riddiford Street in the heritage area. Investigate heritage listing of 259 Mansfeild Street</li> <li>• Create a single storey heritage area for 211-221 Riddiford Street, with rules confirming set back upper level additions are permissible</li> <li>• Establish an advisory panel of professionals, local experts and council officers to comment on and assist resource consents in Newtown Centre</li> </ul>			
<b>Decision Requested:</b>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
That Plan Change 75 is approved to also include 184, 211-221, 247-249 and 257 Riddiford Street in the Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area. Clarify in the Newtown Suburban Centre Design Guide that new structures are not meant to be fake historical replicas.			
8	Mandy Joseph	115 Hamilton Road, Hataitai, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 277-279 Tinakori Road as part of the proposed heritage area and considers that the building should be identified as “non-heritage” for the purposes of Rule 21B.2.2.</p> <p>277-279 Tinakori Road is a 2 storied building that was built in the 1990’s. The building is constructed of new materials and contains replica character features such as a double parapet, double hung windows and a verandah.</p> <p>The plan change threatens the ability to economically realise the development potential of the site. The submitter agrees with the conservation of heritage buildings and areas, but considers there is an absurdity to assigning heritage value to entirely new buildings, especially where this will have an economic impact on the value or potential value on that site.</p> <p>Similarly, the submitter notes that in the Appendix 11, Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area, 17 Moxham Ave has been identified as a non-heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 277-279 Tinakori Road should be identified as a non-heritage building for the purpose of Rule 21B.2.2.</p>			
9	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington 6011	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the proposed Centres Heritage Area Plan Change 75.</p> <p>The plan change should be extended to include the creation of a waterfront heritage area from Aotea Quay to the Port Nicholson Yacht Club.</p> <p>The current backlog of items awaiting heritage assessment should be remedied. A small team of dedicated qualified heritage architects/planners should be established to ensure that this unfair situation is remedied promptly.</p> <p>A community consultative heritage committee should be established to ensure suitable renovation and protection of historic heritage buildings, structures, vegetation and sites.</p> <p>Any additions to historic heritage buildings must be congruent in colour, style and location of the original building or structure.</p> <p>A statement should be included that clearly states where Centres Heritage Areas fits in relation to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Coastal Plan, Historic Places Act and the ICOMOS Charter.</p> <p>The District Plan should protect all or any historic heritage stock whether owned by the Council, Port Authority, OnTrack, or by any other private, commercial bodies or individuals until such time as Council has completed a full audit of each Wellington suburb to ascertain the historical record and provide protection from demolition or removal from a site of a heritage buildings and or structures.</p> <p>A register of mature, visually prominent trees and bush should be established, with the ultimate goal that all vegetation is afforded the protection of the District Plan. A separate recording system should be established and encouraged; whereby all new flora are recorded for posterity.</p> <p>Heritage trees felled on purpose or inadvertently, should be replaced within a reasonable time with a large tree of the same species. The original tree should be memorialised as above.</p> <p>All heritage buildings and structures demolished with consent and after public notification should be memorialised with a plaque which is visible from the street. This plaque should be paid for by the demolisher; who should also be responsible for the erection of a map-board/legend telling the history of the site and of the demolished building or structure.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Plan Change 75 is adopted but with certain additions as described.</p>			
10	Peter James Cox	163 Adelaide Road, Newtown, Wellington	Yes

