

Plan Change 12 - Summary of Submissions

Note: S – Support
O - Oppose

SID:	Submitter	RID	S/O	Request	Reason
1	The Burkes Pass Heritage Trust C/- Jane Batchelor, 41 Kirkwood Avenue, Christchurch	1	S	<p>- To approve Plan Change 12.</p> <p>- To explore further policies to encourage owners to consent to listing their heritage items in the future.</p> <p>- To develop a range of non-regulatory measures to assist those who currently opt out of a schedule listing, but may in future consent to listing, for example waive the current fee of \$105 presently charged in addition to the building consent fee for listed heritage items.</p>	<p>Heritage protection is an important responsibility of local government.</p> <p>Both policy and items listed on the schedule need to be reviewed at regular intervals to respond to ongoing research and increasing knowledge.</p> <p>Addition of items is essential to improve the accuracy of the 'stock-take' and hence the ability of the Council to plan and advocate for these items.</p> <p>Encouragement of owners is essential for 'buy-in'.</p>
2.	Jane and Graham Batchelor 41 Kirkwood Avenue, Christchurch	1	S	<p>To approve Plan Change 12</p> <p>To develop further incentives for owners who have items on the Heritage Schedule, e.g. remission of fees for consents/rates for work enhancing heritage value, facilitating professional advice i.e. conservation, archeology, or access to other expertise from Council staff or their contacts.</p>	<p>Local government has the primary responsibility for heritage protection. The major mechanism for this is via the Heritage Schedule. The schedule must be expanded to contain all items of significant worth in a timely manner (preferably with owners consent).</p> <p>Education and encouragement of owners is vital to success</p> <p>Regular review should occur of potential new items.</p> <p>Policy should be reviewed to ensure it is meeting its aims and reflect the highest standards of heritage protection.</p> <p>Access to heritage fund is not enough to mitigate the requirements of resource consents and monitoring and having to pay at every stage.</p>
3	Jeremy Thomas Gray Sutherland Cavanawera, Te Ngawai, Albury, R.D. 17, Fairlie 7987	1	O	<p>I agree that RM Act should be in place for demolition, but not for alteration. That the RM Act be removed from the Plan in regard to alterations of sites/buildings and be replaced by consultation involving</p>	<p>Support in general for Plan Change 12, but note the following points.</p> <p>The only negative comments about the heritage process is the Resource Management Act content. We have lost at least one building from the</p>

				MDC and NZHPT.	<p>Plan as a result.</p> <p>I question its necessity, Historic Places Trust (NZ) have clear guidelines regarding alterations. We should incorporate possible dialogue with owners of historic sites/buildings. The RM Act does not appear to encourage this, after all the Plan is to preserve history.</p>
4	<p>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</p> <p>P.O. Box 4403, Christchurch</p>	1	O	<p>That the following items are amended to identify the archaeological significance that they have in relation to the Historic Places Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gothic Style Cemetery Post - Glendonald Sod Hut - Former Railway Hotel (Albury Tavern) - Burkes Pass Hotel Stables - Burkes Pass School - Brackens Barn - Annis Cob Cottage - Albury Park Lime Works <p>That the items proposed for listing in the District Plan be assigned to Category Y to ensure that the protection afforded them is consistent with the purposes of the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>That all presently known flaws in the plan listing be addressed as part of this proposed plan amendment, to avoid future difficulties and to ensure the most effective outcome is achieved as a consequence of this change.</p> <p>That a commitment is given to setting aside funding to initiate a more comprehensive overview approach to the identification of historic heritage in the district.</p> <p>The proposed minor alterations for the purposes of clear identification be supported.</p> <p>That the introduction of descriptive criteria for listing be supported.</p>	<p>The proposed listings identify specific criteria for significance. These criteria include archaeological potential. In all of the items listed, this listing is crossed as being not relevant. It is the view of the Trust that this is misleading and has the potential to confuse present and future owners about the way in which the provisions of the Historic Places Act apply to these places. Creates tension between this plan amendments and the purposes of the Historic Places Act. The situation is exacerbated by the Category Z listing.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to current listings are supported, as they provide more accurate descriptors.</p> <p>The proposed change is incomplete in that there has been no systematic process of identification.</p> <p>The proposed change fails to address known difficulties that exist within the present listings, with particular reference to the lack of clarity as to which building are "heritage" in groups of buildings that have been identified (e.g. Haldon Station).</p> <p>Present provisions in the plan are insufficient to provide appropriate protection for the places that are listed as Category Z. They identify activities such as demolition or removal as a permitted activity and require only that the places are documented before destruction. This is inconsistent with best practice and the decision to list new places under this category fails to meet the requirements of the RMA.</p>