

---

## Submission on Napier City Proposed District Plan

### Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

*Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:** Napier City Council - Planning Unit

**Date received:** 14/12/2023

**Submission Reference Number #:**261

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Napier City Proposed District Plan

**Submitter:**

Sue Dick and Howard Pilgrim

**Address for service:**

Sue and Howard Dick and Pilgrim  
1 Seaview Terrace, Bluff Hill Napier 4110  
New Zealand

**Email:** sue@e2la.co.nz

**Attachments:**

Sue and Howard Dick and Pilgrim.pdf

**I wish to be heard:** Yes

**I am willing to present a joint case:** No

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- **Yes**

## Submission points

---

**Point 261.1**

**Section:** HH - Historic heritage

**Sub-section:** Policies

**Provision:** General

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

**Reasons:**

1) We do not believe that a heritage listing benefits the owners of these properties, but that **it will in effect render maintenance of them more costly and difficult**. Requirements for a resource consent to undertake necessary upgrade work (eg replacing windows and roofs) may deter owners from undertaking critical repair work that would optimise their retention in sound condition.

2) If this row of 19<sup>th</sup> century homes within the curtilage of the Napier CBD is of benefit to the people of Napier city, as outlined in the assessment report, then **we are of the firm view that the people of Napier city should contribute to their retention and maintenance, not just the owners**. We understand from Fleur Lincoln that an incentives programme has been prepared for Council to consider, but we understand that any support funding is likely to be quite limited in size and prioritised for individually-listed Group A properties.

3) Six of the houses were first occupied in 1887 and are now 136 years old. These houses were built to provide accommodation for young men arriving in Napier to build the new city. For long periods they remained as accommodation units which at times meant they fell into disrepair. Especially in the 1970s and 1980s. **However, over nearly 140 years none has been demolished**. When we bought No 1 Seaview Terrace in 2008, all of these homes were used as rental or holiday accommodation. 15 years later, four out of the seven have become primary owner-occupied homes and most have now had significant renovation work completed. New owners buying and living here do so because they value the heritage character of these buildings and intend to maintain them. This is a new era for these homes.

4) When we attended the public consultation hui in 2019, we were attracted to the *demolition prevention* policy (Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation) that such a heritage listing might offer, ensuring a mutual benefit to each of the owners by a requirement to retain their home rather than demolish it. Essentially, an insurance policy for the retention of the group. However, following further thought, and balanced with other perceived disadvantages, we have now changed our minds for the following reasons:

- The houses are now **worth more** than would be desirable for a purchaser who might consider demolition/rebuild options;
- The **pieces of land on which the houses sit are too small** for alternative development;
- There is no evidence of a single owner buying up the entire row with the idea of demolition for a grand rebuild overlooking the city and Bay;
- Demolition has not occurred for nearly 140 years so we estimate that the **risk of demolition is low**;
- If demolition occurred following a fire, for example, any new build would reflect modern character.

In conclusion, we believe their future as a row of heritage houses is **secured in private ownership** without the proposed heritage listing. We believe owner occupation is the biggest guarantee of standards of repair and maintenance being met, not a heritage listing on the Napier City Plan. To back this point of view, we note the poor repair of a rental heritage-listed property nearby our home, whose owner cannot afford essential repairs. Heritage listing has neither benefited its state of repair nor secured its long-term future.

5) We have made some enquiries regarding the effect that such a listing might have on the **future market value and resale desirability of our property**. There is mixed opinion in the public realm about this. We know from having tried unsuccessfully to sell our place last year that there is a limited pool of buyers interested in buying such heritage properties. Largely because of the perceived extra burden maintaining an old home poses for home-owners. We believe that a heritage listing with its additional restraints, and accountability to a third party, sparks alarm in many people, even if there is fine print outlining what is still permitted, detail which in many cases may not be read. So, we are saying there can be **a knee-jerk reaction against acquiring a heritage-listed property**.

## Relief sought

We have held discussions with three of the other affected home owners, including holding a small consultation gathering with Fleur Lincoln and Elizabeth Pishief at our home. We have taken reasonable steps to be informed about this issue.

We seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan

---

## Point 261.2

**Section:** SCHED3 - Historic heritage items

**Sub-section:** SCHED3 - Heritage Items Schedule

### Provision:

Ref. No.	HNZ Category	Name	Address	Legal Description	Heritage Group
198		Houses	1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, & 6 Seaview Terrace	Part Lot 4 DEEDS 427 Lot 5-10 DEEDS 427	B

**Sentiment:** Oppose

### Submission:

#### Reasons:

- 1) We do not believe that a heritage listing benefits the owners of these properties, but that **it will in effect render maintenance of them more costly and difficult**. Requirements for a resource consent to undertake necessary upgrade work (eg replacing windows and roofs) may deter owners from undertaking critical repair work that would optimise their retention in sound condition.
- 2) If this row of 19<sup>th</sup> century homes within the curtilage of the Napier CBD is of benefit to the people of Napier city, as outlined in the assessment report, then **we are of the firm view that the people of Napier city should contribute to their retention and maintenance, not just the owners**. We understand from Fleur Lincoln that an incentives programme has been prepared for Council to consider, but we understand that any support funding is likely to be quite limited in size and prioritised for individually-listed Group A properties.
- 3) Six of the houses were first occupied in 1887 and are now 136 years old. These houses were built to provide accommodation for young men arriving in Napier to build the new city. For long periods they remained as accommodation units which at times meant they fell into disrepair. Especially in the 1970s and 1980s. **However, over nearly 140 years none has been demolished**. When we bought No 1 Seaview Terrace in 2008, all of these homes were used as rental or holiday accommodation. 15 years later, four out of the seven have become primary owner-occupied homes and most have now had significant renovation work completed. New owners buying and living here do so because they value the heritage character of these buildings and intend to maintain them. This is a new era for these homes.
- 4) When we attended the public consultation hui in 2019, we were attracted to the *demolition prevention* policy (Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation) that such a heritage listing might offer, ensuring a mutual benefit to each of the owners by a requirement to retain their home rather than demolish it. Essentially, an insurance policy for the retention of the group. However, following further thought, and balanced with other perceived disadvantages, we have now changed our minds for the following reasons:
  - The houses are now **worth more** than would be desirable for a purchaser who might consider demolition/rebuild options;
  - The **pieces of land on which the houses sit are too small** for alternative development;
  - There is no evidence of a single owner buying up the entire row with the idea of demolition for a grand rebuild overlooking the city and Bay;
  - Demolition has not occurred for nearly 140 years so we estimate that the **risk of demolition is low**;
  - If demolition occurred following a fire, for example, any new build would reflect modern character.

In conclusion, we believe their future as a row of heritage houses is **secured in private ownership** without the proposed heritage listing. We believe owner occupation is the biggest guarantee of standards of repair and maintenance being met, not a heritage listing on the Napier City Plan. To back this point of view, we note the poor repair of a rental heritage-listed property nearby our home, whose owner cannot afford essential repairs. Heritage listing has neither benefited its state of repair nor secured its long-

term future.

5) We have made some enquiries regarding the effect that such a listing might have on the **future market value and resale desirability of our property**. There is mixed opinion in the public realm about this. We know from having tried unsuccessfully to sell our place last year that there is a limited pool of buyers interested in buying such heritage properties. Largely because of the perceived extra burden maintaining an old home poses for home-owners. We believe that a heritage listing with its additional restraints, and accountability to a third party, sparks alarm in many people, even if there is fine print outlining what is still permitted, detail which in many cases may not be read. So, we are saying there can be **a knee-jerk reaction against acquiring a heritage-listed property**.

#### **Relief sought**

We have held discussions with three of the other affected home owners, including holding a small consultation gathering with Fleur Lincoln and Elizabeth Pishief at our home. We have taken reasonable steps to be informed about this issue.

We seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan

Submitters: Sue Dick and Howard Pilgrim

Address: 1 Seaview Terrace, Bluff Hill, Napier 4110. (we are the owners of this property)

Contacts: E: [sue@e2la.co.nz](mailto:sue@e2la.co.nz), [REDACTED]

E: [hnp@howardpilgrim.com](mailto:hnp@howardpilgrim.com), [REDACTED]

15 DEC 2023


15 DEC 2023

### 1.0 Areas of Proposed Plan to be addressed

#### Part 2 Historic and Cultural Values: HH Historic Heritage Policies

PART 2 – DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS / Historical and Cultural Values / HH - Historic heritage

Download • Bookmark • Compare • Reading mode • Make a Submission

This chapter contains provisions that have legal effect. They are identified with a  to the right hand side of the provision.

