

Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

Section 42A Hearings Report for Hearing Commencing

13th March 2018

Report dated

12th February 2018

**Report on submissions and further submissions:
Submissions Concerning Nominations of
Buildings, Structures or Sites for inclusion in
Appendix 13 of the Marlborough Environment
Plan.**

Report prepared by

John Gray

Senior Architect

Smart Alliances Ltd

Blenheim

Introduction

My name is John Bradbrook Gray. I am a Senior Registered Architect, with Smart Alliances Ltd, Blenheim. . My qualifications and experience are as follows:

I hold a Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Auckland. (1981)

I lived and worked in Dunedin until relocating to Marlborough in 2009. I have had an interest in historic buildings since an early age, especially those of Dunedin and the Goldfields of Otago.

My specialist area of expertise is in Building Heritage and Conservation Architecture. I am recognised as an Architect experienced in Building Conservation matters and in the preparation of Conservation Plans, Heritage Studies, Heritage Assessments and Urban Design Guidelines.

I am a former director of, Oakley Gray Architects Ltd, Dunedin, a practice with a history going back to 1925, a Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects and have had 44 years' experience in the architectural profession, 35 years of that as a Registered Architect.

I also have considerable experience in a wide range of Architectural and Urban design issues, with my former practice having designed several notable Otago and Southland buildings over the past 25 years. Many of these buildings were in Heritage Precincts or adjacent to historic buildings. This work was in addition to my specialist area of Heritage Architecture and the restoration of such buildings.

I have also been commissioned to prepare several briefs of expert witness evidence for council resource consent; and environment court hearings over the past 30 years, within my areas of expertise of Heritage and Conservation Architecture and Urban Design.

HERITAGE SPECIFIC PROJECTS

I have been involved as project architect in the restoration and conservation of several notable Otago and Southland historic buildings including Dunedin's Municipal Chambers (Lawson 1880), the Fletcher House – Broad Bay, Dunedin (James Fletcher, 1908), the Dunedin Railway Station (Troup 1903), the Port Chalmers Town Hall (1878) and the Invercargill Civic Theatre restoration and redevelopment (Wilson, 1904). The Dunedin Municipal Chambers and Dunedin Railway Station projects, both won multiple awards from peer groups, and the Civic Theatre won an NZIA Southern Branch Award.

I was previously commissioned by the Invercargill City Council to review that city's inner city heritage building resource, which resulted in the publishing of Urban Design Guidelines for future development within Invercargill city.

The work also involved the publication of separate Building Colour and Restoration Guidelines for that city.

I also reviewed the Building Heritage Resource of Central Oamaru, from which Urban Design Guidelines for that town, were published.

I have written approximately 70 comprehensive conservation plans and reports on various buildings throughout the South island over the last 25 years and am presently involved in several projects involving historic buildings and structures in Canterbury and Marlborough.

I was not involved with the preparation of the MEP. I was contracted by the Marlborough District Council (Council) in February 2018 (after the MEP submission period had closed) to evaluate the relief requested in submissions and to provide recommendations in the form of a Section42A report.

I have read Council's Section 32 reports and submissions by the applicants, relevant to the required assessments.

Code of Conduct

I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it.

I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf.

Scope of Hearings Report

This report is prepared in accordance with section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

In this report I assess and provide recommendations to the Hearing Panel on submissions made on Appendix 13 matters.

In particular, this report contains my assessment of submissions on Appendix 13 matters. The nominations have been assessed against the Plan criteria contained in Policy 10.1.4. For completeness, I include the Policy below:

Policy 10.1.4 – Increase the community’s awareness of historic heritage values by identifying heritage resources, including historic buildings, places, sites, monuments and plaques that meet the following criteria for significance in the Marlborough Environment Plan:

- (a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;**
- (b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason;**
- (c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;**
- (d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;**
- (e) is important to Marlborough’s tangata whenua iwi; and**
- (f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.**

As submitters who indicate that they wish to be heard are entitled to speak to their submissions and present evidence at the hearing, the recommendations contained within this report are preliminary, relating only to the written submissions.

