

## Section 32 – Variation to Plan Modification 132 – Character Overlay

### 1. Summary

The plan change was publicly notified in City Scene on 19 September 2004. Since the plan change was publicly notified, some mapping and text errors have been identified.

The plan change as notified did not include all of the character-supporting or character-defining buildings for Symonds St and the Ellerslie. The plan change also showed part of a site in Kingsland as character supporting whereas the intention was to show this part of the site as neither character supporting or character defining.

In addition to the variation proposes to clarify the provisions relating to those sites which do not contain either a character-defining or supporting building and to correct the typographical error in the rule relating to verandahs.

### 2. Issues – Benefit/Cost

#### 2.1 Character overlay maps referred to on planning maps

It is proposed to alter planning map number 2 of the relevant planning maps to include an outline of the character overlay areas and a reference number to Appendix B. This will mean the character overlay maps are easier to locate within the district plan.

It is proposed to amend Appendix A and B of the planning maps in order to include the maps that show which sites within the character overlay areas contain character defining and supporting buildings. These maps were previously included in the proposed new Appendix 11 to the planning text. However as they related directly to the district plan maps, it is considered that for readability and access, it is more appropriate to locate these maps in Appendix B.

The amendment to Appendix A is to list the character overlay reference numbers and to refer the reader to Appendix B.

As mentioned above the variation proposed to remove the character overlay maps form Appendix 11 and insert these in Appendix B of the planning maps. Proposed Appendix 11 will remain in place and will continue to contain the “Character Overlay Areas – Character Summaries” and the “Design Guidelines for Traditional Town Centres”.

Proposed Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed changes improve the clarity off and accessibility to the character overlay maps.</li><li>• The proposed text changes also improve the clarity and the sense of those rules which are to be amended.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The notifying of a variation will increase the time and financial cost associated with the plan change.</li></ul>

#### 2.2 Add or Remove Character-Defining or Character-Supporting Notation

a) Kingsland

Part of the property at 424 New North Road was incorrectly identified in the plan change as a character-supporting building. The Kingsland Character/Heritage Study does not identify this part of property as character-supporting, and therefore this needs to be corrected. The character-supporting notation needs to be removed from that part of the site as shown on the amended map.

It is important that the character overlay correctly identifies those sites and parts of sites that do not contain either character-defining or supporting buildings to ensure that only those buildings that have been identified as character defining or supporting are protected.

b) Ellerslie

(i) The property 111-121 Main Highway was omitted from the plan change as notified as being a character-defining building. The Ellerslie Character/Heritage Study identifies this property as character-defining, and therefore this needs to be corrected. The report considers this building as significant due to the following characteristics:

- Good example of 1930s Californian Art Deco
- Original 1930s shop front
- Original 1930s plaster ceilings
- Verandah with minimal fascia signwriting
- Original wrought iron detailing remains

In this regard, it is important that the character overlay correctly identifies this character-defining building to ensure compliance with the appropriate rules that help to ensure its protection.

ii) The property at 107-109 Main Highway was omitted from the plan change as notified as being a character-supporting building. The Ellerslie Character/Heritage Study identifies this property as character-supporting, and therefore this needs to be corrected. This building is noted in the above study as having the following significance:

- One of few remaining examples of Victorian weatherboard and timber-framed retail premises
- Historical references to Ellerslie's origins

It is important that the character overlay correctly identifies this building as character-supporting to help to ensure its protection.

c) Upper Symonds Street

The property 126 Symonds Street was omitted from the plan change as notified as being a character-defining building. The maps for the Symonds Street Character/Heritage Study do not show this property as character-defining. However it has been confirmed by one of the report authors that it was always the intention to identify the Hektor building on this site as character defining and that the building is covered in the research undertaken and it has been included within the Historic Places Trust Registration of the Upper Symonds Street Historic Area. The following background information has been provided regarding this building:

*The building in question is an interesting example of Art Deco design within Auckland and this area. It represents the last period of commercial development within the Upper Symonds St Area as well as providing reference to past businesses in the area such as the Pioneer Rubber Co for which the building was constructed. The Hektor Building's scale and design combines with the former car showroom on the corner of Upper Symonds St and Glenside Crescent to define the architectural/historical character of this block of buildings which survive as the only original buildings on the eastern side of Symonds St below Khyber pass Road.*

*(Bruce Petry, Salmond Reed Architects, email, 4 April 2005)*

It is therefore important that the character overlay correctly identifies this character-defining building to help to ensure its protection.

ii) The property at 25 New North Road was omitted from the plan change as notified as being a character-supporting building. The Upper Symonds Street Character/Heritage Study identifies this property as character-supporting, and therefore this needs to be corrected. The building is owned by the Spiritualist Church and it dates from the 1950s.

