

FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 3 - Historic Heritage Chapter 26

Statement of Evidence of Anna-Marie Chin Architects Ltd

Submitter 368

Historic Heritage

28 June 2016

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Anna-Marie Chin and I am a registered architect in NZ and a director of Anna-Marie Chin Architects Ltd. I have had 23 years architectural experience. I am originally from Invercargill and have holidayed in the district for 44 years. I have been permanently living in the district from the last 15 years.

2.0 EVIDENCE

2.1 (26.2.1) definitions of listed heritage categories 1- 3

In general I do not support the inclusion of the word "permanent" within either category 2 and 3. This does not mean anything and could be interpreted to mean the items of historic value have to remain as is in their entirety.

2.2 (26.5.2 2) To provide for the sustainable use of historic heritage

I strongly support the sustainable use of historic heritage. I support that as much as possible for these categories should be consented without consent, such as maintenance and repair. I support that the category 3 does not require consents for internal alterations.

These buildings can be costly to repair in themselves, the materials used internally can be very expensive to repair or replace and where a lower category applies then the additional cost should not be applied to them. To obtain a resource consent requires more reports than required by standard consents and just adds to costs. Resource consent is a very costly process in itself.

2.3 (26.5.1.2) Protect, maintain and enhance historic heritage

I support the idea of protecting items, areas and buildings of historic significance. The concern I have is for the interpretation of what is of historic significance. History is not a static thing it is an evolution over time. And then it is for how these are managed assessed in a way that does not prevent history from continuing. It is how history is recognized but then can be enhanced by good design consideration.

In this regards I support Jackie Gilles in her clause 5.0.

2.4 26.6 Terms used in this chapter Heritage Fabric

I support Jackie in her view on Heritage Fabric. There should be a definition but no examples as I also believe these can be misinterpreted.

2.5 (26.6.7) Development within curtilage or setting

I strongly oppose this rule and request it be deleted. The assessment of the "setting" is highly subjective. At the time a building or feature has been classified as historic then the setting should have been defined and included. Otherwise this could come down to very subjective interpretations which in turn could become a costly exercise to assess.

2.6 (26.5.4) To enhance historic heritage features where possible

I support clause 26.5.4.1 in principle, the offering of "possible relaxations of rules" . I do not have any suggestion on how this could be offered but support it as an idea, especially as this could help in possible a better outcome.

I do not support the clause 26.5.4.2 to add "consent notices and covenants" adds another layer of cost and assessment that should just be covered by the rules and policies in the district plan. I do not think it adds to the protection of buildings.

2.6 The historic listing 251 - Former Methodist Church, 8 Berkshire St, Arrowtown

I am an owner of this building and I request this listing be deleted. At present there is no clarity on what is being protected. The photos that show the building which are to be protected are not the building as it exists today. This is an alteration that was carried out during the assessment period and has extensively modified it from these photos. Having said this, we took care in making these alteration decisions and worked in conjunction with Jackie Gillies and Associates to ensure we were considering the building.

