

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISIONS OF THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

TITLE: Recommended Decisions on Plan Change 3 - Heritage Part II - Issued by the Hearings Panel for the Queenstown Lakes District Council

DATED: 7 May 2007

Executive Summary

Plan Change 3 seeks to ensure, where practical, that the Queenstown Lakes District's significant heritage features and items are recognised and protected for future generations and that heritage landscapes, and their associated values within the District, are recognised and protected.

The Plan Change was notified on 10 June 2005 with submissions closing on 5 August 2005. The summary of submissions was notified on 6 December 2005, with further submissions closing on 23 January 2006.

A total of 80 original submissions and 23 further submissions were received on Plan Change 3.

A hearing to consider the submissions received to Plan Change 3 was held in Queenstown between Monday 4 and Wednesday 6 September 2006. The Hearings Panel consisted of Mr Neville Marquet (Chairperson), Councillor Christine Kelly and Councillor John Wilson.

Further to hearing submissions, the Hearings Panel recommended to the Council decisions on submissions received. These recommendations were considered by the Full Council at its meeting held on 15 December 2006. At this meeting the Council decided to accept the Hearings Panel's recommended Decisions in part, rejecting those parts that related to submissions which sought that additional heritage items be included in the Plan Change (refer to Attachment 2) and accepting all other parts of the recommended Decisions.

The Council decided to accept the recommended Decisions only in part as it was concerned that landowners of the additional items, sought for inclusion by way of submission, had not been given the appropriate opportunity to participate in the Plan Change process. As a result, the Council resolved to extend the timeframe for further submissions with respect to those original submissions which sought the inclusion of additional items in the Plan Change.

The extension of timeframe for further submissions was notified on 10 January 2007, with submissions closing on 7 February 2007. A total of 45 additional further submissions were received.

A further hearing to consider the submissions relating to the inclusion of additional items in the Plan Change was held in Queenstown on Monday March 19 and Tuesday 20 March 2007. This Hearings Panel consisted of Mr Trevor Shiels (Chairperson), Councillor Gillian MacLeod and Councillor Lou Alfeld.

The following report sets out the considerations and decisions of this Hearings Panel with regard to the relevant submissions received on Plan Change 3.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Background	5
3 List of Submitters	7
4 The Hearing	10
5 Summary of Submissions and Panel’s Decisions	18
5.1 Features	18
5.2 Trees	39
Attachment 1: Recommended Amendments	
Attachment 2: Additional Items Sought by Submission	
Attachment 3: Features Assessments	
Attachment 4: Tree Assessments	
Attachment 5: Features and Trees Recommended to be Reviewed	
Attachment 6: Frankton Marina Site – Plan	

1 Introduction

This report sets out the considerations and decisions of the 2007 Hearings Panel (also referred to as "the Panel") on submissions received on Plan Change 3 – Heritage Part II to the Partially Operative District Plan. In particular, the report relates to submissions which seek the inclusion of additional heritage items in the Plan Change as listed in Attachment 2 to this report.

The provisions in the Queenstown Lakes Partially Operative District Plan (referred to as "the District Plan") which are relevant to these submissions include:

District Plan Section	Provisions
Appendix 3	Inventory of Protected Features

Submissions have been grouped together where it is considered that the content of the submissions is the same or similar. Under Part 5, each submission (or group of submissions where relevant) is summarised, and then the Hearings Panel's consideration and decision/s is provided.

In summarising the submissions, the name of a submitter is shown in **bold**, with their submission number shown in normal font within a square bracket. The name of a further submitter is shown in ***bold italics***, with their submission number shown in italics within a square bracket.

Decisions on submissions are detailed under the consideration of each submission. Where amendments are to be made to the District Plan as a result of a decision on a submission, additional text is shown as underlined and text to be removed is shown as being ~~struck out~~.

