
REPORT 5
(1215/11/IM)

DECISION ON DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 53: PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO HERITAGE BUILDINGS, OBJECTS AND AREAS

1. Purpose of Report

To report the recommendations of the District Plan Hearing Committee concerning District Plan Change 53 – Proposed additions and deletions to heritage buildings, objects and areas.

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

- 1. Approve the recommendations of the District Plan Hearing Committee in respect of District Plan Change 53 as set out in Appendix 1 to this report.*

3. Background

Proposed District Plan Change 53 proposes to add 50 buildings and objects to the District Plan Heritage List. Plan Change 53 also proposes to create a Heritage Area at Fort Balance above Massey Road, Miramar. In addition, the Plan Change also proposes that the MED – former Capital Power Building at 40 Cuba Street - be removed from the Heritage List.

In 2005, the Council adopted the Built Heritage Policy which, among other things, recommended greater statutory protection for the City's built heritage. This Policy reflects changes made to the Resource Management Act in 2003, which now requires that Council recognises and provides for the protection of historic heritage as a matter of national importance.

Implementation of the Built Heritage Policy began in 2 phases. The first phase was Plan Change 43, which aims to strengthen the District Plan rules (notified 4 May 2006, heard 14-25 May 2007 – decision for approval also at this Council meeting). The second phase of this work proposes the addition of further buildings and objects to the list of protected heritage items (i.e. PC53).

District Plan Change 53 was publicly notified 14 December 2006. Twenty-one main submissions and six further submissions were received.

The hearing was held on 20 August 2007. Nine submitters, Wesley Wellington Parish, New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Baptist Union of New Zealand, Sandra Moran, Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, Lawson Robinson, Glenside Progressive Association, Shepherds Trust and the Miramar/Maupuia Progressive Association spoke to their submissions.

4. Discussion

The Committee gave careful consideration to all the issues raised by the submitters, including those issues elaborated on in presentations by the individuals who appeared before the Committee at the hearing.

Generally there were two types of submitters on the Plan Change. The first grouping comprised of submitters that were generally supportive of the Plan Change as a whole, with many supporting the listing of a particular item(s). The second grouping were submitters that opposed the listing of a particular item(s).

All of the above submissions are considered in detail in the Hearing Committee's report attached as Appendix 1.

Having considered the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the issues raised in submissions, the Hearing Committee considered that the Wesley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street and the Shepherds Arms, 265 Tinakori Road should not be listed. The Hearing Committee considered that, aside from these two buildings, the Plan Change as a whole was generally appropriate and that the proposed heritage listings should be adopted.

Once approved by Council, the decision will be publicly notified and served on the submitters. Submitters then have the option of appealing the matter to the Environment Court within 30 working days. If no appeals are made the plan change will become operative.

Report from: Sally Baber, Independent Commissioner, Chair, Hearing Committee District Plan Change 53 Proposed additions and deletions to listed heritage buildings, objects and areas.

REPORT OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 53 –
PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO
LISTED HERITAGE BUILDINGS, OBJECTS AND
AREAS.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: SALLY BABER, INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER
(CHAIR)
COMMISSIONERS LEONIE GILL AND JOHN
MORRISON

DATE OF HEARING: 20 AUGUST 2007

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1) *Approve Proposed District Plan Change 53 – Proposed additions and deletions to listed heritage buildings, objects and areas in accordance with the following:*

(i) *Amend the proposed listing description of:*

Railway Workshop Building 1937

To:

Railway Locomotive and Rolling Stock Depot 1937

(ii) *Amend the proposed listing description of:*

St Paul Wellington Cathedral, including interior, Lady Chapel and Service Buildings 1954-1998.

To:

Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, including the general form of the interior spaces and Lady Chapel Building 1954-1998.

(iii) *Amend the proposed listing description of:*

Former Brooklyn Post Office Building, garage and sheds 1913-14

To:

Former Brooklyn Post Office Building 1913-14

- (iv) *Amend the proposed listing description of:*
- Former Primitive Methodist Church Building, Manse and Front Fence 1907*
To:
- Former Primitive Methodist Church Building 1907*
- (v) *Amend the boundaries of the proposed Fort Ballance Heritage Area on Map 13 as shown in Appendix 2 of this report.*
- 2) *Accept or reject all the submissions and further submissions to the extent that they accord with recommendation (1) above. See sections 3.1 and 3.2 below for further details.*
- 3) *Recommends Council officers to undertake the following work as a result of issues raised through consideration of submissions:*
- (i) *Place Kau Point Battery Site (1890) on the further work file for investigation into the possible listing in the future.*
- (ii) *Correct the anomalies in the District Plan Heritage Schedule referring to the name and address of 'Cobb House' c1867 – Map 29, reference 373 and the address of Clarence Farm/Greer House c 1865 as soon as practical.*
- (iii) *Investigate the possibility of an historic plaque being developed and attached to all listed heritage buildings.*

2. IDENTIFICATION OF BUILDINGS AND OBJECTS FOR LISTING

Proposed District Plan Change 53 was a Council initiated Plan Change with all of the 50 buildings and objects proposed for listing assessed by specialist heritage professionals. A nationally recognised set of assessment criteria was used to ensure the historic heritage qualities in Wellington are recognised. These criteria include;

- Historic Value (age, association (events, people))
- Social Value (public esteem, symbolic, commemorative, cultural)
- Aesthetic Value (architectural form/fabric/style), Townscape or Landscape value)
- Scientific Value (technical, archaeological)
- Setting/Surrounding Value (contribution to setting, group value).

Conservation Architect Russell Murray and Research Historian Kerryn Pollock were commissioned to assess the identified buildings and objects. The consultants researched the historic background of the properties, visited the properties, completed an architectural description, assessed the eligibility for listing and described the settings or surroundings.

APPENDIX 1

The following buildings and objects were publicly notified for listing 14 December 2006:

- 22 Ascot Street
- 10 Balmoral Terrace
- 4 Claremont Grove
- 86 Clark Street
- 22 Cleveland Street
- 151 Cuba Street
- 8 Daniell Street
- 22 Donald McLean Street
- 20 Egmont Street
- 7 Fore Street
- 62-64 Ghuznee Street
- 81 Hatton Street
- Ira Street - Former Brickworks Wall
- 19 Kate Sheppard Place
- Lyall Pd, Maranui Surf Life Saving Club Building
- 1 Kent Terrace
- Botanical Gardens Stables, Mess Rooms and Tool Shed below Treehouse Visitors Centre
- 185 Melbourne Road
- 246 Middleton Road
- 246 Middleton Road
- 400 Middleton Road (already listed, correction of address and inclusion of milk stand).
- Molesworth Street - Wellington Cathedral of St Paul
- 56 Mulgrave Street
- Wellington Raiyards – Workshop
- 550 Ohariu Valley Road – Community Hall
- Oriental Parade – Clyde Quay Boat Harbour Sheds
- 154 Oriental Parade
- 234 Oriental Parade
- 240 Oriental Parade
- 298 Oriental Parade
- 75a Puriri Street
- 2-14 Riddiford Street
- 27 Riddiford Street
- 2 Rugby Street, Museum Stand, Basin Reserve
- School Road - former Levin & Co Warehouse
- 14 St Mary Street
- Corner of Buckle & Taranaki Streets – Former Army General Officer Commanding building
- Corner of Buckle & Taranaki Streets - HMNZS Olphert Building
- 75 Taranaki Street
- 16 The Terrace
- Former P&T building – Waitangi Park
- 136 The Terrace
- 262 Thorndon Quay
- 284 Thorndon Quay
- 285 Tinakori Road

Most of the commercial buildings on the proposed list were identified through the Non-Residential Inventory Review in 2001. This review started in 1998 as a result of the District Plan Hearing process. Consultants were commissioned to identify additional places that were not already included in the District Plan. Using a thematic framework to screen possible candidates, a number of buildings were identified and then researched. The end result was an inventory that included places already listed in the District Plan as well as new items that were worthy of listing in the future. The inventory was published in 2001.

Many of the residential buildings were identified in the 1999 Residential Inventory Review. At that time, an audit was undertaken of the buildings already listed in the 1995 Heritage Inventory as well as the possible addition of further buildings. The buildings that were identified are now nominated as part of this Plan Change and have been reassessed for their heritage value to ensure that they still warrant listing.

With reference to the residential buildings located along Oriental Parade, these buildings were identified as part of preparation of the Oriental Parade Design Guidelines in 2003 (i.e. PC 18). At that time an issue arose as to the identification and possible protection mechanisms for buildings on Oriental Parade that may have

heritage value but have not been listed in the District Plan. The District Plan and Reserves Management Subcommittee (1 August 2003) directed staff to investigate the potential for additional buildings along Oriental Parade to be listed as heritage items in the District Plan. These findings were later presented to the District Plan and Reserves Management Subcommittee (30 June 2004) with the Subcommittee endorsing further research into the possibility of listing 110, 154, 186, 214, 234, 240, 274, 280, 298 and 320 Oriental Parade in the District Plan.