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter strongly <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area over the properties located at 161, 163, 169 and 171 Adelaide Road. The buildings are in no way part of the John Street shopping area and have been altered over the years.</p> <p>When the dwelling at 171 Adelaide Road was built there was no shop frontage. 163 Adelaide Road has been considerably changed from its original appearance. The “Dock Way” (163 Adelaide Road) now has a new doorway and window. 161 Adelaide Road’s exterior is considerably changed, with the original windows changed and weatherboards removed and replaced with hardi-flex type sheets which are modern and not sympathetic to the buildings original appearance. All the buildings have had numerous lean-to additions to the rear.</p> <p>169 Adelaide Road (without the later lean-tos) is the only building that could qualify for heritage merit.</p> <p>Council Officers agreed to exclude the rear lean-tos from the heritage area, with a line to be drawn to the rear of 163, 169 and 171 leaving the remainder of the land available (over 3 sections) to the redeveloped. The map now shows the whole of this land included in the area.</p> <p>Because of the cost of continued maintenance and other WCC requirements, the submitter strongly objects to any heritage designation being placed on the properties as it is apparent the buildings are reaching the end of their economic life. The submitter could not rely on the WCC Built Heritage Fund for maintenance, as this is based on a first come first serve until the money runs out.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 161, 163, 169 and 171 Adelaide Road be deleted from DCP75 Centres Heritage Areas.</p>			
11	Telecom New Zealand Limited	Telecom New Zealand Limited Incite (Wellington) Limited, PO Box 2058, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of the Hataitai Exchange building at 32-34 Waitoa Road in the Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area. The building was constructed as a Post Office and telephone exchange in the 1950’s and is still predominately used today as a utility site (telephone exchange and telecommunications site). The site is designated in the District Plan as T3: Hataitai Exchange. If the building was included in the proposed heritage area, the heritage values would need to be considered for any future outline plans of work. As an Exchange, there is likely to be future external changes and the proposed heritage area would result in restrictions on the future use and development of the utility site.</p> <p>The building is utilitarian and not consistent with the other selected buildings to be included in the heritage area in terms of character and continuity. The submitter considers the value of the building (warranting its inclusion into the heritage area) is unwarranted and unnecessary and will potentially impact on the provision of telecommunications services as a result.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>Amend the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area boundary to exclude the Hataitai Exchange at 32-34 Waitoa Road.</p>			
12	Greater Wellington Regional Council	C/O Rachel Pawson 142 Wakefield Street, Wellington	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> District Plan Change 75.</p> <p>The submitter considers that DPC 75 is generally consistent with the Operative Regional Policy Statement (1995) and the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (2009) (PRPS).</p> <p>In terms of historic heritage values, the PRPS identifies Policies 20 and 21 which must be given effect to by regional, city and district plans. DPC75 has undertaken an assessment to determine the heritage significance of each area. This assessment process aligns with Policy 20 of the PRPS. The area would be protected by DPC43 (heritage provisions) which is consistent with Policy 22 of the PRPS.</p> <p>Policies 29 and 30 of the PRPS requires city or district Councils to identify significant centres and support intensification to maintain and enhance viability and vibrancy. The submitter does not consider that DPC75 is in conflict with these policies.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
No decision requested.			
13	Michael Brett Mainey	6 Clermont Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for the John Street intersection in the District Plan. The submitter owns 187 Adelaide Road which was purchased in 2007 with the express intention of redeveloping the site with a new building up to 4 stories high in accordance with the (operative suburban centres) zoning.</p> <p>The existing building is not economically viable to retain. Engineers have confirmed the building has structural problems and is suffering from deferred maintenance related damage. The submitter does not want to earthquake strengthen the building as it is beyond economical salvage.</p> <p>The building does not have historic value. It is a simple box structure with various add-ons which lack interest. Accordingly it is not worth retaining.</p> <p>The submitter has applied for demolition consent and will be applying for resource consent to redevelop the site.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the proposed Plan Change at John Street/Adelaide Road not go ahead.</p>			
