

- 4.2 In the s42A report the reporting officer supports the classification of the Johnsonville Line fits as a rapid transit service for the purposes of implementing the NPSUD, contrary to the position of the notified PDP:

In my assessment, the Johnsonville Line fits within the NPS-UD's definition of a rapid transit service. This means the plan should enable at least six storey building heights within walkable catchments of its rail stations. This is consistent with rapid transit interpretations from the other Wellington Region councils, national guidance and the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan. Enabling six stories in these areas would also meet, or not be inconsistent with, the NPS-UD objectives.

- 4.3 I agree with the submissions on Stride and Investore with regard to the classification of the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service, and consequential upzoning of the areas within a walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville rail line.

- 4.4 I also agree with and support the recommendations of the s42a report that the Johnsonville line meets the NSPUD definition of a rapid transit service and that the plan should therefore enable building heights of at least six storeys within walking catchments of its rail stations.

- 4.5 In my view the s42a report provides a comprehensive analysis of this issue, and in general I agree with the reasoning provided. In particular I agree with the reporting officer that:

- (a) The Johnsonville line fits within the NPSUD's definition of "rapid transit service". In my view, the Johnsonville line meets each of the key descriptors contained in the NPSUD definition of "rapid transit service". These are frequent, quick, reliable, high capacity, public transport, permanent route largely separated from other traffic. As set out in the evidence of Mark Georgeson the Johnsonville Line provides a dedicated rail corridor, has a 15 minute frequency, and has a capacity of over 1000 people per day. I consider that the word "quick" within the NPSUD definition needs to be interpreted in terms of total travel times rather than just moving speed. All stations on the Johnsonville line (excluding

Johnsonville which is to be upzoned as a Metropolitan Centre) provide a peak journey time to Wellington central of 21 minutes or less. This is a shorter journey time to Wellington central than a significant number of stations that have been classified as rapid transit for the purposes of implementing the NPSUD including all stations on the Hutt Valley Line north of Epuni, and all stations on the Kapiti Line north of Porirua.

- (b) The classification of the line as rapid transit and enabling six storeys within walkable catchments of its rail stations is consistent with the objectives of the NPSUD.
- (c) The Johnsonville line is classified as rapid transit by Greater Wellington Regional Council, the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021, and Wellington Regional Growth Framework 2021. This demonstrates that there is support for classifying the Johnsonville Line rapid transit from the Regional Council and regional planning documents from both a land use planning and infrastructure perspective. Classifying the line as rapid transit through the district plan will achieve consistency with these regional planning documents.
- (d) The classification is consistent with the approach taken by other councils in the Wellington region.

4.6 I also support the reporting officer's recommendations to introduce definitions to the PDP of "rapid transit" and "rapid transit stops" that explicitly include the Johnsonville rail line and stations. These recommended definitions provide additional clarity and remove any ambiguity around this issue.

4.7 It is notable that both the planning advice provided to the elected Council prior to notification of the PDP in June 2022, and the recommendations of the s42a report, support the inclusion of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit for the purposes of implementing Policy 3 of the NPSUD and enabling six storeys within walkable catchments of its rail stations. The decision to exclude the line as rapid transit in the notified version of the PDP for the purposes of implementing the

is traversed in greater detail in the List and associated report. I have attached a copy as **Appendix B**.<sup>2</sup>

26. I will also comment on the lack of consultation with the owner of Hurston as a reason for excluding the building from the schedule. Heritage New Zealand engaged and consulted with the representatives of the owners—the resident Sisters—during the preparation of the List entry report. We acknowledge that the actual owner(s) live overseas in Rome, which made owner consultation somewhat less straightforward and the leadership of the Missionary Sisters took on that role.
27. I also disagree with the exclusion of Hurston from SCHED1 on the basis WCC does has not undertaken a detailed heritage assessment. The professionally researched history and assessment of Hurston by Heritage New Zealand is sufficient evidence to inform the panel’s decision, prior to council commissioning their own heritage assessment. This assessment clearly demonstrates that Hurston meets one or more of the criteria to be considered to have significant historic heritage values, and therefore identified in SCHED1.<sup>3</sup>
28. Notwithstanding I can appreciate the caution of the s42A author, yet in my view, the significant historic heritage values identified and described by Heritage New Zealand are evidence to conclude that Hurston should be identified in SCHED1.

## **GORDON WILSON FLATS**

29. I agree with the s42A author to include the Gordon Wilson Flats on SCHED1 – Heritage Building, Item 299. As explained above under McLean Flats, in particular paragraphs 17-19, the two adjacent Modern buildings are jointly recognised as a Category 1 historic place entered on the List, for their outstanding historical significance in the telling of the storey of the alignment of Modernism and public housing in the decades during and following the Second World War.
30. It is relevant to stress that in 2017 the Environment Court upheld an appeal against removing the heritage status of the Gordon Wilson Flats. A Council Panel had previously approved the proposal to remove the building from the heritage schedule and to rezone the site from residential to

---

<sup>2</sup> Online at <https://www.heritage.org.nz/list-details/9783/McLean%20Flats%20and%20Gordon%20Wilson%20Flats>.

<sup>3</sup> For the panel’s convenience, this is attached as **Appendix B**.

