

Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan
Decision Report pursuant to Clause 10 of the First Schedule
of the Resource Management Act 1991

Subject: Chapter 6 - Commercial Zone

In Reference to:

- ***Commercial Zone Provisions 6.1 – 6.4***
 - ***Commercial Zone Rules 6.5.1 – 6.5.6***
 - ***Appendix 7: Carterton Town Centre Design Guide***
 - ***Appendix 8: South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guidelines***
-

6.1 Introduction

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.14	Department of Conservation	FS 90 Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support
398.11	Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa	-	-

Discussion

The **Department of Conservation** (525.14) opposes '6.1 Introduction' because it believes there is a lack of consideration in the Introduction of the effect of activities in the Commercial Zone on natural values, in particular waterbodies. The submission also seeks that a Significant Resource Management Issue and Policy be added to address this matter. **Greater Wellington Regional Council** supports this submission.

Wairarapa Inc trading as Go Wairarapa (398.11) seeks that section '6.1 Introduction' of the Plan be amended to include reference to existing and future residential activity in the Commercial Zone and submit that this needs to be addressed by outlining conditions rather than leaving it permitted by omission, and therefore uncontrolled.

Evidence Heard

Department of Conservation presented evidence accepting and supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding two further matters to the Introduction.

Greater Wellington Regional Council presented evidence noting the amendments to Section 12 Freshwater Environments also would address their concerns.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the submitter's support for the Section 42A report recommendation, and concur that the addition of the new sentences better describe the Commercial Zone.

Decision: 6.1 Introduction

Submission Reference: 525.14	Accept in part
FS90	Accept in part
398.11	Accept

Decision Amendment: 6.1 Introduction

Add the following two sentences at the end of the second paragraph of '6.1 Introduction':

"A range of mixed use activities in the Commercial Zone assists in building vibrant town centres, and reinforces them as focal points for a range of retail, business, community and lifestyle activities. The Commercial Zone is that of a working business environment, and the zone has Permitted Activity standards and a range of Permitted Activities that reflect that the amenity values and character of it are those for a commercial environment."

Consequential Amendment:

Add the following sentence after the second sentence of paragraph 8 of 12.1 as follows:

The volume and velocity of stormwater runoff and contamination from surface residues from the large areas of impermeable surfaces in commercial and industrial areas can affect the health of natural systems, in particular waterbodies.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The added sentences better describe the nature and character of the commercial areas in the Wairarapa.

6.2 Significant Resource Management Issues

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
398.12	Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa	-	-
398.13	Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa	-	-

Discussion

Wairarapa Inc trading as Go Wairarapa (398.12) supports Issue 1.

Wairarapa Inc trading as Go Wairarapa (398.13) opposes Issue 4.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the submitter's support for Issue 1.

Issue 4 recognises that commercial activities can generate high levels of traffic movements, which can adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the main transport routes in the Wairarapa. The Commissioners considered it is appropriate to retain this Issue, as this ensures that the management framework in the District Plan implements tools for managing these effects.

Decision: 6.2 Significant Resource Management Issues

Submission Reference: 398.12	Accept
398.13	Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- Retaining the current Issue statement most appropriately describes the range of significant resource management issues for the Commercial Zone, as they apply to all Wairarapa towns.

6.3.1 Objective Com1 – Character and Amenity Values

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.15	Department of Conservation	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd	Support

Discussion

The **Department of Conservation** (525.15) seeks that Objective Com1 be amended to add words to mitigate the adverse effects of activities on the natural and physical environment. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission.

Evidence Heard

Department of Conservation presented evidence accepting and supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of amending Objective 6.3.1 to address adverse effects.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report recommendation that adding the reference to mitigating adverse effects is consistent with achieving the purpose of the Act.

Decision: 6.3.1 Objective Com1 – Character and Amenity Values

Submission Reference: 525.15 Accept
FS 86 Accept

Decision Amendment: 6.3.1 Objective Com1 – Character and Amenity Values

Add the following words to '6.3.1 Objective Com1 – Character and Amenity Values

*To maintain and enhance the character and amenity values of the Commercial Zone in a manner that enables its commercial functions to provide for the wellbeing of the Wairarapa **while mitigating adverse effects on the natural and physical environment.***

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended objective is the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Act, as it supports the ongoing functioning of the commercial areas which contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the local communities, while managing the effects on the environment.