14	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	C/O Sacha Walters PO Box 19173, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> District Plan Change 75.</p> <p>The remnants of historic suburban town centres, including the commercial buildings, has created a sense of identity and place which is important to each of the Centres identified. This allows people to experience in some way a taste of how past generations lived and to develop a greater understanding of our history and identity.</p> <p>The heritage area assessment reports are a thorough examination of the heritage values of the commercial buildings in these areas, offering a compelling argument for their protection.</p> <p>NZHPT is supportive of the requirement to gain a discretionary resource consent for the demolition of any building protected in the identified heritage areas.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Council adopt Plan Change 75 – Centres Heritage Areas, as notified.</p>			
15	Robyn Sivewright	100 Aro Street	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter conditionally <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Aro Valley in the District Plan but notes that there may be a financial cost on increased insurance premiums.</p> <p>The heritage area will help conserve early 19<sup>th</sup> century streetscape and avoid architectural nightmares depending on fashion of the moment. It is a living working area which is maintained by the architecture/buildings.</p> <p>The submitter would like all resource consent applications notified to the local community and property owners in the Centre.</p> <p>None of the buildings identified in the Aro Valley heriatge area are individually listed and are not able to access the Built Heritage Incentive Fund, contrary to what the (s32) report implies. Part of the fund should be set aside for heritage areas.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>To remove 3 Devon Street from the heritage area – it is not part of the proposed area.</p> <p>That these (proposed heritage area) buildings be rated in a new third category that sits between residential and commercial rates.</p>			
16	Alan Joseph Fairless	PO Box 27435, Marion Square, Wellington	No
The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Aro Valley in the District Plan.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> No decision requested.</p>			
17	Jaqui Tutt	25 Epuni Street, Aro Valley, Wellington, 6021	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Aro Valley in the District Plan.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> No decision requested.</p>			
18	Julia Margaret Brooke-White	129 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington, 6021	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Aro Valley in the District Plan.</p> <p>The submitter raises a concern that the resource consent granted at 85 Aro Street (behind the fish and chip shop) will result in a development which be very visible and detrimental to the heritage values of the area.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> To reverse the decision which was made on 85 Aro Street, without public notification, to adversely affect the high heritage values of the Aro Street shops by allowing a modern block of flats in its very heart.</p>			
19	Lisa Thompson	195 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington, 6021	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter strongly <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for Aro Valley in the District Plan.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern about the impact of the suburban centre boundary (as detailed in Plan Change 73) and the likelihood that this (extension of commercial zoning) will undermine the proposed heritage protection in this Plan Change.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That the Plan Change be approved. That consideration and the appropriate measures be taken regarding the potential impact of Plan Change 73.</p>			
20	Roland Sapsford	23 Epuni Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> Plan Change 75, in particular the creation of a heritage area in the Aro Valley Centre.</p> <p>The heritage, character and amenity value of the Aro Valley suburban centre is significant both in its own right and in its contribution to the character, amenity and heritage values of Aro Valley as a whole.</p> <p>There is increased development pressure in this area, as evidenced by the large consented apartment building behind the fish and chip shop.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Include the heritage assessment and design guide circulated as part of Plan Change 73 (relating to Suburban Centres) so they can be used as part of the resource consent process. Ensure the boundaries of the Aro Valley heritage area accurately reflect the final boundaries of the Aro Valley Centre and Inner Residential Areas.</p>			
21	Aro Valley Community Council	C/O Jane O'Loughlin 48 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the District Plan Change in principle. The submitter has concerns about the increased cost of insurance that appears to result for buildings that have heritage status.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
That Council investigate the issue of insurance costs, and to work with the insurance industry to make sure these costs are not unreasonable.			
