

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

In the Matter of: The Resource Management Act 1991

And

**Plan Change H(a): Historic Heritage
to the Manawatu District Plan**

**Statement of Evidence of Ian Bowman, architect and conservator
on behalf of Manawatu District Council**

Date: 18/05/2023

Event Date: 07 June 2023

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 My full name is Ian Alexander Bowman.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Manawatu District Council (MDC).
- 3 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 4 I am a qualified historian, registered architect and qualified conservator of built heritage and have advised in the discipline of conservation of built heritage for approximately 40 years. I am the principal in my own practice, Ian Bowman, architect and conservator.
- 5 My qualifications and experience are set out in Appendix 1 of my evidence.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 1 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. Whilst this is a Council hearing, I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing my evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Hearings Panel. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 My evidence will comprise:
 - An outline of my involvement with the proposed plan change; and

- Comments on submissions.

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE

- 7 Since 1999 I have given built heritage advice to the MDC on various heritage issues including heritage values of buildings, plan changes, resource consent applications and design guidelines.
- 8 My involvement with the current proposed plan changes dates back to 2014 when with historian Val Burr I prepared heritage inventory entries on buildings proposed for listing on the District Plan. The work involved reviewing existing entries, updating inventory entries where their values warranted listing, and to give opinions on changes of rankings from 'C' to 'B', 'C' to 'A', and 'B' to 'A', where their values warranted a change in listing.
- 9 Recently, and following receipt of submissions, I have been engaged to make comments on wording in the proposed plan change relating to:
- non-contributing parts to buildings, and
 - relocations policy.
- 10 I also attended and contributed to a meeting on 21 April 2023 with submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) in which these issues were discussed.

MATTERS RAISED BY SUBMITTERS

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga SO3/2

- 11 In their original submission, HNZPT SO3/2 opposed the definition of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings proposed in the Plan Change. Following the meeting on 21 April 2023 new wording has been proposed as follows:
- 12 *“Parts of heritage items that make little or no contribution to, or detract from, the heritage values for which the heritage item, has been listed in schedule 4b.”*

- 13 I agree with this new definition as it relates to the primary objective of retention of heritage values of listed items. The previous wording potentially allowed for the removal of parts of buildings that were built after the original construction but were, nevertheless, of heritage value.
- 14 In their original submission, HNZPT SO3/2 requested a policy on the removal of contributing parts of a scheduled heritage building.
- 15 A new policy is proposed to change notified Policy 10 as follows:
- 16 *“HH-P10: To enable external alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of heritage buildings listed in Schedule 4b where the changes do not impact negatively on the heritage values of the item listed in Schedule 4b.”*
- 17 I agree with this new policy as it is aimed at retention of heritage values while allowing modifications to, or the removal of, non-contributing parts of listed heritage buildings. The new policy will ensure that the design of alterations to non-contributing parts of heritage buildings would need to be consistent with the heritage values of the listed item.
- 18 A consequential amendment is also required to make Rule 11 consistent with Policy 10 as follows:
- 19 *“HH-R11 External alterations to, or the removal of non-contributing parts of a heritage building listed in Schedule 4b.”*
- 20 I agree with this amended wording as it will ensure consistency with Policy 10.

New Zealand Defence Force S04/7

- 21 In their original submission, the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) S04/7 supported standard HH-6 in part recommending a change to the wording regarding alterations to non-contributing parts of heritage buildings by replacing the term ‘change’ to increase’ as follows:
- 22 "HH-S6 External Alterations to Non-Contributing Parts of Heritage Buildings in Schedule 4b must comply with the following standard:
i. External alterations to non-contributing parts of a heritage building

listed in Schedule 4b must not result in any increase to the height and footprint of the non-contributing part of the building.”

- 23 I agree with this revised wording as this would allow a reduction in height and footprint of non-contributing parts of a listed item thereby reducing their negative effects and allowing for restoration¹.

