



April 22, 2019

Wellington City Council
P O Box 2199
Wellington 4140

Submission on the ‘Planning for Growth’ scenarios

This submission is made on behalf of an organisation, **Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc.**

It is an incorporated society with the aims of researching and sharing the history of the suburb of Mt Victoria and promoting interest in, and preservation of, its unique heritage.

Contact details: Joanna Newman, Convenor
[details removed]

As appropriate to our mandate, this submission focuses aspects relating to Mt Victoria and heritage protection.

POSITION

We do not support higher buildings in Mt Victoria or the removal of the protection of the character in Mt Victoria.

This is for the following reasons:

1. Density

As WCC’s statistics show, Mt Victoria is already a medium density housing area - in fact relatively high for a residential suburb. To increase the quantity of housing in this suburb would make it statistically high density, which would completely destroy its character and the qualities of life which help preserve that character.

2. Character

The built form and heritage of Mt Victoria are too important to Wellington’s identity to lose. And, it would be lost, if the protection of its character were to be removed.

Of all the character areas in Wellington, this is the one visible to all visitors, national and international. It is the backdrop to a high percentage of images promoting and defining the

city (see attached images).

The potential for further promotion of its heritage to Wellingtonians and visitors is strong. It has been the home to many famous or well-known figures (e.g. Bernard Freyberg, Kate Edgar, William Waring-Taylor) and their original homes are still standing.

We also believe it is important that views of this suburb (and the Town Belt) are not blocked by a wall of multi-storey buildings along Kent Terrace, and the character of the Kent/Cambridge Terrace is not destroyed by creating a shaded wind tunnel.

Mt Victoria has already suffered from poor planning decisions. We would press for greater adherence to the heritage protection rules in the current District Plan and would not support any weakening of these in future.

GENERAL

We understand the stated need for the city to accommodate more people in a sustainable way.

We do not accept, however, that the removal of heritage protection in Mt Victoria or Thorndon is required to achieve the Council's goals of providing more housing in Wellington.

There are, for example, significant areas of Te Aro and Newtown that could be developed for housing before any requirement to even consider destroying the valuable heritage precincts of the city.

CONSULTATION CONCERNS

We would also like to express our concern at the nature of the consultation. This document has been put out for consultation at almost exactly the same time as The Annual Plan, Traffic Resolutions affecting inner city suburbs and Te Atakura-First to Zero.

This means that four important documents are out for consultation at the same time, all with a four-week response period, at a time when the Council knows that many residents are taking a 10-day leave to maximise annual leave. It severely limits the time organisations have for meaningful consultation with their own members, let alone preparation of submissions.

The Council runs the risk of appearing to manage consultation in such a way as to avoid maximum involvement.

Iconic Mt Victoria, April 2019

