

Submission to Plan Change 28 – Heritage Items List – 22 January 2025

From Julie Hadfield – Opawa Homestead, Albury

Julie Hadfield

Opawa Homestead, RD14 Albury/Cave 7984 South Canterbury NEW
ZEALAND

www.opawahomestead.co.nz

Ph 027 685 5999

I acknowledge that the information above and all other information provided in this submission will be made publicly available. YES (I acknowledge)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? I DO NOT

If others make a similar submission would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing? I WOULD

Ph 027 685 5999

To MDC Councillors and Hearing Commissioners

Further to my previous 2 emails (attached to this submission) I am now appealing the decision by MDC to continue to list the Opawa Homestead on the Heritage Items List.

The lack of policy and clear communication, along with inequitable treatment over similar historic items are my reasons for this appeal.

Lack of Communication and Policy:

At no stage through the process, was I ever notified that, as the asset owner, I would have no say in whether my home would be included in the Heritage Items List. I acted in good faith and allowed Richard Knott (consultant) to visit the property as I was interested in what he thought about the building – which I know is very historic and special (I am not arguing the historic value of Opawa). I was told of the process that he was going to complete but I believed that at the end of it all, I would be able to agree to the Homestead being listed or not, and that it would then not be included on the District List, if I did not agree.

When Mayor Munro came to visit me, late 2024, to advise that despite my emails, the decision was made to include this Homestead on the Heritage Items List, I raised again, the issue that I was never told of not having a choice and asked her then, what would have happened if I had refused to allow Richard Knott onto the property or simply not replied to the request to come? Her reply was ‘that it would have probably been added to the list anyway’.

It has been noted that there were other items of historic interest that have been removed off the list

or now not added as there was no response from the asset owner or entry onto the property was refused by the owner(s).

This is a direct clash to what the Mayor has said – other items were not included due to no visit, so then if I had not acted in good faith and not replied or simply said no to a visit, Opawa should also have been left off the list – not automatically added as the Mayor stated.

This shows a lack of communication and process on the part of MDC with its staff, contractor(s) and elected members.

Listing my asset without my express permission, brings into question my rights as a property owner in NZ – how can a Local Government body be able to control a privately owned asset such as mine, against the wishes of the freehold owner?

I have asked how my Homestead came to be nominated for inclusion on the Heritage items List – the answer I was given was that it was nominated anonymously – to me this is not acceptable and unfair to expect me as the owner to just accept that and not be given the name of the nominator. As stated previously, I have had negative exposure with Government bodies due to ‘anonymous person(s)’ feeling they know what is best for my asset and interfering with the running of it. I believe that ulterior reasons were part of this ‘anonymous’ discussion and am now very wary of it happening again.

I feel that I am entitled to know who nominated this Homestead and their reasoning for doing so. It is only fair for me to know and then decide if their reasoning was for genuine reasons and not again, with an ulterior motive.

Inequitable treatment of similar assets:

There is a 2nd Homestead that has been on the District Heritage Item list for years, that is of almost identical age and historical value to Opawa Homestead. This is now being removed from the list as a Resource Consent was issued in 2018 to allow demolition of the Homestead. Since the Consent was issued in 2018, an extension was also issued, but after 6 years, the Homestead still stands in place.

Note of reiteration: I do not have anything against the owners for wanting to demolish their asset – it is owned by them, so they should be able to do with it what they like. What I am highlighting here is the uneven treatment between that homestead and Opawa.

Given both Homesteads have been deemed to hold significant historic value, enough to both be listed (then and now) on the District Heritage Item List, I am asking why that Homestead is being removed from the Heritage List while it still stands and is not being left on the Heritage Item list until such time it is a pile of rubble on the ground – if that ever happens?