For the avoidance of doubt, it should be emphasised that any conclusions reached or recommendations made in this report are not binding on the Hearing Panel. It should not be assumed that the Hearing Panel will reach the same conclusions or decisions having considered all the evidence to be brought before them by the submitters.

This report is intended to be read in conjunction with the Section 42A report for Topic 8, Heritage Resources and Notable Trees

Analysis of submissions

There were approximately ten submissions received on provisions relevant to the Appendix 13 matters. The ten submissions related to seven different, sites, buildings or structures.

Items to be assessed

The following nominations have been assessed, in relation to Appendix 13:

Matter 1: Addition of the Sounds Soldiers' memorial at Torea Saddle

Matter 2: Addition of the Wairau Public hospital Nurses Home

Matter 3: Amendment to notified Kakapo Bay Whaling station site

Matter 4: Removal of Omaka Presbyterian Church

Matter 5: Addition of Lot 1 DP4615

Matter 6: Amendment to listing, Sunnymead Farm Cottage

Matter 7: Amendment to listing, Opaoa Wharf Building

Pre-hearing meetings

There have been no pre-hearing meetings for this topic.

Matter 1 - Sounds Soldiers Memorial, Torea Saddle

Submissions

Submission number	56.1
Submitter name	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents' Association
Submission	Seeks that the Sounds' Soldiers Memorial at Torea Saddle be included as a heritage resource in the appendix. Provides further detail on the memorial via a completed nomination form and excerpts from the published book "The Sounds Soldiers memorial - Stories of the Fallen", authored by the contact person.
Decision requested	Add the Sounds Soldier Memorial at Torea Saddle to Appendix 13.

Submission number	531.1
Submitter name	Alastair MacKenzie
Submission	<p>Oppose the omission of Sounds Soldiers' Memorial in the proposed Marlborough Environment Plan.</p> <p>Comments from the Nomination of Historic Heritage - Buildings, Sites and Place form provided in the submission include:</p> <p>Sounds Soldiers' Memorial, located between Portage Bay and Torea Bay, is an iconic memorial to those who did not return from WW1 and WW2.</p> <p>Unique memorial built by public contribution from a small community to remember sons, brothers and husbands.</p> <p>The following documents are included to support the submission:</p> <p>Nomination of Historic Heritage - Buildings, Sites and Place form</p> <p>The Sounds Soldiers Memorial - Stories of the Fallen - a comprehensive research document about this iconic landmark</p> <p>Photocopied pages from The Sounds Soldiers Memorial - Stories of the Fallen - highlighting specific references to the landmark</p> <p>Stuff article entitled Memorial restored for 100th commemoration</p>
Decision requested	That the Sounds Soldiers' Memorial is granted Heritage Resource status and is included in Appendix 13 of the Marlborough Environment Plan.

Assessment

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

This structure definitely has considerable local landmark value, being positioned on the saddle between Portage and Torea Bays, on a popular transition point of the modern Queen Charlotte track. It has stood on this point since its construction completion in 1921.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason;

This monument commemorates the sacrifice of 29 local soldiers who died during the First and Second World Wars.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

This monument is typical of New Zealand country memorials for the fall in the Great Wars. It is built using Marble and other stone from the top of the South Island.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

It is a local monument built through public subscriptions from a small local community collected during 1920, to remember, sons, brother, husbands and friends.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

This memorial remember the lives of fallen soldiers from this community, of both Maori and European decent.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

Although the memorial is not part of a heritage precinct, it's siting on the Torea Saddle, signifies the heritage and association of the memorialised soldiers with both the Queen Charlotte and Kenepuru Sounds.