6.3.4 Objective Com2 – Efficient Vehicle & Pedestrian Movement

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
494.4	Land Transport New Zealand	-	-

Discussion

Land Transport New Zealand (494.4) supports Objective Com2.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining Objective 6.3.4, as it is the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Act in providing for an efficient transportation network for all modes of transport.

Decision: 6.3.4 Objective Com2 – Efficient Vehicle & Pedestrian Movement

Submission Reference: 494.4 Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing objective is the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Act, as it provides for an efficient transportation network for all modes of transport.

6.3.13 Objective Com5 – Carterton Town Centre

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
351.1	The Barbara Durbin Family Trust	-	-
344.1	The Carterton Town and Country Development Group (Inc)	-	-
497.9	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	-	-

Discussion

The Barbara Durbin Family Trust (351.1), The Carterton Town and Country Development Group (Inc) (344.1) and NZ Historic Places Trust support Objective Com5 – Carterton Town Centre’.

Evidence Heard

B Durbin presented evidence supporting the objective for the Carterton Town Centre.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining Objective 6.3.13 as it is the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Act in maintaining and enhancing the character and amenity values of the Carterton Town Centre.

Decision: 6.3.13 Objective Com5 – Carterton Town Centre

Submission Reference:

351.1	Accept
344.1	Accept
497.9	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing objective is the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Act, as it provides for new and innovative commercial developments while maintaining and enhancing the valued character and amenity of the Carterton Town Centre.

6.5.2 Standards for Permitted Activities: (a) Maximum Building Height

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
401.5	E Crofoot	-	-
402.5	A Crofoot	-	-

Discussion

E Crofoot (401.5) and **A Crofoot** (402.5) seek that the maximum building height for commercial zoned properties at Castlepoint, and for other commercial zoned properties in the coastal area, be restricted to 7m.

Evidence Heard

A & E Crofoot presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of amending the maximum height to 7m for commercial zoned properties in the coastal settlements.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report recommendation of amending the maximum building height of commercial zoned properties to 7m for coastal settlements. The maximum height in the Residential and Rural Zones in the coastal environment have a maximum permitted height of 7m, therefore, the Commissioners consider applying the same maximum height to the Commercial Zone is the most efficient and effective approach for the scale of buildings in the coastal settlements.

Decision: 6.5.2 (a) Maximum Building Height

Submission Reference:

401.5	Accept
402.5	Accept

Decision Amendment: 6.5.2(a) Maximum Building Height

Add a clause (ii) to Rule 6.5.2(a) as follows:

(ii) 7 metres for coastal settlements.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended provision provides an efficient and effective approach for managing the maximum height of buildings to maintain the character and amenity values of the coastal environment.

6.5.2 Standards for Permitted Activities: (c) Minimum Building Setback

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
526.19	Greater Wellington Regional Council	-	-
522.18	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Oppose

Discussion

Greater Wellington Regional Council (526.19) seeks that Rule 6.5.2(c) be amended to require a 5m setback from permanently flowing water bodies in the Commercial Zone. The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.18) seeks that a new standard be added requiring a minimum 5m building setback from any waterbody except in the South Wairarapa District where a minimum 20m building setback is required from any river or stream which has an average width of 3m or more. **Windy Peak Trust** opposes the submission of the Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils.

Evidence Heard

Greater Wellington Regional Council presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation to add a 5m building setback from any waterbody.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Section 42A report recommendation of adding a setback from waterbodies would be the most efficient and effective approach in managing the effects of buildings on waterbodies. This setback would manage the siting of buildings to minimise the potential for buildings to adversely effect the qualities of waterbodies, including their natural values, flooding and aesthetic qualities.

Decision: 6.5.2(c): Minimum Building Setback

Submission Reference: 526.19	Accept in part
522.18	Accept in part
FS 102	Accept in part

Decision Amendment: 6.5.2(c): Minimum Building Setback

Add a clause (ii) to Rule 6.5.2(c) as follows:

(ii) 5 metres from any waterbody

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- 5m is the most efficient and effective setback distance as it protects the values of the waterbodies.

6.5.2 Standards for Permitted Activities: (f) Signs

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
404.2	Problem Gambling Foundation of NZ	-	-
398.14	Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa	-	-

Discussion

The **Problem Gambling Foundation of NZ** (404.2) seeks that Rule 6.5.2(f) be amended by adding an exception prohibiting any sign that has street frontage from promoting or advertising gambling (i.e. pokies or gaming lounges).