What is the policy of MDC to allow Resource Consents to apply over a timeframe before having to be re-applied and re-issued? 6 years for this Consent have already passed, the Homestead still stands, is perfectly liveable (not derelict or dangerous), but the item is being taken off the list. This shows that now MDC do not hold any of its historic value as important anymore – but they did when it was listed originally. Allowing items to be removed from the list due to un-actioned consents, provides the opportunity for the item to be forgotten as it falls under the radar over time.

Given that MDC has shown they feel the historic importance is deemed as no longer existing on a Homestead that is of very similar age, nature, historic value etc as Opawa, causes me to ask, why then is Opawa being added to the list while Mount Nessing Homestead comes off? They should either both be on the list or both be off the list! It is not equal to treat them so differently as is being done now in Plan Change 28.

Following this process that MDC has shown, this is my thought process – I could apply for a Consent to demolish Opawa Homestead – for reasons known only to me (Mount Nessing owners will have had their own reasons, again - derelict building could not have been one of them given it is still standing and not falling into piles). Once the consent to demolish is issued for Opawa, I can just apply to extend it – whatever the required timeframe is for that and given the treatment of Mount Nessing Homestead in their consent process, it would then follow that Opawa Homestead would also be removed from the District Heritage Item List – due to consent issued to demolish. In order to show equal treatment across the assets, MDC would have to follow that line of process.

When Mayor Munro sat in my lounge late 2024 to notify me of the decision by MDC to include the homestead on the list, against my wishes, she also stated that I would never have to pay for any Resource Consent costs relating to the Homestead if it was on the Heritage Item List. Councillor Rit Fisher was also at this meeting and is a witness to that statement – this would mean that when I applied for a Consent to Demolish, this application and any subsequent extensions for that Consent would be of no charge to myself or any future owners. In fact, application for ANY resource consent to add/alter/remove parts of the Homestead would also come at no cost to myself or any future owners.

Again, this is showing lack of communication between staff/contractor/elected members as I do not believe Council would forego any Consent charges – but as I have the Mayor’s word, that is what I am expecting – no charges for any resource consents.

A ‘Nice to Have’?

I question what *actually* is required by Central Government for Heritage Items? Is it that simply items are **noted** on a list as holding some historic value but with no conditions/restrictions required? Or is it that the items are listed with certain stated requirements (stated by Central Government)? It seems a pretty cloudy area that may have been taken to an extreme level by MDC, including the stance that asset owners will have no power or say as to if the asset is actually listed and thus fall under the consent conditions.

Is this whole process simply a ‘Nice to Have’ item that the current Government is pushing all Local Councils to be realistic about costs and bureaucracy, show some sensibility and stop pushing these agendas?

I believe it is – this should not sit at a Local Governance level and MDC do have the ability to reject part or all of this change. MDC can decide for themselves to show a level of common sense and not take things to the extreme.

Listing of heritage items to preserve them and acknowledge their importance in the country, is the role of the NZ Historic Places Trust (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga). They are resourced with the full knowledge, skills and people, that are required to make sensible, well thought-out decisions as to how each item should be treated. This body is who I would turn to if I wished to protect my asset for future generations to come – not at local government level, who should rather be sticking to the basics and serving their community, not trying to be all with everything, with a less than ideal pool of knowledge, skills and people!

The Heritage Item Listing has no purpose – there is no mandatory requirement for the asset to be maintained at its current level or to be improved to preserve the asset’s historic value. So again, I ask the question – what is the point in pursuing such a list? There is no reason and it has come at a large cost to the ratepayer and a lot of anguish from asset owners and the community members.

Apart from an extremely small fund being made available across all assets listed (\$5,000 pa), there is no cost relief offered to owners of listed items to aid them to look after the asset. With the addition of several new items onto the existing list, there are now a much higher group of historic items that could apply for funding – but the amount of the funding available is not increasing at all – it currently sits at a ridiculous level if Council is serious about protecting heritage items in the Mackenzie.