#### d) Discussion

It is proposed that the above sites need to be altered in order to include sites as either character defining and character supporting. These sites were left out of the maps as notified. The Character/Heritage Studies for Kingsland, Ellerslie and Upper Symonds contain the following advice regarding character supporting and character supporting buildings.

##### *Character defining*

*Based on research, assessment and analysis undertaken 'Character-defining' buildings and elements are those that make a major contribution to the character and heritage significance of the centre, and if removed would create a serious loss in identified character. Their retention is strongly advocated. These elements are seen as key participants in the historic character and sense of place of Ellerslie. Very few of these are currently scheduled for protection in the District Plan.*

##### *Character supporting*

*...elements identified as "Character Supporting" currently make a positive contribution to the character and heritage values of the centre.. They have been identified as "character supporting" if they contribute to the historic character and sense of place or are consistent with the character and values of the "character defining" buildings. For example, they may contribute to the streetscape character, or form part of an intact group of traditional "Mainstreet" buildings, but not be of particular historic, social or architectural value. In order to protect these values as part of the Character Heritage overlay, removal, redevelopment and/or extensive alteration within the overlay should trigger a resource consent process.*

It is important that the character overlay maps correctly identify both character defining and character-supporting buildings to ensure the protection of the character of the character overlay areas that are subject to this variation, being Kingsland, Ellerslie and Upper Symonds Street.

Proposed Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides consistency between the Character/Heritage Studies and the plan change.</li> <li>• The imposition of the character-defining or character supporting classification will see a higher level of control placed on any development (including demolition).</li> <li>• The appropriate classification is reflected in the plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The notifying of a variation will increase the time and financial cost associated with the plan change.</li> </ul>

2.3 Amend the formatting of text in Section 3.0 relating to Site not identified as being character defining or character supporting.

The plan change contains specific requirements for those sites that are not identified as being either character defining or character supporting. It is considered that reformatting of the first paragraph of this section in a similar way to section 1.0 and 2.0 will clarify the situations where resource consent is required. The proposed amendment is to alter the following paragraph:

*This control applies to all sites within the character overlay area that are not identified as character-defining or character-supporting. No person shall construct or relocate a building or undertake any additions that exceed the height of an existing building on the site without a restricted discretionary activity consent.*

To read:

*This control applies to all sites within the character overlay area that are not identified as character-defining or character-supporting. No person shall without a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity:*

- *construct or relocate a building*
- *undertake any additions that exceed the height of an existing building on the site.”*

The reformatting will clarify what meant in this section of the plan change.

Proposed Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reformatting will clarify those circumstances where a resource consent is required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If no change is made this part of the plan change will be more difficult to understand.</li> <li>• The notifying of a variation will increase the time and financial cost associated with the plan change.</li> </ul>

Amend the text in Section 4.0 - Verandahs in relation to criterion (g)

Section 4.0 of the plan change relates to verandahs. A word has been omitted from criterion (g) of the assessment criteria relating to verandahs. The word “no” needs to be inserted so that the criterion reads:

- (g) The carriageway edge of all verandahs must be **no** lower than 3 metres above the footpath and no greater than 4 metres above it.”

This change ensures that criterion is consistent with other verandah controls contained within the district plan.

Proposed Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency between the plan change and other verandah controls in the district plan.</li> <li>• The criterion makes sense and is understandable.</li> <li>• Clear guidance relating to the height of verandahs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The notifying of a variation will increase the time and financial cost associated with the plan change.</li> </ul>

### 3. Options

#### Promote a Variation

The character overlay seeks to minimise any adverse effects arising from future developments and it introduces control on development of physical resources by encouraging the retention and reuse of identified buildings. The amendments proposed would not alter the fundamental principles of the plan change. However, if buildings are incorrectly identified, and text contains errors, the objectives of the plan change will not be achieved.

#### Do not Promote a Variation

If a variation is not notified, the Council will be limited by the scope of submissions as to what changes can be made to the plan change. This would mean that those buildings that were not identified as character-supporting or character-defining, would only be able to be noted as such if a submission specifically requested it, and text omissions would not be corrected.

A review of the submissions has been undertaken and they do not enable errors and omissions to be rectified.

### 4. Conclusions

A variation is proposed to plan change 132 Business Centre Character Overlay. The variation corrects mapping and text errors and clarifies the circumstances where a resource consent is required for non character-supporting and defining buildings. This report recommends that the variation be endorsed for notification.