

Richard Knott for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 24 June 2016

Chapter 26 Historic Heritage, Hearing Stream 3

1. In my evidence I consider the methodology for identifying heritage items to be included in the inventory of protected features (**Inventory**) in Chapter 26 of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**). I note that neither the notified chapter nor the section 32 report confirms the methodology that was used to add new items to the Inventory or that which should be used for the identification or assessment of new items to be added to the Inventory. I recommend (as has Ms Jones) that the chapter be amended to include the criteria which new items that are proposed to be included in the Inventory in the future should be assessed against (i.e. the Plan Change 3/PDP criteria, as set out in Appendix B to my evidence).
2. Those items that are identified as meeting the criteria, are then classified as fitting one of three Categories, with each Category recognising the relative significance of the building/item. These Categories are defined in the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) but not in the PDP. I recommend (as has Ms Jones) that the PDP be amended to include a description of each Category (based upon but updated from the descriptions included in the ODP).
3. I also respond to a number of site specific submissions which have been made in relation to individual heritage items, included in the Inventory under 26.9 Buildings, Structures and Features and 26.10 Archaeological Sites. These relate to a range of issues including requests for an 'increase' or 'decrease' of categorisation, deletion from the schedules, and suggested additional items to be added to the schedules.
4. I consider each of these items individually. In a number of cases, where there is a sufficient level of information available for me to peer review, I make recommendations regarding whether I support, or do not support, the suggested changes. However, in some cases insufficient information is available for me to make a judgement. In these instances, I recommend no alteration to the PDP.
5. I also respond to a submission asking for the Pig and Whistle building to be removed from the Queenstown Court House Historic Heritage Precinct. I note

that the boundary of this precinct was amended by way of the notified version of the PDP and differs from the boundary shown in the ODP. One consequence of this is that the Pig and Whistle building, which was previously partly within the precinct (the boundary ran through it) is fully within the notified version of the precinct. In my opinion the Pig and Whistle building does not directly contribute to the heritage precinct and I conclude that the boundary should be adjusted to remove the building from the precinct.

6. In relation to the Glenorchy Heritage Landscape area, submissions seek the 'statement of significance' and 'key features to be protected' to be amended to reduce the features protected. I note the evidence of New Zealand Tungsten Mining Ltd but consider that there is still insufficient understanding of the area to confidently reduce the 'key features to be protected'. Therefore, I do not support the requested amendments but do think that an appropriate Heritage Assessment could provide the needed clarity. Such an assessment could be relied on to determine whether a feature is a 'heritage feature' in accordance with rule 26.6.21.
7. I also consider submissions made regarding the objectives, policies and rules, as I now turn to.
8. I confirm my support for the two rules relating to alterations (26.6.5 External Alterations and 26.6.6 Internal Alterations) but note that they both rely upon the statement 'works affecting the fabric or characteristics of buildings and features'. As there is currently no definition of 'fabric or characteristics' I consider that the rules are unclear. I therefore suggest a new definition for 'heritage fabric or characteristics'.
9. I note that I have concerns regarding the practical use of the definition of 'setting' which is currently included in the notified chapter, and confirm that providing an 'extent of place' provides greatest clarity on this matter. I accept that where an 'extent of place' does not exist, it best to rely upon a more narrowly defined setting, and subsequently have recommended a narrower definition of 'setting'. I confirm that I have reviewed existing extents of place where they are available and support adopting those extents of place recommended in the revised version of Chapter 26, which is included in Appendix 1 of the s 42 report on this chapter.