\$5,000 would not even make a dent in the costs I have incurred over the past 24 years of owning the Homestead - \$5,000 is less than half of what it cost for me to renovate and restore 1 room in the Homestead last year as an example. Repainting the Homestead or replacing the roof (in order to protect the asset) would be hugely more expensive than that small amount.

There is also no rebate on rates charged for properties holding these assets so there is no break for the asset owner there either.

I understand that an increase in the fund amount or offering a rebate on rates to private asset owners, would mean a significant cost to the general ratepayer in our District and that is an unfair expectation to place on them – they are not responsible to fund the expensive costs, we as the private asset owners face each year while maintaining the assets. So - I am stating again, this whole Heritage Item

Listing is in fact a 'nice to have' – our ratepayer base can not afford higher rates, it is not economically viable to ask everyone to do so, this is not an absolute requirement to have the Listing – it is an 'extra' that the District can operate without.

Closing:

After 24 years of living at Opawa, funding all the expense by myself, putting a ton of energy, time and work into it MYSELF, I am well aware of how special my home is. I am maintaining it with the hope that it will remain standing for many many years to come and be enjoyed by so many. At this late hour, it seems incredulous that MDC now want to step in and take some type of control over my asset – so they can be congratulated at ticking the box of having a 'list'!

I could have painted this house hot pink, ripped out all of the character features, knocked parts out or actually demolished the whole building over that 24 years, all without any sign-off from the Council – a brand new build could be standing in its spot instead. How would it stand in your heritage measures as a hot pink, character-less shell of its former self?

I wonder how this whole issue sits with the Private Property and Human Rights Acts – I certainly know other areas of the country have ratepayers taking a legal route against their Council to stop the actions MDC is taking right now – that will incur even more cost for the ratepayer – over and above the consultant and staff costs to date on a change that seems a waste of time, energy and money and has only managed to raise angst between Council and its Communities.

At the end of the day, you have your so-called 'experts' on staff who will refuse to show common sense or give two hoots about the ratepayers involved and will push through what they want.

If my Homestead does end up on the heritage items List, the current clauses of Plan Change 28 must be Grandfathered for my asset, Any future changes, if detrimental will not apply to this asset. If there is a favourable change, that *will apply* to Opawa for myself and all future owners. There will be no charge for any Resource Consent applied for by myself or any future owners and all of this must be recorded in writing, forwarded to myself and held on the property file for future reference.

This being the case, **I still do not agree that my Homestead is to be on the Heritage Items List** and ask for the Commissioners and Councillors to now look with common sense at this whole issue – take the best route for the ratepayer, communities and historic items that are in the district.

NOTE the items of heritage in our District, but don't add any consent conditions or restrictions to any asset – unless you can drastically increase your available funding or provide a significant rates rebate – without lumbering another unnecessary cost on the ratepayers. This 'nice to have' has already cost everyone dearly and just should never have come to the stage of starting.

End.

Search by Consent Number, Street Number and Street Name or Legal Description.

Note:

Consent Number	180069
Location	1031 MT NESSING RD, OPUHA WARD
Type of Work	To demolish a Category Y Heritage Building
Current Status	Invoiced

History

Status	Date	Details
Formally Received	24/07/2018	
Further Information Requested	13/08/2018	
Information Received	20/08/2018	
Decision Notified	28/08/2018	
	24/07/2023	
Section 125 - Extension applied for	01/08/2023	



Outlook

Plan Change 28 - Opawa Homestead

From Julie Hadfield <JulzHadfield@outlook.com>

Date Fri 8/2/2024 7:45 PM

To districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz <districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz>

Cc mayor@mackenzie.govt.nz <mayor@mackenzie.govt.nz>; karen.morgan@mackenzie.govt.nz <karen.morgan@mackenzie.govt.nz>; kerry.bellringer@mackenzie.govt.nz <kerry.bellringer@mackenzie.govt.nz>; scott.aronsen@mackenzie.govt.nz <scott.aronsen@mackenzie.govt.nz>; matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz <matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz>; murray.cox@mackenzie.govt.nz <murray.cox@mackenzie.govt.nz>; rit.fisher@mackenzie.govt.nz <rit.fisher@mackenzie.govt.nz>; phillipa.guerin@mackenzie.govt.nz <phillipa.guerin@mackenzie.govt.nz>

To MDC District Plan Team & Councillors

I am writing regarding the proposal to add my home, **Opawa Homestead**, to the Heritage Item List under Plan Change 28.

