Richard Farry

#### **2GP - VARIATION 2**

## **SUBMISSION NUMBER S58.002**

# **Summary of verbal submission from Richard Farry**

# Section 6(f) Resource Management Act 1991

Matters of National Importance:

The protection of Historic Heritage from inappropriate subdivision use and development.

#### Rule 15.11.5

Assessment of restricted discretionary activities in an overlay zone, mapped area, heritage precinct or <u>affecting</u> a scheduled heritage item.

# Rule 15.11.5.6

All subdivision activities on sites containing a scheduled heritage building. Matters of discretion:

Effects on heritage values.

Specifically narrowed down to sites <u>containing</u> a heritage building. The building could be effected by a subdivision on a site where it is not contained

# Rule 15.11.4.1

Notwithstanding the policies and objectives relating to the protection of heritage values, this <u>provision</u> does not expressly require consideration of effects on heritage values.

Only possibly indirectly by reference to "character of the neighbourhood".

Attempted to add a sub clause "e" but this was ruled "out of scope".

#### **Section 42A report**

The reference to submission S58.002 in the report is manifestly in error where it refers to greenfield areas mapped with an NDMA not being adjacent to any scheduled heritage item.

Area map "change NDMA 03" is immediately adjacent to a significant category 1 heritage item schedule number B425 Bishopgrove, 16 Patmos Avenue (HNZ list number 2140).

## Rule 15.11.5.Y

This provision refers to the maintenance or enhancement of areas with significant <u>natural</u> environment values but does not refer to heritage values, notwithstanding the wording of the rule description.

## **Conclusion**

Inclusion of the submitted provision has no adverse impact but could provide some protection to heritage values in accordance with the Policies and Objectives.