Other buildings have been identified as part of the Central Area Review (Plan Change 48), Parks Management Review of Properties and individual nominations from community groups and conservation specialists. The opportunity has also been taken to correct the address of 400 Middleton Road, Nott House (already listed in the District Plan as 246 Middleton Road) and extend the listing to include the historic milk stand associated with the property.

In total, twenty-one main submissions and six further submissions were received.

The Hearing for the District Plan Change was held at Council Offices on 20 August 2007 with the officer's report distributed to submitters who requested to be heard prior to the hearing.

At the hearing on 20 August 2007, Sarah Nelson (Council's Planner) spoke to the officer's report on the Plan Changes. Russell Murray (Conservation Architect) also provided advice on the architectural and heritage elements of the items proposed for listing in the Plan Change. Nine submitters; Wesley Wellington Parish, New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Baptist Union of New Zealand, Sandra Moran, Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, Lawson Robinson, Glenside Progressive Association, Shepherds Trust and the Miramar/Maupuia Progressive Association spoke to their submissions.

The Committee gave careful consideration to all the issues raised by the submitters, including those issues elaborated on in presentations by the submitters who appeared.

The following discussion sets out the key issues and the Committee's reasons for making its decision.

3. SUBMISSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Plan Change 53 submissions were received from:

Submitter No.	Submitter Name
1	Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand
2	New Zealand Defence Force
3	Wellington Civic Trust
4	Friends of Wellington's Botanic Gardens
5	Ian Woodmore
6	New Zealand Historic Places Trust
7	Dean, Wardens and Vestry of Wellington Cathedral of St Paul
8	Claire Bibby
9	Onslow Historical Society
10	Glenside Progressive Association
11	The Architecture Centre
12	Lawson Robertson

Submitter No.	Submitter Name
13	Docomomo New Zealand
14	Baptist Union of New Zealand
15	The Thorndon Society
16	The Shepherd Trust
17	Wesley Wellington Parish
18	Barry Blackett
19	Sandra Moran
20	Dr Peter Russell and Mrs Renee Russell
21	Francis and Sandra Lepper

Further submissions on Plan Change 53 were received from:

Submitter No.	Submitter Name
FS1	Margaret Hensch
FS2	Ronald Potts
FS3	Miramar/Maupuia Progressive Association
FS4	Glenside Progressive Association
FS5	Wesley Wellington Parish
FS6	New Zealand Historic Places Trust

3.1 Submissions supporting the Plan Change and/or the proposed listing of a specific item

Submissions and discussions:

Submitter 1, Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand, related to the Wellington Railways Workshop. The submitter supported the inclusion of the building on the heritage list but requested that the description be amended to more accurately describe the buildings workshop use as being for a locomotive and rolling stock depot.

Submitter 2, New Zealand Defence Force, supported the proposed listing of the former General Headquarters and HMNZS Olphert buildings, corner Taranaki/Buckle Streets and the Fort Ballance Heritage Area, Fort Ballance Road. The submitter noted that the buildings are located within a designated Defence Purposes site and as such, the designation has primacy over any District Plan provisions. The buildings have also been identified for strengthening or demolition under section 66 of the Building Act and the NZDF are considering their options for strengthening. The submitter also noted that the object list and map for the Fort Ballance Heritage Area should include Fort Gordon, the Seesaw Searchlight emplacement, 12 pounder/4 inch Battery, Lower battery and magazine, Submarine Mining test Room and Observation Post. In addition, the submitter suggested that the Kau Point Battery Site of 1890 should also be considered for future listing.

Submitter 3, The Civic Trust, supported the Plan Change and would like to see the list extended further in the future.

Submitter 4, Friends of Wellington's Botanic Gardens, supported the inclusion of the Botanical Gardens Stables, Mess Rooms and Tool Shed below the Treehouse Visitors Centre on the District Plan heritage list.

APPENDIX 1

Submitters 5 (Ian Woodmore), 8 (Claire Bibby), 9 (Onslow Historical Society Inc.), 10 (Glenside Progressive Association Inc.), 18 (Barry Blackett), 20 (Dr Peter Russell and Mrs Renee Russell) and further submission FS1 (Margaret Hensch) all supported the inclusion of Halfway House, 246 Middleton Road and Nott House, 400 Middleton Road on the District Plan Heritage List. In particular submitter 5 suggested that the whole of Glenside should be made a Heritage Area.

In addition, Submitter 9 also supported the former custodians house 86 Clarke Street, the former Kaiwharawhara School 7 Fore Street, the Community Hall, 550 Ohariu Valley Road and the former Levin and Co Warehouse School Road being added to the District Plan Heritage List.

Claire Bibby spoke at the hearing on behalf of submitter 10 and expressed her support for the inclusion of Halfway House and Nott House on the District Plan heritage list. Ms Bibby also provided a presentation to the Committee which contained many contextual photos of the Glenside area, including photos of past and surviving pre 1900's buildings. Ms Bibby also showed photos of earthworks and discussed how such works, along with poor maintenance, unrestricted development and weak regulatory safeguards all have impacted in heritage in the area.

Ms Bibby also highlighted the contextual importance of the surroundings of buildings, with particular reference to Nott House and its original orchard, paths, fencing and milkstand located on Middleton Road. Ms Bibby noted the building profile written by Mr Murray discusses the importance of the milk stand and encouraged the Committee to ensure it also was protected via the listing.

Ms Bibby encouraged the Council to engage with people of Glenside to help them understand their history. She suggested that the continuation of identifying heritage sites, community education, incorporation of heritage into planning schemes and effectively utilising District Plan rules all provide opportunities to do this.

Ms Bibby also discussed historical connection of the buildings with Harrison Cottage pre 1854, Clarence Farm/Greer House c 1865 (map 26, symbol reference 360), and Braid Cottage c 1867 (Map 26, symbol reference 373 – detailed as Cobb House in the District Plan). Ms Bibby also emphasised that the current Glenside listings in the District Plan contain a number of anomalies that need amending.

Submitter 6, New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), supported the proposed Plan Change and encouraged the Council to be more precise when outlining the extent to which the building's setting and surroundings are listed. NZHPT submitted that further information should be provided as to why places are proposed and include an aerial photograph showing the boundaries of a site. NZHPT also submitted that proposed map for Fort Balance needs clarity and should also identify the former tram line and magazine buildings.

Robert McClean, on behalf of NZHPT spoke to their submission. Mr McClean conveyed that the Council's approach to listing aligns with NZHPT's guidance on identification of historic heritage, especially in terms of research and assessments undertaken for the building profiles. Mr McClean commended the Council for the comprehensiveness of the documentation and quality of research for each building. However, Mr McClean encouraged Council to adopt the full assessment criteria recommended by the NZHPT.

APPENDIX 1

Specifically, Mr McClean highlighted NZHPT's support of the Balmoral Terrace Perimeter Wall 1893 and 1923, the Ira Street Former Brickworks Wall 1925, the listings in the Glenside area, the Botanic Garden's Stables, Mess Rooms and Tool Shed, Wesley Church Hall and the former Army General Officer Commanding Building.

Mr McClean also discussed the benefits and costs of historic heritage protection, citing Australian and UK research studies into property values and the link between regulation and demolition by neglect. The studies found that there has been little influence of listing on property values in Australia, but in the UK there can be instances when a regulatory regime is an influencing factor in levels of maintenance and subsequent building condition. NZHPT emphasised and encouraged the Council to provide improved incentives in this regard.

Submitter 11, The Architectural Centre Inc., submitted that they would like to see the list extended and further recommended that the Council:

- Adopt a system that enables more frequent inclusion of new items onto the District Plan Heritage List.
- Provide greater clarification for sites with multiple addresses
- Provide a more effective protection system for heritage items, including financial penalties if heritage values are compromised
- Notate explicit interiors, fixtures and fittings in all cases
- Discourage facadism and that the minimum heritage listing cover 'façade and building structure'
- Give greater recognition to modernism/Post-World war II buildings as acknowledged in the WCC Built Heritage Policy (2005)
- The unpainted state of a building should be explicitly recognized when it is an integral part of a building
- Give greater recognition of site-specific sculpture
- Provide maps and protect important urban spaces to preserve this aspect of the special character of Te Aro
- Give greater recognition to exemplary heritage and development in the city
- Establish a 'negative heritage list' to provide incentives and positive design to encourage redevelopment.

Submitter 13 (Docomomo) submitted that they would also like to see the list extended further to greater recognise modern buildings, sites and neighbourhoods. The submitter noted that unpainted off-form concrete is important to modernist buildings and should be protected. Further, facadism is not supported by the submitter, as this approach denies the significance of buildings, places and interiors.

