

SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION

FORM 13 - Pursuant to Sections 95A, 95B, 95C, 96, 127(3), 137(5)(c) and 234(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991



Submitter

Name	Jeannie Cozens
Contact Person (If different from above)	
Postal Address	
Home Phone	
Cell Phone	
Email	

Details of the Proposal to which this Submission Relates

Name of Applicant	Masterton District Council
Address of Proposal	64 Chapel Street, Masterton
Application No.	RM240135
Description of Proposal	Demolish the Masterton Town Hall

Details of Submission

My submission:

- Supports the whole proposal Supports part of the proposal
 Opposes the whole proposal Opposes part of the proposal

In the event this application is subject to a Resource Consent Hearing. Do you wish to be heard in respect of your submission?

Yes No

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

SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION

FORM 13 - Pursuant to Sections 95A, 95B, 95C, 96,
127(3), 137(5)(c) and 234(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991

2 of 2

Submission Statement

The specific parts of the Proposal that this submission relates to.

See attached

Decision you want the Council to make:

Grant the Consent Decline the Consent Grant the Consent with Conditions

Signature

To be signed by the submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter.

Name Jeannie Cozens
Date 10th February 2025

Important notes for the Submitter

1. In accordance with the Privacy Act 1993, submissions will be made available for viewing by Council and members of the public.
2. This form is for your convenience only. You may make a submission that addresses the points above in a letter or other suitable format.
3. Submissions will not be returned, so please keep a copy.
4. A copy of your submission must be sent to both Council and to the applicant.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 11 February 2025 8:33 AM
To: Planning Admin
Subject: RM240145 Resource consent submission on Demolition of Town Hall
Attachments: JC resource consent submission.docx

Hi Christine Chong (?)

I have just that my submission on the Application for resource consent for demolition of the Town Hall may have been sent to the wrong address.

When clearing my desk I found the notification advertisement which says submitters should use the planningadmin@mstn.govt.nz address.

My submission was sent a minute before the deadline to submissions@mstn.govt.nz which sprang into the email address as soon as I typed 'Masterton'. I

obviously that address for a previous submission).

My email may have already have been redirected to you. If not I hope you can accept my submission attached to this email.

[NB I sent a copy of my submission to Russell Hooper shortly after my submission was emailed to MDC and have received an acknowledgement]

Kind regards

Jeannie Cozens

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: RM240145 Demolition of Town Hall submission
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 2025 15:59:00 +1300
From: JC [REDACTED]
Reply-To: [REDACTED]
To: Submissions Sub <submissions@mstn.govt.nz>

Please see attached submission

10 February 2025

Masterton District Council

Re 64 Chapel Street Masterton

Submission on the Resource Consent Application No RM240135 [Demolition of Masterton Town Hall and Municipal Building]

Notification of Consent

The resource consent application was notified in the Wairarapa Times Age just five days before Christmas. The timing of the submission process over the Christmas-New Year and the January holiday period may have affected participation.

The application is for the demolition of the Municipal Building (including its heritage façade) and the Civil Defence Building, but is advertised as relating to the demolition of the 'Town Hall' may have to the This may have discouraged people from viewing the application.

All three options provided in the Long-Term Plan (LTP) 2024-2035 included demolition of the Town Hall. The Council's decision during LTP deliberations on 5 June 2024 to begin demolition of the Town Hall may have contributed to the perception that demolition was a 'done deal'.

Definitions

This subject of this resource consent is the 'District Building' at 64 Chapel Street Masterton (Pt Sec 104 Town of Masterton) a heritage building listed in Schedule 1 of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (WCDP).

The applicant's definition of 'the Town Hall' as applying to the Town Hall, Municipal Buildings and the Civic Defence Building together, and separately at times, confusing. The Civic Defence Building (CD Building) as it is essentially a separate structure. It is not a heritage-listed building and has not been determined as earthquake-prone.

The term 'District Building' appears in Council's financial reports as an umbrella term for the Town Hall or Municipal Building (or 'offices'). Current discussion on Council's proposals now tend to use the terms Municipal Building and Town Hall in preference to District Building.

Earthquake-Prone Building (EPB) status

An Earthquake Prone Notice was issued on 26 August 2018 for 'the building situated at 64 Chapel Street, Town Hall and Frank Cody Lounge', requiring seismic work (remediation or demolition) to be completed by 26 February August 2026. (Frank Cody Lounge is in the Municipal Building).

