

RMA Form 5

Submission on publicly notified proposed district plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

Via email to district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz.

1. This is a submission from THE BODY CORPORATE OF 220 – 222 JACKSON STREET PETONE C/- GEOFFREY MITCHELL WANE (Body Corporate Member authorised to act on its behalf on this matter) on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is geoffandchichi@gmail.com
3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to, my submission on those provisions, and the decisions I seek are shown in the below table. I also seek all further, alternative, necessary, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.
5. I wish to be heard in support of my submission.
6. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Introduction

7. 220 -222 Jackson St has a popular history in Petone. From 1878, it was originally George and George Drapers.
8. The current building was built in c1921 of concrete and reinforcing steel.
9. With the closure of major manufacturing plants in Petone, most shops were closing and the population was low. The concept of re-developing 220 – 224 Jackson into apartments to draw people back into the Petone centre. The intention was to retain as much as the original exterior as possible and to ensure overall design was in keeping with the building's original style.
10. The developers' architect (Perry Architects) consulted with their own heritage architects and with the council's then historical consultant – Ian Bowman. The recessed balcony was designed in keeping with the period. The marionette balconies on its left and right were a compromise on full-sized balconies. The blocked off shop windows above the retained verandah were restored to original. Shop bay entrances were restored.
11. Everything was done to keep the original historical look, while ensuring the building was a lot safer.
12. The assessment of heritage buildings undertaken in 2023 -24 used different criteria to that included in the proposed plan. One of the assessor architects acknowledges this.
13. 220 – 222 ended up some how being classified as a non-contributing building.
14. I have spoken with Michael Kelly (one of the assessors) who has discussed the classification informally with his colleague. They have reached a provisional consideration that 220 – 222 should be classified as a “contributing building”. **But they say that consideration of anything other than a “heritage building” classification was not part of their work.**
15. It is not known whose part of whose work it was/is.
16. However it is submitted that 220 – 222 Jackson St be re-classified as a “contributing building” and that the classification criteria be reviewed for consistency.

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	Part 2 – District-Wide Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL VALUES Historical Heritage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heritage buildings and heritage structures - Heritage Areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> oppose in part 	<p>(a) there is an inconsistency in the classification criteria for deciding heritage buildings versus non-contributing buildings between that listed in the proposed district plan and that used by the heritage architects making the assessments</p> <p>(b) this has a particular impact on 220 – 222 Jackson St. It is joined to 224 Jackson St which rightly has been classified as a heritage building. However, 220 – 222 Jackson St has been separately classified as a non-contributing building, which is evidentially incorrect.</p>	<p>(a) Council officers work with the Council’s heritage architect assessors to resolve the inconsistencies in heritage building evaluation criteria</p> <p>(b) Whatever the assessment criteria, 220 – 222 is evidentially a “contributing building” and its assessment should be changed from a “non-contributing building” accordingly.</p>
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
13					
14					