Recommendation

I recommend that the Sound Soldier memorial at Torea be listed in Appendix 13, Schedule 2, as item 148

Matter 2 - Wairau public hospital Nurses home (Former)

Submissions

Submission number	768.74
Submitter name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Submission	<p>Schedule 2 - Category II and Locally Significant Heritage Resources</p> <p>a. Heritage New Zealand opposes the absence of the Wairau Public Hospital Nurses' Home (Former) (The Home) from Schedule 2.</p> <p>b. The Home, built in 1925-6, is a good representative example of a building type that is now becoming increasingly less common as hospitals tend to no longer require onsite residential wings for its nurses.</p> <p>c. Built to improve the quality of accommodation and study facilities for student nurses at the Wairau Public Hospital, the core two storeyed brick Nurses' Home has a combination of architectural and social significance. It is an example of an institutional building with a domestic character, being the hub of study and social activities for hundreds of trainee nurses and their friends and colleagues for six decades.</p> <p>d. Heritage New Zealand considers the Home as an important heritage resource that should be included in the schedule for Category 2/B items.</p> <p>e. Additional information on the importance of the Home is included in Attachment 3.</p>
Decision requested	That the following be added to Schedule 2 of Category 2/B Heritage Resources: MEP Reference – 147

	<p>HNZ List No (if applicable) – 1534</p> <p>Heritage Resource – Wairau Public Hospital Nurses' Home (Former)</p> <p>Address – 2 Hospital Road, Witherlea, Blenheim</p> <p>Value applies to – Building envelope</p> <p>Refer to Hard Copy Submission for information on the Wairau Public Hospital Nurses Home (Former).</p>
--	--

(1167) Nelson Marlborough District Health Board - Oppose

Inclusion of the former nurses' home in the MEP would lead to unnecessary processes and costs. In the event that the building is scheduled in the MEP, NMH notes that resource consent will be required for works other than repair or maintenance.

The building, which is cordoned off, is deemed to be a significant risk to public health and safety due to fire and seismic risk and asbestos building materials.

The repair works and associated costs required to bring the building up to standard are extensive and not economically viable.

NMH also opposes the policy recommended by Heritage New Zealand (submission point 32) insofar as it affects the former nurses home. Additionally, NMH wishes to ensure that any 'catch-all' policy in the MEP does not capture the building as a heritage resource and/or that it is explicitly excluded.

Assessment

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

The former Nurses Home, (original 1925 section) has been a landmark building on the Wairau Hospital site, since it's construction in 1925-26. It is one of the few early Wairau hospital buildings remaining on this site.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason;

While this building does not appear to have specific historic association with a particular person of note, it was living quarters for nurses in training, and would therefore have affinity with these former residents.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

The former Nurses Home reflects characteristics associated with a residential hospital facility of it's age. While it has pleasant proportions and contrasting use of materials, the materials, construction methods and workmanship are very typical of the era. It does not appear to exhibit extraordinary design, style, skills or use of materials that would elevate it's values or significance in these characteristics.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

These former nurses' homes are now relatively rare throughout New Zealand, owing to the redundancy of their use, at hospitals throughout the country. This has led to their subsequent demolition, owing to their age, construction materials leading to low earthquake resistance; and in many cases the presence of asbestos.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

There is no known association.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

There is no association in this regard.

Recommendation

The recommendation for this building, is somewhat complex. While it is approximately 92 years old and is of “pleasant” appearance, it is in my opinion, not of “Exceptional” or “Considerable” significance. If I am preparing a comprehensive and detailed “Heritage Impact Assessment” report on a building, I assess and rate all spaces and elements of the building based on a five level value of significance. These being - Exceptional, Considerable, Some, Little or No, and Intrusive.

An overall evaluation of the elevations or spaces of a building is then made using these assessed values in conjunction with the assessment criteria in the Heritage New Zealand’s, “Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance - Information Sheet 2”. My reports are further guided by the methods for assessing significance and measuring values, as listed in “J. S. Kerr’s, *The Seventh Edition, Conservation Plan; A Guide to the Preparation of Conservation Plans for Places of European Cultural Significance, Australia ICOMOS, 2013.*”

As an overview and based on my experience, taking into account the above methods of assessment, I would in all probability, rate this building overall as, of “Some” significance. A rating of (C).