22	Dominic van Putter	52a Norton Park Ave, Fairfield, Lower Hutt	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area at the John Street Intersection. The area has already had upgrades (hospital, supermarket, Hirequip and McDonalds) so the rest of the area should follow alone.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the proposed plan change at Adelaide Road and John Street does not go ahead.</p>			
23	John Owen Kelman	30 Cunliffe Street, Johnsonville, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area in the John Street/Adelaide Road precinct in Newtown. It is not the Councils role introduce a plan change that will effectively prevent any redevelopment of land. If people think their buildings should be preserved, it should be up to them to buy and preserve them. The submitter sees little merit in retaining such dilapidated rotting structures.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>To stop the plan change.</p>			
24	John Joseph Dunphy	22 Shotter Street, Karori, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 16 Riddiford Street and 205 Adelaide Road in the heritage area. The proposed heritage area would undermine the value of the buildings. The purchase of the building was made unencumbered by any restriction and to force the proposal is untenable and would disadvantage the owners of the buildings. The proposed listing would restrict the ability to redevelop or alter property.</p> <p>Council should offer to buy or compensate for buildings it proposes to list.</p> <p>The building maybe earthquake prone. The listing would result in severe and unjustifiable financial and practicable difficulties.</p> <p>The building is not unattractive, but aesthetically it is not of high value and it has little or no architectural merit.</p> <p>The building requires significant maintenance. The value is in the land rather than the building. The proposal removes redevelopment or reconstruction options.</p> <p>The submitter notes the development at 194 and 200 Adelaide Road and feels that that development is at odds with the heritage area. WCC has allowed modern developments in the surrounding area, but yet will unfairly encumber the submitter with a heritage area.</p> <p>The submitter feels they were not adequately consulted on the proposal.</p> <p>The submitter raises concerns with renewing insurance policies and real estate agents saying the listing would be a slight.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 16 Riddiford Street and 205 Adelaide Road are removed from the proposed heritage area.</p>			
25	Christina van Zanten	The Moores Building 9-11 Riddiford Street, Newtown	No
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter wishes to <b>amend</b> the proposed District Plan Change 75. The submitter accepts keeping the front of the building the same, but <b>opposes</b> the requirement to gain resource consent at the back of the building because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are out of view</li> </ul>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are not in keeping with their original (heritage) design</li> <li>• The resource consent may cost more than the alteration/repair</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That if Council goes ahead with DPC 75, to apply the plan to the front of the building only.</p>
26	Emanate Holdings	PO Box 7314, Newtown, Wellington	Yes
			<p>The submission relates to the proposed Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 150 Riddiford Street being classified a heritage building. The building is simply a shed made of corrugated iron and has no merit being classified as a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> No decision requested.</p>
27	Trustees Virginia Trust	PO Box 7314, Newtown, Wellington	Yes
			<p>The submission relates to the proposed Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 138-140 Riddiford Street being classified a heritage building. The building is old with no particularly significant or outstanding architectural features or character. It has no merit in being classified as a heritage building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> No decision requested.</p>
28	Laura Newcombe	12 Riddiford Street, Newtown, Wellington	Yes
			<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a heritage area at the John Street Intersection. The submitter owns 12 Riddiford Street which is an already a listed building. The submitter did not object to the listing of her building because at the time she did not realise how unfair the provisions would be in terms of signage for her business.</p> <p>The heritage signage rules are too restrictive. This is unfair compared to the large amount of signage granted resource consent on the nearby supermarket and the other signage on her building that has "existing use rights". Council should remove this signage. It is grossly unfair that the submitter is restricted but yet the supermarket development gets everything.</p> <p>The submitter is opposed that Council would even consider that The Rice Bowl would have any heritage value.</p> <p>Most property owners look after these heritage buildings, without Council demands.</p> <p>Where is the residents parking that this heritage building is entitled to?</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> No decision requested.</p>