I do not consent to my home being added to the list and, as the owner of the property, request the removal of the aforementioned homestead from the proposed items on the list, immediately.

The day after the public consultation meeting in Fairlie (Tuesday 23 July 2024), I composed an email to the District Plan team asking for the definitions of the 2 first categories under the Historic Items List:

- Repairs/Maintenance
- Additions/Alterations

I was looking for absolute clarity and definition of these categories - perceptions as to what each of these mean can be different between property owners and MDC representatives. I received a reply that I would have the definitions the following week. Being 7.15pm Friday of the following week now, I am yet to receive anything further from the District Plan team and so my questions are unanswered.

After becoming increasingly anxious that the detail and definition of these categories have not been clarified (whatever they are as of today) and whether they would remain or change in future years, or that the requirements of a resource consent for any work on a listed item, would or would not change, making it incredibly hard for owners to adhere to, gives strong reason why I do not agree to my home being added to the Heritage Item List.

I will ask now, what is the point of having a Heritage Items List of so-called 'treasured' District items when it has become apparent that applying for a resource consent and paying the fee, can allow for that 'treasured' Heritage Item to be demolished? What does an actual resource consent achieve; particularly in the case of allowing a Heritage Item to be demolished? Is the 'treasured' Heritage Item not treasured anymore because a consultant deems it to now not be a 'treasured' Heritage Item? And, if this is the case, why was it ever added to the list in the first place?

This is not protecting the item, as the Heritage Item list is supposedly designed to do. In this case, a resource consent seems likely to be nothing more than a money grab and is an unnecessary step for any work that is to be undertaken on any listed Heritage Item.

I believe that if you are going to have a list of Heritage Items, the items stated in the list should be required to be maintained at their current state or better. If there is no requirement to look after the stated item, then what is the best and successful outcome of having a list of Heritage Items?

For these listed items to be maintained, it costs the owner a lot of their time, energy and money to keep up with set standards, all the while receiving NO incentive from Council to do so. There is no apparent assistance via reduced rates on the property that hosts the item, and the Council's Heritage Items fund is seemingly low to almost non-existent even if owners do apply for monetary assistance to maintain the Heritage Item. If you are going to increase the already substantial list of Heritage Items, then should the Heritage Fund also be substantially increased to match the possible demand from Heritage Items owners?

For Council to offer either or both of those options above, would mean more cost the to ratepayer - even more than they face already, with their ever-increasing rates hikes. How, may I add, is it fair to expect the ratepayers to fund maintenance on privately owned assets? That is unfair. Where does Council seek funding for this work on privately owned assets? As funding from *Heritage NZ* (NHPIF) will only give priority funding to 2 (two) eligible projects at this time:

- Conservation of sites of significance to Maori
- Conservation and preservation of sites that support regional economic development.

Opawa Homestead does not sit in either of these categories, so if council receive funding from the NHPIF, I will not be eligible to receive any of it. So who will fund the work?

I have extensively renovated/changed/maintained Opawa Homestead for approximately 24 years with no assistance in any way, shape or form, from Council. I have kept it in character of the era in which it was originally built and have essentially 'protected' it, from my own private funds, to be able to stand another 160+ years (bar any fire or quake disaster), while the residents are living in it comfortably. Let me point out that the Homestead is not in its original state from the 1860's and has been extensively added to in the 1920's & '30's - so it is far from the small Homestead it once was and was no longer original, before I arrived.