Submission 15, The Thorndon Society, supported the inclusion of the Cook Islands High Commission building, 56 Mulgrave Street on the District Plan heritage List.

Submitter 21, Francis and Sandra Lepper, supported the former Brooklyn Post and Telegraph Office Building (22 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn) being added to the District Plan Heritage List. The submitter would like the 1950's garage and shed to be excluded from the proposed listing because they have no historical significance. It is further suggested that the Council should consider the manufacture of, and installation of an appropriate plaque denoting that the building has been recognised for its historic value.

Further submission FS3 by the Miramar/Maupuia Progressive Association supported submission 3 relating to the general support of the entire plan change but further expanded to specifically support the inclusion of the Ira Street Wall on the District Plan

Heritage List.

Robin Boldarin, on behalf of the Miramar/Maupuia Progressive Association spoke in support of their submission. Ms Boldarin discussed how the wall had community recognition and accordingly should be listed. Ms Boldarin expressed that development pressures in the area were impacting on the character of Miramar and that retaining historic features such as the wall would ensure links with the past are kept.

Considerations:

The Hearing Committee noted and considered the points raised by the submitters.

With reference to submitter 1, the Hearing Committee agreed that information contained in the schedule should be as accurate as possible and accordingly accept that the wording in the railway building description should be amended, as sought by the submitter, to read:

Railway Locomotive and Rolling Stock Depot 1937

With reference to submitter 2, the Hearing Committee recognised that the items on Defence Force land are subject to a designation which caters for defence operations. The Committee also note that an outline plan of work must first be approved by Council pursuant to section 176a of the Resource Management Act. The Committee are confident that Council will work with the Defence Force to ensure defence operations can be undertaken in a manner that does not compromise heritage values and are encouraged by the Defence Force's positive attitude toward protecting its on-site heritage. Likewise it is noted that the buildings may be earthquake prone which may require strengthening in the future. The Committee recognised that this is not an uncommon scenario for older buildings and Council will work with the Defence Force to ensure the best possible outcome for the buildings.

In terms of the former Army General Officer Commanding building and HMNZS Olphert building, the Committee welcomed the inclusion of these buildings on the heritage list. With specific reference to the Army General Officer Commanding Building, the Committee noted the heritage value of the unpainted concrete parts of the façade and emphasised that it should continue to remain unpainted. The Committee also considered that the large (consented) billboard sign that is attached the Buckle Street elevation is unsympathetic to the heritage values of the building and indeed makes no positive contribution to the streetscape of the area. The Committee would like to encourage the land owners to remove it to allow the full splendour of the building to be seen.

Following on from the submitter's suggested amendments to the Fort Ballance Heritage Area, further research was undertaken by Military Historian, Peter Cook. Mr Cook's assistance provided greater understanding of other important items of interest in the vicinity and it is recommended that the proposed Heritage Area boundaries are extended to encompass these. It is recommended that the extended area continue to be referred to as Fort Ballance, but a supplementary guidance sheet will be attached to the area's profile which identifies items such as Fort Gordon, the Seesaw Searchlight emplacement, 12 pounder/4 inch Battery and Lower battery and magazine highlighted by the submitter. The extended Fort Ballance boundaries are contained in Appendix 2 of this decision report.

The Committee notes the submitter's suggestion that Kau Point Battery Site (1890) should be considered for proposed listing and recommend that it is added to the further work file for future investigation.

APPENDIX 1

With reference to the submitters 3, 11 and 13 who wish to see the heritage list extended further, the Committee noted officer advice that plans are now in place for the on-going research and continued expansion of items that are listed in the District Plan. The Committee noted the notification of Plan Change 58 on 11 August 2007 which marks the second round of proposed listings within the past 12 months.

The Committee recognised submitters 6 and 11 request that greater clarification should be provided when identifying heritage items and note that additional details are now provided on the schedule when listing an item. These include a site's deposited plan and number to ensure correct identification and a fuller description of the extent to which an item is to be protected. The Committee considers these details provide adequate information without over complicating the Plan.

With reference to submitter 2 and 6, who discuss the clarity of the Fort Ballance map, the Committee agreed that this map could be improved. Appendix 2 of this report contains an updated map and supplementary information has been added to the area's profile which also identifies these additional features.

The support of submitter 4 relating to the Botanic Garden items is noted and the Committee recommended that these items are confirmed for listing.

The support of submitter 9, relating to the former custodians house 86 Clarke Street, the former Kaiwharawhara School 7 Fore Street, the Community Hall, 550 Ohariu Valley Road and the former Levin and Co Warehouse School Road is noted and the Committee recommend that these items are confirmed for listing.

With reference to the Halfway House and Nott House the support of submitters 5, 8, 9, 10, 18, 20 and further submission FS1 is noted by the Committee. The Committee particularly observed the loss of historic buildings in the Glenside area and that the community recognise this loss, as emphasised by submitter 10.

The Committee recognised that Nott House, 400 Middleton Road is already listed and accept that the plan should be updated to reflect the correct address and also extend the listing to include the historic milk stand on Middleton Road that is associated with the property.

In response to submitter 10's concerns, the Committee also appreciate that Greer House (ref: 360) and Cobb House (ref: 373) also need amending to reflect their correct address/names. Based on this, the Committee recommend that these anomalies are corrected in the schedule as soon as possible.

The Committee also endorse the listing of the Halfway House. This building is discussed in further detail in section 3.2 of this report and an update building profile is contained in Appendix 3.

In response to submitters 11 and 13, the Committee recognised that facadism is not an ideal heritage outcome and agreed with the submitter that Council should not encourage such practices.

The Committee also identified that the Built Heritage Policy (2005) emphasises the importance of protecting post WWII buildings and noted that both this Plan Change and Plan Change 58 contain post WWII buildings. The Committee encourage Council to continue work in this area.

In terms of providing adequate protection for heritage items, including financial penalties if heritage values are compromised, the Committee noted that both the Council's Compliance and Monitoring, and Heritage teams keep a watchful eye on heritage items. The Committee also noted that heritage is not restricted to the historic and contemporary sculpture can contribute immensely to an area. The Committee were satisfied with the current systems in place to deal with heritage assessment and 'negative heritage' and did not consider that changes need to be made in this regard.

In terms of submitter 11's comments that Council should provide maps and protect important spaces in Te Aro, the Committee refer the submitter to Plan Change 48 (heard 14-25 May and also presented at this Council meeting) that has identified many heritage attributes of the Te Aro Area. As part of the hearing for that plan change, the areas and spaces around Egmont, Eva and Leeds Street have also been highlighted as potential areas of value.

The support of submission 15 relating to the Cook Islands High Commission is noted and it is recommended that this item is confirmed for listing in the District Plan.

The Committee were encouraged by the support of submission 21 regarding the listing of the former Brooklyn Post and Telegraph building and agreed that the 1950's garage and shed should be excluded from the listing. The Committee considered that the main area of focus and importance should be the Post and Telegraph building and the inclusion of the garage and shed was unwarranted. Accordingly, the Committee recommend that the wording in the building description should be amended, as sought by the submitter, to read:

Former Brooklyn Post Office Building 1913-14

Further, building on submitter 21's suggestion, the Committee would like to encourage the Council to explore ways in which historical plaques can be manufactured and installed to buildings of heritage value. A recommendation to investigate the possibility of an historic plaque being developed and attached to all listed heritage buildings has been included as part of this report.

The support of further submission FS3 relating to the former Ira Street Brickworks wall was noted and it is recommended that this object is confirmed for listing in the District Plan.

Recommendations:

- **Accept** submission 1 and amend the listing description of the Thorndon Quay Rail Building to read 'Railway Locomotive and Rolling Stock Depot 1937'.
- **Accept** submission 2 in that the former General Headquarters and HMNZS Olphert buildings, corner Taranaki/Buckle Streets and the Fort Ballance Heritage Area, Fort Ballance Road (with suggested additions) are included in the District Plan Heritage List.
- **Accept** submission 3 insofar that they support the proposed plan change.
- **Accept** submission 4 in that the Botanical Gardens Stables, Mess Rooms and Tool Shed below Treehouse Visitors Centre are included on the District Plan Heritage List.
- **Accept** submissions 5, 8, 9, 10, 18, 20 and further submission FS1 in that Halfway House, 246 Middleton Road and Nott House and milk stand, 400 Middleton Road, are included on the District Plan Heritage List.

- **Accept** submissions 6 insofar that changes are required for the Fort Ballance Heritage Area on map 13 and insofar as they support the Plan Change.
- **Accept** 11 and 13 insofar that they support the Plan Change. For the reasons outlined in the discussion, additional comments/amendments are noted, but changes are not considered to be necessary at this stage.
- **Accept** submission 15 in that the Cook Island High Commission building, 56 Mulgrave Street is included on the District Plan Heritage List.
- **Accept** submission 21 insofar that the listing description of the former Brooklyn Post and Telegraph Office Building, 22 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn is amended to read 'Former Brooklyn Post Office Building 1913-14'
- **Accept** further submission FS3 in that the Ira Street Wall is included on the District Plan Heritage List.

