

Further Submission on NPDC's Notified Proposed District Plan

Response ID:48 Data

1. Further submitter details

1. Name of further submitter

David Cook

2. Contact person (if different from above)

3. Email Address

The Council will serve all formal documents by email. Where there is no email address provided, the documents will be posted to the postal address stated below.

dncnzl@gmail.com

4. Postal Address

14 Rhodes Fall, Rangatira Park, Taupo 3330

5. Phone Number

6. I am:

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest of the general public. (In this case, also explain the grounds for saying you fall in this category; or

7. Please state the grounds as to why you come within the category selected above.

I am a beneficiary of Reo Moana Trust, and son the Trustees

2. Council Hearing

8. Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission?

No

9. If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?

Yes

3. My Further Submission(s)

10. The specific further submissions in support or opposition and the decisions sought for NPDC's Proposed District Plan are as follows:

Please only insert one further submission point at a time, there is the ability to add additional points further down.

I support/oppose the submission of: (state the submission number, name and address of the person making the original submission)

Submission #297.112; Ivan Bruce, Heritage Taranaki Inc., 33 Scott St Motouroa NP 0413

Submission No./Point No. (of the original submission)

297.112

Provision

Do you support or oppose the original submission?

Oppose

The reasons for my support/opposition are: (state the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)

Adding Reo Moana Flats, 10 Weymouth Street, New Plymouth, to Schedule 1 of NPDC's list of Heritage Buildings would neither be in A; the private interest of the owners, B; the interests of the residents of the flats, or, on balance, C; the general interest of the Taranaki public.

A;

This submission has already created a large and unnecessary amount of anxiety for the elderly owners, Marlene and Nelson Cook. They seek to maintain their right to freely maintain and improve their rental property in a commercially viable manner throughout their latter years without unnecessary, stressful and costly intervention of quite restrictive Heritage Building rules. This is a reasonable request.

B/

The continued commercial viability of the flats depend on the owners being free to make cost effective improvements to improve livability for residents.

For example, the original rotting, leaking timber window frames were replaced by aluminium joinery as they were the most reasonable solution. This improvement is identified as 'incongruous' by the Heritage Buildings Report assessment and therefore, following this simple line of thought, 'regrettable' by Heritage Taranaki Inc. Similarly the additions of two first floor window openings have greatly improved the amenity of those two dwellings for their residents. These improvements would have contravened DP rules had this submission been adopted previously and the cost of compliance or use of any 'congruous' alternative would have been prohibitive.

Residents of Reo Moana flats would either have had objectively worse dwellings to inhabit, or had to pay more rent, or possibly both.

C/

Arguably it is more important to the general Taranaki public that reasonable and well maintained flats remain available for competitive rent than they come under the unnecessary control of further restrictive rules. As long as this building remains structurally sound, despite improvements, it will remain the essence of its landmark character and its 'historic' nature will remain available and general value undiminished to the public.

There is one further matter. I seek that New Plymouth District Council disregard the Heritage Building Report assessment of Reo Moana Flats from Historic Taranaki Inc. It is displayed on New Plymouth District Council's website falsely using New Plymouth District Council's letterhead. Purporting an authority it does not have renders the document inherently biased and is a patent disgrace.

I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed/disallowed (give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)

Disallowed, as explained above

4. Note To Further Submitter

A copy of your further submission MUST be served on the original submitter with 5 working days after it is served on the local authority. Contact details for all submitters can be found on the Proposed District Plan page of the NPDC website.

Please note all information provided in your submission, including your personal information, will be made publicly available.

Your submission (or part of it) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the

submission (or part of it):

it is frivolous or vexatious,

it discloses no reasonable or relevant case,

it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further,

it contains offensive language,

it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert advice, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

11. I understand that details of my submission will be made publicly available and I must serve a copy of my further submission to the original submitter within 5 working days of making my further submission.

I understand

5. Thank You!

Thank you for your further submission. Formal acknowledgement of your further submission will be provided once processed and accepted by Council.

Email a copy of my further submission(s)

Aug 24, 2020 03:48:56 Success: Email Sent to: dncnzi@gmail.com
