

Supplementary ADCOSS Evidence Auckland Council Unitary
Plan 079 Special Character and pre-1944 Mapping

Attn: Thomas Erikson
Unitary Plan Submission Team
Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 237170
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142
Thomas.Erikson@aupihp.govt.nz

Mr Richard Northey
Auckland District Council of Social Services
184 Arthur Street
Onehunga
Auckland 1061

3 February 2016

Contact Person: Richard Northey, Chair, ph 6341494, mob
027 2479662, email: northeyr@xtra.co.nz or
rnorthey@pgfnz.org.nz

Scope of Evidence in Submission

**This includes Supplementary Evidence to: the Unitary
Plan on Topic 079 Special Character and Pre-1944
Mapping**

We would like to provide further evidence in the form of a
supplementary oral submission, currently set down for
hearing on Thursday 4 February from 11.15am. The
supplementary evidence is included in red.

**The Auckland District Council of Social Services
(ADCOSS)**

ADCOSS is an umbrella organisation covering the Auckland
isthmus area. Membership is made up of representatives

from voluntary agencies, community groups, statutory bodies and interested individuals. Submitting this evidence was approved by our 12 member Executive on the 14th of December 2015.

Our functions include disseminating information on social policy issues, social legislation and policy changes, to our members and to other social and community service providers. We do this by running workshops, seminars and training sessions. We also frequently make submissions to public bodies, the Auckland Council and Parliamentary Committees.

We have an Executive, made up of members elected at our AGM and co-opted throughout the year. This meets monthly to discuss current issues and programmes, and it is to this meeting that representatives from our sub-committees report. We currently have sub-committees on: housing issues, producing submissions, finance, older adults, and disabilities.

We are affiliated to the Community Networks Aotearoa, based in Wellington, which works closely with Central Government, the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services, and Hui E! in the social policy field.

The Submission made on behalf of ADCOSS is as follows:

We seek the following decision from the Independent Hearings Panel and the Auckland Council:
Accept the proposal with regard to Topic 079 of the Unitary Plan as currently proposed in the Evidence from the Auckland Council.

We wish to be heard in support of our Evidence.

1. ADCOSS supports strongly the Vision of the Auckland Plan and therefore those aspects which are to be implemented in part through this Unitary Plan. This is for a more compact

city linked by better, more comprehensive, co-ordinated and more reliable public transport; with strong protection of heritage, character and architecturally significant buildings and structures; and permitting and enabling more populous and intensified suburbs around appropriate town centres each with a wider range of employment opportunities and cultural, social, civic and recreational facilities and activities.

2. ADCOSS believes that there should be strong protection for heritage, and also for character and architecturally significant buildings and structures, to ensure that such structures cannot be demolished, removed or significantly modified without an appropriate publicly notified consent process. We support the provision of a requirement that demolition, removal or very substantial modification of those Historic Character or pre-1944 buildings now proposed to be identified in the Plan should require resource consent. We also support the proposed protected heritage and special character areas which we believe have been robustly identified and for Council to give more resources and higher priority to identifying and protecting heritage and special character buildings, structures and areas that should and need to be scheduled or zoned for long-term protection against demolition or removal.

3. We believe that the proposed three year period proposed for analysing the pre-1944 buildings to determine whether they should retain long term protection is inadequate. This vital work needs to be done well to determine whether historic character protection or scheduling is appropriate and very desirable or whether an unnecessary restriction on a property owner's rights should be removed. We believe that this period should be extended to at least 6 years. This process should have the flexibility to eventually allow for the possible emergence of an intermediate level of structures that justify protection somewhat less than for the historic character category but still having sufficient local value to

require prior notification to neighbours and key heritage organisations.

4. To aspire to be the World's Most Livable City Auckland must respect and retain the better examples of its built history and heritage – a good range of the styles, types and distinctive features of buildings that have helped give pride and character to our city as it has developed. Their vital importance to the quality of life of current and future Aucklanders and even to retain and attract the most creative, capable and entrepreneurial people, cannot be overstated. Some examples of specific heritage styles that should receive appropriate protection include the Arts and Craft of the early 20th Century and Art Deco from the late 1920s onward. We are somewhat concerned that some more recent notable houses designed by the mid-century Group Architects are not yet adequately protected. After sale our family's Vernon Brown designed beach house at Coromandel was demolished without any resource consent requirements for example. Apart from the already scheduled heritage buildings, which are unaffected by the provisions in this topic, there are also a range of buildings in geographical locations and street frontages which significantly contribute to our character as a city and need and deserve some real protection. The criteria and priority for each should be on the character and distinctiveness they have brought and will continue to bring to the city rather than simply their age. Through adequate protection now in the historic character and pre-1944 zones there should remain a robust opportunity to retain some that are bound to emerge as deserving scheduling in the future. For the majority of buildings in the pre-1944 properties now listed they have sufficient character and worth that demolishing or removing them should require gaining resource consent. This should aim at ensuring that what is proposed to replace them provides comparable value in terms of streetscape and character to their neighbourhood and their city.

4. As far as we can see the precise locations and areas proposed to retain historic character and also pre-1944 protection appear to be appropriate. There is a good spread in the more character filled older suburbs of Auckland. These suburbs need to retain a high proportion of these buildings to help retain the mix of reasons that they are great places to live, of which the better of the older buildings adds a major component to the quality of life in these suburbs and in our city.

Yours sincerely

Richard Northey
Chair
Auckland District Council of Social Services