34. Renowned architect Ernst Plischke designed the Kahn House and it is a benchmark design within his noteworthy career. Plischke was part of an influential group of architects who fled Nazi Europe, a group that also included the globally famous Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe. With them they carried the latest ideas in avant garde European Modernism. This design diaspora introduced and became primary proponents of the aesthetically sober and ahistorical mode of design to New Zealand in the case of Plischke (and the United States for Gropius and Mies).
35. European Modernism contrasted with other types of more decorative Modernisms already prevalent in New Zealand: Art Deco and Streamlined Moderne. Over time, countries and regions within countries developed adaptations of the European Modern aesthetic and eventually applied it to virtually every building type. Modernism revolutionised architecture and architectural education globally and Plischke was New Zealand's earliest progenitor.
36. The Kahn House is held in high esteem within the architectural and heritage communities. Completed in 1942, it is among the earliest Modern houses in New Zealand and a rare "textbook representation" of European Modernism in New Zealand for a domestic environment. Many people found such architecture too "cold" for family life and aspects of Modernism only became popular for housing when adapted and softened by architects in the 1950s and 1960s.
37. The Kahn House is one of Plischke's finest domestic designs; a phenomenal survivor from Modernism's earliest years in New Zealand; an important link to the 1930s global spread of Modernism as architects fled Nazi Europe; and is still in ownership of the family that commissioned the house, and because of this maintains a very high degree of integrity.
38. In conclusion, Kahn House has significant historic heritage values and as such should be identified in SCHED1.

**134 WILLIS STREET**

## **SCHED1**

49. The 42A author addresses **item 120** Our Lady Star of the Sea in paragraphs 677 to 683. I note that the chapel is entered on the List as a Category 2 historic place (List number 1413), and the whole complex is also entered as an Historic Area (List number 7042). I agree with the proposed amendments to the SCHED1 entry, as this will clarify which parts of the site are included in the schedule, and which parts are not. I note that the PDP maps indicate the three scheduled places with three separate purple pentagons.
50. I have noted the 42A author's recommendations to retain items **299** (Gordon Wilson Flats), **520** (Kahn House) and **524** (143 Willis Street) in **SCHED1**. Based on the evidence of Ms Smith, I agree with the recommendations regarding these places. These recommendations and supporting discussion are contained in paragraphs 684 – 703 (Gordon Wilson Flats); 790 – 799 (Kahn House); and 814 – 820 (134 Willis Street).
51. Dr Jacobs has also included in his evidence statements (paragraphs 29 to 41) regarding the heritage significance of these three places, which confirms the assessment undertaken by Ms Smith.
52. In paragraphs 831 – 850 the author recommends a number of minor technical changes to SCHED1 in response to submission points by HNZPT. I agree with these recommendations.
53. Regarding the concept of ranking or categorisation of SCHED1 places (paragraphs 851 to 867). I accept the author's conclusions on this topic. Amending the schedule in this way would necessitate a complete re-writing of the HH chapter policies, rules, and framework of activity status.
54. I agree with the 42A author (paragraphs 876 to 881) regarding the submission on the State Insurance Building – **Item 181** in SCHED1. Additional work to the 1998 portion of the building could be more intrusive or detract from the current heritage values of the building, therefore any additions and changes to the whole building should be controlled by plan rules.
55. In paragraphs 895 – 899 the question of an appropriate curtilage for Scots College Main Building (SCHED1 item 219) is discussed. I concur that a curtilage for this building is appropriate to limit the application of heritage rules, and Ms Smith has provided cogent reasons (her paragraph 489) for recommending the extent of curtilage.

has heritage values to support its inclusion in Schedule 1. Historic Places Wellington Inc (FS111.27) and Wellington's Character Charitable Trust (FS82.158) agree. Considering this, they seek to retain item 299, Gordon Wilson Flats, on SCHED1.

## Response

169. In response to this request, I have:

- Read the HHE report.
- Reviewed the photographs from my visit to the interior of the building in February 2020 (by VUW and with the Council).
- Visited 320 The Terrace from the street.
- Read the decision for *NZEnvC-116 The Architectural Centre v Wellington City Council and Victoria University of Wellington*.<sup>56</sup>

## Summary

170. The Gordon Wilson Flats is an 11-storey building designed by the New Zealand Government Architect as high-density social housing. The building was constructed in 1957-1959, and includes twelve studio apartments on the ground floor, and 75 two-storey two-bedroom apartments on the upper floors (maisonettes).

171. The block was closed in 2012 due to concerns about the safety of the façade and was sold to Victoria University in 2014. There was a plan change to remove the building from the district plan heritage schedules in 2016 which was appealed successfully by the Architectural Centre. The Gordon Wilson Flats is included in both the ODP and PDP.

172. The Gordon Wilson Flats (and neighbouring McLean Flats) were listed by HNZPT in February 2021 as a Category 1 Historic Place. The Gordon Wilson Flats are included on the MBIE earthquake-prone buildings' register and the notice expires in December 2026. The McLean Flats are not included in the ODP or PDP – and this is considered in more detail in section 8.3 of this report.

## NZEnvC-116

173. The Gordon Wilson Flats were included in the ODP until DPC 81 where it was proposed to rezone 320 The Terrace.<sup>57</sup> The plan change would have facilitated the demolition of the building and the development of the site by the university. The Hearing Panel recommended the rezoning of the site and de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats. This decision was appealed by the Architectural Centre in *NZEnvC-116 The Architectural Centre v Wellington City Council and Victoria University of Wellington*.