In addition, there are opposing submissions on this building. Heritage New Zealand, request that the building be listed in Appendix 13 of the MEP to give it heritage protection, and Nelson Marlborough Health, who oppose the listing on the grounds that it would lead to unnecessary processes and costs. They further opine that *“the building which is cordoned off, is deemed to be a significant risk to health and safety due to fire and seismic risk and asbestos building materials. The repair works and associated costs required to bring the building up to standard are extensive and not economically viable.”*

While there is reasoned argument on both sides, it is probable that a building of this age and construction methods, would fall within the definition of an “Earthquake-Prone Building”, under the definition in Section 133AB of the, Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016

If this building is assessed by a Registered Engineer to be an earthquake prone building, the building owner is required under the Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016, Subpart 6A, Section 133AA - 133AY to either strengthen or demolish the building within a certain time period.

Present legislation does not compel the owner of a heritage building to strengthen, conserve or restore such a building, therefore even if the building is added to the Appendix 13 register, it does not guarantee it’s long term survival.

Owners of such redundant buildings are in a very difficult position, in that they own a building that they have no use for, and is located in a position on an existing site that makes alternative occupation for an alternative use outside their core operational parameters difficult, if not impossible to achieve due to operational or security constraints. In addition, in most cases the costs of strengthening and upgrading to enable an alternative use is totally uneconomic. Conversely the cost of demolition is also very costly, due to the nature of the heavyweight construction and the usual presence of considerable asbestos products throughout such buildings. The usual scenario is therefore that these buildings inevitably deteriorate to the point of total dereliction through neglect.

Therefore, upon balanced reflection and with regret, **I recommend that the request to include the Wairau Hospital Nurses Home, in Appendix 13 of the MEP, be declined.** I further recommend that negotiation take place between Nelson Marlborough Health and various interested agencies, to ascertain if there are viable alternatives for this building, and that if such negotiation is successful, the building then be reconsidered for inclusion on the Appendix 13 schedule.

Matter 3 - Amendment to notified Kakapo Bay Whaling Station Site

Submissions

Submission number	768.75
Submitter name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Submission	<p>Schedule 2 - Category II and Locally Significant Heritage Resources MEP Reference 61</p> <p>a. The Kakapo Bay Whaling Station has been identified for listing and so has a heritage listing number assigned. However, due to resource constraints the site not been fully processed by Heritage New Zealand and so is not currently entered on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero.</p> <p>b. Heritage New Zealand still considers that the site should be included in the Schedule as it has historic heritage significance or value and to help emphasise this, relevant reports are included in this submission as Attachment 4.</p> <p>c. To reflect the fact that this Heritage Resource is yet to be entered into the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero, the word 'proposed' should be included after the list number.</p> <p>Refer to Hard copy Submission to view report on Kakapo Bay Whaling station.</p>
Decision requested	That the word 'proposed' be added inside parentheses after the Heritage New Zealand List Number for Heritage Resources MEP Reference 61.

Assessment

At present it is unclear as to the full extent of the heritage protection of Kakapo Bay under Appendix 13. The wording implies the whole bay, while the mapping shows only the cemetery, being scheduled.

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

There is documented evidence of the bay having been settled by local Maori from the 13th or 14th century and Jacky Guard established his shore whaling station there c.1829. Kakapo Bay originally had European significance as a prominent shore whaling station; and later as a farming settlement, fishing base including ship building.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason;

Jacky and Betty Guard moved to Kakapo Bay from Te Awaiti in Tory Channel, c.1829. The first two European children, born in the South island were born there, John Guard (1831) and Louisa Guard (1833). Kuika Rangiawa (wife of James Wynen) and her child were also killed here, which is said to have led to the dissatisfaction of local Maori that resulted in the "Wairau Incident", where local Maori attacked British settlers, leaving several dead including Superintendent Wakefield. By 1832, it was reported that Jacky Guard purchased the bay from Ngati Toa chiefs, Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

A very early whaling station, with two tripots and whale oil tank, still evident in the bay, along with a small cannon said to be gifted to Jacky Guard. Apart from these relics and the cemetery on the hill, there are no other built heritage items from the early days.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

A very early documented coastal whaling station, in conjunction with the early social history of Kakapo Bay. Land at the bay has been in the ownership of the Guard family for approximately 187 years, which may be the oldest continuous ownership of private land by any family in New Zealand.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

The land in this bay has considerable importance to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi, owing to its early occupation and association with prominent Chiefs.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

The whole bay forms an area of high historical significance, due to the length of documented occupation and the number of significant historical events it is associated with. There is also believed to be considerable quantities of whale bones on the floor of the bay, which continues the significance beyond the shore line.