Wairarapa Inc/Go Wairarapa (398.14) seeks that Rule 6.5.2(f) be amended to address the issue of sandwich board signs on footpaths. The submission also suggests that the siting of tables and seating on footpaths also needs to be addressed.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the assessment in the Section 42A report, in that controls on signage associated with gambling venues is most appropriately managed by each Councils respective Gambling Venues Policy. The current District Plan sign submissions are effective in managing the location, size and scale of signs, irrespective of the purpose for which they have been erected.

The provision of sandwich board signs on footpaths is most appropriately managed by a Bylaw for each District Council. Sandwich board signs erected on footpaths can be managed by the Councils through their responsibilities as Road Controlling Authorities, which is considered the most effective method for managing these types of signs, given their temporary and mobile nature.

Decision: 6.5.2(f) Signs

Submission Reference:

404.2	Reject
398.14	Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing provisions for signs provide an efficient and effective approach for managing the effects from signs, in terms of their location, size and scale, to ensure they support the ongoing efficient functioning of commercial activities, while maintaining and enhancing the character and amenity of commercial areas.

6.5.2 Standards for Permitted Activities: (i) Activities within a Pedestrian Precinct

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
522.27	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Oppose

Discussion

The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.27) seek that Rule 6.5.2(i) be amended to add an Exception to exempt buildings from the standard where the buildings are set back 3m or more from the front boundary. **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

Rule 6.5.2(i) sets out the permitted activity standards for activities within the Pedestrian Precincts relating to shop frontages, verandahs and vehicle crossings. The Pedestrian Precincts are the central core of the commercial areas, and are focused on achieving a high quality pedestrian oriented environment. Providing a continuous building frontage along the roads in the Pedestrian Precinct contributes towards an environment which encourages a high concentration of pedestrian activity.

The Commissioners do not consider the recommended exception to Rule 6.5.2(i) allowing buildings to be setback from the front boundary to be the most effective approach for creating a high quality pedestrian environment. Allowing for buildings to be sited back from the front boundary could result in an irregular building façade pattern along the length of a road, resulting in poor quality pedestrian environments. The Commissioners consider the resource

consent process to be most efficient and effective approach for buildings setback from the front boundary, to assess the effects of the proposed siting on the pedestrian environment.

Decision: 6.5.2(i): Activities within a Pedestrian Precinct

Submission Reference: 522.27 Accept in part
FS 102 Accept in part

Decision Amendment: 6.5.2(i): Activities within a Pedestrian Precinct

Amend 6.5.2(i) by adding a Building Setback as follows:

(4) Building Setback

(a) All buildings shall be sited on the front boundary of the site.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing provisions for pedestrian precincts provide an efficient and effective approach for managing the nature and location of buildings in the pedestrian precinct, to ensure they support the ongoing efficient functioning of commercial activities, while maintaining and enhancing the character and amenity of commercial areas.

6.5.3 Controlled Activities

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
522.9	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Oppose
522.5	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose
497.10	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	-	-

Discussion

The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.9) seek that 6.5.3(a) which provides for subdivision in accordance with the District Wide Rules in Part B of the Plan be deleted. **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission.

The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.5) seeks that a rule be added to 6.5.3 requiring all the standards for permitted activities in Rule 6.5.2 to be met. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission and **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission.

NZ Historic Places Trust (497.10) seeks Rule 6.5.4(a) be amended by reviewing the design standards for new buildings by including size, bulk, scale and historic heritage as further matters for control/restriction in Rule 6.5.3(c) and 6.5.5(a).

Evidence Heard

NZ Historic Places Trust presented evidence outlining that standards would assist in the implementation of the Carterton Town Centre design guide.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters that individual subdivisions rules in each Environmental Zone are unnecessary, as Section 20 sets of the full set of subdivision rules.

The listed controlled activities in the Commercial Zone are building relocations and developments in the Carterton Town Centre Character Area. Given these activities apply to buildings, it is appropriate that the permitted activity standards also apply.

The design guide for the Carterton Town Centre Character Area was introduced in response to the poor building form of some new buildings fronting High Street. The Commissioners consider the frontage of the building and how it relates to the street and neighbouring buildings is the key consideration for the Carterton Town Centre Character Area. The Commissioners do not consider introducing standards for the size, bulk and scale of buildings to be the most effective approach as these standards could limit the viability and functioning of the commercial activities.

Decision: 6.5.3 Controlled Activities

Submission Reference: 522.9	Accept
FS 102	Reject
522.5	Accept
FS 86	Accept
FS 102	Reject
497.10	Reject

Decision Amendment: 6.5.3 Controlled Activities

Delete 6.5.3(a) as follows:

6.5.3 Controlled Activities

The following are Controlled Activities:

~~(a) Subdivision in accordance with the District Wide Rules B)~~

~~The matters over which control is reserved are listed in Section 20.1.1.~~

(b) Any activity involving.....