---

<sup>56</sup> NZEnvC-116 The Architectural Centre v Wellington City Council and Victoria University of Wellington. [2017-NZEnvC-116-The-Architectural-Centre-v-Wellington-City-Council.pdf \(justice.govt.nz\)](https://www.justice.govt.nz/decisions/nzenvc-116-the-architectural-centre-v-wellington-city-council.pdf)

<sup>57</sup> DPC 81: Rezoning 320 The Terrace (Gordon Wilson Flats) [Plans, policies and bylaws - Plan Change 81: Rezoning 320 The Terrace \(Gordon Wilson Flats\) - Wellington City Council](#)

174. The Environment Court majority decision found that “the Gordon Wilson Flats has significant heritage value and therefore should not be delisted.”<sup>58</sup>
175. My understanding of the decision is that the Court considered that “A judgement on the practicalities, difficulties or costs of refurbishment (i.e., are there any reasonable alternatives to demolition?)” could be achieved by scrutiny of a resource consent application for development on the site.<sup>59</sup>
176. The decision was not unanimous, and the minority view<sup>60</sup> considered that the building has “moderate” heritage value. This was based, in part, on the 2016 WCC heritage inventory report. The minority view noted that the building was not listed by HNZPT at the time of the plan change or appeal.<sup>61</sup>

#### Research and assessment

177. The Council’s heritage report for Gordon Wilson Flats was updated following the HNZPT registration of the building as a Category 1 Historic Place in February 2021. The building was researched and assessed by NZ Heritage Properties in August 2021, and the HHE report takes into consideration the research and findings of the HNZPT registration report.
178. The HHE report found the Gordon Wilson Flats to have significant historic, physical, and social values, and to be rare and representative. I agree with this assessment.

#### Overall

179. The Gordon Wilson Flats has significant heritage values, and has recently been listed as a Category 1 Historic Place on the New Zealand Heritage List Rārangī Kōrero. Category 1 historic places are of special or outstanding historical or cultural significance or value. The Council is required by the RMA to have regard to the New Zealand Heritage List when preparing a district plan, and is required by the GWRC RPS policy 21 to identify places with significant heritage values in the district plan.
180. The Gordon Wilson Flats have been assessed against the WCC heritage criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21 criteria and is eligible for inclusion in SCHED1 of the PDP.

#### **Recommendation**

181. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 continues to include item 299, 320 The Terrace, Gordon Wilson Flats.

---

<sup>58</sup> NZEnvC-116, paragraph 54

<sup>59</sup> NZEnvC-116, paragraph 54

<sup>60</sup> NZEnvC-116, paragraph 56 to 64

<sup>61</sup> NZEnvC-116, paragraph 56

### Overall

188. The Johnsonville Masonic Hall is one of the oldest surviving purpose-built masonic buildings in Wellington, and is the only one that retained its original use for over 110 years. It is one of the few listed heritage buildings in Johnsonville, and is one of the oldest surviving non-residential buildings in the suburb. Based on the 2013 heritage inventory report and the additional research and assessment in appendix 2, my view is that the place meets the criteria and thresholds for inclusion in SCHED1.

### **Recommendation**

189. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 continues to include item 366, Johnsonville Masonic Hall, 25-29 Phillip Street.

### **4.5. SCHED1 ITEM 415, EMENY HOUSE (FORMER), 1 RANFURLY TERRACE**

190. Tony de Lorenzo (9.1) considers the schedule entry for 1 Ranfurly Terrace to be confusing, and the restrictions on the house to be onerous. Considering this seeks to amend SCHED1 to remove item 415, Emeny House (former), 1 Ranfurly Terrace. Alternatively, submission 9 seeks to amend the items included in SCHED1.
191. Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir (FS91.42) generally supports submission 9.

### **Response**

192. In response to this request, I have:
- Read the HHE report.
  - Read the heritage Inventory Audit Report from June 2022 (included as an appendix in the HHE report).

### Summary

193. The house at 1 Ranfurly Terrace was constructed in 1898, and owned by the Emeny Family for 109 years until 2007. Charles Emeny was a plasterer and contractor who was responsible for the plasterwork in the interior, and for the ornate front fence. The house was added to the district plan in DPC 58 following a request by the Emeny family in 2007, and the plan change was notified at approximately the same time that the house was sold to new owners. It is the only house on the Wellington District Plan with a fully scheduled interior.

### Research and assessment

194. The HHE report was prepared in 2022, and the house (including the interiors and gardens) were assessed against the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21. The place has significant historic and physical (architectural, townscape, surroundings, technological, integrity) values, and is rare and representative.



Donald McLean Street should be included in the district plan list of heritage buildings. The decision was appealed by the owners, but this was withdrawn following mediation.

243. At the time of DPC 53, the church was subject to the pre-1930 demolition rule that made alterations to the street façade a discretionary restricted activity in the ODP. The pre-1930 demolition rules do not apply to the church in the PDP.

Research and assessment

244. The HHE for the church at 24 Donald McLean Street was prepared by the Wellington City Council heritage team in August 2020. The report includes earlier research by historian, Michael Kelly in 2006.

245. The HHE report assessed the property against the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21. It was found to have significant historic, physical (architectural, townscape, integrity), to be representative.

246. I agree with this assessment.

Extent

247. Submission 181 considers that the buildings adjacent to the church are not in keeping with the main church building.

248. In response, I have checked the extent of the listing in SCHED1 and confirm that the extent of the church includes the area mapped in the PDP - WN48/219 (Fee Simple, 1/1, Part Allotment 61-63 and Part Lot 73 Deposited Plan 24, 481 m<sup>2</sup>). The two properties referred to in submission 181 are not included within this curtilage and are not subject to the heritage listing.