Recommendation

That the listing reference 61, in schedule 2 of Appendix 13 of the MEP, be altered to include the whole of the Kakapo Bay as shown outlined in blue, on the attachment 2, Further Submissions of Heritage New Zealand, Pouhere Taonga, on the Proposed MEP, dated 22nd June, 2017. It is further recommended, that the intent of the wording in item 37 of the HNZ "Further Submissions", be adopted into the plan, to give recognition and protection to the historic heritage values across the whole bay, while not placing undue burden over a number of properties.

Heritage New Zealand sought that the Kakapo Whaling Station Site be notated with "proposed". This matter has been addressed in the Section 42A report prepared by Mr Whyte.

Matter 4 - Removal of Omaka Presbyterian Church

Submissions

Submission number	768.76
Submitter name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Submission	<p>Schedule 2 - Category II and Locally Significant Heritage Resources MEP Reference 73</p> <p>a. The Omaka Presbyterian Church has been identified for listing and so has a heritage listing number assigned. However, due to resource constraints the site has not been fully processed by Heritage New Zealand so it is not currently entered on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero.</p> <p>b. Heritage New Zealand still considers that the site should be included in the Schedule as it has historic heritage significance or value and to help emphasise this, relevant reports are included in this submission as Attachment 5.</p> <p>c. To reflect the fact that this Heritage Resource is yet to be entered into the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero, the word 'proposed' should be included after the list number.</p> <p>Refer to Hard Copy Submission for report on Omaka Presbyterian Church.</p>
Decision requested	That the word 'proposed' be added inside parentheses after the Heritage New Zealand List Number for Heritage Resources MEP Reference 73.

Submission number	1043.1
Submitter name	Presbyterian Church Property Trustees - Wairau Presbyterian Parish
Submission	<p>Our objection to the Omaka Church being entered on the NZ Heritage list is based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The building is no longer used as a church and the congregation has neither the intention nor the financial resources to restore the building as a functioning church. The historic significance as a church community is in the site on which we have another building used for worship and Christian education and community activities over the years.• The building is not a great example of a rural church or rural church architecture and that if it were to be included in the district scheme, it is unfair to ask a small church community to preserve and maintain such a building without a very significant continuing contribution from Heritage NZ and the local Council.• A preservation order on the church would severely restrict the future use of the site and may require extensive maintenance / restoration. If adopted to apply specifically to the building, the congregation would have to apply for a notified departure from the local District Scheme for any exterior (and possible any interior) changes or for shifting or demolition and the local Body would be obliged to object to any change to uphold their own scheme. It would be of less concern if the change applied to the site as of

	<p>significant historic value as we could possibly deal with this by way of a notice board or plaque listing the significance of history/ personnel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parish is a religious charity whose primary purpose is to proclaim God's mission in the community - not there to preserve and maintain an old building deemed no longer suitable for this purpose. • Would Heritage be interested in acquiring the church and moving it to a suitable site for the local body/ community to preserve and use?
Decision requested	Delete Omaka Presbyterian Church (First Church) from Schedule 2 in the Appendix.

Assessment

This church building is currently listed in Schedule 2 of Appendix 13 of the MEP, as item 73.

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

This church was originally built in 1859, but located on the eastern end of the original site of 1.5 acres, out near the State Highway 6 boundary. It is believed this building has been moved at least twice during its existence. Originally to near the centre of the 1.5 acre site and then sometime in the early part of the twentieth century, to its present site.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason.

The land for the Presbyterian Church, totalling 1.5 acres, was gifted by the founder of Renwick Town, Dr Thomas Renwick. By the time this building was moved to its present site, there had been a new church built near the current site in 1886, so its actual purpose on the current site is unknown.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

This is a very simple one roomed church building with separate vestibule. It is unremarkable in most regards, but a good early example of a simple country church, built with local materials, by local craftsmen of the time. It is unusual, in that the interior, lined with Matai boards, has never had an form of finishing applied to the boards during its 159 years.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

Simple early examples of country churches like this are rare, still to be in their church yard setting, acknowledging that this building is not sited on its original location.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

There is no known association.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

There is no association in this regard.