29	Naran and Premi Bhana	72 Moxham Avenue, Hataitai, Wellington	No
			<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area at Riddiford Street/John Street, specifically the inclusion of 7 Riddiford Street - the monolithic 2005 construction.</p> <p>The buildings in the area do not meet the consistency criteria set by Council as all buildings are of different eras and building materials. The buildings have changed markedly, with large scale rear additions and changes to interiors. The submitter particularly opposes the inclusion of rear additions on the eastern side of Riddiford Street, as they are not visible from the street, nor accessible to the public.</p> <p>The entire building behind 7 Riddiford Street's façade, including and below the veranda, is new and of block wall construction as per the resource consent granted in 2005. The back of the building comprises new monolithic clad apartments which are not visible from the street.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p>

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>That 7 Riddiford Street is excluded from the proposed area. Alternatively, only the front top portion of the façade, two feet above the veranda made heritage.</p> <p>Recognise that only the old John Street doctor's villa is of any cultural and heritage significance and that it should solely be made a heritage building.</p>			
30	Urmila Bhana	7 Riddiford Street, Newtown, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area at Riddiford Street/John Street, specifically the inclusion of 7 Riddiford Street - the monolithic 2005 construction.</p> <p>The buildings in the area do not meet the consistency criteria set by Council as all buildings are of different eras and building materials. The buildings have changed markedly, with large scale rear additions and changes to interiors. The submitter particularly opposes the inclusion of rear additions on the eastern side of Riddiford Street, as they are not visible from the street, nor accessible to the public.</p> <p>The entire building behind 7 Riddiford Street's façade, including and below the veranda, is new and of block wall construction as per the resource consent granted in 2005. The back of the building comprises new monolithic clad apartments which are not visible from the street.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That 7 Riddiford Street is excluded from the proposed area. Alternatively, only the front top portion of the façade, two feet above the veranda made heritage.</p> <p>Recognise that only the old John Street doctor's villa is of any cultural and heritage significance and that it should solely be made a heritage building.</p>			
31	Peter and Theodora Varuhas	PO Box 13453, Johnsonville, Wellington 6440	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area in Newtown because the provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impose additional unnecessary costs and regulations</li> <li>• Prevent the submitter from being able to deal with their properties as required</li> <li>• Restrict private property rights</li> <li>• Increase maintenance and compliance costs</li> <li>• Reduce the value of the properties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the proposed plan change be rejected.</p>			
32	Murray Pillar	291c Tinakori Road, Thorndon, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitter conditionally <b>supports</b> the creation of a Heritage Area for the Thorndon shops. The Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area cannot stand alone but needs to sit within a protocol that fully supports the heritage of the area. Consistently designed elements could include street and traffic signs, hard landscaping, street light, rubbish bins, seating etc.</p> <p>Conversion of retail buildings to residential does not contribute to the life and vibrancy of the street.</p> <p>Commercial heritage has to exist to facilitate the community's sense of place. This does come at a cost to building owners, therefore encouragement is required to maintain this commercial activity avoiding the community becoming just any group of buildings on a main traffic route.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the (Thorndon shops) heritage area within a greater urban design protocol that fully supports the heritage of the area.</p>			
33	Howard Anthony Eastment	18 Duppa Street, Berhampore, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	
<p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a heritage area at John Street/Adelaide Road. The submitter purchased 19, 21 and 23 Riddiford Street in 1993. The original property was constructed c1925. In 1993 a fish and chip shop on site closed because of financial reasons and poor physical structure of the rear fish factory add-on (indicating state of the building).</p> <p>The submitter currently has building works pending and difficulty in tenancing the building and securing finance (because of a lack of tenants). In addition, the building is also earthquake prone. The Council should consider buying the property.</p> <p>The listing would mean that the building owner is left to carry the cost of resource consents and the hassle of public notification. The submitter would like to build quality townhouses above and behind the shops which would mean some demolition work of the rear fish factory lean-to.</p> <p>The Built Heritage Incentive Fund could be spent on one building upgrade alone.</p> <p>The heritage change would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added cost and management to owners</li> <li>• Difficulty in on-selling the properties</li> <li>• Outside parties can object to and influence a project</li> <li>• Difficulty in obtaining finance</li> <li>• Replacing the character zoning which is not acceptable</li> <li>• Owners are being forced against their will (to accept the proposed heritage area)</li> <li>• Severe impacts on investment future</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Cancel the heritage listing for 19, 21 and 23 Riddiford Street, Newtown.</p>				