3.2 Submissions opposing the Plan Change and/or the proposed listing of a specific item

Submissions and Discussion:

Wellington Cathedral of St Paul

Submitter 7, The Dean, Wardens and Vestry of Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, relates to Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, the Lady Chapel and Service Buildings located on the corner of Molesworth and Hill Street.

In their written submission, the submitter seeks that the buildings be removed from the proposed heritage list as the proposed listing would unduly restrict the function of the Cathedral. Specifically, Submitter 7 states that the buildings were created for, and are dedicated for the purposes of divine worship and its associated liturgical activities that derives from Church doctrine and is subject to change from time to time. The building is subject to the Diocesan Properties and Facilities Act which means before any internal alterations may be undertaken diocesan approval must be secured. In addition, those responsible for management and any developments have strict lines of accountability to parishioners, the Diocese and the Bishop. The proposed listing would constitute an unwarranted intrusion on the stewardship exercised by the Wardens and Vestry in relation to the property. Submitter 7 states that the function of the Cathedral is not a static one and should respond to changing social or community needs. Over time, liturgical developments mean that the interior layout, furnishings and other aspects will need to be changed. In addition, the site and the buildings are not in their complete form and the whole complex is a 'work in progress'.

The submission is supported by Further Submissions FS2 (Ronald Potts) and FS5 (Wesley Wellington Parish). Further Submission FS5 in particular states that both parties share a 'commonality of cause' in that the listing will place additional burden on church operations and activities.

Following on from the written submission, the Planning Officer, Sarah Nelson suggested amending the notified wording of the listing description from:

St Paul Wellington Cathedral, including interior, Lady Chapel and Service Buildings 1954-1998.

to:

APPENDIX 1

St Paul Wellington Cathedral, including sequence and general form of porch, nave, aisles and altar-end interior spaces and Lady Chapel Building 1954-1998.

The thought behind this was to recognise the form and layout of the interior spaces of the building without capturing under the listing particular finishings, furnishings or fittings of the Cathedral. Specifically, the primary spaces of the porch, nave, aisles, and altar-end were the areas considered to be most important and it was the Officers recommendation that the listing should be amended to focus on these spaces rather than the interior as a whole. Miss Nelson, also suggested removing the service buildings from the proposed listing, but retaining the Lady Chapel Building.

In support of their submission, the Very Reverend Frank Nelson (Dean of Wellington); Mr Ron Potts (former Cathedral Vestry member and intimately connected with forty years of cathedral history and building projects); Dr Briar Gordon (Cathedral Vestry member and Cathedral representative to Synod) and Professor Athol Mann (Chair, Diocesan Board of Trustees) spoke in person at the hearing.

Revd Frank Nelson emphasised that the Cathedral is a sacred place where people can commune with God and each other. He stressed that Christianity is not a static religion and it is not simply holding to a set of rules. The Reverend recognised the significance of where the Cathedral stands and what it stands for – in the eyes of a number of different stakeholders in both church and diocese, and city and nation.

The Reverend pointed out that the Cathedral was subject to fairly tight rules and guidelines. The Cathedral Vestry, which is charged with the day to day running of the Cathedral and its maintenance, simply cannot make arbitrary changes of a lasting nature without careful consultation with, and permission from, the Diocese.

The Reverend also spoke that the Cathedral is a non profit organisation, with the vast sum of money needed to build the Cathedral coming from Cathedral members and the Diocese as a whole. He stated that the current assessed value of the Cathedral is \$35 million and it is extremely unlikely that future congregations will alter the Cathedral. He also pointed out that it would be unlikely that the congregation, Wellington City Council or the New Zealand Historic Places Trust would be able to rebuild the Cathedral if there was a catastrophe such as an earthquake or fire. The replacement value would be too high.

During question time, the Committee asked whether the amended wording had helped alleviate concerns about the proposed listing. Dr Gordon recognised that the wording had attempted to address the concerns raised, but considered that District Plan listing and canon law together would place an excessive level of constraint over the Cathedral. Dr Gordon suggested that a Memorandum of Understanding maybe an alternative mechanism for protection.

Questions were also raised about the effect of Plan Change 43 (new Heritage Provisions) and its impact on signage for the Church. Miss Nelson conveyed that any existing sign would have existing use rights under the provisions, but any sign greater than 0.5 m² on site would require resource consent.

Halfway House and Nott House and milk stand

In his written submission, submitter 12, Lawson Robertson, did not support the inclusion of Halfway House and Nott House (and milk stand) on the District Plan Heritage List stating that the report profile contained inaccuracies and that further research for the whole of north Wellington should be undertaken in the first instance.

At the hearing Mr Robertson spoke in support of his submission. Mr Robertson called the Committee's attention to his personal research into the history of the area which indicates that the name 'Halfway House' is incorrect for the building located at 246 Middleton Road. Mr Robertson believes that the building is not the original Halfway House and over the passage of time, it has been accepted as fact when it is not the case. Mr Robertson expressed that he would be happy to assist in further research into the area.

This position is not supported by further submission FS4 (Glenside Progressive Association Inc.) who spoke in opposition to Mr Robertson. Claire Bibby, on behalf of the Association, conveyed to the Committee, that although the actual building may not have been formally *the* 'Halfway House', it is now widely known within the community as such. Ms Bibby emphasised that the name is now part of generations of history and it would be confusing to the community if it was not referred to as the Halfway House. Ms Bibby discussed that the building has had in the past a historical use related to a 'Halfway House' activities, i.e. accommodation for those changing horses and coaches.

Former Primitive Methodist Church and Manse, 22 Donald McLean Street

Submitter 14 sought that the building be removed from the proposed heritage list, citing that the proposed listing is contrary to Part 2, Section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in that it failed to enable the Wellington Chinese Baptist Church community to provide for its social, economic and cultural wellbeing in an appropriate manner. In particular, the submitter stated in their written submission that:

- the buildings do not have social, technical or architectural value that warrant listing
- The buildings are not recognised by the NZHPT Register
- The proposed listing could place the long term plans and economic well being of the church in jeopardy
- The current maintenance and upkeep of the buildings is not a sustainable use of church funds
- The church needs upgrading
- The existing configuration of the building does not meet the social or spiritual needs of the local Chinese community members.

The submission was supported by further submission FS5 (Wesley Wellington Parish) with the further submitter stating that both parties shared a 'commonality of cause' in that the listing would place an additional burden on church operations and activities.

In support of the submission, Mr Andrew Beatson (legal representative); Mr Mark Chiu (long standing member of the Church and legal advisor); Professor David Kernohan (Heritage Specialist) and Ms Gen Hewett (consultant planner) spoke in person at the hearing.

The Church's statutory consideration on the proposed listing was outlined by Mr Andrew Beatson. Mr Beatson discussed the role of the Council and interpretation of the RMA. Mr Beatson outlined that the Church acquired the core Donald McLean Street site in 1979 and since that time had acquired properties on adjoining sites for potential redevelopment to help improve the site. Mr Beatson expressed that the building, manse and hall were not particularly functional and that the Church, despite ongoing maintenance, had become "dark, tired and cluttered in appearance". Mr Beatson reiterating the objections to the proposed listing as outlined in the Church's written submission (summarised above).

APPENDIX 1

The Committee also heard from Mr Mark Chiu. Mr Chiu outlined the origins of the Church and gave a general overview of the use and function of the buildings for the Church community. He explained to the Committee that the current configuration on the buildings does not meet the congregation requirements and that the cramped nature of the manse is unsuitable for residential accommodation. The unsuitability created difficulties in attracting a Minister. He also discussed the current and future acquisitions of the neighbouring properties as well as economic expenditure over the past five years. Mr Chiu considered that the heritage listing would seriously curtail the Church's present and future ability to serve and administer to its community and impede and unduly restrict redevelopment of the site.

Heritage specialist Prof. David Kernohan discussed the heritage and architectural elements of the site, focusing mainly on the values of the Church building. Prof. Kernohan considered that the assertion (by the Council) that the Church buildings have considerable social and historical value was an overstatement, noting that the manse is an unexceptional house of that period. Prof. Kernohan also commented on the cramped nature of the rooms. Prof. Kernohan did not agree that the buildings have added cultural and community value because of its association with the Chinese community, noting that the Chinese community did not value the site with high esteem. He also observed that although the Church is a good example of a Gothic Church, it was no more special than other 19th century Church buildings around New Zealand. He also commented that the Church was built by not well known architects, displaying minimal scientific or technical significance. Prof. Kernohan considered that the building arguably did not sit well with its residential neighbours. In his closing statement, Prof. Kernohan conveyed that the heritage significance of the buildings were "close to the bar" and should not be added to the heritage list.