Make consequential re-numbering to Rule 6.5.3.

Add a Note to Rule 6.5.3 as follows:

Note:

All the standards for permitted activities in Rule 6.5.2 must be met.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- Removing the subdivision rule avoids potential confusion in interpreting the District Plan.
- Applying the permitted activity standards to controlled activities is an efficient and effective approach to managing the location, size and scale of buildings for the listed controlled activities.
- The existing standards focusing on the external appearance and design of the buildings is the most effective and efficient approach to maintaining the character and amenity values of the Carterton Town Centre Character Area.

6.5.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
522.14	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose
522.5	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose

Discussion

The Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils (522.14) seek that 6.5.5(b) have a non-notification clause added. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission and **Windy Peak Trust** opposes it.

The Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils (522.5) seek that a rule be added to 6.5.5 requiring all the standards for permitted activities in Rule 6.5.2 to be met. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission and **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The listed restricted discretionary activities are activities which do not comply with the permitted activity standards or are particular activities where the effects are known. The permitted activity standards set the baseline for acceptable effects. Any non-compliance with these standards has the potential to adversely effect the environment, including parties in close proximity to the activity. We do not consider it is the most efficient or effective approach to include a non-notification or and no service notice for these types of activities. We consider the notification provisions in the Act provide an effective process for determining how any resource consent application is to be processed.

Section 104(2) provides for Councils to disregard the effects of a permitted activity when determining a resource consent application for a restricted discretionary activity. Applying the permitted activity standards to restricted discretionary activities would be ineffective, as the activity status requires a case-by-case assessment of the effects of the particular proposal.

Decision: 6.5.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities

Submission Reference: 522.14	Reject
FS 86	Reject
FS 102	Accept
522.5	Reject
FS 86	Reject
FS 102	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The notification sections in the Act provide an efficient framework for determining how resource consent applications are to be processed.
- The provisions of the Act provide the direction in assessing resource consent applications and consideration of permitted activity effects. This approach is consider the most efficient and effective mechanism for managing the effects from a range of activities.

6.5.6 Discretionary Activities: (a) Any New Residential Unit at Ground Level, with Frontage onto Road

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
312.1	The Barbara Durbin Family Trust	-	-
342.1	The Carterton Town & Country Development Group (Inc)	-	-
311.1	Tomali	-	-

	Enterprises		
--	-------------	--	--

Discussion

The Barbara Durbin Family Trust (312.1) seeks that Rule 6.5.6(a) be amended as it relates to Carterton so that either any residential unit is ancillary to a Permitted Activity on a site, or any residential unit other than at ground level, is a Discretionary Activity.

The Carterton Town and Country Development Group (Inc) (342.1) seeks that Rule 6.5.6(a) be amended as it relates to Carterton so that any new residential unit not at ground level is a Discretionary Activity. **Tomali Enterprises** (311.1) seek the same amendment (but not restricted to Carterton).

Evidence Heard

B Durbin presented evidence supporting the traditional 'flat above or beside the shop' type development where it is ancillary to the commercial use.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters that the commercial areas should be utilised for commercial purposes, as this use contributes to the economic and social wellbeing of the local communities. The reasons given in the submissions highlight the importance of retaining the commercial areas for commercial needs. However, the relief sought by submitters appears to contradict these sentiments, as amending Rule 6.5.5(a) as submitted would permit residential development at ground level. Rule 6.5.6(a) requires any residential unit at ground level and with frontage onto a road to be a discretionary activity, requiring resource consent. Any other forms of residential unit, such as first floor apartments or residential unit at the rear of a shop would be a permitted activity. The Commissioners consider this rule is the most efficient and effective approach to managing residential development in the Commercial Zone.

Decision: 6.5.6 Discretionary Activities - (a) Any New Residential Unit at Ground Level, with Frontage onto Road.

Submission Reference: 312.1	Reject
342.1	Reject
311.1	Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing rule is the most efficient and effective approach to managing residential development in the Commercial Zone, as it allows residential units above ground level, which maintains the core commercial function at ground level, while providing for residential activity in the town centres which can add a level of vibrancy and activity to these centres.