Overall

249. My view is that the church at 24 Donald McLean Street meets the criteria and thresholds for inclusion in SCHED1. Concerns about the values of the buildings adjacent to the church are not relevant, as they are not included within the extent of the heritage listing.

**Recommendation**

250. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 includes item 490 – 24 Donald McLean Street, Former Primitive Methodist Church.

- 5.3. **SCHED1 ITEM 497, ROBERT STOUT BUILDING, 21 KELBURN PARADE**  
251. Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington (106.29) considers that the Robert Stout Building does not have sufficient heritage values to be included in SCHED1. Considering this seeks to amend SCHED1 to omit item 497, Robert Stout Building, 21 Kelburn Parade.

252. There is an error in the summary of further submissions, and Historic Places Wellington Inc (FS111.27) have not submitted on the Robert Stout Building (their comments relate to the Gordon Wilson Flats).

**Response**

253. In response to this request, I have:

- Read the HHE report.
- Visited the building from the street in April 2023.

Summary

254. The Robert Stout Building is the second oldest purpose-built university building at Victoria University after the Hunter Building. It is a brick-clad reinforced concrete building with mansard and basement accommodation, and was constructed in 1938 to house the registry and university administration including the vice-Chancellor’s office. The Robert Stout Building was designed in a neo-Georgian style by William Gray Young and Francis Swan, with a two-storey addition by Gray Young, Morton and Calder from 1959. Both Swan and Gray Young are significant Wellington architects, and Gray Young is noted for his neo-Georgian style buildings.

Research and Assessment

255. The WCC heritage team prepared a HHE report in 2020. The HHE report assessed the property against the WCC criteria/GWRC Regional Policy Statement policy 21. It was found to have significant historic, physical (architectural, townscape, group, integrity), and social values, and to be representative.

256. I agree with this assessment.

Curtilage

257. Submission 106 notes that item 171 Hunter Building, Victoria University, (and the adjacent Robert Stout Building) are located on a large site. Section 6.1 of this report note that a curtilage for the Hunter Building is included in both the ODP and PDP. If the Robert Stout Building continues to be included in SCHED1 then it would be appropriate to include the same curtilage that was established for the Hunter Building – this is discussed in detail in Sections 2.6 and 6.1.

Schedule entry

258. Based on the above, the schedule entry for item 497 should be clarified to the following:

DP Ref #	Address	Name	Legal Description	Protection required	Values	Link	HNZPT #
497	21 Kelburn Parade	Robert Stout Building	PT TOWN BELT TN OF WELLINGTON	Entire external building envelope.	A, B, C, E, F		

				Building curtilage for application of the historic heritage rules is mapped.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Overall

259. Based on the above, my view is that the Robert Stout Building meet the meets the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21 criteria and thresholds for inclusion in SCHED1.

**Recommendation**

260. Based on the above I recommend that:

- a. SCHED1 should continue to include item 497, the Robert Stout Building; and
- b. SCHED1 and the interactive map should be updated to include the same curtilage as item 171, Hunter Building, Victoria University, 21 Kelburn Parade.

**5.4. SCHED 1 ITEM 505, PENTHOUSE CINEMA, 205 OHIRO ROAD**

261. Wellington Amusement Holdings (22.1) consider that the portion of the cinema building included in SCHED1 does not have sufficient heritage value, and the retention and strengthening of the parts of the building included in SCHED1 is not viable. Considering this seeks to amend SCHED 1 to omit item 505 – Penthouse Cinema, 205 Ohiro Road, Brooklyn.

**Response**

262. In response to this request, I have:

- Read the HHE report.
- Visited the Penthouse Cinema from the street, the café, and other internal hospitality spaces on 16 February 2023.
- Read the relevant parts of the decision report for resource consent SR 516321 for the redevelopment of the cinema.

Summary

263. The Penthouse Cinema is a 1939 Art Deco purpose-built cinema located in the suburb of Brooklyn. The building is earthquake prone with an EPB notice that expires in January 2029. The addition and carpark to the south of the cinema date from c.2006, and are not included within the extent of the listing.

Research and Assessment

264. The Penthouse Cinema was researched and assessed by NZ Heritage Properties in 2021. The HHE report assessed the property against the WCC criteria/GWRC Regional Policy Statement policy 21. It was found to have significant historic, physical (architectural, townscape, integrity), and social values, and to be rare and representative.

### Planned redevelopment.

272. In June 2022 a resource consent (SR 516321) application was submitted to the Council to partially demolish the existing cinema building. The consent was approved in November 2022 and allows for the construction of an additional floor level at the approximate location of the 1939 auditorium, with an addition to the south of the building to include a new stair. The interior would be reconfigured with 6 x cinemas and a ground floor auditorium. The consented development retains the extent of the building included in SCHED1.

### Overall

273. The SCHED1 partial listing of the Penthouse Cinema includes the part of the building with the highest architectural and townscape values. There is a resource consent for redevelopment of the site which includes the retention of the Art Deco elements.

### **Recommendation**

274. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 should continue to include item 505, the Penthouse Cinema.

### **5.5. SCHED1 ITEM 509, WHARENUI APARTMENTS, 274 ORIENTAL PARADE**

275. Wharenuui Apartments (358.3, 358.4) consider that the values of the building do not warrant the additional costs or restrictions on maintenance imposed by listing; provides a detailed response to the HHE evaluation; and considers that development should be able to occur on the land immediately behind the apartments. Considering this seeks to amend SCHED1 to omit item 509, Wharenuui Apartments, 274 Oriental Parade; and to allow for development to the rear of the property.