34	Simon Williams & Blair Rutherford	Simon Williams 4 Larch Grove Paraparaumu	Blair Rutherford 211 Rintoul Street Berhampore Wellington	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed Berhampore (Rintoul Street) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the creation of a heritage area at Berhampore, particularly the inclusion of 209 and 211 Rintoul Street. The submitters do not consider that the buildings contribute to the proposed heritage area or add to an understanding of historic heritage. The buildings can not reasonably be considered under S189 of the RMA (Heritage Order).</p> <p>This is an example of further poor planning policy by Council and appears to be a group scheduling without proper analysis or consideration. The submitter provides opinion from Salmond Reed Architects that the assessment process was insufficient and that the proposed area is unlikely to adequately protect the commercial heritage of the area.</p> <p>Targeted consultation was not followed up in Berhampore.</p> <p>209 Rintoul Street is substantially altered and has been used as a house for almost 30 years.</p> <p>In addition to the negative effects identified in the section 32 report, the proposed heritage area would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease the salability and market value of the properties</li> <li>• Increase compliance costs</li> <li>• Impact on private property rights</li> <li>• Increase maintenance costs</li> <li>• Increase restrictions/cost that could lead to inadequate maintenance and improvement to security and comfort</li> <li>• Create difficulties in making the properties more suitable for residential use</li> <li>• Decrease redevelopment options</li> <li>• Increase costs in securing professional services to assist with resource consents</li> <li>• The Built Heritage Incentive fund carries bureaucratic expectation and is not adequate compensation for the negative impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> That the provisions of the Proposed District Plan Change be amended such that, should the proposed Berhampore Heritage Area be established, the contents and boundaries be amended such that 209 and 211 Rintoul Street are shown to be non-contributing buildings, in that they do not add significantly to the</p>				

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
35	The Architecture Centre	PO Box 24178, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the plan change in its current state, but do support the intention behind it.</p> <p>The submitter feels the proposed heritage areas has become confused with character (vs Heritage). For Example, Thorndon appears to be bias towards Victoriana, even though the buildings have been built in the 1980's.</p> <p>Buildings must be more than 'old' to be heritage. Newer, younger buildings of strong design quality maybe considered heritage as well.</p> <p>The proposed heritage areas represent marginal retailing locations; they are typically run down and poorly maintained. Many older buildings have substantive newer elements which could hardly be considered to be of heritage or character merit.</p> <p>There is no real financial incentive for owners of these buildings to carry out expensive repair work to bring them up to their former glory. Current permitted uses could be reconsidered in order to bring some life back to these areas. A line needs to be drawn on whether to include residential buildings or not.</p> <p>The submitter suggests the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorndon – Designate 275A, 287, 332, 310, 318 and 332 Tinakori Road as non-heritage. Include 338-340 Tinakori Road and the brick wall between 275 and 275A Tinakori Road as heritage.</li> <li>• Aro Valley – Designate 93a and 97 Aro Street as non-heritage. Include 3 Epuni Street and 3-5 Devon Street as heritage.</li> <li>• John Street Intersection – designate 17, 19, 21 and 23 Riddiford Street as non-heritage.</li> <li>• Newtown – Designate 10 and 14 Rintoul Street and 156-162 and 191-191A Riddiford Street as non-heritage. Include 139 Riddiford Street as heritage.</li> <li>• Hataitai – Designate 7 Moxham Avenue and 24B Waitoa Road as non-heritage. Include 17A Moxham Avenue as heritage.</li> <li>• Berhampore – include 454 Adelaide Road and group of buildings south of this as heritage.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter would also like to see various buildings recognised in Brooklyn and consideration given to the mix of buildings in Kilbirnie. Other areas worthy of inclusion are Miramar, Seatoun, Karori and Kelburn.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the Plan Change is revisited.</p>			
