

Further Submission in Support of or Opposition to a Submission  
to Proposed Plan Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront

D-204579

To: The Wanganui District Council  
PO Box 637  
Wanganui

Further Submission on: Proposed Plan Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront

Name (in full): TONY KALE (WANGANUI POTTERS SOCIETY)

Address: (Full postal address) 112 CARLTON AVE WANGANUI

1. I support ~~or oppose~~ the submission of: N°26 E.M. LEWIN 252 TAURU QUAY

(Please state name and address of person making original submission and submission number of original submission)

2. The particular parts of the submission ~~we~~ we support or oppose are: That any plan for subdivision and development of Riverfront area be publicly notified.

That a rethink & dismissal of the extra buildings in a Public Space be considered.

(Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the Proposed Plan Change)

3. The reasons for ~~my~~ our support or ~~opposition~~ are:

That the need to create a Premier Public space would be compromised by the addition of new buildings up to 2 1/2 storeys.

Also the loss of visual & physical connections between the River & Central City.

(Please state in summary the nature of your submission giving clear reasons). Use additional pages if more room is required.

4. I/we seek the following decision from the Council:

(Please give precise details)

That any plan for the subdivision and development of the Riverfront area be publicly notified, and building owners consulted.

That a lot more consideration be given to the provision of parking in close proximity to the facilities used in the area.

5. ~~I~~ we ~~do~~ do not wish to be heard in support of this submission.

6. If others make a similar submission I ~~would~~ would not be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

7. Address for service of person making further submission:

Signature:  Telephone No: 34 77970

Date: 22/8/2011 Facsimile No:

**Note: LAST DAY for further submissions is on Thursday, 25 August 2011.**

A copy of your further submission must be served on the person/organisation who made the original submission within 5 working days after you have lodged your further submission with the Wanganui District Council.





HP 33002 - 081

22 August 2011

District Plan Review  
Wanganui District Council  
PO Box 637  
101 Guyton Street  
Wanganui

Tena Koe,

---

**Further Submissions of New Zealand Historic Places Trust  
Pouhere Taonga on the Wanganui District Council's Proposed Plan  
Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront**

---

Thank you for the opportunity to make a further submission for Wanganui District Council's Proposed Plan Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront

The further submission is contained in the attached table. The attached table records the original submitters name, submitter number and relevant submission number, whether NZHPT supports or opposes the submission, those parts of the submission that are supported or opposed, the reasons for support or opposition and the decision sought from Wanganui District Council

The NZHPT may wish to be heard at the hearing in support of this further submission.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. E. Neill".

---

Ann Neill  
General Manager - Central Region

**Address for service:**

Sonia Dolan

Heritage Adviser - Planning

New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga

PO Box 2629

Wellington 6140

Phone: 04 494 8048

Email: [sdolan@historic.org.nz](mailto:sdolan@historic.org.nz)

**N.B Please note the change of postal address for Central Region office**



## Further Submission of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (NZHPT) to Plan Change 21 of the Wanganui District Plan

Original Submitter's Name	Original Sub. No.	What part of PC 21	NZHPT Support/ Oppose	Submission requests:	Decision Sought and reasons for support/opposition
---------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--

General Submissions and Sites					
G E Bullock	9	In relation to Old Town Heritage Overlay Zone	Oppose	<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>Upgrading old buildings to new standards may not be the best option for Wanganui.</p> <p>Two storied buildings no longer required.</p> <p>More economic to build new buildings and not to earthquake proof existing buildings</p> <p>Flexibility of Town Plan is too rigid and needs relaxing to accommodate the owners of these</p>	<p>NZHPT seeks that Council refuse the relief sought by the submitter as protection of the Old Town Heritage Overlay Zone is imperative to protect its historic heritage. Historic heritage is a matter that is to be considered as part of the District Plan as set out under s6(f) of the Resource Management Act.</p>