### **Response**

276. In response to this request, I have:

- Read the HHE report.
- Considered the detailed response to the heritage assessment included in submission 358.
- Viewed the exterior of the building from Oriental Parade / Grass Street in April 2023.

### Summary

277. Wharenuui is a 11-storey (plus penthouse) apartment building designed by Keith Cooper and W.E. Lavelle for Structon Group Architects, and built in 1958. The Modernist building was constructed from reinforced concrete, has an irregular floor plan that was designed to maximise views over Oriental Bay for the apartments.

### Heritage assessment

278. In 2021 NZ Heritage Properties prepared a HHE report for 274 Oriental Parade. The HHE report assessed the property against the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21. It was found to have significant historic values (themes, events), physical values (architectural, townscape, group, surroundings, and integrity), and to be rare and representativeness.
279. Submission 358 includes a detailed response to the heritage assessment, and I have considered each of the issues raised by the submission. In summary:
- I generally agree with submission 358 that the historic (people), and physical (archaeology) values have not been established to be significant in the HHE report.
  - I also generally agree with the HHE assessment that the place has significant physical values (architectural, townscape, group, and integrity), and that the place is rare and representative.
280. Based on the HHE report, my view is that the place meets the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21 requirements for inclusion in the district plan.

### Curtilage

281. Section 2.6 of this report includes discussion of the use of curtilages by the Council for the purpose of rules 21A.2.2 and 21A.3.1 in the ODP and HH-R5 and SUB-R7 in the PDP.
282. Submission 358 notes that the rear of the property at 274 The Oriental Parade includes a vacant site that has pedestrian access via Wilkinson Street.



Figure 7: Whareniui apartments proposed curtilage<sup>67</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Figure 7 shows the extent of Lot 1 DP 49887 with the area associated with Whareniui shaded in green.

283. My view is that the significant items are located in the area marked in green on figure 7 above. The remaining parts of the site behind Wharenui do not appear to have significant heritage values, and development on the rear site is unlikely to affect the heritage values of 274 Oriental Parade for the following reasons:

- a. The hillside was not developed historically (there are no buildings shown on the 1892 Thomas Ward Maps or the 1937 Housing Survey map), and there are no heritage buildings or structures on this part of the site.
- b. The hillside does not appear to have been part of the 1958 Wharenui development – for example there is no evidence of significant landscaping planned for the site.
- c. The hillside does not appear to be a significant part of the surroundings of the apartments, because it is located to the rear of the building, and is difficult to see from the street.
- d. The rear of the site has a height control of 11m, which is substantially lower than the 11-storey Wharenui building, and so it is unlikely that a building constructed at the rear of the property would be visually dominant.

Schedule entry

284. Based on the above, the schedule entry for item 509 could be clarified to the following, if a curtilage is agreed:

DP Ref #	Address	Name	Legal Description	Protection required	Values	Link	HNZPT #
509	274 Oriental Parade	Wharenui Apartments	LOT 1 DP 49887	Entire external building envelope <a href="#">Building curtilage for application of the historic heritage rules is mapped.</a>	A, B, E, F		

Overall

285. Although I agree with submission 358 that some of the historic and archaeological values noted in the HHE report have not been established to be significant, my view is that the building meets the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21 criteria.

286. I note the concerns held by the owners about the development potential of the rear of the site. My view is that the curtilage identified in figure 7 could be used to establish a curtilage for the site in relation to the application of rules HH-R5 and SUB-R7.

### **Recommendation**

287. Based on the above, I recommend that SCHED1 item 509 should continue to include item 509, Wharenui Apartments, 274 Oriental Parade.

### **5.6. SCHED1 ITEM 510, 280 ORIENTAL PARADE, OLYMPUS APARTMENTS**

288. Olympus Apartments (473.1 and 473.2) considers that 280 Oriental Parade does not qualify as a heritage building; and that heritage listing will add to the cost of maintenance, repair, and improvements. Considering this seeks to amend SCHED1 to omit item 510, 280 Oriental Parade, Olympus Apartments.

### **Response**

289. In response to this request, I have:

- Read the HHE report.
- Considered the detailed comments raised in submission 473 on the assessment of heritage significance.
- Visited 280 Oriental Parade from the street in April 2023.

### Summary

290. The Olympus Apartments were designed by architect Edmund Anscombe for the Wilkinson Estate in 1937. It is a four storey Art Deco/Moderne reinforced concrete apartment building constructed on a corner site at the intersection of Oriental Parade and Grass Street. Edmund Anscombe is a notable Wellington architect who is known for his interwar Art Deco / Stripped Classical style buildings.

### Research and assessment

291. The HHE report was prepared by NZ Heritage Properties in June 2021. The HHE report finds that the apartments have significant historic, physical (architectural, townscape, group, integrity), and social values, and considered the place to be rare, and representative.

292. I agree with this assessment.

### Historic values

293. Submission 473 notes that the Olympus Apartments are an attractive Art Deco building, but does not consider that the HHE report has established the place as significant. The submission specifically questions the weight placed on the design of the building by Edmund Anscombe:

*The report appears to place weight on the building being designed by Edmund Anscombe. A number of other buildings designed by Mr Anscombe are heritage listed, each with their own features. Despite the report providing opinion that the apartment has significant architectural value, exactly what this is and how it is similar or differs from other protected buildings is not identified.*

294. My view is that the HHE report establishes that Edmund Anscombe was an important New Zealand architect (and evidence is provided in the report in the biography on pages 12 to 14), and that Anscombe was noted for his skill in designing Moderne and Art Deco buildings. The Olympus Apartments were (the last apartments to be) constructed in his “signature” style. This establishes both the significance of the person, and the significance of the association.

