

Prehearing Meeting Notes:

Manawatū District Council and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga 26 April 2023

In attendance:

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZ): Dean Raymond, Thejas Jagannath, Rueben Daube, Eleanor Cooper

Manawatū District Council: Ian Bowman (Council's Heritage consultant), Rochelle Waugh (Consultant Planner), Andrea Harris (Consultant Planner)

Discussion by topics:

Non-contributing buildings

Rochelle provided some background to the plan change and the intent of the provisions for non-contributing buildings. Dean raised concerns where it is less clear, wanting to remove any ambiguity for consent planners.

Rochelle provided some photos of examples in the District where there are clear additions, that may not enhance the heritage values. Discussion on whether it's about the size, height, footprint of the non-contributing parts of heritage buildings.

Rochelle has looked at the Auckland Council definition and thought it was simpler and may address the concerns raised. Thejas and Dean thought the Auckland definition could be more useful.

ACTION: Rochelle to provide an updated definition based on the Auckland one for Heritage NZ to consider.

Discussion took place on how consent planners will know the details of the heritage buildings. Some information is in the Schedule 4b, but there are also the individual technical reports. A guidance note in Schedule 4b could be added to alert plan users to the full heritage reports. Dean thought this could be a useful addition to the Plan. *ACTION: Rochelle to draft a new guidance note referring plan users to the individual heritage reports that can be obtained from Council noting that these reports have greater detail on each heritage item compared with the summary in Schedule 4b.*

Rochelle covered off the issue of removal of non-contributing parts of a heritage item. This would see reference to 'removal' in Policy 10 and HH-Rule 11. Dean agreed with this change. *Action: Rochelle to amend Policy 10 and HH-Rule 11 to include removal and share with Heritage NZ to show draft changes.*

On the submission about R16 and the formatting, Thejas noted that the HH Rule is closely worded to the HH standard. They need to complement each other. Andrea noted that the Council is in the process of updating the structure of the District Plan in line with the National Planning Standards so the final numbering may change. *Action: Rochelle to review the wording of HH-R16 against the standards to ensure they flow in the document.*

NZDF submission

Rochelle discussed the NZDF submission on which Heritage NZ made a further submission on. Proposed policy related to change in the non-contributing part of a building, while NZDF considered

that the increase in height or footprint is more important. Ian noted that the additions on the RNZAF Hangars were not contributing to the heritage values of the Hangars. Any reduction in size would be better as more of the original building would be seen. The same applied to additions on the house. All agreed an increase in height or footprint had a greater risk on the heritage item. Dean noted they were comfortable with the provisions relating to an increase in height or footprint as the trigger for consents as that had the greatest potential impact on heritage values. *ACTION: Rochelle to amend the rule to remove reference to change and replace with increase. The amended wording would be shared with Heritage NZ.*

Dean discussed the submission point on including in the schedule references to what was contributing or not for each heritage item. Rochelle noted that we don't have that level of information to add. It was agreed that the reference to a guidance note for the full technical reports within Schedule 4b may assist with this submission point. Ian did note that having the inventory online (as other councils have done) is really worthwhile. Further consideration for where these detailed technical reports could be held will be done.

Signage

Rochelle discussed that she needed to review more the issue of signage in relation to obscuring architectural features and signs minimising damage to heritage fabric. Scope could be an issue as the provisions can only be relevant to Schedule 4b. Dean did note that signage in commercial areas is more likely a concern. He was going to have a look for some good examples. Rochelle did note that Wellington included reference to ensuring that damage to the heritage fabric was minimised in their policy and not in the rules. *ACTION: Rochelle to consider this further. Dean to provide any good examples of provisions that could address the submission point.*

Okahupokia Pā

Rochelle noted that the Pā is not part of this plan change. Dean indicated he was ok with this not being listed as it is to be part of a future plan change.

Mangaweka Bridge

Rochelle noted that she has not been able to find this listing. Ian has completed a heritage report for the bridge in the past. Noted that this bridge was in both Rangitikei and Manawatu areas. *ACTION: Dean to confirm the status of the listing. Rochelle to confirm the resolution of council on retaining the bridge.*

Relocation policy

This is in response to the O'Brien submission where Heritage NZ is a further submitter. Rochelle explained a potential unintended consequence that demolition could be easier than relocation through the policy pathways. Dean noted that Wellington City has recently released their s42A report which contains new changes that could be better than what was originally notified. Dean indicated that they had submitted on both demolition and relocation provisions and are happy with

the changes proposed in the s42a Report. *ACTION: Rochelle to review the Wellington City Council s42a report for heritage.*

Meeting closed noting that Rochelle is to provide updated wording to Heritage NZ in light of the discussions and actions above.