I am completely committed and have the knowledge and funding, to continue to look after my own asset. I do not require either MDC, or a consultant, to 'guide' or 'advise' me on how I can continue to do so! Requiring myself, as the asset owner, to pay a fee and apply for permission through a resource consent to continue what I have been doing since I purchased Opawa Homestead, is borderline arrogant, pointless and verging on ridiculous.

My rates cost approximately \$1900 a year. For this, the direct benefit is that the road bounding my property is graded sporadically through the year. My water supply, sewer and rubbish disposal costs are all non-Council related. The rates expense is less than half of my annual house insurance bill; add to that the money I have spent (and continue to spend) on renovations and maintenance while caring for my Homestead. Council should now understand that I am consciously and presently aware of the costs of protecting my home for my family and for any future owners to enjoy, and do not take lightly the responsibility I have for living where I do.

In the early 1990's, the Glass family, when selling Opawa Homestead and the farm it resided on, considered listing the Homestead with the NZ Historic Places Trust as a Class C to prevent it being demolished, but in not wanting to restrict any future improvements or alterations, they did not end up listing it. I purchased this property in 2000. The relatives of the previous families Rutherford, Hartley, Wills, Glass, Holes and Sutherlands have all been excited and very happy that I am now here, and for all that I have done to protect their family home. None have ever expressed concern that the changes made or treatment of the

Homestead have been anything that has negatively affected its position or style or historic nature.

If, in the future, I would like to protect this Homestead from any future possibilities of demolition or major alterations, I will then choose to do this myself through the NZ Historic Places Trust and not through MDC.

Your intention to add Opawa Homestead to the Heritage Items List is penalising myself as the owner, whilst offering absolutely no assistance to help me continue the careful treatment of it as I have shown since day one. Council should now look at positive ways to encourage and helping local owners of Heritage Items in the District, instead of working against them and essentially making it difficult for them to care for, maintain and enjoy their asset.

As an aside, listing the Opawa Homestead as a Heritage Item, will affect the resale aspect of this property. The market of buyers looking for a very old 8 bedroom farmhouse is limited already without adding the restrictive and potentially costly label of becoming a listed Heritage Item - not only with consent fees (which I understand will always be increasing), but the added expense of using a 'suitable qualified consultant' as stated in the public meeting in Fairlie. We all know the cost of such consultants, but they seem necessary to be able to wade through the paperwork of a consent application form from MDC.

I have been through bureaucratic, non-sensical, penalising control actions of the Regional Council after an 'anonymous discussion' in recent years, which resulted in the decrease in value of my property, by stripping away a very important part of history from the grounds of the Homestead (historic & substantial ponds), with no common sense and complete disregard for historic use and existing wetland and animal habitat.

I understand the Homestead was nominated "anonymously" last year to be added to the Heritage Items List. I am tired of people hiding behind anonymity all the while interfering in the private business of others and their lives. They seem quite content in the 'idea' that they believe they know best about the property of others! These anonymous community members truly have no idea of what I have achieved and protected here, and what I have paid to get the homestead to the standard it is today. It is glaringly obvious to me that the anonymous party are completely unaware and show total disregard of the facts: I love this homestead, I am completely capable and committed to looking after it, and do not require, in any capacity, any assistance from MDC via a Heritage Item List nomination to protect and care for it - especially at the 11th hour after I have been working hard for the past 24 hours on it.

I am deeply concerned that the anonymous nomination could have been made with malicious intent, given my recent experience with the Regional Council and the 'anonymous person's' actions. I have no faith or trust in the process and believe that this could well be a similar situation. I believe this should be considered as another very valid reason to remove the proposed listing of the Homestead.

On one hand, Opawa Homestead is deemed important to preserve and be stated as a Heritage Item. But on the other hand, the historic value was of no importance at all when the ponds were ordered to be removed by Regional Council.