Architectural values

295. Submission 473 considers that the HHE report has not clarified what the architectural values of the building are, beyond a statement that they are significant.
296. I agree with submission 473 that the architectural assessment requires clarification, but also consider that the place has significant architectural values. I have considered the WCC/GWRC assessment criteria and the *Methodology and guidance for evaluation Wellington’s historic heritage* (pages 14-15) and my assessment against criterion B(ii) is:

*The Olympus Apartments have **significant architectural values**, and are **notable as a fine and highly intact example** of a Moderne apartment building and display the principal characteristics of this style and class.<sup>68</sup> In particular this includes the horizontal proportions of the building established by the string course at the heads of the windows, and the streamline form established by the curved northwest corner of the building. The building also includes typical Moderne / Art Deco details such as the signage/font for the building name, the parapet that conceals the roof, the triangular projecting windows that are typical of the work of architect Edmund Anscombe, the timber window and door joinery, and the composition and decoration to the main entrance.*

Comparative analysis

297. Submission 473 considers that the HHE report has not established how the Olympus Apartments are similar to or differ from other buildings in SCHED1.

---

<sup>68</sup> For example, Stuart Arden and Ian Bowman, *The New Zealand Period House: A conservation guide*, Random House: Auckland, 2004, 24 ... *The term Moderne was originally used to describe the more ornate buildings of the 1920s and '30s that were not of the unadorned International Style. Industrial designers led the way towards streamlined Moderne-style products which heavily influenced the design of buildings. These products were designed to express speed, with ovoid or teardrop the most popular shapes. Cars, trains, boats and aeroplanes were designed in this style and it was particularly the aeroplane aesthetic of projecting wings, curves and portholes that was adopted by architects for Moderne-style buildings. Moderne houses characteristically had horizontal forms with rounded corners and curved, projecting wings. Parapets hiding flat or shallow roofs were common ... Window and door joinery continued to be of timber rather than the more expensive steel joinery of the International style...*



298. The HHE report includes comparative analysis on pages 18-19 and Appendix 1 pages 28-33. The methodology for comparative analysis is included in *Methodology and guidance for evaluation Wellington's historic heritage*.
299. The comparative analysis in the HHE report includes the three apartment buildings designed by Edmund Anscombe in the 1930s in Wellington, and a nearby block of flats at 262 Oriental Parade that were designed in a similar style.
300. The comparative analysis establishes that:
- a. Anscombe designed six Moderne style apartment buildings in Wellington in the 1930s.
  - b. Two of these - Franconia and the Anscombe Flats - are listed by HNZPT and included in the ODP. While Belvedere is included in the ODP, but is not listed by HNZPT.
  - c. Similarities between the listed apartment buildings include that are good examples of Anscombe's work. They were all located on corner sites, constructed in reinforced concrete, designed in a Moderne style, and have had few external alterations.
301. Overall, the comparative analysis shows that the Olympus Apartments are a good representative example of Anscombe's 1930s Moderne style apartments.

Overall

302. I consider that the Olympus Apartments are a fine and highly intact example of a Moderne Building designed by significant Wellington architect Edmund Anscombe who was noted for his use of this architectural style. The building has significant heritage value and meets the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21.

**Recommendation**

303. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 should continue to include item 510, 280 Oriental Parade, Olympus Apartments.

**5.7. SCHED1 ITEM 511, GAS TANK (FORMER), 139 PARK ROAD**

304. Wētā FX (361) notes that 139 Park Road is a unique location, and the site is required to provide space for their business. Wingnut Films Productions Limited (467) notes the condition of the tank, and consider that it is unsuitable for reuse. Considering this both submissions seek to remove item 511, the former gas tank at 139 Park Road, from SCHED1.
305. Sarah Cutten and Matthew Weir (FS91.27) support submission 467.1

403. My view is that the example of Chew Cottage provided in submission 161 is not relevant as the houses are not comparable.

Houses designed by Plischke in SCHED1

404. Submission 161 raises concerns about the number of houses<sup>86</sup> designed by Ernst Plischke in the District Plan, which the submitter considers to be disproportionate. These are:

- Item 434 – Lang House and Garage, Category 1 Historic Place
- Item 519 – Sutch Smith House
- Item 520 – Kahn House, Category 1 Historic Place
- Item 523 – Hirshfeld House, Category 1 Historic Place

405. Ernst Plischke designed at least 40 private houses in New Zealand, of which at least 14 houses were constructed within the Wellington District boundaries.<sup>87</sup> Three of these are Category 1 Historic Places.

406. My view is that the Council has correctly identified four significant houses designed by Plischke that have been recognised by HNZPT or were recognised as significant in the monograph of the architect's work. I also note that each of the four properties meet multiple assessment criteria from the WCC criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21, and their significance extends beyond their initial design by Ernst Plischke.

Overall

407. The Kahn House is listed by HNZPT as a Category 1 Historic Place. The Council has fulfilled its obligation under the RMA to have regard to the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero by carrying further research, and assessing the place under the WCC heritage criteria/GWRC RPS policy 21. The assessment found that the place has significant heritage values and is eligible for inclusion in SCHED1 of the PDP.