On 2 April 2024 earthquake-prone building remediation deadlines were extended for 4 years by the Minister for Building and Construction, to allow a review of the earthquake-prone building system to take place.

A legislative amendment formalising the extension of earthquake prone deadlines (with a possible additional extension of 2 years) came into effect a week before MDC's application was lodged.

This development removes the urgency and arguably the rationale for a resource consent decision. Unless there is a requirement to demolish the Town Hall and Municipal Building the need for resource consent is no greater than it has been for the past seven years.

The deadline extension allows more time for a business case to be developed for future use of the Town Hall and Municipal Building.

It is of high importance that the best decision be made on this resource application as the demolition Masterton's heritage Town Hall and Municipal Building, which Council is poised to begin, is irreversible. If the buildings are demolished there is a complete loss of heritage value.

The resource consent decision should not be influenced by the applicant's reference to work that has been done or is being progressed on the assumption that resource consent will be granted. The priority in this case is on applying the heritage values in the WCDP to the consent application as far as possible.

Note that LTP decisions are not commitments but statements of intent that may be altered in light of unanticipated events via a council's Annual Plan or LTP. Section 96 of the LGA states that a resolution to adopt a LTP or Annual Plan does not constitute a decision to act on any specific matter included within the plan, so Council can deviate from the plan during the year for good reason if something unforeseen does arise.

Issues for consideration

The application to demolish the Town Hall and Municipal Building should take into account the policies in the (proposed and operational) Wairarapa Combined District Plan, in particular HH-P9:

HH-P9 - Demolition of heritage buildings and items

Discourage demolition of scheduled heritage *buildings* and items unless it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives, and having regard to the following matters:

Effects on historic heritage values

The LTP consultation form states that 'Council has the budget to retain the Municipal Building façade but was removed at the 5 June Council LTP Deliberations Meeting to reduce cost.

Demolition would have a significant effect on the surrounding heritage buildings, which include the Wairarapa Times-Age building opposite the Town Square and the former Public Trust on the corner of Perry and Chapel streets.

Demolition of one of the biggest buildings in Masterton would likely take many months and an empty site will expose a view of a busy traffic roundabout at the intersection of four roads, framed by McDonalds and Burger King fast food outlets.

The importance attributed to the heritage item by the wider community

The Hands Around the Town Hall protest with estimated attendance of 1000 in July 2021 and is evidence of community desire to retain the Town Hall and the Municipal Building (including façade). A Masterton Action Group was formed as a result and led to the formation of the Masterton Residents and Ratepayers Association the same year.

The 2024-35LTP consultation document acknowledged that the loss of the heritage aspect of the Town Hall precinct would be unacceptable to our community'.

The Heritage Assessment by WSP(2024) found that there very few, if any, other examples of Town Halls or Municipal Buildings designed in a similar manner, which gives them high rarity value.

Feasibility of adaptive re-use

Options available are not readily evaluated by the use of rating charts and subjective assessments of value, as issues are compartmentalised to some extent.

There is complex interaction between proposed structural interventions, heritage considerations, architectural designs, client requirements, cost considerations and specific needs.

This could benefit from creation of a technical project team to work together to develop a working option should provide more certainty going forward.

There may be other options available based on different approaches to remediation than the approach taken to date, that are more cost effective that could be explored before a decision is made to demolish the Town Hall.

The cost of maintenance or repair

RPS costings for the options in the 2024 LTP are based on high-level estimates based on assumptions and house cost data, given the level of information at this stage

It seems premature to be making significant decisions on the limited information/evidence provided by the options proposed by the application.

A massive increase has been predicted for the cost of water services to households with the implementation of the Local Water Done Well legislation is likely to have an impact on council spending priorities.

The application maintains that the Council's preferred option to demolish and rebuild is 'affordable'. The Council's capacity to take on increasing debt is not a measure of the community's ability to pay.

Building Safety

The District Building has been closed and locked for years. I understand remediation to 34% NBS is required if it is to be used.

Recommendation

Mothballing and decommissioning would seem to be the best option to allow further development is done to refine requirements and costings for future use of the building.

Jeannie Cozens



Please Note:

- I oppose the whole proposal
- I wish to attend a hearing in respect of my submission.