HH - Historic Heritage

#### Part 4 Schedule 3 Historic Heritage Items, Item 198: 7 houses on Seaview Terrace

PART 4 – SCHEDULES AND APPENDICES / Schedules / SCHED3 - Historic heritage items

Download • Bookmark • Compare • Reading mode • Make a Submission Search for a keyword

SCHED3 - Heritage Items Schedule

Ref. No.	HNZ Category	Name	Address	Legal Description
198		Houses	1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, & 6 Seaview Terrace	Part Lot 4 DEEDS 427 Lot 5-10 DEEDS 427

2.0 This submission *opposes* the proposed inclusion of 7 Seaview Terrace houses in a group heritage listing on the Napier City Proposed District Plan as Item 198 on Schedule 3.

#### Reasons:

- 1) We do not believe that a heritage listing benefits the owners of these properties, but that **it will in effect render maintenance of them more costly and difficult.** Requirements for a resource consent to undertake necessary upgrade work (eg replacing windows and roofs) may deter owners from undertaking critical repair work that would optimise their retention in sound condition.
- 2) If this row of 19<sup>th</sup> century homes within the curtilage of the Napier CBD is of benefit to the people of Napier city, as outlined in the assessment report, then **we are of the firm view that the people of Napier city should contribute to their retention and maintenance, not just the owners.** We understand from Fleur Lincoln that an incentives programme has been prepared for Council to consider, but we understand

that any support funding is likely to be quite limited in size and prioritised for individually-listed Group A properties.

- 3) Six of the houses were first occupied in 1887 and are now 136 years old. These houses were built to provide accommodation for young men arriving in Napier to build the new city. For long periods they remained as accommodation units which at times meant they fell into disrepair. Especially in the 1970s and 1980s. **However, over nearly 140 years none has been demolished.** When we bought No 1 Seaview Terrace in 2008, all of these homes were used as rental or holiday accommodation. 15 years later, four out of the seven have become primary owner-occupied homes and most have now had significant renovation work completed. New owners buying and living here do so because they value the heritage character of these buildings and intend to maintain them. This is a new era for these homes.
  
- 4) When we attended the public consultation hui in 2019, we were attracted to the *demolition prevention* policy (Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation) that such a heritage listing might offer, ensuring a mutual benefit to each of the owners by a requirement to retain their home rather than demolish it. Essentially, an insurance policy for the retention of the group. However, following further thought, and balanced with other perceived disadvantages, we have now changed our minds for the following reasons:
  - The houses are now **worth more** than would be desirable for a purchaser who might consider demolition/rebuild options;
  - The **pieces of land on which the houses sit are too small** for alternative development;
  - There is no evidence of a single owner buying up the entire row with the idea of demolition for a grand rebuild overlooking the city and Bay;
  - Demolition has not occurred for nearly 140 years so we estimate that the **risk of demolition is low**;
  - If demolition occurred following a fire, for example, any new build would reflect modern character.

In conclusion, we believe their future as a row of heritage houses is **secured in private ownership** without the proposed heritage listing. We believe owner-occupancy is the biggest guarantee of standards of repair and maintenance being met, not a heritage listing on the Napier City Plan. To back this point of view, we note the poor repair of a rental heritage-listed property nearby our home, whose owner cannot afford essential repairs. Heritage listing has neither benefited its state of repair nor secured its long-term future.

- 5) We have made some enquiries regarding the effect that such a listing might have on the **future market value and resale desirability of our property**. There is mixed opinion in the public realm about this. We know from having tried unsuccessfully to sell our place last year that there is a limited pool of buyers interested in buying such

heritage properties. Largely because of the perceived extra burden maintaining an old home poses for home-owners. We believe that a heritage listing with its additional restraints, and accountability to a third party, sparks alarm in many people, even if there is fine print outlining what is still permitted, detail which in many cases may not be read. So, we are saying there can be a **knee-jerk reaction against acquiring a heritage-listed property.**

### 3.0 Outcome sought

We have held discussions with three of the other affected home owners, including holding a small consultation gathering with Fleur Lincoln and Elizabeth Pishief at our home. We have taken reasonable steps to be informed about this issue.

We seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan

### 4.0 Hearing

We wish to be heard in relation to this submission.

Signed: Sue Dick

Howard Pilgrim



15 December 2023