

Submission on Notified Proposal for Plan, Change or Variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Timaru District Council

Name of submitter:

Timaru Civic Trust (Nigel Gilkison)

.....
[State full name]

This is a submission on the following proposed plan *or* on a change proposed to the following plan *or* on the following proposed variation to a proposed plan *or* on the following proposed variation to a change to an existing plan) (the 'proposal'):

Timaru Proposed District Plan

.....
[State the name of proposed or existing plan and (where applicable) change or variation].

I ~~could~~/could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

[*Select one.]

~~*I am/am not* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that~~

~~(a) adversely affects the environment; and~~

~~(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

[*Delete or strike through entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.]

[†Select one.]

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: [Give details]

.....
see attached submission document
.....
.....
.....

My submission is: [Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views]

[If your submission relates to a proposed plan prepared or changed using the collaborative planning process, you must indicate the following:

- Where you consider that the proposed plan or change fails to give effect to a consensus position and therefore how it should be modified; or
- In the case that your submission addresses a point on which the collaborative group did not reach a consensus position, how that provision in the plan should be modified.]

.....
see attached submission document
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

I seek the following decision from the local authority: *[Give precise details as this is the only part of your submission that will be summarised in the summary of decisions requested]*

.....
see attached submission document
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

I ~~wish~~ (or do not wish) † to be heard in support of my submission.

*[*In the case of a submission made on a proposed planning instrument that is subject to a streamlined planning process, you need only indicate whether you wish to be heard if the direction specifies that a hearing will be held.]*
[†Select one.]

***If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**

*[*Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case.]*

.....
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

[A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means]

Date 15/12/2022

Electronic address for service of submitter: email@universalform.co.nz

Telephone: 021 210 7374

Postal address (or alternative method of service under s352 of the Act):

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]* Nigel Gilkison

Note to person making submission

1. If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B. If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
2. Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
 - It is frivolous or vexatious:
 - It discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
 - It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
 - It contains offensive language:
 - It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialist knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.



TIMARU CIVIC TRUST (TCT)

SUBMISSION ON TIMARU DISTRICT COUNCIL (TDC) - PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

(15 December, 2022)

The Timaru Civic Trust does not wish to present at the proposed public hearing.

ZONE NAME CHANGES

We note that all of the Land Use Zone names (and some of their associated rules) have been changed from those used in the previous District Plan. In principle, TCT supports the new zoning categories and the overarching principle of bringing these Zone names into line with current national zoning naming conventions.

In our opinion, the implications of these zone changes and how they might effect property owners, are not well illustrated in the Proposed District Plan (PDP). Property owners want to see a comparison of how they will be effected by the changes being proposed and the summary information is inadequate at clearly illustrating this. Given that all zone names are changing and some zones are being omitted altogether, it would have been useful to provide a simple analysis of what has changed with each zone transition and the potential implications for landowners (ie. a 'before' & 'after' comparison sheet showing what restrictions/rules have and have not changed between the old and the new zoning).

NEW CITY CENTRE ZONE

The CITY CENTRE ZONE promotes the primacy of the CBD as the main retail and mixed use commercial centre for our district and this has been enshrined in the new Strategic Directions chapter of the Proposed District Plan. This approach is strongly supported by TCT.

The philosophy of focussing future mixed use development intensification around existing city centres and transport hubs seems to align well with the recently adopted National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD 2020), which requires Councils to plan well for growth and ensure a well-functioning urban environment for all people, communities and future generations.

The controls proposed for the new CITY CENTRE ZONE are similar to the COM 1A controls, including promoting 'mixed use' activity, including scope for inner city residential (above ground floor level) and the avoidance of Industrial activity within the CITY CENTRE ZONE.

Timaru Civic Trust (Inc) is a registered Charitable Trust (CC22212)

PO Box 674 Timaru 7940 info@timarucivictrust.co.nz



We support the additional urban design controls placed on buildings within the RETAIL CORE PRECINCT, which include Verandah, active frontage and setback controls.

We suggest that both the *active frontage* and *setback* controls, which are part of the retail core are extended to apply also to the entire new 'Southern Centre Precinct' to ensure that we do not get poor urban design outcomes, such as when building frontages in city centres are set well back from the street edge, with parking in front (eg the former *Warehouse Stationary* building in south Stafford St.).

