

Oral presentation from Wellington Heritage Professionals Hearings Stream 1, 12.00pm Friday 24 February 2023

1. Greet the panel, introduce Amanda, Cherie and Chessa and Eva who have written some expert evidence.
2. We are here representing a group of 9 Wellington-based heritage practitioners.
3. As noted in our submission, we bring decades of heritage experience and expertise (here in Wellington, nationally and internationally as architects, archaeologists, consultants, local government heritage advisors and central government policy makers).
4. A number of us are members of ICOMOS New Zealand, the home of the ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. This means we are subject to the ICOMOS New Zealand code of ethics. Detailed information about our qualifications and experience is page 7 and 8 of our submission.
5. Our submission reflects the understanding we have of the issues that surround the protection and conservation of Wellington's historic heritage.
6. Wellington is a harbour city with a compact CBD and distinctive weatherboard housing from the late 19th to mid-20th centuries nestled in surrounding hills. Successful cities trade and capitalise on their distinctiveness. The people of Wellington have long understood this and have worked hard over many decades to identify and protect places with heritage and character values that contribute to Wellington's success. Our unique heritage and streetscapes are an integral part of what makes Wellington the coolest little capital city
7. We have 'on the ground' experience of seeing our heritage diminished/lost due to current and past DP provisions.
8. The even more reductive nature of the proposed plan's approach to heritage and character is likely to lead to poor outcomes for Wellington.
9. We think Wellington can do better at protecting heritage from inappropriate development so that it can reap the wellbeing and environmental rewards (these are outlined in Appendix 5 to our submission).

Limitations to our evidence

10. We attended the information session for submitters in January and have had great support from both the hearings coordinator and the friend of submitters.
11. However, as you may gather from the written evidence we have commissioned and submitted (which addresses some definitions that we now realise are out of scope for this hearing stream) we have not found it straightforward to engage with the hearings documentation.
12. For example, we have only recently become aware that the notice of hearing sets out what is in scope for the hearing (we had concentrated our efforts on the s42a report). The evidence we commissioned is solely based on what we found in the s42 report that related to our submission (number 412) plus the definitions we mistakenly thought were in scope.
13. We did not commission evidence on matters such as Underutilised land and development capacity (which we now understand to be in scope for hearings stream 1) because we

found no reference in the section 42a report or its appendices to our submissions on those matters.

14. We would therefore like to take this opportunity to direct you to where we have addressed these matters in our written submission.

Growth approach of intensification and Underutilised land and development capacity

15. In our submission on the draft DP (appended to our PDP submission), we outlined our concern that despite being focussed on enabling housing supply, the District Plan is unlikely to solve Wellington's housing affordability problems.
16. At paragraph 18 of our PDP submission we have pointed out that there is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington.
17. This is despite the fact that the NPS-UD required Wellington City Council to prepare a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA) with an analysis of how their planning decisions affect the affordability and competitiveness of the local housing market. Wellington City Council published its inaugural HBA in 2019 and it does not include any analysis of the impacts of heritage and character provisions on the housing market in Wellington.

Climate change and nature-based solutions

18. At paragraph 4 of our submission we noted that heritage and character can make a significant contribution to Wellington's climate change goals by:
 - reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use
 - mitigating the effects of climate change through building community cohesion and resilience.
2. We addressed these points in more detail on p6 and 7 of our submission on the draft spatial plan.

Local/community planning

19. At paragraphs 13 to 21 of our submission on the draft district plan we outlined our concerns that the Council's efforts to engage on heritage and character have been inadequate.
20. At paras 45 to 47 of the same submission we emphasised the benefits that a local community planning approach could have brought.

Strategic direction

21. We made submissions seeking a number of amendments to the introduction and various objectives because it is important that these parts of the plan acknowledge the role that heritage and character play in Wellington.
22. Having considered the Council's response in the S42a report we are now only seeking amendments at three points which are covered in the evidence that we have commissioned from Eva and Chessa.
23. At this point I will invite Chessa and Eva to present their evidence. As the Council have

noted in their rebuttal evidence, Chessa and Eva signed our submission and are also providing expert evidence. As they have stated in their evidence, they have read and agree to comply with the EC Expert Witness Code of Conduct.

24. Finally, we welcome any questions from the panel.