6.5.6 Discretionary Activities: (c) Any other activity that is not a permitted, controlled or a restricted discretionary activity

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
522.25	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose

Discussion

The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.25) seeks that Rule 6.5.6(c) be deleted. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission and **Windy Peak Trust** opposes it.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The rules need to be clear and avoid confusion in terms of the activity status of proposals. Rule 6.5.6(c) results in a double 'catch-all', as all activities under Rule 6.5.2 are permitted. Therefore, Rule 6.5.6(c) is redundant and needs to be removed to provide for the effective administration of the District Plan.

Decision: 6.5.6(c)

Submission Reference: 522.25	Accept
FS 86	Accept
FS 102	Reject

Decision Amendment: 6.5.6(c)

Delete clause (c) as follows:

~~Any other activity that is not a permitted, controlled or a restricted discretionary activity.~~

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- Removing the catch-all discretionary activity rule avoids potential confusion in administering the District Plan.

6.5.6 Discretionary Activities: Add a New Clause

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
------------------	----------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

522.5	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 86 Progressive Enterprises Ltd FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose
-------	--	--	-----------------------

Discussion

The **Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils** (522.5) seeks that a rule be added to 6.5.6 requiring all the standards for permitted activities in Rule 6.5.2 to be met. **Progressive Enterprises Ltd** supports this submission and **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

Section 104(2) provides for Councils to disregard the effects of a permitted activity when determining a resource consent application for a discretionary activity. Applying the permitted activity standards to discretionary activities would be ineffective, as the activity status requires a case-by-case assessment of the effects of the particular proposal.

Decision: 6.5.6 Discretionary Activities: Add a New Clause

Submission Reference: 522.5	Reject
FS 86	Reject
FS 102	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The provisions of the Act provide the direction in assessing resource consent applications and consideration of permitted activity effects. This approach is considered the most efficient and effective mechanism for managing the effects from a range of activities.

34 Appendix 7: Carterton Town Centre Design Guide

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
497.37	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	-	-

Discussion

NZ Historic Places Trust (497.37) seeks the design guide for the Carterton Town Centre be amended to be less prescriptive.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this point.

Commissioners Deliberations

The Carterton Town Centre Design Guide describes the qualities and attributes of the central business district. A balance is to be found in providing certainty to the community, property owners and Council as to the nature and type of development that can be developed in the town centre, while providing flexibility in terms of building function. The Commissioners consider the existing design guide achieves this balance, as it clearly articulates the nature of buildings anticipated for the commercial area.

Decision: Appendix 7

Submission Reference: 497.37 Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing design guide is the most efficient and effective approach for describing the nature and design of buildings in the Carterton Town Centre Character Area, as it provides a high level of certainty, while allowing individual property owners to use their property for a range of uses.

35 Appendix 8: South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guidelines

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
37.6	Greytown Community Heritage Trust	FS 6 A Harrison	Support
497.38	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	-	-
510.5	Small Producers Association	-	-
509.4	Benfield & Delamare	-	-
275.1	V Read	-	-

Discussion

Greytown Community Heritage Trust (37.6) requests colour schemes be managed for all proposals, and all resource consents in the Historic Precinct area referred to the Greytown Community Heritage Trust. **A Harrison** supports this submission.

NZ Historic Places Trust (497.38) seeks the design guide for the South Wairarapa Town Centres be amended to be less prescriptive.

Small Producers Association (510.5) and **Benfield & Delamare** (509.4) request delete the South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guide and substitute it by adding height and bulk restrictions and providing a system of contributions and assistance for maintenance and repairs to owners of pre 1920 buildings.

V Read (275.1) requests amend Design Guide for Martinborough to incorporate issues such as context, scale and character, public realm and access and permeability.

Evidence Heard

Greytown Community Heritage Trust presented evidence supporting the intent of the design guide, and seeking clarification of how colour schemes were managed. They also requested the design guide should refer to the Greytown Community Heritage Trust as part of consultation in preparing designs for new developments.

Small Producers Association and **Benfield & Delamare** presented evidence expressing concern about requiring buildings to be designed to a certain style of architecture, which did not recognise modern living or commercial environments.

V Read presented evidence that the design guide should take into account wider urban form issues, and not just be focused on buildings.

Commissioners Deliberations

The South Wairarapa Town Centre Design Guide describes the qualities and attributes of the central business districts in the three South Wairarapa towns. A balance is to be found in providing certainty to the community, property owners and Council as to the nature and type of development that can be developed in the town centres, while providing flexibility in terms of building function.

The Commissioners consider the existing design guide achieves this balance, as it clearly articulates the nature of buildings anticipated for the commercial areas.