**Recommendation**

408. Based on the above I recommend that SCHED1 includes item 520 – 53 Trelissick Crescent, Kahn House.

**5.11. SCHED 1 ITEM 521, FIRTH HOUSE, 18 VERA STREET, KARORI**

409. Opoutere Trust (3.1), Ian Attwood (79.1) and Nicola Crauford and Steve Martin (208.1) consider that item 521 - Firth House (former), 18 Vera Street has been substantially altered, and that the HHE report does not accurately record the

---

<sup>86</sup> SCHED1 also includes Item 290 – Massey House, Category 1, a commercial building on Lambton Quay.

<sup>87</sup> From Sarnitz, "List of Works" pages 285-288

# 1. Executive Summary

1. Travel rate models, such as walkable catchments, using pedestrian walking speeds are commonly used to understand the dynamics of individuals' movement through space. This analysis has many applications such as city planning, emergency evacuation routes, and access to community services. Wellington City Council reviewed and updated its walking network using pedestrian infrastructure pathways (such as, footpaths, crossings, and tracks), topography, and walking rate calculations.
2. A walking network is a collection of paths and tracks a pedestrian uses when travelling to different locations. Information, such as travel rate and slope, is added to these paths and tracks to model 'real-world' conditions. This allows estimated walkable catchment areas to be calculated.
3. Creating a walking network for Wellington City was a cross-council project and included input from the District Plan, City Transport and Infrastructure, Community Services, and Parks, Sport, and Recreation teams, as well as many others. It contains the following information:
  - Path, tracks, and popular routes through parks
  - Pedestrian tunnels and bridges
  - Controlled crossing points with an average wait time
  - Uncontrolled crossing points with an average wait time
  - Slope gradient
  - Low, moderate, and high walking speed estimates based on direction of travel, for example walking uphill versus downhill
4. By including this information in our walking network, we can model 'real-world' conditions in our walkable catchments.
5. Walking speed is highly subjective. There is no such thing as an 'average walking speed' that can be applied to everyone. It is generally assumed that the walking speed for the average person is 5km/h (1.4m/s). When we began reviewing scientific literature, we found that this average speed was too fast for low and moderate speed walkers. We studied articles that measured pedestrian travel rate ranges for different age groups and abilities to get a more accurate picture. These articles included studies from all around the world and included diverse groups such as young children and older adults.
6. We then accessed anonymous travel mode data for Wellington collected by the fitness tracker application, Strava, to see how the international literature compared to the travel rate data

- (d) Wellington City Council's Historic Heritage Evaluation report for the Gordon Wilson Flats dated August 2021;<sup>4</sup>
- (e) The listing details for the Gordon Wilson Flats as a Category 1 Historic Place on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's website;<sup>5</sup>
- (f) Other materials referenced in my statement.

## MY OPINION

13. I agree with the views of the Council's Historic Heritage Evaluation report that the Gordon Wilson Flats have significant historic, social, architectural, technological and rarity values at a national level. It follows that I agree with the decision by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga in February 2021 to register the Gordon Wilson Flats as a Category 1 Historic Place.
14. I also agree with the views of Adam McCutcheon and Moira Smith that the Gordon Wilson Flats have significant heritage values, and that when assessed against the Wellington City Council's heritage criteria and policy 21 of the Regional Policy Statement, the Gordon Wilson Flats are eligible for inclusion in the heritage building schedule.
15. The Gordon Wilson Flats are a very important example of medium to high density apartment-style social housing in New Zealand. They are now especially significant, following the recent (around 2019) demolition of Auckland's Upper Greys Avenue Flats, as the last remaining example of large density maisonette apartment planning from the 1950s. The following paragraphs address key issues related to the heritage values of the Gordon Wilson Flats.
16. *Heritage Value*: My book *Beyond the State: New Zealand State Housing from Modest to Modern* addressed the history of government-sponsored social housing ('state housing') in New Zealand, and the international context, with a special focus on the architectural design and heritage value of the buildings of the First Labour Government onwards until the 1970s. I concur with the statements of the others mentioned above in support of the heritage value of the Gordon Wilson Flats and will not repeat those points here. However I will address relevant issues in terms of my additional expertise as an architectural historian who is also particularly engaged in education, both formally and informally, urban issues criticism and commentary, and

---

<sup>4</sup> [HHE Gordon Wilson Flats](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga "McLean Flats and Gordon Wilson Flats"](#).

**Table 1: Application of High Density Residential Zone sought in walkable catchments from centres and rapid transit**

Zone	Centre Height	Walkable Catchment and Height
City Centre	Unlimited	0-400m - 43m (12 storeys) 400-800m – 36m (10 storeys) 800-1500m – HRZ 22m (6 storeys)
Metropolitan Centre	55m	0-400m – 36m (10 storeys) 400-800 HDRZ 22m (6 storeys)
Town Centre	36m	0-400m – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Newtown: 36m (10 storeys)</li> <li>• In Miramar: 29m (8 storeys)</li> <li>• In Tawa: 29m (8 storeys)</li> </ul> 400-800 HRZ 22m (6 storeys)
Local Centre	22m	0-400m – 18m (5 storeys)
Rapid Transit Stops		0-800m – 22m (6 storeys)

4.15 While the application and assessment of the proposed extent of zoning and heights will be discussed in future hearings, my evidence on this matter focuses particularly on the definition and inclusion of a term “walking catchment” in the PDP by the council officer in the s42A report.

4.16 The proposed definition impacts on the application and extent of the residential zones in the PDP, which of interest impacts the submissions and changes sought by Kainga Ora in Table 1.