NEW MIXED USE ZONE

We are pleased to see the inclusion of the new Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) which provides for a wide range of activities, including commercial activities, community facilities, educational facilities, residential activities, and existing industrial activities, around the periphery of the City Centre Zone.

We suggest that there are **additional urban design controls** placed on the location and design of building frontages, landscaping and car parks within this zone to ensure that streetscapes are not overly dominated by car parks and large areas of tarmac. Car parks should be prohibited from being placed in front of new buildings, instead they should be placed behind or beside new buildings, with the street frontage of the new building built up as close as possible to the road reserve. Buildings should be built with active street frontages facing the street, attractive boundary treatments, screened storage areas and well landscaped car parking areas (which are visible from public areas) to ensure that they are attractively designed and that the car parking does not dominate the building. Consider using similar urban design controls as included for the LFRZ in APP9.

LARGE FORMAT RETAIL ZONE (SHOWGROUNDS RETAIL PRECINCT)

We agree with extending the development thresholds for this zone, as proposed, but we also feel that there should be further restrictions placed on this land, as it has the potential to significantly adversely effect the wider local retail (trade) economy - particularly the CBD.

We feel that there should be a reduction of the quantum of commercial floor area permitted on this site. There should also be further restriction on Small Format Retail (including service retail and food & beverage retail) with the minimum size restricted to 500m², in order to prevent this area becoming a new retail centre/hub, which could negatively impact on the viability of our existing city centre, which is our primary retail centre.



Unfortunately, many of the requirements imposed by the proposed DP rules (such as the proposed Urban Design rules for this zone) for this zone will never be required to be implemented, as the development has already been approved and the buildings are currently being built.

TCT feel that the public and key stakeholders should have been consulted about the best future use of this land some time ago, before the council (via TDHL) sought to sell this land to a developer. The District Plan is very clear about protecting and prioritising the CBD as the district's primary retail destination - yet council reneged on its obligation to protect the CBD when it sold the Showgrounds land to a developer for a retail mega-centre, after purchasing it to safeguard it from exactly that purpose. The negative effects of this decision by councillors to allow this sale to proceed, despite significant public opposition, will continue to negatively impact on the viability and vitality of our CBD, and our wider local economy, for decades to come.

HISTORIC HERITAGE

TCT generally supports the proposed increase in the number of Scheduled Heritage Items within the district. We also support the rules in the DDP relating to Historic Heritage Items, including the provisions that help enable the seismic strengthening of heritage buildings.

TCT recognise that our heritage buildings and places within our CBD contribute significantly to the character and the identity of our city centre and that it is essential that this character be maintained, whilst still allowing scope for redevelopment and regeneration.

We support the proposed identification of the new Historic Heritage Areas (Stafford St & Caroline Bay) to help with preserving the cultural and social heritage and the character and identity associated with our most historically significant public areas and the oldest parts of our city.

One question that is raised by the inclusion of the new Historic Heritage Areas that are created is: Are **all** of the buildings within the new Historic Heritage Areas (including 'non-heritage scheduled' buildings) defined as 'Heritage buildings' and are they therefore eligible to qualify for heritage grants?

We question the specific rule associated with the demolition of CAT B scheduled item, which currently defines this activity as 'Discretionary' (Rule HH-R9). We believe that this activity status should be raised to 'Non-complying', as is the case with CAT A scheduled items. The reason for this is to protect these important heritage buildings from total loss (demolition). If a building has been deemed worthy of protection, then demolition of any scheduled item should be avoided.