In terms of colour scheme for buildings, the existing design guide provisions only apply colour schemes to new construction and additions and alterations. The Commissioners concur with the submitters, that buildings painted inappropriate colours could compromise the qualities of the town centres. As discussed in the decision on Rule 21.1.3 in the decision report on Historic Heritage, it has been determined to amend this rule to more effectively manage the re-painting of buildings in the Historic Heritage Precincts.

The Commissioners appreciate the constructive comments made by Ms Read in managing future development in Martinborough, which could equally apply to the other towns in the Wairarapa. The design guide focuses on built development on individual sites, as this is the most efficient and effective approach for achieving the objective of maintaining and enhancing the character and amenity of the town centres. However, the Commissioners consider future investigations are warranted to determine the future form and function of Martinborough overall, which may result in future changes to the design guide.

As discussed in the Historic Heritage decision report, a rule based on the height or girth of a tree is not considered the most effective or efficient approach for managing vegetation in the commercial area of Greytown.

Decision: Appendix 8

Submission Reference: 37.6	Accept in part
FS 6	Accept in part
497.38	Reject
510.5	Reject
509.4	Reject
275.1	Reject

Consequential Amendment: Rule 21.1.3 Historic Heritage Precincts

Amend 21.1.3 Sites of Historic Heritage Precincts as follows:

~~“Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts~~ **Commercial and Industrial Zones**

- (a) *Minor repairs and maintenance of any premises within the Historic Heritage Precincts listed in Appendix 1.8 which meet the following standards:*
- (i) *The work is confined to conservation, reassembly, reinstatement, repair or stabilisation of the original character, fabric or detailing of the premises;*
 - (ii) *The work is carried out to the same design, using original or similar materials to those originally used and does not detract from the form, character and appearance of the premises; and*
 - (iii) ***For the South Wairarapa District, the work is consistent with the South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guidelines in Appendix 8.***

Add the following Definitions to 21.1.3 as follows:

Note: For the purpose of the above rule -

“Maintenance” means the protective care of a place.

A place of heritage value should be maintained regularly and preferably according to a conservation plan, except in circumstances where it is appropriate for places to remain without intervention. In relation to buildings and structures, maintenance means carrying out any work which:

- (1) is for the purposes of keeping the building and/or structure in good condition; and***
- (2) does not result in any increase in the area of land occupied by the structure; and***
- (3) does not change the character, scale and intensity of any effects of the structure on the environment (except to reduce any adverse effects or increase any positive effects) but does not include upgrading.***

“Repair” means making good decayed or damaged material.

Repair of material of a site should be with original or similar materials. Repair of a technically higher standard than the original workmanship or materials may be justified where the life expectancy of the site or material is increased, the new material is compatible with the old and any heritage value is not diminished.

- (b) *Signs within the Commercial and Industrial Zones in the Historic Heritage Precincts listed in Appendix 1.8 which meet the following standards:*
- (i) *No individual sign exceeds 2m² in area (all faces). Total signage on any one building shall not exceed 4m² in area.*
 - (ii) *No sign is illuminated by any means other than directional lighting.*
 - (iii) *Signs are located above verandahs but within the parapet height or suspended within verandahs.*
 - (iv) ***One free-standing sign per site, and shall not exceed 0.5m² in area (all faces).***

~~Masterton District~~ **Rural and Residential Zones**

- (a) *No works relating to any premises within the Historic Heritage Precincts in Appendix 1.8 except for works within the Queen Elizabeth Park Precinct which are provided for in the Park Management Plan (including amendments), and except for works within the Nopps and Norris Reserves in the Masters Crescent Precinct which are provided for in the respective Reserve Management Plans, **and except for works otherwise excluded in the relevant Council's Heritage Inventory.***

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing design guide is the most efficient and effective approach for describing the nature and design of buildings in the South Wairarapa Town Centres, as it provides a high level of certainty, while allowing individual property owners to use their property for a range of uses.
- The existing and amended rule better clarifies the nature and extent of the repairs and maintenance that can be undertaken as a permitted activity within Historic Heritage Precincts. This rule is considered the most efficient and effective framework for achieving the Plan objective of protecting the historic heritage in the Wairarapa.
- The character and historic heritage values of the Historic Heritage Precincts vary across the different Environmental Zones. We consider the most efficient and effective approach for managing Historic Heritage Precincts is based on the underlying Environmental Zone, to ensure the particular character and values of the different Precincts are managed to achieve the Plan objective of protecting the historic heritage values in the Wairarapa.