NZIA CANTERBURY BRANCH SUBMISSION TO DRAFT CENTRAL CITY PLAN

CHANGES TO HERITAGE PROVISIONS

A. STATED AIM

Draft Central City Plan - Summary Document
Distinctive City - Heritage

The CCC acknowledges the challenges of retaining heritage buildings but recognises the benefits of retaining these as familiar landmarks in the redevelopment of the central city.

Council will seek to retain these important links through increased grants funding and targeting these to recognise the need for repair and strengthening supported by a regulatory approach. (pg.4)

The Branch supports this policy objective.

B. METHOD OF ACHIEVING STATED AIM

Draft Central City Plan - Volume 2
3.8 Heritage Provisions

General Comment

i) Generally the proposed Draft Central City Plan Provisions/Policies respond positively to the severe impact the Earthquakes have had on the cities Heritage stock.
ii) They highlight the need for structural upgrades for earthquake prone buildings to 67% of the new code.
iii) The reality of the work required to repair and strengthen Heritage buildings is reflected in the policies so that there is a better balance between retention of Heritage fabric and the economic viability of the building.

Specific Policy Comments

4.3.2 Policy, Earthquake Recovery

Policy 4.3.2 relates to retention of existing heritage buildings. While outside the remit of the Draft Central City Plan, it may be that CCC need to consider the Insurance challenges that face Heritage buildings

4.3.5 Policy, Alterations, additions reconstruction and new buildings

Policy 4.3.5 refers to facadism, where heritage facades are retained with new buildings built behind. This issue might be better dealt with in the urban design parts of the plan, although there is disagreement amongst heritage advocates on the value of facadism.

4.3.10 Policy, Incentives and Assistance

Policy 4.3.10 could include the assistance of Heritage planners when projects have to deal with the Building Consent team in the CCC. This relates to how Structural, Fire & Accessibility provisions of the NZBC impact on the heritage values the City Plan is trying to protect.

Policy 4.3.10 could also be clearer by listing examples of possible items of work available for monetary incentives.

C. OUTCOME OF PROPOSED METHOD

Positive outcomes

i) We acknowledge that Heritage buildings are part of a continuum, and that buildings should be allowed to change and adapt to remain relevant to a present age.
ii) This ongoing debate between Preservation versus Conservation of heritage buildings seems to have been addressed with the emphasis on ADAPTIVE REUSE as a means of striking the balance mentioned in General Comments point iii) above.

Negative outcomes

i) There is no mention of dispensation for Heritage buildings from other policies e.g. Parking and rigid Building Code requirements (structural, fire, accessibility).

D. Recommendation

i) Allow ‘special case’ treatment to be given to consent applications involving a Heritage building in regards to complying with both the City Plan and the NZ Building Code.
ii) List the type of projects that would be eligible for Heritage Grants.
iii) The Urban Design Panel could include a heritage expert where a project involves alteration or addition to a heritage building.