S.M. and J.M. O’Brien Family Trust, S1/1

- 24 In their original submission, the S.M. and J.M. O’Brien Family trust oppose the wording of policy HH-P11 considering that the proposed wording is too limited and does not provide for the relocation of heritage items to be balanced against other relevant resource management issues (existing Policy 7). Their submission considered that the proposed wording may result in demolition being seen as a more favourable option than relocation. The submitter also suggests that the wording in HH-P11 a. does not allow for natural hazards that are likely to cause danger in the future such as flooding.

- 25 Proposed new wording for HH-P11 comprises:

“HH-P11 To only allow relocation of heritage items listed in Schedule 4b where it can be demonstrated that:

a. The relocation is necessary to save the heritage item and protect the heritage values from the threat of, or damage from natural hazards; or

b. The relocation will protect the heritage values and significance of the heritage item identified in Schedule 4b, and

c. In the case of relocation to another site, alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered by a suitably qualified heritage expert to be a reasonable option to avoid demolition.”

¹ See ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010 definition of restoration, “**Restoration** means to return a **place** to a known earlier form, by **reassembly** and **reinstatement**, and/or by removal of elements that detract from its **cultural heritage value**.”

- 26 I agree with this new wording which resulted from discussions with MDC planning and heritage consultants and the HNZPT.
- 27 The previous wording in sub clause a. allowed for relocation when the heritage item was in imminent danger from natural hazards. This did not take into account danger from non-imminent natural hazards such as occupying a site on a flood plain, for which the revised wording now allows.
- 28 Sub clause a. is a stand-alone condition while sub clause b. is conjunctive with sub clause c. Sub clause b. ensures protection of heritage values where relocation is on or off-site while sub clause c. ensures that, if the building is relocated off-site and it is deemed by a built-heritage expert, having considered all alternatives to relocation, to be a better result than demolition. A built-heritage expert will have the qualifications, knowledge and experience to give appropriate advice to the MDC should a consent for relocation of a listed heritage item off-site be applied for.
- 29 Under sub clause c. as part of the consideration of options, the built-heritage expert will have considered how the protection of heritage values and significance of the heritage item is provided for.

CONCLUSIONS

- 30 Following submissions on the proposed Plan Change (H)a: Historic Heritage to the Manawatu Plan by HNZPT S03/2, the NZDF S04/7 and S.M. and J.M. O'Brien Family Trust, S1/1 new wording has been proposed by the MDC.
- 31 I agree with the new wording as described in paragraphs 12, 16, 19, 22 and 25 for the reasons described in paragraphs 13, 17, 20, 23 and 27 to 29.

Date: 18 May 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized first letter followed by a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.

APPENDIX 1: QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

I hold the following qualifications:

- Bachelor of Arts (History and Economic History), Victoria University of Wellington
- Bachelor of Architecture, University of Auckland
- Master of Arts (Conservation Studies), University of York
- Various certificates in building materials conservation from ICCROM, ICOMOS and other international conservation organisations

I am a registered architect (NZRAB registration 2095), the immediate past Chair of ICOMOS NZ, current Board member of ICOMOS NZ, an Executive Board member and Treasurer of ISCEAH, expert member of ISCS, co-convenor of APT Australasia Chapter and peer reviewer of World Heritage nominations for the World Heritage Committee.

I am a Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects.

I am a self-employed architect and conservator and have approximately 36 years' experience advising local and regional authorities, government agencies and private clients on projects relating to built heritage conservation.

Experience relevant to this hearing includes:

- Preparing heritage inventories of individual buildings and heritage areas for numerous local authorities;
- Advising on applications for resource consents for local authorities;
- Assisting in the writing of heritage strategies, preparing design guidelines and conservation plans for local authorities;
- As an expert witness in Council hearings, the Environment Court, the High Court and Environmental Protection Authority Nationally Significant Proposal boards of enquiry.