

**BEFORE THE AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act  
1991 and the Local Government  
(Auckland Transitional Provisions)  
Act 2010

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Topic 029 Special Character  
(Historic Character)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the submissions and further  
submissions set out in the Parties  
and Issues Report

---

**JOINT EVIDENCE OF ELIZABETH HANCOCK, NICOLA LEGAT AND TANIA MACE, ON BEHALF OF THE  
GREY LYNN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION  
AND GRAEME JOHN BURGESS  
19 MAY 2015**

---

## **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1. We support special character (historic character) areas as a mechanism to preserve the historic heritage suburbs of Auckland.
- 1.2. We generally support the opinion of Mr Anthony Matthews as set out in his primary evidence for this topic.
- 1.3. We support the Council position that the character of these areas is based on historic built development, and is historic heritage character.
- 1.4. We consider that the area covered by this overlay should be extended to include adjoining and other areas that exhibit this same heritage character but which are not currently recognised by Council. We understand that zoning issues for this topic have been allocated to a separate hearing (079) and further to this that these matters will also be addressed in the hearing Topic(030), pre-1944 Overlay.
- 1.5. We are concerned about how the notification rules will apply in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones. Notification needs to be at a level appropriate for the effects of a planning application. We do not wish to see a situation where buildings in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones are removed without the community and/or neighbours being notified. The notification rules should recognise that Special Character is valued not only by the owners of the individual buildings within these zones, but also by the wider community.

## **2. INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1. This evidence has been prepared by Elizabeth Hancock, Nicola Legat, Tania Mace on behalf of the GLRA and Graeme Burgess.
- 2.2. Tania is a freelance historian who has worked in the heritage field since 1995.
- 2.3. Elizabeth is a journalist and community group member with an interest in heritage and urban issues.
- 2.4. Nicola is a publisher, journalist and local community group member with a long interest in heritage and urban issues.
- 2.5. Graeme is an architect in private practise who has specialised in heritage and conservation work since 1990.
- 2.6. This evidence has been prepared with limited time and resources

## **3. CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 3.1. We confirm that we have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that we agree to comply with it. We confirm that we have considered all the material facts that we are aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that we express, and that this evidence is within our area of expertise, except where we state that we are relying on the evidence of another person.

## **4. SCOPE**

- 4.1. We have not participated in mediation sessions relating to this Topic.

- 4.2. We support the Special Character areas.
- 4.3. We support Mr Matthews opinion that the character of the Residential A (formerly Auckland City Residential 1 or North Shore City Residential 3), + Residential 2 (formerly Auckland City Residential 2) areas is largely derived from the historic character of built development in these parts of Auckland.
- 4.4. We support Mr Matthews opinion that this character would be affected by the removal of historic development or by unsympathetic change.
- 4.5. There is a difference between character & heritage character. One of the key differences is the diversity that comes from change over time. Historic development contains anomalies and surprising juxtapositions, whereas character per se as applied can have a generalising and blanding effect, as illustrated by the recent removal of an historic home in Summer St and its replacement with two 'mock villas', and the removal of an original humble art deco home in John St and its replacement with a stripped back 'mock villa'.
- 4.6. We consider that the areas identified by Council as having special (historic) character do not extend far enough as many areas on the periphery of the identified character areas share the same pattern of historic development and are representative of that development to a high degree, particularly those parts of Grey Lynn not covered by the special character overlay.
- 4.7. We are concerned about how the notification rules will apply in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones. Notification needs to be at a level appropriate for the effects of a planning application. We do not wish to see a situation where buildings in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones are removed without the community and/or neighbours being notified. The notification rules should recognise that Special Character is valued not only by the owners of the individual buildings within these zones, but also by the wider community.

## **5. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PAUP PROVISIONS**

- 5.1. Council should extend the special historic character areas to include areas that have the same or similar historic character, but which are not currently included. Some of these areas, such as the streets of Grey Lynn (late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century development), remain largely intact but are changing at a rate that will rapidly dilute that character unless that historic character is recognised by extension of the character overlays.
- 5.2. We understand that Council is undertaking survey work in these areas through the pre-1944 overlay process under Topic 030. We consider that this topic is tied to the 030 Topic.
- 5.3. We are concerned about how the notification rules will apply in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones. Notification needs to be at a level appropriate for the effects of a planning application. We do not wish to see a situation where buildings in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones are removed without the community and/or neighbours being notified. The notification rules should recognise that Special Character is valued not only by the owners of the individual buildings within these zones, but also by the wider community.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1.** We support the Special Character Overlays, and agree that this is based on historic character. Recognising Historic (Special) Character through the application of overlays to areas of historic development, both residential and commercial is necessary as mechanism to manage and protect the historic heritage of Auckland from inappropriate development.
- 6.2.** We consider that the overlay areas should be extended to cover adjoining historic parts of Auckland that exhibit the same historic character and support the process that Council is undertaking to review those parts of Auckland through the pre-1944 overlay assessments.
- 6.3.** We are concerned about how the notification rules will apply in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones. Notification needs to be at a level appropriate for the effects of a planning application. We do not wish to see a situation where buildings in the pre 1944 and Special Character zones are removed without the community and/or neighbours being notified. The notification rules should recognise that Special Character is valued not only by the owners of the individual buildings within these zones, but also by the wider community.

Elizabeth Hancock

Nicola Legat

Tania Mace

Graeme John Burgess

19 May 2015

## **ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

### **Graeme John Burgess**

BArch 1980 Auckland University School of Architecture  
Registered Architect 1985  
Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects  
Member of the Auckland Council Heritage Advisory Panel  
McCahon House Trust Board

### **Work History**

1980-87 employed as architectural assistant + architect. Auckland, Sydney, Christchurch.  
1987-present Burgess + Treep Architects (established with my wife Lucy Treep),  
Specialising in heritage + conservation since 1990

### **Consultant to**

Auckland Council  
New Zealand Historic Places Trust  
Thames-Coromandel District Council  
Matamata Piako District Council

### **Conservation Plans**

Middle Courtville, Parliament St	1991
Corner Courtville, 9 Parliament St	1992
Carnegie Library princes St Onehunga	1997
Bella St Pumphouse Thames	1998
Thames Railway Station and Goods Shed	1998
Hauraki House (former Coromandel District School)	
Tararu School Thames	1999
Te Kotukutuku School, Matakana Island	2002
Spinks Cottage, St John's Church, Dixon St Wellington	2004
McCahon House, Otitori Bay Road, Titirangi	2004
Coromandel Citizens Hall (former St Georges School) Coromandel	2005
Corban Estate, New North road Henderson	2005
Turangawaewae House, Maori Parliament, Ngaruawahia	2008
Former Duder's Store, Hauraki Corner, Takapuna	2010
Pukekohe Railway Station, Pukekohe	2010
Omanaia Marae, Omanaia, Hokianga	2012
Maurice Shadbolt House, Arapito St, Titirangi	2013
Hone Tuwhare Crib, Kaka Point, South Otago	2014
Blumenthal House, St Heliers	2014-15

### **Educational Activities**

2005 Lecture Course co-coordinator: ARCHHTC 309 Conservation Architecture, Auckland University School of Architecture.  
Design Tutor, Auckland School of Architecture, 1990, 1992, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2015.  
Supervisor of Masters Program students at Auckland School of Architecture 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2015