Given that seismic strengthening of heritage buildings is a requirement which has been imposed on building owners by central government, and that the cost of strengthening heritage buildings is both significant and



does not generally result in increased rental income (particularly in smaller regional towns, such as Timaru), TCT suggest that the Council look at providing some additional financial and/or other incentives which will assist building owners within with upgrading their buildings to the required standard, within the required timeframe. The value that our heritage buildings contribute to the character and identity of our district is recognised within the proposed DP, but there is currently very little financial commitment from Council to contribute to the retention of this important cultural asset. The protection of these historic heritage items that is imposed by the council's proposed DP rules, imposes additional restrictions on what heritage building owners are able to do with their buildings (above and beyond that of 'non-heritage listed' buildings) and therefore the council should be assisting with the cost of preserving and maintaining these heritage buildings which contribute substantially to the unique built character and visual identity of Timaru.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON 'HH' SECTION:

HH-R1

reads:

"Note: for earthwork strengthening and external alterations, see HH-R5 and HH-R7"

should read:

*"Note: for **earthquake** strengthening and external alterations, see HH-R5 and HH-R7"*

HH-R5

reads:

"External strengthening of a Historic Heritage Item"

should read:

*"**Earthquake** strengthening of a Historic Heritage Item"*

HH-P16

reads:

"Only allow the removal or demolition of buildings that do not contribute to the values of Historic Heritage Areas."

comment: In order for the above rule to work, the DP will need to specifically define each and all buildings within the Historic Heritage Areas which do (and those that do not) contribute to the values of Historic Heritage Areas (ie a plan showing which buildings contribute and those which do not is crucial).



ENABLING NEW/OTHER HERITAGE ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO HERITAGE SCHEDULE

Given that the District Plan Review happens only every 10 years, or so (or longer), we would like to see the provision to be able to introduce new heritage items into the District Plan Heritage Schedule during the intervening periods between DP reviews. This information was requested as part of previous feedback submissions at the DRAFT DP Review stage.

DEDICATED HERITAGE PLANNING OFFICER

Our local heritage is an existing asset which is increasingly valuable to us, as a district, both in terms of its commercial and economic value and in the value that it contributes to our communities social and cultural wellbeing.

The Timaru Civic Trust congratulate Timaru District Council on commissioning the heritage audit as part of the DP Review process. This audit gives us a thorough and well researched record of each of our district's heritage assets. We also would like to thank the Council for the opportunity for the Civic Trust to be involved in the DP Heritage Steering Group process. This DP Review process has seen the list of scheduled heritage items in the district significantly increased and heritage protections reinforced.

This, along with the increased importance being placed on protecting and cultivating our cultural heritage (both nationally and locally), we see the need for a dedicated specialist heritage officer to be employed by the council to administer and monitor heritage issues related to the PDP.

It is important that the heritage provisions and protections imparted by this PDP are applied correctly and consistently, and that they are overseen and monitored by an experienced specialist heritage planning officer.

We understand that Waitaki District Council (with a population about half that of the Timaru District) have a dedicated specialist heritage officer and we hope that Timaru District Council could see fit to do the same.

INTEGRATION WITH 'CITY HUB/TIMARU CITYTOWN' PRINCIPLES & PROPOSALS

Although the 'City Hub'/CityTown Strategy is still in development, this should be referred to in the Proposed District Plan and its eventual conclusions and proposals should be implemented and integrated into the ongoing District Plan Review process (either adopted directly into the DP, or included as a development or regeneration area framework).



CPTED GUIDANCE

TCT supports the inclusion of CPTED guidance for the design of public open spaces. However, it must be made clear when and how this guidance is to be used and whether it is mandatory, or not.

CPTED and its principles are not 'hard and fast' rules, rather, they are guiding principles that must be adapted to fit the local context. It is also important to point out that whilst many of the CPTED principles are about the *design* of the space, several principle deal with the on-going *management* issues which need to be addressed and monitored throughout the life of the space.

We suggest including an introduction about CPTED principles (including definition) and guidance on how the principles are to be implemented/enforced and what information is required to conform (eg is a CPTED assessment a necessary requirement, and if so, when is it required?).

Suggested Definition:

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a multi-disciplinary approach of crime prevention that uses urban and architectural design and the management of built and natural environments. CPTED strategies aim to reduce victimization, deter offender decisions that precede criminal acts, and build a sense of community among inhabitants so they can gain territorial control of areas, reduce crime, and minimize fear of crime. (from International CPTED Association (ICA), <https://www.cpted.net>).

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Nigel Gilkison", with a wavy line extending to the right.

Nigel Gilkison

Chairperson, Timaru Civic Trust (TCT)