<p>NZHPT is aware that the Council has produced a (now operative) Earthquake-Prone Buildings Policy. Furthermore, there is clearly a public good in protecting heritage buildings which have values which contribute to social, cultural and for <b>economic benefits</b> for present and future generations.</p>	<p>Future wellbeing of Wanganui must take into account property owners and tenants economic needs</p> <p>If building must be retained and earthquake proofed, true and genuine feature should be all that is taken into consideration.</p>				
<p>NZHPT seeks that Council refuse the relief sought by the submitter for reasons that protection is required for 'built historic heritage' and it is acknowledged as an important characteristic within the Riverfront zone.</p>	<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>Reconsider the listed permitted activities</p> <p>Increase the maximum building height in the Riverfront zone from 7.5m to 10m</p> <p>Reduce the restriction on parking/housing vehicles on the ground floor.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Collective of Taupo Quay Building Owners (#35-49)</p>
<p>NZHPT does not agree that the height to boundary rule will dramatically alter the Wanganui heritage environment form for reasons that the rules are effects-based and so each case would be assessed on its merits. In any case, as outlined in s.6(f) of the RMA the District Plan must protect historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use</p>	<p><b>The submitter objects to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new requirement to provide parking to area previously zoned Central Commercial, and</li> <li>2. The new requirement to impose a height restriction on street boundaries established by 2 metre height + 45 deg angle</li> </ol>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Submitter does not believe that the creation of the Central Edge Commercial Zone is</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>Bruce Henry Dickson</p>

		<p>necessary</p>	<p>The submitter believes that these two rules will dramatically alter the form of future development which has been established historically and detract from the Wanganui Heritage environment.</p>	<p>and development.</p> <p>NZHPT, however, agrees with the submitter that the parking requirement may then result in carparking lots creating dead space (especially after normal working hours). NZHPT recommends there should be the ability to 'waive' these carparking requirements for 'car free' proposals should alternative carparking or public transport options are available.</p>
--	--	------------------	---	---



Glenn Young Universal College Learning (UCOL)	14	Support in part	<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>“ ...For recognition and acknowledgement of the significance of UCOL's educational activities and facilities to the Central City and Riverfront areas of Wanganui be provided in the policy and/or explanatory sections of PPC21....”</p> <p>“ ... That reference be made to UCOL's educational activities in "Policy P89" and the introduction to " Z20 Arts and Commerce" in the list of important characteristics in the "Arts and Commerce Zone" ...</p> <p>“ ... That Proposed Rule R243 c, R243 d, R221F and R221g be deleted or withdrawn...”</p>	<p>NZHPT does not agree that rule R243 c, R243d, R221F and R221g should be deleted or withdrawn. NZHPT did, however, recommend that that these rules be clarified as it is unclear as to whether the non-complying rule(s) could be measured or enforced. NZHPT suggested a further regulatory rule/measure to avoid demolition and vacant land so that the creation of vacant land, open land or parking areas are a non-complying activity (refer to page 5 of our submission).</p>
Stephen Palmer	17	Oppose	<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>There be no new planning zones and delete the existing Old Town and Riverbank Overlay zones.</p> <p>Replace most rules with policies that allow the planners to engage with developers through discussion rather than the adversarial resource consent applications</p>	<p>NZHPT seeks that Council refuse the relief sought by the submitter as the Old Town Overlay and Riverbank Overlay zones are relatively fit for purpose in relation to consideration of historic heritage matters.</p>



<p>Steve Ellis - Old Town Properties</p>	<p>20</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>and to make mutually agreed decisions that will maintain a compact CBD, encourage adaptive re-use or heritage buildings, create new buildings that are in harmony and scale with the existing environment, preserve the waterfront and make a pleasant pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Delete rules relating to set backs and gaps between buildings.</p> <p>Encourage the use of Dublin Street, Bell Street, Taupo Quay and St Hill Street as a two-way ring road system to circumnavigate and access the CBD.</p>	
<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>We would like R228 not to apply to the bottom end of St Hill Street, currently under the Heritage Overlay zone. This should be a discretionary ruling.</p>				<p>NZHPT seeks that Council refuse the relief sought by the submitter.</p>	