36	Martin Road	40 Raroa Road, Kelburn, Wellington, 6012	
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the proposed heritage areas in Plan Change 75. The support is based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The heritage areas are a natural result of the alignment of Acts, policies and 'tools' to protect Wellington's heritage.</li> <li>• The low number of objections to the proposal, and therefore a large amount of support. The concerns raised by those that did not support the proposed areas have been already eliminated or can be minimised.</li> <li>• The small number of buildings being impacted by the plan change, and the low level of the impact of the plan change (i.e. the total proposed suburban centre heritage areas amount to less than 0.2% of the total rating units in Wellington). There are only 3-4 comparable 'areas listing in the District Plan. All of the areas identified are located on primary or secondary frontages meaning resource consent would be required for external changes. Building owners can apply for resource consent fee reimbursement.</li> <li>• The value of a heritage area compared to individual heritage listings. An individually listed building is not restricted on replacement (should the building be lost). In an area, a replacement building can be designed in sympathy to the rest of the area. Heritage area can create greater pride in an area, foster greater community spirit and raise property values (e.g. Tarikaka Street).</li> <li>• The Adelaide Road area heritage value and risk. The submitter provides a historical overview of 169, 171 and 175 Adelaide Road which were built by the submitter's ancestor. Redevelopment plans for Adelaide road could impact on the buildings, should the area not proceed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the six suburban centres as detailed in proposed plan change 75 are adopted.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
37	Estate Nelson Young	C/O Chiu and Cain Law Level 2, Real Estate Institute House, 354 Lambton Quay, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the inclusion of 24 Waitoa Road, Hataitai as part of the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <p>The building is not of such social, historical, technical or architectural value that the proposed listing as a heritage site is warranted. It is not listed in the NZHPT register as a property of heritage significance. The designation as a heritage building will prevent the proper and continuing use of the building.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That the property at 24 Waitoa Road, Hataitai, Wellington not be listed in the District Plan as a heritage building.</p>			
38	Brian Main	PO Box 16094, Wellington South	Yes
<p>The submission relates to the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area</p> <p>The submitter <b>opposes</b> the creation of a Heritage Area at the John Street intersection. The submitter owns 1-3 and 5 Riddiford Street and has a very long association with the area.</p> <p>The heritage assessment report is full of glaring errors (examples given).</p> <p>The buildings that exist today are a result of present and past owners refurbishing them and bringing them from the brink of ruin, following the removal of a proposed Council road widening scheme. Many of the architectural features described in the heritage assessment are not original and are from building recyclers.</p> <p>Some of the facades do create an attractive streetscape, but signage in the area detracts from this. There are several items that are not heritage. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Carport at 175 Adelaide Road</li> <li>• Rear additions at 179 and 181 Adelaide Road</li> <li>• Rear c1998 additions at 183 Adelaide Road</li> <li>• Rear c1994 additions at 191 Adelaide Road</li> <li>• The 1995 brick wall at 191 Adelaide Road</li> <li>• Rear of 7 Riddiford Street constructed in 2008</li> <li>• Rear of 15 Riddiford Street constructed c2002</li> <li>• Rear of 27 Riddiford Street constructed c2003</li> </ul> <p>In addition 17, 16, 18 &amp; 20 and 19-23 Riddiford Street are single story and do not fit into the area. The heritage area would deny owners the ability to build above and create opportunities for infill housing.</p> <p>Specifically concerning 1-3 Riddiford Street, in 1993 all internal walls, wall linings, doors etc had been removed by the Hospital Board. All internal character has been recreated. Original rear wash houses and WC's have been removed. The shop fronts were altered c1927.</p> <p>Number 5 Riddiford is a new building constructed in 1998. This creates an interesting precedent in Council policy to recognising brand new buildings as heritage.</p> <p>Forcing restrictions on owners will impose extra costs and difficulties in building work which maybe needed for the commercial viability of the buildings. Owners need to adapt to changing markets and the heritage area may mean that owners are restricted and that they may stop maintaining buildings.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>That Council define what elements of the streetscape and character of the area should be retained as having heritage value.</p> <p>That building owners should freely be able to adapt and modify their buildings, unless identified as being of heritage value.</p>			