In terms of planning resource management advice, the Committee heard from the Church's consultant planner, Gen Hewitt. Ms Hewitt was of the opinion that the proposed listing was not justified in terms of the RMA as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Ms Hewitt believed that should the building should not be listed, due to an over emphasis on the "protection" aspects of section 5 of the Act and that the Church would be penalised for their own strategic planning (in reference to the acquisition of neighbouring properties). Ms Hewitt discussed the various qualities of heritage assessment and was of the opinion that the buildings are only of minor local interest and streetscape value. Ms Hewitt discussed District Plan zoning, policies and the implications of Plan Change 43.

The Committee asked particular questions regarding the acquisition of the neighbouring properties and whether the congregation has emotional attachment to the buildings. Mr Chiu indicated that the Church held no emotional attachment to the building. The Committee also asked, questions regarding the heritage values of the Church and manse buildings, particularly whether there were other examples of this type of Church in Wellington. Prof. Kernohan was able to name another example of this type of Church on Cambridge Terrace. The Committee also discussed the pre 1930's demolition rule that applies within the area (blanket form of protection that requires resource consent for any alteration/removal/demolition of a pre 1930's building in Newtown, Berhampore or Mt Cook).

The Shepherds Arms, 285 Tinakori Road

In their written submission, submitter 16, The Shepherds Trust, opposed the proposed listing of the Shepherds Arms, stating:

- The building has little, if any, heritage value due to past alterations to the building fabric. This has involved external re-cladding, removal of internal

APPENDIX 1

walls and flooring, installation of a new staircase and electrical and sewage upgrading.

- The addition of the building to the Heritage List will have a detrimental impact on the value of the building as a commercial investment
- The listing would unnecessarily impact on private property rights.

To accompany their written submission, several photographs of the extensive renovation and building projects were provided.

Miranda Joseph, a Trustee of the Shepherds Trust, spoke in support of the Trust's submission at the hearing. Mrs Joseph conveyed that she felt that the building should not be listed as hardly any of the original form, and none of the original material, exists in the building today. She believed that the building is a complete replica and that the listing of it would erode the integrity of the listing process. Mrs Joseph explained that the building is a privately owned commercial building that is affiliated with a brewery. She raised concern that the listing may interfere with branding and signage changes that may need to be made from time to time.

During question time, the Committee sought advice from Mr Murray for the reasoning behind the proposed listing when little of the original fabric of the building remains today. Mr Murray explained that the major impetus for the proposed listing was that the building had been in continual use as a pub for over 100 years and had a social value for that.

Welsley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street

Submission 17, Wesley Wellington Parish, related to the Welsley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street.

The submitter sought that the hall is removed from the proposed heritage list citing that the building is subject to a proposed Heritage Area in Plan Change 48 (Central Area Review) and this additional listing is too onerous and unnecessary leaving the church with virtually no autonomy in the way it can administer and use its land for the benefit of its parishioners. The submitter stated that the proposed listing will limit changes that will be needed in the near future to meet Parish requirements. The proposed restrictions would jeopardize the church's commitment to the site and represented an unreasonable ongoing burden on the Parish community. The Submitter pointed out that the site already contains a listed church and two heritage trees which bring about significant costs in maintenance.

The submission is opposed by Further Submission FS6 (New Zealand Historic Places Trust).

In support of the submission, Mr Con Anastasiou (legal representative); Ms Lynne Frith (Superintendent Minister of Wesley Wellington Parish); Ms Gina Jones (architect) and Mr Ian Leary (consultant planner) spoke in person at the hearing.

Mr Anastasiou detailed the background of the site, describing the land and structures owned by the Parish and other listed items on site. Mr Anastasiou discussed in detail Plan Changes 43 and 48 and their implications for the site and also outlined that Plan Change 53 proposed listing would add another layer of protection which would bring with it further difficulties for the Parish. Mr Anastasiou expressed dissatisfaction with the consultation process that had been undertaken. Mr Anastasiou pointed out that heritage professionals views (in relation to Mr Murray's assessment) was a matter of opinion, not a matter of incontrovertible fact. He also pointed out that the officers report had incorrectly identified the building as category 1 registered with NZHPT.

APPENDIX 1

Specific reference was made to Section 85 of the Act (which deals with whether a proposed listing would render the building incapable of reasonable use) by Mr Anastasiou.

The day to day use and function of the site as a whole was described by the Superintendent Minister, Ms Lynne Frith. Ms Frith gave an overview of parish life indicating that congregational and parish life not only provided for Christian nurture, but for the retention of culture and language, and for the provision of hospitality for new migrants. She described other functions of the site, including traditional cooking in the umu area, community gatherings, sleepovers, sewing classes and youth programmes. Ms Frith expressed to the Committee that the hall as it exists does not meet the needs of the parish community and this coupled with ongoing maintenance had serious implications for the continued future use of the space. The parish's position is that their resources should be focused on catering for an ever increasing congregation, not on what they see for the preservation of an old and increasingly unstable building.

The parish's architect, Gina Jones, gave a presentation on the architectural elements of the hall building which also included many photo's of the hall and it's current use and surroundings. Ms Jones, described levelling issues with the building, as well as different window and door styles throughout. Ms Jones was of the opinion that the building does not have sufficient value to warrant listing and that the only noteworthy building on the Wesley site being the Church. Ms Jones also described her professional experiences with the difficulties of gaining consent to alter listed buildings and considered that the proposed listing of the hall would be detrimental in this regard.

With regards to planning advice, the Committee heard from consultant planner, Ian Leary. Mr Leary described the subject site and also discussed in further detail the heritage protection layers and their implications for the site, namely Plan Changes 43 and 48. Mr Leary considered that the net effect of the rules would virtually require the whole site to be frozen in time. Mr Leary conveyed to the Committee that the parish did not accept the requirements to obtain resource consents for alterations to its wider land and buildings. The activity classifications and overall effect of the rules would make the land incapable of reasonable use, contrary to Part II of the RMA. Mr Leary also highlighted that the officers report incorrectly stated that the hall was a category 1 registered building with the NZHPT. He was also of the opinion that the Council's Heritage Incentive Fund (discussed in the officers report) would be inadequate to provide funding for all of Wellington's listed items.

The Committee asked several questions of the submitters. Issues surrounding possible subdivision, parish options for future redevelopment and funding were all examined. The Committee also asked several architecturally based questions of Ms Jones.

234 and 240 Oriental Parade

In her written submission, Sandra Moran (submitter 19), sought that the two buildings be removed from the proposed District Plan Heritage List and questioned the heritage value of the remaining properties along Oriental Parade, given that Council has allowed more recent high rise developments to change the landscape for ever. The submitter stated that the proposed Plan Change appeared to 'single out' these dwelling houses when there were other examples in the area which do not appear to be listed. The submitter also stated that the heritage classification would not allow the owners to develop their sections in a similar manner to neighbouring properties and that owners should not be penalised with significant rates which have come about as a result of unrestricted high rise development. The submitter believes that heritage areas are more aligned to areas such as Thorndon as opposed to Oriental Parade.

APPENDIX 1

At the hearing, Commissioner Gill declared that she had a conflict of interest in hearing these particular items, in that she personally knew Ms Moran. Commissioner Gill withdrew from any discussion or questions on the subject buildings.

Ms Moran spoke in support of her written submission at the hearing. Ms Moran expressed that she was not averse to heritage and indicated that, in a recent upgrade of another property she owns (at 276 Cuba Street) she had tried to be as in keeping as possible to the heritage attributes of the building.

With regards to Oriental Parade, Ms Moran believed that it was not the buildings that provided the charm of the area, but rather the sea, bay and hills that defined it and it was too varied in nature to warrant protection. She considered that Oriental Bay had become very disjointed. Ms Moran felt that the Bay had become highly developed and now she was being penalised through high rates for a family home as a result of a boom in demand for land. She mentioned that her family had lived in the Bay since the early 1950's.

In terms of 234, Ms Moran noted that the building has been especially altered, citing the top floor windows (which were once bay windows), the new balcony and garage. Ms Moran indicated that the building needed work and that she was looking at the option of bringing the building forward as she was experiencing a sense of enclosure from the much taller buildings flanking the property. She was of the opinion that if the building was listed, it would be very expensive to move because of added constraints.

With specific reference to 240 Oriental Parade, Ms Moran has plans to develop a hardstand, garage and roof terrace. She noted that that building profile assessment made reference to the out building in the back yard – a building which she stated is essentially derelict.

In general, Ms Moran conveyed to the Committee that the sites were not in keeping with modern day living (i.e. deprived of sunlight, views etc) and she considered getting resource consent would be difficult enough, without the added restriction of listing.