What, I ask, is the point of owning anything in this District, when anyone can seemingly interfere with private lives and decisions regarding private assets; and along with MDC as a government body being one of 'those', believing they can have the right to 'guide' an owner along the 'correct path' to look after their own asset on their own land?

'My home is my castle' as the saying goes, Opawa Homestead is not the property of MDC, nor does it reside on MDC land, and therefore is to remain off the Heritage Items List.

Julie Hadfield – Owner of Opawa Homestead, Albury

Julie Hadfield

Opawa Homestead, RD14 Albury/Cave 7984 South Canterbury NEW ZEALAND

www.opawahomestead.co.nz

Ph 027 685 5999

Opawa Homestead - reiteration of no agreement to be added to the MDC Heritage Items List

From Julie Hadfield <JulzHadfield@outlook.com>

Date Mon 9/16/2024 8:46 PM

To rit.fisher@mackenzie.govt.nz <rit.fisher@mackenzie.govt.nz>; phillipa.guerin@mackenzie.govt.nz <phillipa.guerin@mackenzie.govt.nz>; Anne Munro - Mackenzie District Mayor <mayor@mackenzie.govt.nz>; matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz <matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz>; karen.morgan@mackenzie.govt.nz <karen.morgan@mackenzie.govt.nz>; scott.aronsen@mackenzie.govt.nz <scott.aronsen@mackenzie.govt.nz>; matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz <matt.murphy@mackenzie.govt.nz>; kerry.bellringer@mackenzie.govt.nz <kerry.bellringer@mackenzie.govt.nz>; District Plan <districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz>

Cc Julie Hadfield <JulzHadfield@outlook.com>

 4 attachments (3 MB)

MDC Heritage Letter 8 July 2024.pdf; Email from Opawa Homestead 2 August 2024.pdf; NZHTrust.jif; RM180069.JPG;

To MDC Councillors & staff

Following on from Plan Change 28 regarding Heritage Items List in this District & my email of 2 August 2024 to you all - note as of 16 September 2024, I have not received any response to that email to say it was received or if/when any further discussion would be held - despite this action being directed at your workshop last Tuesday (a long time after my email was sent).

My original email of 2 August is attached to remind you all of the points I raised at that time.

Cr Fisher has contacted me to discuss the status of my home on the Heritage Items List & from that discussion & lack of response from MDC, I now have further points & questions to raise.

It seems that there is inconsistent treatment of items on the MDC Heritage Items List & I believe this is unfair & needs to be addressed.

To be clear, although I think it is sad to hear that one of the oldest items in the Mackenzie has been approved to be demolished (Mt Nessing Homestead) by MDC, I have nothing against either the family or the decision the family has made for their asset, as it is their private property & they are entitled to make it. This email is not intended to have a go at the Simpson family in any way.

I want to raise some issues around the treatment of that property on the Heritage Item List & my own property - Opawa Homestead.

Both Opawa & Mt Nessing Homesteads, are pretty much the same age, were built & lived in by the same early family that held significant amounts of land in the Mackenzie as very early South Canterbury Runholders in the late 1800's onwards. Both buildings are in above average to good condition - neither of them are rotting, falling down, unable to be lived in or have any condition that would affect their status of a significant heritage item of the district. However, RM180069 resource consent was issued in 2018 for the Mt Nessing Homestead to

be demolished with an extension issued in 2023. This action to demolish has not yet occurred & the Homestead stands in place.

The letter to affected landowners from MDC on 8 July 2024 listed the existing Heritage Items List of the Operative District Plan, #15 being the Mt Nessing Homestead & to the far right, noted that it was to be removed from the list as consent had been issued to demolish. Cr Fisher was told by MDC staff that the Homestead was being removed from the MDC Heritage List due to earthquake damage (which in effect, is saying this damage caused the Homestead to no longer hold a Heritage status, is it?). That Homestead did receive damage to its chimney in the Canterbury earthquakes & I believe that work was undertaken to remove the chimney for safety reasons from the building. However, the removal of the chimney has not affected the ITEM - the Homestead, which still stands today, the historical nature of the building is intact. The decision to demolish the Homestead was made by the family in order to be able to build a more suitable home for their needs, not as a result of the earthquake damage (subsequently fixed).