Recommendation

That the Omaka Presbyterian Church, remain listed on Schedule 2, Appendix 13 of the MEP as item 73

It is noted that the Heritage New Zealand Listing Report (List No. 1474, Proposed) identifies the property on which the church sits. It is recommended that only the “Building Envelope and Interior” are recognised, as is currently proposed in Schedule 2, Appendix 13.

It is noted that the Church is incorrectly mapped in the notified plan. The building mapped appears to be the adjoining church building immediately to the west of the Omaka Presbyterian Church on the same property (see Map Page 53). If the decision is made to retain the Omaka Presbyterian Church, then the correct building should be mapped in Volume 4.

Heritage New Zealand sought that the Omaka Presbyterian Church building be notated with “proposed”. This matter has been addressed in the Section 42A report prepared by Mr Whyte.

Matter 5 - Addition of Lot 1 DP4615

Submissions

Submission number	1299.1
Submitter name	Philip James Sim
Submission	<p>Oppose the omission of Waikawa West Pt Sec B1 Maori Block site</p> <p>Comments from the Nomination of Historic Heritage - Buildings, Sites and Place form provided in the submission include:</p> <p>Local landmark - At least two wahi tapu sites, water spring and urupa</p> <p>Importance to Tangata Whenua - Te Atiawa iwi, flat land area use to grow fruit/vegetables/ berries</p> <p>Reflects an earlier townscape - Dates back to iwi settled 1850 in Picton then moved to Waikawa</p> <p>The following documents are included to support the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nomination of Historic Heritage - Buildings, Sites and Place form • Ayson and Partners survey of boundary locations for Northern end of Ranui Street • Photo of property outlined in blue sourced from Dekho (although not included in submission, the relevant property ID is Property Number 527547 Lot 1 DP 4615)
Decision requested	That Property Number 527547 Lot 1 DP 4615 is granted Heritage Resource status and is included in Appendix 13 of the Marlborough Environment Plan.

Assessment

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

Inspection of this site did not reveal any historic structures or significant physical features, such as a water spring or urupa as listed by Mr Sim. This site is stated as having strong local associations with Mr Sims Whanau. To my knowledge, this site does not appear to be a registered archaeological site.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason.

Though this site has very strong association with Mr Sim’s whanau, who were local identities, no evidence has been presented relating to authenticated persons of historical note.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

Mr Sims evidence is stated as being based on whanau oral history and well-known local iwi Te Atiawa stories. While the evidence relating to flax dying is relevant and pertinent, there does not appear to be any direct documented association to this site.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

The evidence presented does not support this value.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

The site holds strong associations to Mr Sims whanau.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

It does not appear to have direct association with, or form part of an historic precinct, or other registered areas of historic value.

Recommendation

I recommend that the request to include Lot 1 DP 4615, in Appendix 13 of the MEP, be declined.

Matter 6 - Amendment to listing, Sunnymead Farm Cottage

Submissions

Submission number	768.77
Submitter name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Submission	<p>Oppose in part.</p> <p>Schedule 2 - Category II and Locally Significant Heritage Resources.</p> <p>MEP reference 74</p> <p>a. The Sunnymead Farm Cottage has been identified for listing and so has a heritage listing number assigned. However, due to resource constraints it has not been fully processed and is not currently entered on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero. This needs to be reflected in the schedule with the word 'proposed' after the list number.</p> <p>b. Heritage New Zealand is neutral regarding whether the heritage resource should be added to the schedule.</p>
Decision requested	That the word 'proposed' be added inside parentheses after the Heritage New Zealand List Number.

Assessment

The Sunnymead Farm Cottage, is currently listed in Schedule 2 of Appendix 13 of the MEP, as item 74.

