

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, A SUBMISSION ON NPDC'S NOTIFIED PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991

To: New Plymouth District Council
Address: Private Bag 2025, New Plymouth 4342
Email: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Further Submitter Details

Name of further submitter: Kimberley Markham
Contact person (if different from above) Cam Twigley
Postal address: PO Box 551, New Plymouth 4340
Email address for service: cam.twigley@btw.nz
Phone number: 0274544886

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 above.

I am: (please tick relevant box)

- a) A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
(In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- b) 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 that you come within this category); or
- c) The local authority for the relevant area.

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

- The Heritage Taranaki submission relates directly to a property that is owned by Kimberley Markham. If the submission point is allowed it would significantly impact Kimberley's private property rights.

Council Hearing (please tick relevant box)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission? Yes No

If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing? Yes No

Submission

The submission points, support or opposition, reasons and decisions sought are set out in the attached document.

Note: Any attachments to your submission should only be supporting information, not the submission.



24/08/2020

Signature of the person making further submission
or the person authorised to sign on behalf of the
person making further submission

Date

Name of Further Submitter: Kimberley Markham

My specific further submission(s) are as follows:

(Please only insert one further submission point per line. Add further sheets as required)

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
Entire submission from: Submission number 297 Heritage Taranaki Inc - Ivan Bruce 33 Scott Street, Motoroa, New Plymouth 0413	Sub No. / Point No. Entire Submission	Support / Oppose Oppose	Provision Historic Heritage Chapter – all provisions	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of 251 and 253 Courtenay Street, New Plymouth within Schedule 1 (SCHED1) of the Proposed District Plan (PDP).</p> <p>The submitter has not been consulted by Heritage Taranaki about the significant changes proposed to their property. This has not enabled a reasonable time period to consider all of the Historic Heritage provisions in the PDP and the implications for the submitter’s future plans for use and enjoyment of their property.</p>	<p>Oppose that the building (251 and 253 Courtenay Street, New Plymouth) be listed as a Schedule 1 building. By default all PDP provisions related to the historic heritage chapter are also opposed.</p>
Submission number 297 Heritage Taranaki Inc - Ivan Bruce 33 Scott Street, Motoroa, New Plymouth 0413	297.122, 297.123, 297.234 and 297.235	Oppose	SCHED1 / Heritage Buildings and Items and SCHED3 / Archaeological Sites or Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	<p>The building does not meet the criteria as set out in the proposed objectives and policies. The submitter’s position is consistent with NPDC’s decision to not list the building in SCED1 SCED3 in the notified Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The Heritage Taranaki submission references an assessment on website Kete New Plymouth. This assessment of the dwellings at 251 Courtney Street notes that the ‘cottage was <u>probably</u> constructed in the late Nineteenth Century’. The assessment completed by Hamish Crimp is considered to be based</p>	<p>Oppose that the buildings (251 and 253 Courtenay Street, New Plymouth) be listed as a Schedule 1 and 3 building</p>

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				<p>on assumptions and does not clearly identify whether the building is in fact a pre-1900 building.</p> <p>The following assessment of heritage values has been completed with regard to both of the dwellings at 251 and 253 Courtenay Street, which supports the building not being listed in SCHED1 and SCED3:</p> <p><i>Historical:</i> The buildings are not considered to represent important themes or aspects relating to the history of New Zealand or of the city, district or region which can teach us about the past.</p> <p><i>Importance to Community:</i> The buildings have no particular current importance to the community. The submitter incorrectly interprets the criteria of 'importance to the community' by indicating what it was historically used for.</p> <p><i>Architecture and Construction Features:</i> As small nineteenth century timber cottages, the buildings are not considered to have a particular architectural interest or to represent an important architectural period or style. The buildings are also not considered to</p>	

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				<p>be particularly innovative or use, being single storey timber dwellings.</p> <p><i>Setting and Context:</i> While the dwellings are visible from Courtenay Street and have some historic continuity with being two adjacent cottages constructed in circa 1894, the development in the surrounding area is considerably more modern and detracts from the overall heritage values of the area. Particularly as both sites appear to contain a more modern dwelling at the rear.</p> <p><i>Archaeological Values:</i> While both buildings are noted to have been constructed in the mid to late 1890's the significant site modifications are likely to have destroyed or modified any potential archaeological evidence relating to pre 1900 human activity.</p> <p><i>Rarity, representativeness and Integrity:</i> While 251 Courtenay Street is in good condition for its age, significant alterations have been made. Specifically, the weatherboards on the east, west and north facing walls have been replaced by corrugated iron, the brick chimney has been removed and the original windows have been removed and replaced with wooden casement windows. These</p>	

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				<p>modifications detract from the overall pre 1900's representativeness and historic value of the buildings. 253 Courtenay Street is in a state of disrepair and the costs to restore the cottage would be extensive. For these reasons, both 251 and 253 Courtenay Street are not considered to be particularly rare or representative of the 1890's era.</p>	
<p>Entire submission from: Submission number 297</p> <p>Heritage Taranaki Inc - Ivan Bruce</p> <p>33 Scott Street, Motoroa, New Plymouth 0413</p>	<p>297.234 and 297.235</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>SCHED3 / Archaeological Sites or Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</p>	<p>The submitter questions the need to protect built archaeological sites through the District Plan when they already receive protection under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. The submitter questions what Heritage Taranaki are trying to achieve by including built archaeological sites in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned about the implications on their neighbours' property rights given there are rules in the Proposed Plan which relate to works within 50m of archaeological sites. The submitter questions whether their neighbours have been consulted on the proposed changes and have been provided a chance to make a submission?</p>	<p>Oppose that the buildings (251 and 253 Courtenay Street, New Plymouth) be listed as a Schedule 3 building in the PDP. By default all PDP provisions related to the historic heritage chapter are also opposed.</p>

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				The submitter considers a better way to manage the building would be in accordance with HH-P18 through supporting landowners to manage, maintain and preserve archaeological sites via the non-regulatory methods outlined in the policy.	

Note to Further Submitter

This further submission on the Proposed District Plan must be received by the New Plymouth District Council by **5pm on Tuesday 25 August 2020**.

To get your further submission to us, either:

Post to: New Plymouth District Council, Reply Paid DX, DX Box NX10026, New Plymouth.

Attention: District Planning Team

Deliver to: Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth
or to library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood or Waitara

Email to: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Visit our website: newplymouthnz.com/eplan

A copy of your further submission MUST be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority. Contact details for all submitters can be found on our Proposed Plan page at newplymouthnz.com/eplan.

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 1 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 evidence, 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.