<p>Wendy Pettigrew</p>	<p>25</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p><b>The submitter requests that:</b></p> <p>The plan change makes no mention of the Old Town Conservation Overlay Zone.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in the definitions of the zones and their characteristics. The policies for Central Commercial Zone &amp; Arts and Commerce Zone both define the areas as having no gaps between buildings. There are existing "gaps" in both these zones.</p> <p>Central Edge Commercial Zone does not mention heritage buildings and yet there are a number already in this zone.</p> <p>The permitted activities in the Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial Zone do not include Professional and Administrative Offices - yet these are permitted in the Arts &amp; Commerce Zone. There are already a large number of Professional &amp; Administrative Offices already in both these 2 zones. Important to have mix of permitted activities in all 3 zones.</p> <p>Identification of a few view shafts - most views down to the Whanganui River - there are many more which should be identified. Maintaining these view shafts</p>	<p>NZHPT seeks that Council grant the relief sought by the submitter and in particular the need to refer to the heritage characteristics for the each of the newly created zones. As outlined in NZHPT's submission the heritage characteristics need to refer to the issues, objectives and policies and methods in each of the newly created zones.</p>
------------------------	-----------	------------------------	--	---

				<p>and not obstructing them with signage or buildings are important.</p> <p>Plan change should have mentioned the Old Town Overlay zone. Reconsider why are gaps between buildings seen as bad.</p> <p>The Central Edge Commercial zone should reference heritage buildings.</p> <p>The Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial should permit Professional and Administrative Offices.</p> <p>There are more view shafts that require protection.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--





**FAXED**

L.H. O'Connell  
25/8/11

**Further Submission in Support of or Opposition to a Submission  
to Proposed Plan Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront**

To: The Wanganui District Council  
PO Box 637  
Wanganui

Further Submission on: Proposed Plan Change 21 – Central City and Riverfront

Name (in full): Universal College of Learning (UCOL)

Address: (Full postal address) Private Bag 11022  
Palmerston North

1. I ~~support or~~ oppose the submission of: New Zealand Historic Places Trust,  
PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140. Submission No. 28  
(Please state name and address of person making original submission and submission number of original submission)

2. The particular parts of the submission I/we ~~support or~~ oppose are: Refer attached document.  
  
(Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the Proposed Plan Change)

3. The reasons for my/our ~~support or~~ opposition are: Refer attached document.  
  
(Please state in summary the nature of your submission giving clear reasons). Use additional pages if more room is required.

4. I/we seek the following decision from the Council: Refer attached document  
(Please give precise details)

5. I/we do/~~do not~~ wish to be heard in support of this submission.

6. If others make a similar submission I would/~~would not~~ be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

7. Address for service of person making further submission: As above.  
Attention: Glenn Young, Facilities Manager

Signature:  Telephone No: 06 952 7072

Date: 25 August 2011 Facsimile No: 06 952 7199  
Email: g.young@ucol.ac.nz

**Note: LAST DAY for further submissions is on Thursday, 25 August 2011.**  
A copy of your further submission must be served on the person/organisation who made the original submission within 5 working days after you have lodged your further submission with the Wanganui District Council.

**PRIVACY INFORMATION**

When making a submission to the Council, it forms part of the public consultation process and public records and as such, may be reproduced as an attachment to a publicly available Council agenda, and remain on the Council minute records.

**2. The particular parts of the submission I/we oppose are:**

The submitter's request to consider a new rule making the creation of vacant land or open parking lots non-complying.

**3. The reason for my/our opposition are:**

The primary reason for objecting to this request is that no landowner (let alone a statutory body reliant on education funding) should be made to comply with a rule in a District Plan by having to build on a vacant lot. As amply demonstrated in Christchurch, vacant lots can be the result of seismic forces being unleashed. For various reasons beyond the control of any landowner, it may be necessary for land to remain vacant for an extended period. Were such a rule to become operative, it follows that a vacant lot would be non-compliant with the District Plan, and the Resource Management Act 1991, unless resource consent were to be obtained to make the vacant land permitted.

**4. I/we seek the following decision from the Council:**

Reject the request made by the submitter.