- 4.17 Kāinga Ora made a further submission<sup>19</sup> to support in part the need for a definition of Walkable Catchment sought in a primary submission by Generation Zero Wellington.<sup>20</sup>
- 4.18 However, upon further review of the Council’s Section 42A report, I am of the opinion that a definition of “walkable catchment” (or in the Council’s section 42A report “walking catchment”) is not the best method for indicating where it may be appropriate for a walkable catchment (and consequently medium and high density residential development) to apply, particularly as this term is not currently used across the plan and definitions are static while walkable catchments will change over time as future connections and developments are established.
- 4.19 I propose the walkable catchment criteria should be used to instead guide where the High and Medium Density Residential Zone should apply and inform a policy in the High and Medium Density Residential Zone about where high and medium density housing should be provided for. In my opinion, this will provide the clarity and strategic direction sought to the application of residential zones and walkable catchments in the Plan.
- 4.20 In doing so, I also suggest amendments to the time and distance identified to walkable catchments around centres and rapid transit in the PDP. The reporting officer draws on Ministry for the Environment guidance and states that the starting point for a walkable catchment around rapid transit stops, metropolitan centres and the city centre should be 10 minutes and this may vary between 5 and 10 minutes depending on the shops and services, the level of transport services, development potential, topography and connectivity.<sup>21</sup> The reporting officers recommends that there should be a:
- (a) 5 minute walkable catchment around the JRL line stations,
  - (b) 10 minute walkable catchment around and the Kapiti rail line stations and Metropolitan Centre Zones,
  - (c) 15 minute catchment for the City Centre zone, and
  - (d) the Local/Town Centre zones should have none.

---

<sup>19</sup> FS89.68

<sup>20</sup> 254.8

<sup>21</sup> Section 42A report, paragraphs 269 and 270.

All of which is reflected in the officer's recommendation for the "walking catchment" definition.<sup>22</sup>

- 4.21 While I agree that the walkable/walking catchment should be extended to 10 minutes for all stations on the Kapiti Line (Keneperu to Takapu Road), I consider this should also be extended to all stations on the JRL (Johnsonville to Crofton Downs – see **Figure 1** below) in order to maximise opportunities for High Density Residential development and to support investment in transport infrastructure and smaller centres.
- 4.22 This approach is justified through evidence from Mr Cullen and Mr Rae that notes the best practice approach of using a 10 minute/800m walkable catchment rather than a 5 minute/400m walkable catchment. This is also reinforced through NPS-UD Policy 3(c) and the accessibility that rapid transit provides to areas of employment along with the ability of intensification to enhance, and be enhanced by, adjoining centres.

---

<sup>22</sup> Section 42A report paragraph 389.

**Figure 1 – Wellington Tranz Metro Network**



4.23 I do not support the reporting officer’s recommendation for a 15 minute/1200m walk from the City Centre and nor do I support the recommendation for no walkable catchments from Local Centre and Town Centre Zones.

4.24 The expansion of High Density Residential Zone walkable catchments to 1500m from the edge of the City Centre Zone and the introduction of Town Centres with an 800m/10 minute walkable catchment for Newtown, Miramar, and Tawa is justified given the primacy of Wellington’s Central City in the region and the more significant level of commercial and community services in the Town Centres. This is supported by retail spend and Journey to Work (walking) data, as discussed below.



- 4.25 Retail spend data outlined in "Retail and Market Assessment for Wellington City Council Colliers International Sense Partners November 2020" is discussed in further detail below. This indicates that Miramar, Newtown, and Tawa serve a suburban catchment, rather than a residential catchment thereby warranting a greater or commensurate level of intensification. Mr Cullen's evidence also supports this approach.
- 4.26 The Journey to Work data (walking)<sup>23</sup> illustrates that people are walking at least 1500m to access the City Centre Zone and 800m to access the areas that Kāinga Ora considers should be Town Centre Zones in Wellington. A plan depicting this is shown in **Appendix 2**. The Blue line outlines the extent of the centre catchment, and the Yellow shading indicates which Statistical Area (**SA2**) people have walked from to go to the SA2 closest to the relevant centre.
- 4.27 I do note that this Journey to Work data has limitations<sup>24</sup> so should be considered in accordance with other ground truthing information to build a fuller picture of appropriate walkable catchments. Detail on this is provided by Mr Rae in his evidence. In addition, further information will be provided in the Stream 2 - Residential hearing.
- 4.28 With regard to Local (and Town) Centre Zones, the reporting officer recommends against including Local (and Town) Centres Zones within the definition of walking/walkable catchment. The reporting officer states that enabling four storey buildings around local centre zones (including Miramar and Tawa) is commensurate with the level of commercial and community services and consistent with various technical reports and that there is little commercially realisable capacity for apartments in these areas. Newtown Local Centre Zone has been provided with some six storey HDRZ as it is partly within the 10 minute walking catchment of the CCZ and reflects the high range of commercial and community services present and current and future public transport accessibility.<sup>25</sup>
- 4.29 I disagree with these recommendations for the following reasons:
- (a) Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD requires that district plans enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of

---

<sup>23</sup> Statistics NZ 2018

<sup>24</sup> The data is based on 2018 Census results, SA2 boundaries are large and do not necessarily match perfectly to Centre Zones and origin of journey, Numbers of walkers to work do not represent everybody who walks to work or the centre as this is reliant on Census data.

<sup>25</sup> S42A report paragraphs 379-381