During question time, the Committee referred to Plan Change 18 (Oriental Bay Height Area) and the restriction on building heights that that Plan Change brought about. Ms Moran stated that she did not support the Plan Change and she had appeared in opposition to it at the Environment Court.

Considerations:

The Hearing Committee gave careful consideration to all the issues raised by the submitters, including those elaborated on in presentations by the submitters who appeared at the hearing.

Wellington Cathedral of St Paul

With reference to submitter 7 on the Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, the Hearing Committee noted that the Cathedral is an extremely important building. Particular consideration was given to the interior of the building, with the Committee noting the importance of the porch, nave, aisles and altar-end interior spaces. The Committee considered that the general form of these spaces were integral to the impression a visitor has when inside the Cathedral, but recognised that the Cathedral is an operational building and must be able to be managed in a way appropriate to its various ecumenical needs. On this basis, the Committee agreed that the listing should not cover fittings and furnishings and the following wording for the listing description was recommended by the Committee:

Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, including the general form of the interior spaces and Lady Chapel Building 1954-1998.

Careful consideration was given to the option of the Council entering into Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the members of the Cathedral and the Diocese. The Committee was split in their decision on whether or not to pursue this, with two Commissioners in favour of listing in the District Plan and one Commissioner with the dissenting view in favour of exploring the MoU option.

The majority Committee noted that there is a large car park to the rear of the property that could easily accommodate a high rise building. The height limit in the area is 43.8m, meaning the Cathedral could potentially sell off the car park and build a quite substantial building in its place. The Committee considered that such a development would be very difficult to manage appropriately via a MoU, as the Cathedral members and the Diocese wouldn't necessarily have to inform the Council if they decided to sell the land. Even if they did inform the Council of such intent, the Council would have no right to object. The Committee observed that if the Cathedral was listed, the Diocese would still have the option of selling off the land but any subsequent development would have to respect the Cathedral itself (through the heritage provisions in Plan Change 43).

The majority of the Committee also raised concern that entering into a MoU agreement may set a precedent which would weaken the integrity of the future listing process. It considered it would also place protection of a significant building outside of the RMA process and District Plan and therefore away from the knowledge of the wider community. It could also be potentially cumbersome.

The majority Committee concluded that not only is it the city's most important Anglican building, but it is also a well recognised landmark within the city, and for that reason has high public recognition and affection. The majority of the Committee considered that the amendments to the listing description would allow for flexibility for the operations of the Cathedral in a day to day sense as well as allowing for the Dean, Wardens and Vestry to continue working on the property over time. On this basis, it is considered that the St Paul Wellington Cathedral (including noted interior spaces) and the Lady Chapel should be included in the District Plan Heritage List.

Halfway House and Nott House and milk stand

In response to submitter 12 regarding the common reference to the Halfway House, the Committee recognised that past inaccurate references can often lead to the assumption that this is indeed fact. Whilst the Committee recognised that that the building may not be the original 'Halfway House', it appreciated that the name is now recognised locally and it is now local knowledge that refers to it as such. With this in mind, the Committee recommended that the building profile was re-written to reflect that the building was not necessarily *the* 'Halfway House' but is located within a historical 'half-way' area that was frequented by stop over travellers. The revised profile also signals that the building is locally known as Halfway House and this regard, the Committee considered that the listing description should remain as Halfway House. A revised building profile is attached in Appendix 3 of this report.

In addition to the written points raised by submitter 12, The Committee noted that the Glenside community were heavily involved in advocating for the listing of these buildings and the inclusion of these buildings on the list reflects those community aspirations. The Committee referred to earlier work, involving a planning exercise with the community for the Northern Growth Management Framework (Plan Change 36)

which canvassed heritage issues/items within the area. This planning exercise did not highlight the need for further research into this area and these findings are acceptable. Based on this, the Committee did not deem it necessary to recommend any further research into a generic north Wellington area review.

The Committee also identified an incorrect reference to a local historian and this will be amended accordingly.

Former Primitive Methodist Church and Manse, 22 Donald McLean Street

The Committee considered that the Church was a very prominent building in Donald McLean Street and also feel that there was strong community connection towards the Church. For this reason, the Committee was of the opinion that the Church was somewhat of a landmark in the area and gave careful thought as to what the streetscape would look like if the building was removed.

The Committee also took into account the pre-1930's demolition rule that applies within the area, and noted that the rule is not designed to protect heritage *per se*, but rather to allow consideration of a building's contribution to the character and streetscape values of a neighbourhood. The Committee noted that the pre 1930's rule does not require heritage assessment of a building when an application is sought for alterations, removal or demolition. The Committee recognised importance of the Church's streetscape contribution, but considered that the Church went beyond this and that it was a handsome building within its own right, displaying architectural, contextual and social value – all key considerations when assessing a building for its heritage value. Accordingly, the Committee agreed that the Church building should be listed in the District Plan as proposed.

However, the Committee did not agree that the Manse and front fence should be listed and recommend that these items be removed from the listing description. Therefore, it is recommended that the listing description be amended to read:

Former Primitive Methodist Church Building 1907

In terms of the merit or otherwise of listing, the Committee considered that the heritage listing does not preclude redevelopment of the remainder of the site. Whilst it was acknowledged that the heritage listing would require the owners to pay more attention to future design, the Committee were confident that the Church would still have opportunity to redevelop and that there was economic viability and reality for the remainder of the site to be redeveloped.

It is recommended that the Former Primitive Methodist Church, 22 Donald McLean Street be listed.

The Shepherds Arms, 285 Tinakori Road

In response to submitter 16, the Committee recognised that the site has been used for as a local pub for a long time and indeed was well known as such in Wellington. The Committee also recognised its contribution to the Thorndon village atmosphere.

However, given the extensive level of alteration and modification to the building, particularly the exterior fabric, the Committee was distinctly of the mind that the 'historic use' of the site as a pub was not a strong enough quality to warrant full listing of the building. In making this decision, the Committee took into account the fact that the streetscape character of this part of Thorndon is protected under the District Plan. In this case, it considered that these rules and relevant Design Guide gave adequate protection to building without the need to individually list it.

APPENDIX 1

In light of this position, the Committee recommended that the Shepherds Arms, 285 Tinakori Road is not listed in the District Plan.

Welsley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street

The Committee did recognise that the church hall building had been designed by famous Wellington architect Thomas Turnbull but felt that the positioning of the building behind the much grander Church was a major disadvantage for the building. The Committee considered that this lack of visibility meant that the building had little to no streetscape appeal or wider public connection/recognition.

Further to this, the Committee also recognised that while the general shape and some features remained in the building, they felt that building's modernisation at various times meant the building had lost its historical architectural integrity.

The Committee also noted that the main focus of the site was the listed church and listed trees located at the street frontage. Given that the heritage provisions of Plan Change 43 would apply to these items, the Committee were confident that any future redevelopment or subdivision of the site would be handled in sensible manner, sensitive the heritage values of these items.

With this in mind, the Committee recommended that the Church hall building should not be listed in the District Plan.

234 and 240 Oriental Parade

During deliberations of the proposed listing of the 2 properties, Commissioner Gill declared that she had a conflict of interest in hearing these particular items, in that she personally knew Ms Moran. Commissioner Gill withdrew from any discussion on the subject buildings.

In their consideration, the majority Committee referred to the 'spot zones' attached to the properties which indicate specific height restrictions. 234 Oriental Parade is subject to a 14 metre height restriction, with 240 subject to a 13 metre height restriction. The majority Committee noted the extensive work that had gone into establishing these height restrictions and agreed that there was limited scope to go beyond these thresholds.

With regard to 234 Oriental Parade, the majority Committee felt that the building was an outstanding relic of original Oriental Parade, reflecting the past and its people. The Committee commented that it was a large family home that had been meticulously maintained over the years, and that the proposed listing did not preclude internal alterations to suit modern day family living requirements. The majority of the Committee considered the building to be a fine snapshot of turn of the century history and accordingly it should be listed in the District Plan.

In terms of 240 Oriental Parade, the majority of the Committee were equally supportive of the proposed listing. The Committee noted the building's admirable detail and features and felt that the owner's plans for the rear out-building could be accommodated and that the listing would not unduly restrict those changes.

The majority of the Committee recognised that both houses are some of the few remaining older Oriental Bay timber houses in an area that has been subject to enormous development pressure that has altered the streetscape of the Bay. However, notwithstanding the location of the buildings, they have been through a thorough assessment and majority Committee noted that the buildings do have heritage value within their own right. The submitter has highlighted the fact that the face of Oriental

Parade has altered considerably over time. The majority of the Committee reflected that it is for this very reason that the protection of these buildings, as survivors of Edwardian times, is paramount.

The Committee recommended that 234 and 240 Oriental Parade be retained on the proposed heritage list.

