

Further Submission on NPDC's Notified Proposed District Plan

Response ID:44 Data

1. Further submitter details

1. Name of further submitter

Hugh and Jennie McCullough

2. Contact person (if different from above)

Jennie McCullough

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.

majah@xtra.co.nz

4. Postal Address

219 Gill St, Strandon

5. Phone Number

0276344079

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.

Owner of the property

2. Council Hearing

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

Yes

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)

297, Bruce Ivan - Heritage Taranaki

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

297.14

Provision

217/219 Gill Street being listed as a heritage building

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)

Although the house has some interesting architecture and history, neither the Operative or Proposed District Plan or Heritage New Zealand have identified the site, house or area as culturally or historically significant. It is noted that some pre 1900 sites are protected by Heritage NZ, however the house was built after this.

As the submission has identified, a number of houses by Frank Messenger have already been removed to enable redevelopment. To start listing these houses now as historical would prevent any redevelopment opportunities and put economic burdens of upgrade works on owners.

The site is zoned Medium Density which the Operative and Proposed District Plan seeks to achieve medium density development such as multi units and apartment buildings. The site is large and could potentially provide 3-4 units upon redevelopment. It is also noted that most of the site would also be vested to council as part of esplanade reserve requirements upon future subdivision, which would be a massive benefit to the Council and community should a future walkway be sought along the Te Henui River. In addition, the National Policy for Urban Development (now in effect) seeks to remove all barriers to the provision for more houses for the community. Therefore, having the house identified as a heritage building would be a complete contradiction to the purpose of the Medium Density Zone and National Policy Statement for Urban Development.

Furthermore, the house is now over 100 years old and needs significant work to replace rotting and rusting material and potentially earthquake strengthening. The economic cost of doing this versus redevelopment is not viable. The house has also already been modified with the addition of a garage and installation of aluminum windows as stated in the submission by Bruce Ivan..

In addition, the surrounding area has been recently redeveloped in modern housing (noticeably 213 and 215 Gill Street) and as such the character of the street has already been lost.

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)

We seek that Council disregards the submission by Bruce Ivan to list 217/219 Gill Street as a heritage building in the Proposed District Plan for the reasons stated above. Specifically, that it would prevent the redevelopment of the site to provide more housing which the underlying zone seeks to achieve. The history and architecture of Frank Messenger is interesting but not identified as culturally or historically significant.

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

317- Hamish Crimp

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

317.14

Provision

Listing the Queensland Kauri as a protected tree

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)

Although there are not many Queensland Kauri in New Zealand, neither the Operative or Proposed District Plan have identified the tree as worth protecting.

Most of the planning framework on biodiversity and on restoring gully systems seeks to ensure gullies are planted in indigenous vegetation. The Queensland Kauri is not an indigenous street, it is from Australia.

There have been slips over the years into the river under the tree, possibly as a result of the weight of the tree on the bank. The bank has been protected with erosion structures but is unclear how long these will last.

The need to apply for resource consent for any pruning or emergency removal of the tree as a result of natural hazard event would be a economic burden on the owner.

There is also a major wastewater line (critical infrastructure) in close proximity of the tree. Any emergency works to the pipe may require roots or tree to be removed.

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)

We seek that Council disregards the submission by Hamish Crimp to list the Queensland Kauri at 219 Gill Street as a protected tree in the Proposed District Plan for the reasons stated above. Specifically, for bank stability reasons in the event of any natural hazard event. In addition, that the bank would be better planted in indigenous low weight trees and vegetation to reduce the risk of a slip or damage to the wastewater pipeline. The removal of the tree should it be required in the future would be offset by planting multiple indigenous trees such as fern which protect bank stability and provide habitat for birds.

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 00:27:51 Success: Email Sent to: majah@xtra.co.nz