My question here is - is the Homestead being removed off the MDC list due to earthquake damage (that definitely has not affected the heritage status of the item) or is it being removed due to the consent to demolish for reasons other than damage?

I can also say that the Opawa Homestead fell victim to damage of the Canterbury earthquakes & although no insurance claim was made & the chimney was not removed, the fireplaces are now no longer used as internal bricks are loose & not safe for a fire. Opawa is as Mt Nessing is - still livable & not dangerous. To note, this damage has not affected the historic nature of the ITEM - the Homestead - just like Mt Nessing.

I therefore am questioning the consistency of the treatment of the two brother Homesteads by MDC. One is being removed from the list & the other is being required to go onto the list - what is the reasoning for this inconsistency? Given the age, state, historic nature of both places, being very similar - they should be treated equally. correct? Mt Nessing has not lost any historic value due to earthquake damage or the request to demolish it (which has not yet happened) - it still holds its historic value, which seems to have been waived with a granting of a resource consent.

Page 4 of MDC Minutes - MDC Meeting earlier in September 2024:

It is proposed to roll over all of the scheduled heritage items of the Operative Plan, unless the physical condition of the heritage item is compromised to the extent that it can no longer retain its heritage significance or the item no longer exists, or there is a resource consent provided for its demolition.

Three property owners of the existing scheduled heritage items have sought changes to the schedule.....the third (ie Mt Nessing Homestead) is soon to be demolished in accordance with a resource consent.

Keeping consistency in mind for similar properties in close vicinity of each other, Opawa Homestead should remain off the list just as Mt Nessing has been taken off the list.

My email of August 2nd still stands & my consent as the asset owner, for Opawa Homestead to be listed on the MDC Heritage Items List is not given.

I have attached & asked the following:

- Resource Consent information for RM180069 - publicly available on the MDC website - Mt Nessing Homestead, issued 2018 & granted, extension issued in 2023. Question -

how long does a consent apply for before it ends if the action has not occurred (6 years to date in this case)? The Consent expiring should mean the item goes back onto the Heritage List & a reapplication for consent for the action be required by MDC, at some length of time surely? Once this consent is issued, does the NZHPT need to also be notified & who does that? Mt Nessing is currently listed as Class 2 with the NZHPT.

- MDC Letter dated 8 July 2024 sent to affected landowners - showing # 15, Mt Nessing Homestead on the existing Heritage Item List, noted to remove from Heritage Item List due to Resource Consent to demolish being issued. This statement conflicts with what Cr Fisher being told it is being removed due to earthquake damage. The fact is the earthquake damage has not made the Mt Nessing Homestead unliveable or any less in its historic nature - therefore, there is no real reason to demolish the Homestead due to earthquake issues.
- Screenshot of the NZHPT List - stating items on that list do not protect a place from demolition unless they are also included in a relevant district plan (MDC Heritage Item List). Question - As Mt Nessing Homestead is listed as a Class 2 with the NZHPT, does that mean that the Homestead should automatically be on the MDC Heritage Item List & stay on the MDC list until such time, the Homestead is removed from the NZHPT List? Mt Nessing Homestead has been listed on the NZHPT since 1983 & still currently is listed with the NZHPT.
- My original email of 2 August 2024 to MDC Councillors & staff stating that as the property owner, I do not agree with the Opawa Homestead being added to the Heritage Item List & stating that it is to be removed - As of 16 September 2024, have had no response from MDC that this email was received or any discussion about the points raised within it - even though this action was directed at your workshop last week.

Julie Hadfield

Opawa Homestead, RD14 Albury/Cave 7984 South Canterbury NEW ZEALAND

www.opawahomestead.co.nz

Ph 027 685 5999