Recommendation:

- **Reject** submission 7 and further submissions FS2 and FS5 insofar as they request the deletion of the proposed listing of the Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, the Lady Chapel and Service Buildings but amend the listing description to read '*Wellington Cathedral of St Paul, including general plan form of the interior spaces and Lady Chapel Building 1954-1998*'.
- **Reject** submission 12 that Halfway House, 246 Middleton Road and Nott House and milk stand, 400 Middleton Road, should not be listed until a full review of north Wellington is undertaken.
- **Accept** further submission FS4 that Halfway House, 246 Middleton Road and Nott House and milk stand, 400 Middleton Road, are included on the District Plan Heritage List.
- **Reject** submission 14 and further submission FS5 insofar as they request the deletion of the proposed listing the Former Primitive Methodist Church and Manse, 22 Donald McLean Street but amend the listing description to cover only the Church building and read 'Former Primitive Methodist Church 1907'.
- **Accept** submission 16 in that it requests the deletion of the proposed listing the Shepherds Arms, 285 Tinakori Road.
- **Accept** submission 17 in that it requests the deletion of the proposed listing the Wesley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street.
- **Reject** further submission FS6 insofar as it supports the proposed listing of the Wesley Church Hall, 75 Taranaki Street.
- **Reject** submission 19 insofar that it requests the deletion of 234 and 240 Oriental Parade.

3.3 Other buildings not specifically submitted on but noted by the Committee

In addition to the items specifically submitted on, the Committee also considered all of the other buildings put forward for proposed listing. The Committee were in agreement with the assessments made and were comfortable with the proposed listings. In particular, the Committee commended the inclusion of Maranui Surf Life Saving Club and the Oriental Boat Sheds.

As an aside, Commissioner Morrison declared that he was one of 2 Council appointed Trustees for the Basin Reserve Trust. Commissioner Morrison withdrew from any discussion on the proposed listing of the Museum Stand. The majority of the Committee supported the inclusion of this building on heritage list.

4 SUMMARY

With any plan change, the goal is to achieve public policy objectives while recognising the rights of private owners, and this requires the balancing of competing aims and interests.

In a day to day sense, the implications of listing would mean very little would change for owners of the building. General maintenance and repair of a building and interior

alterations and additions (unless specifically listed) continue to be permitted as of right. When consent is needed, for example for an extension, the Council provides free conservation advice and technical assistance to ensure development is consistent with the heritage value of the building. In some cases, if certain criteria are met, building owners are also entitled to financial assistance under the Heritage Incentive Fund.

In terms of the added responsibility and restriction put in place when a building becomes a heritage item, considerable care has been taken to achieve an appropriate balance in the package of heritage policies and rules in place. It is believed that the rules act sensitively to facilitate the reasonable use of land affected by heritage listings. The rules contain no prohibited or non-complying activities and the opportunity exists through the resource consent processes to seek consent for any work. Nothing is foreclosed.

The buildings proposed for listing are hugely important for the contribution that they make to Wellington's historic make up. They represent physical and cultural legacies that are a significant asset to Wellington City and future generations. The recommendation to put these items forward for listing is well considered based on the expert advice of heritage professionals.

In this light, it is considered that the proposed listings are reasonable and will not render land incapable of reasonable use, consistent with sound resource management practice and in keeping with Part II of the Resource Management Act.

5 CONCLUSION

This report has addressed all of the submissions to proposed District Plan Change 53 either generally, in respect of particular issues, or specifically.

Overall, it is concluded that the Plan Change be adopted with amendments that have been recommended to address omissions or otherwise improve the content or operation of the provisions in response to submissions.

**Sally Baber, Independent Commissioner
Chair, Hearing Committee**

District Plan Change 53

Proposed additions and deletions to heritage buildings, objects and areas.

FORT BALLANCE HERITAGE AREA - AMENDED BOUNDARY



SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE INFORMATION FOR FORT BALLANCE PROFILE

Features of interest in and around Fort Ballance Heritage Area



Legend

••••• Fort Ballance Boundary as ammended by submission

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 Road to Fort from Mahanga Bay (1941) | 12 Fort Gordon |
| 2 Tramway (1885) | 13 See-saw searchlight emplacements |
| 3 Former Gunner Cottage site | 14 Searchlight engine room foundations |
| 4 Rubble field (demolition) | 15 Searchlight engine room foundations |
| 5 Minefield control post and engine room (underground) | 16 No.6 searchlight (foundation) |
| 6 Low Battery foundation remains | 17 Original path from Fort Ballance to Scorching Bay |
| 7 Low Battery magazine (buried) | 18 Sight Pillar |
| 8 Magazine | 19 Fire Command Post |
| 9 12 pounder / 4 inch battery site (buried) | 20 Fort Ballance |
| 10 War shelter (buried) | 21 Parade ground |
| 11 75 mm gun site | 22 Military road (to Shelly Bay via Kau Point, built early 1890's) |



AMENDED HALFWAY HOUSE PROFILE

House at Half-Way, 246 Middleton Road



RM VIII-2005

Architect:	unknown
Date of Construction:	circa 1885 (tentative attribution)
Material:	timber, corrugated iron roof, brick chimneys
NZHPT Register:	not registered
District Plan:	not listed
Legal Description:	Pt Sec 23 Porirua District, Belmont Sub-Division DP A2839

Statement of Significance

This house has high **historic** significance and great **rarity** value as one of three¹ surviving buildings of the early settlement of the Glenside area. It is held in high public esteem and has some social value for that. While of relatively common architecture for the day, it is rare as a surviving rural building with an open setting and has high **representative** value for that. It has relatively high **aesthetic** value due to its high level of authenticity, is part of an important broader historic landscape and has high **group** value with other local buildings of the era, including No. 400 Middleton Road.

The house retains much of its original landscape value in its expansive setting off the main road, which adds to its sense of authenticity.

The house is a good example of early rural construction in the Wellington area and has some known surviving original wallpapers and is of some **technical** interest.

History

This building is known locally as the “Half-way House”. It is one of a small number of surviving historic buildings and sites in Glenside, a semi-rural area between Johnsonville and Tawa. The land through Glenside was well-traversed by Maori prior to settlement by colonists in 1840. Some of the early Maori tracks and later bridle trails were developed to become the ‘Porirua Road’, a main route between Porirua and Wellington.² The first European settlers in the area, Anthony and Susannah Wall, built a house in this area in 1842³. The area was a convenient place to break the long journey (by foot or horse) and quickly became known as ‘The Halfway’. This lasted until 1928, when the Postal Office department held a competition for a new name, and ‘Glenside’ was adopted. The Walls did not offer formal accommodation, however, they took in travellers from time to time. From the mid-1840s, a number of accommodation houses sprang up in the “Half-way”. The historical origins of 246 Middleton Road, locally known as the Half-way House are somewhat confused, owing to conflicting historiography. According to Arthur Carman, Alexander “Sandy” Brown arrived in the district in the early 1870s and took over the management of an existing halfway house, apparently built by John McKain in 1849.⁴ Carman goes on to state that Brown “...built the large two-storey house, set back from the road”, by which he means 246 Middleton Road. He does not refer to this building as a halfway house in the text of his book, however a photograph of the building is labelled thus.⁵ According to him, Brown left the district about 1890.

Fred Marshall states “the house known as the Half-way House ... was a wayside inn which had been kept in the 1850s by McKain. In 1871 Sandy Brown ... lived there until

¹ I. Bowman, ‘Halfway House, Johnsonville. Heritage Assessment’ (2005), p.15

² C. Bibby, ‘The Halfway Houses in Glenside’ (2004). NZHPT File 12013-567.

³ A.H Carman, *Tawa Flat and the Old Porirua Road, 1840-1982* (A.H Carman, Wellington, 1982), p.71. Early sketches survive that depict halfway houses in the district: ‘Home of Anthony and Susannah Wall, The Halfway’ by Martha King (1849), ‘Te Keneperu, Browns Public House (c.1850) and ‘North Road’, signed by Captain Andrew Russell (1848). All are held at the Alexander Turnbull Library.

⁴ Carman, p.71.

⁵ Carman, figure 34.

some time after the opening of the railway in 1885.”⁶ He appears to conflate the present building with McKain’s house of 1849, which is probably an error on his part. Nothing about the physical appearance of 246 Middleton Road suggests it can be dated back this far.

Barbara Kay, descendent of the Wall family, notes that Brown replaced McKain’s house in approximately the 1870s.⁷ This statement is not referenced. Finally, Bob Meyer claims the halfway house attribution to 249 Middleton Road is a mistake. He argues:

*Often, and mistakenly called the “Half-way House”, the two-storied house behind Downer’s Central Region office at Glenside [i.e. 246 Middleton Road] was built by Alexander “Sandy” Brown in 1885. He happened at the same time to be the proprietor of the real Half-way House but for some reason this name was appended to his private residence.*⁸

This is a plausible explanation but his publication is not referenced, which casts his explanation into the realm of speculation. In fact none of the sources contain direct references to primary sources, which makes verification difficult. As they stand, the sources generally agree Alexander Brown constructed 246 Middleton Road around the mid 1880s, though this in itself is probably derived from Carman.