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

The cottage was relocated to the Inkerman Street site, c.1995 from, 154a Tarrants Road, Tua Marina. It was believed to be approximately 110 years old when relocated.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason.

The cottage is believed to have been built by early Marlborough settlers, Henry Brant Botham and Mary Ann Botham around the early 1880's. It was owned by descendant families, the Botham's, Tarrant's and Thomas's, until 1993.

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

This is a simple double storied colonial cottage, built of local timbers and by local tradesmen, using the construction methods of the time. Though I was unable to view the interior of the cottage in detail, what I saw from the front door indicated an abundance of original timbers in the foyer and stairwell area. The exterior has had extensive repair as part of the relocation process, with extensive replacement of weatherboards and the complete replacement of the current south wall cladding with modern board a batten. Although the Heritage New Zealand nomination form states that the exterior windows and doors are original, my brief observation may indicate that this may not be the case, in all instances.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

While not unique, this cottage is probably rare in Marlborough.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

There is no known association.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

There is no association in this regard.

Recommendation

That Sunnymeade Farm Cottage, remain listed on Schedule 2, Appendix 13 of the MEP as item 74, and that the listing includes just the "Building Envelope".

Heritage New Zealand sought that the Sunnymeade Farm Cottage building be notated with "proposed". This matter has been addressed in the Section 42A report prepared by Mr Whyte.

Matter 7 - Amendment to listing, Opaoa Wharf Building

Submissions

Submission number	768.78
Submitter name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Submission	Schedule 2 - Category II and Locally Significant Heritage Resources. MEP reference 106 a. The Opaoa Wharf Building was formally entered in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero as a category 2 historic place. However, due to an error it was mistakenly removed due to Heritage New Zealand incorrectly being advised that it was demolished.

	<p>b. Due to resource constraints, its re-listing has not yet been progressed and it is treated as a proposed listing. Heritage New Zealand considers that the building still warrants protection under the RMA and therefore supports the inclusion of the building in the schedule; however, its proposed listing status should be reflected.</p> <p>c. Additional information on the importance of the Opaoa Wharf Building is included in Attachment 6.</p> <p>Refer to Hard Copy Submission for report on the Opaoa Wharf Building.</p>
Decision requested	That the word 'proposed' be added inside parentheses after the Heritage New Zealand List Number.

Assessment

The Opaoa Wharf building, is currently listed in Schedule 2 of Appendix 13 of the MEP, as item 106.

(a) have value as a local landmark, over a significant length of time;

The wharf building was built in 1915 to replace the original shed built around 1890 and burnt down in 1914.

(b) have historic association with a person or event of note, or has strong public association for any reason.

The shed was the headquarters of W.E. Cluston and Co, shipping agents, and merchants

(c) reflect past skills, style, materials, methods of construction or workmanship that would make it of educational or architectural value;

This building is a basic wharf shed of the earlier 20th century, clad in corrugated iron. The corrugated iron cladding and general building fabric is in poor condition, with the exception of the south side lean-to, which has been highly modified, reclad and had four modern tilt-a-doors, windows and access doors fitted. From what I could see through the windows, it has been heavily modified internally, and is likely to retain little of its original internal features. The structure in its present location divorced from the river; and its present condition, would offer little in the way of historic educational or architectural value.

(d) is unique or rare in relation to particular historical themes, or is a work of art;

There are several other similar buildings in the general vicinity of this one.

(e) is important to Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi;

There is no known association.

(f) forms part of a precinct or area of heritage value.

While there are other similar buildings in the vicinity of Park Terrace, it could not be considered to form a precinct.

Recommendation

It is my opinion that this building has been highly modified, has little merit, or of heritage significance and is therefore on the border line of inclusion in Appendix 13, Schedule 2 of the MEP. If this building was fully assessed today in accordance with the principals in J S Kerr's "Conservation Plan", for a new listing on the Appendix 13 schedule, it would be unlikely to make the list.

However, it is noted that no submitter sought the deletion of the heritage resource. Heritage New Zealand sought that the Opaoa Wharf building be notated with “proposed”. This matter has been addressed in the Section 42A report prepared by Mr Whyte.