The house at 246 Middleton Road is known locally as the “Half-way House”. This name has been attributed to it for at least 50 or more years by local residents.. Based on its outward appearance and known history it is most unlikely to have been the original half-way accommodation house built by McKain but was rather more likely to have been a separate private residence.

Tracing the ownership of the land on which the house stands is more straightforward. Edward Storr Halswell was awarded a crown grant for Section 23 Porirua District in 1866.⁹ He was an absentee land-owner, and leased out portions of the section. When he died in 1874 ownership passed to Hugh Beauchamp Halswell¹⁰, who similarly leased out the land from a distance. It was not sold until 1908 when Charles Izard, member of a prominent Wellington family, purchased Section 23 from Halswell, along with numerous pieces of land in Wellington City, the Hutt District and Horokiwi Valley.¹¹ No written record of any lease to Alexander Brown has been located.¹²

⁶ F. Marshall, ‘Now for Halfway (Glenside), *The Onslow Historian* , vol. 8 no. 1 1978.

⁷ B. and R. Kay, *Anthony Wall, Settler of Porirua: The Papakowhai Story* (Fielding Organising Committee for the Wall Family 50th Reunion), p.40. Collection of C. Bibby.

⁸ R.J Meyer, *Up in the Hills: A History of Johnsonville* (R.J Meyer, Wellington, 1990), p.29.

⁹ Deeds Index 3/289, Wellington Land District. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). Halswell, a New Zealand Company Commissioner of Native Reserves, was in New Zealand from 1841-1845.

¹⁰ Carman, p.66.

¹¹ Deed 176/478, Wellington Land District. LINZ. Izard paid £19,000 in total.

¹² Section 23 was not bought under the land transfer system until 1911 when a certificate of title was issued to Izard (CT WN192/26).

In 1923, lawyer Phillip Watt purchased the property from The New Zealand Meat Packing and Bacon Company, which had acquired it from Izard two years earlier.¹³ Prior to this it appears to have been leased for farming purposes.¹⁴ After World War I Watt's nephews, Jock and Charles Fisher, arrived in New Zealand from Scotland, and resided in the house. In the mid-1930s the land was subdivided and parts were sold for development purposes. A section was set aside which eventually became part of the Glenside Reserve.¹⁵ Around 1937 the Fishers created the Glenside Golf Course and used the house as the clubroom. Some alterations in the hall area date from this period.

In 1951 the Wellington City Council (WCC) purchased the house and remaining land in order to create the Glenside Reserve.¹⁶ The house was rented to a series of council employees, and later individuals unconnected with WCC, from this time.¹⁷ Its distinctive rural setting and relative isolation, exacerbated by irregular public transport, made it difficult to rent out, and tenants did not last long.¹⁸ WCC made some early changes. In 1954 the verandah on the north elevation was covered in to create a sun-room, while in 1956 a new laundry and bathroom was added to the south elevation, replacing a previous lean-to structure.¹⁹ The house was probably divided into two flats at this time. Aside from this, few other changes have been made; maintenance has been sporadic and the house has deteriorated accordingly.

The Glenside Progressive Association (GPA), established in 1951, has long taken an interest in the "Half-way House" and associated reserve. In response to a WCC proposal to sell the property in 2003, the GPA held a public open day at the house, which was attended by 700 people.²⁰ At present WCC retains ownership and a conservation plan has been written.²¹ It has been untenanted since the mid 1990s.

Description

Setting

The building known locally as the Half-way House stands off the east side of the main Tawa road in Glenside, along the route of the Old Porirua Road. Although a name of modern origin, the Glenside area is one of Wellington's long-established communities, dating back to the early 1850s. It consisted principally of scattered farmhouses along the road of which three, including this house, now survive.

¹³ Ibid. Mrs Watt won the naming competition referred to above.

¹⁴ Carman, p.71.

¹⁵ Bibby (2004), p.5; CT WN192/26.

¹⁶ Bibby, 'The History and Heritage of Glenside', *The Onslow Historian* vol. 32 nos.1-4, 2002, p.18. Victoria University acquired part of the town belt in the city as part of planned extension to the campus. This land was purchased to make up the deficit.

¹⁷ I. Bowman, 'Halfway House, Johnsonville. Heritage Assessment' (2005), p.6.

¹⁸ 00001:2264:67/73: Town Clerk's File 246 Middleton Road. Wellington City Archives.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Bibby (2004).

²¹ I. Bowman, 'Halfway House, Johnsonville. Conservation Plan' (2004).

The house is sited in the Glenside Reserve and this forms its immediate setting, rising up to the east until it is cut off by State Highway 1. A large treed knoll dominates the Reserve just to the north and the land runs gently downhill to the stream at the south of the Reserve. To the east is the main road.

The house sits to the edge of the site, at the north bounded by a common driveway, to the south by the stream, to the east by the Glenside Reserve and to the west, “Twiglands” garden centre. The view from the verandah, once of farmland now includes a high-density residential care facility, the yard of a construction company and a garden centre, all on the main road and kept at a reasonable distance by the Reserve boundary. The site falls towards the stream; the house is given some prominence by its elevation above this feature.

There are two notable outbuildings remaining – an old garage-cum-workshop on the flat near the stream and a shed near the house, both in quite poor condition.

Building

The house itself is a plain foursquare box, clad in rusticated weatherboards, trimmed with timber door and double-hung window joinery (sashes generally divided vertically into two lights) and capped with a shallow-pitched hipped corrugated iron roof. A substantial brick chimney projects through the roof near the west end of the house. The form of the house is enlivened by a shallow-pitched verandah which wraps around the south and west sides, and which is partly enclosed on the west side as a sun-porch. At the east end, a collection of small modern lean-tos contain service spaces and is surmounted by a particularly awkwardly designed fire escape stair. A similar and equally ungainly edifice perches inelegantly over the enclosed verandah at the west end of the house.

The principal architectural feature of the house is concentrated on the south elevation, which has a simple symmetrical composition in relation to the three principal bays of the verandah and which contains the front door to the house. The front door assembly, featuring a heavy door with two arched glazed panels and two recessed bolection-moulded panels, glazed arched side-lights over recessed panels and plain top-lights, is set in the centre and flanked on either side with a large double-hung window assembly (which is composed of a large central window and a half-width window on either side); above the verandah, a single double-hung window is centred over the door and each of the lower windows.

The verandah retains its original pattern of posts and simple verandah brackets, although these appear to be modern replacements. At the west end, the verandah extends half a bay beyond the house line and turns the corner, into the built-in 1950s sun-porch which extends the remainder of the width of the house. At the east end, the verandah finishes into a modern lean-to storage shed. Little of the original pattern of the east or west elevations of the house can now be discerned, although the double-hung windows that survive at the first floor are presumably in their original locations. The outward appearance of the house, and the lack of obvious modifications, is consistent with a construction date in the late 1870s or early 1880s.

The north elevation has also been “modernised”, with the central back door converted to serve the 1950s alteration into flats, a prominent 1930s window at the right side of the door and an original double-hung window at the left side. At the first floor, a single double hung-window is centred above the door and provides light to the staircase.

Internally, the layout of the house appears quite authentic. The front door opens onto a small hall with timber dados which leads on to the timber staircase, still in quite original and good condition with its moulded and wreathed handrail, plain rectangular balusters and newels and dark-stained shellacked finish. The main rooms are laid out more or less symmetrically about the staircase, two rooms per side of the house, each with a fireplace, with a bathroom occupying the plan space of the hall at the first floor. At the ground floor, there are two kitchens (one per flat), and a bathroom and other service spaces located in the lean-tos at the east end of the building. While there are fireplaces in the eastern rooms, there is no chimney visible.

Interior features of particular note include the door and window joinery, the hall and staircase, original timber floors in most rooms, the interesting 1950s “Champion” gas cookers and the bathroom fittings, and the remnants of old wallpaper, in many layers, which are still extant in several rooms beneath a variety of more modern wall linings including softboard and hardboard.

Recommendation for Listing

The building known locally as the Half-Way House is one of a group of three early houses still surviving on the route of the Old Porirua Road in Glenside and has high rarity and group value for that. The house has, despite awkward 1950s alterations, retained a high level of authenticity of form and materials and the immediate setting still provides a good sense of the original context.

It is recommended that this building be listed on the District Plan. The listing should protect the extant site and the form, scale and materials of the house, but needs to recognise that there is significant potential for restoration and conservation work to be carried out, some of which might be focussed on restoring part or all of the original form of the house. The listing should recognise the Glenside Reserve as the legal boundaries of the site. It is possible that there is a Reserve Management Plan. It is recommended that any such document be updated to be in accordance with the District Plan listing.