In making decisions, the 2007 Hearings Panel has:

- (i) been assisted by a report prepared by the Council's planning staff and consultants This report was circulated to submitters prior to the hearing taking place; and
- (ii) been assisted by re-evaluations of heritage features and trees where necessary. These assessments were commissioned to assist the Planners Report and formed part of it ; and
- (iii) been assisted by legal advice where necessary, such advice having been made publicly available; and
- (iv) had regard to matters raised by submitters and further submitters in their submissions and further submissions and at the hearing; and
- (v) had regard to the relevant provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991, in particular Section 32.

In considering the overarching jurisdictional matters, the Hearings Panel accepted the legal advice provided and noted that no one at the hearing argued against this advice.

In making decisions on submissions, the Panel notes that where it had a clear view on a particular matter or item, it did not necessarily accept all the reasons given by the submitter or further submitter in order to reach that view.

In accordance with Section 32(2) of the Act, a further evaluation under this section of the Act must be made before the Council makes a decision on a change to the District Plan. In considering the submissions to this Plan Change, an evaluation in accordance with Section 32(3) and Section 32(4) was carried out. The outcomes of this evaluation were consistent with the Section 32 analysis undertaken as part of the preparation of the Plan Change and were taken into account when making a decision on each submission.

Attached to this report as Attachment 1 are the revised versions of the relevant provisions of the District Plan further to the decisions contained in this report. Where there is any inconsistency between the provisions contained in Appendix 1 and the text contained in the body of the report, the provisions in Appendix 1 shall take precedence.

To assist in the Decision process, all features and trees submitters sought to be included in the Plan Change have been assessed.

Heritage features have been assessed in accordance with criteria established during the preparation of the Plan Change. The criteria assess features based on their archaeological, architectural, cultural, spiritual, historic, social, townscape, context, rarity, representative and technological value.

Trees have been assessed by a suitably qualified arborist and where appropriate have been assessed in accordance with the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (referred to as "STEM"). STEM is a well recognised and used method and assesses trees based on their condition, amenity and matters of notable recognition. It provides a system by which different elements of the tree can be scored on a scale of 3 to 27, with 27 being the highest score. There are a total of 10 different criteria regarding the condition and amenity elements and an additional 10 elements for trees with notable recognition. As a result, trees could potentially score anywhere from 30 to 270, or up to 540 for trees with notable recognition. A STEM score of 120 or greater was recommended, and has been adopted in the preparation of these Decisions, as a trigger for determining whether trees should be protected under the District Plan or not.

Attachment 3 of this report provides a summary of the heritage assessments undertaken and Attachment 4 provides a summary of the STEM assessments.

Where the submission does not contain enough information to allow for accurate identification of the feature/tree, it has not been possible to undertake an assessment. These features have been included in Attachment 5, which includes items that are recommended to be reviewed at a later date for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process. Based on this, such submissions have been rejected.

2 Background

Heritage items protected within the Queenstown Lakes District are listed in the Inventory of Protected Features, being Appendix 3 of the District Plan, and are identified on the District Plan Maps.

Classification is given to each heritage item according to the significance of that feature. Categories range from 1 to 3, with category 1 warranting the highest level of protection. Provisions relating to each category are contained in Part 13 - *Heritage* of the District Plan.

In August 2002, the Council notified a Variation to the Inventory of Protected Features. The purpose of that Variation was to update the information and amend any errors contained within the Inventory so as to provide accurate information. As a result of that Variation, it was discovered that the Inventory of Protected Features did not accurately represent the heritage values throughout the entire District. It was considered that a number of significant features were not protected, with the rural areas and Townships in the District being the least represented.

As a result, the Council decided to initiate Plan Change 3 to:

- Ensure, where practical, the District's significant heritage features and items are recognised and protected for future generations; and
- Ensure that the heritage landscapes, and their associated values, within the District are recognised and protected.

The purpose of the Plan Change was summarised as being:

To research the addition of heritage features to the Partially Operative District Plan, and ensure recognition of heritage landscapes, so that the District's significant heritage values are effectively recognised and protected.

During the preparation of Plan Change 3, an assessment of alternative options, including the effectiveness, costs and benefits, efficiency and appropriateness of each, was undertaken in accordance with section 32 of the Act. The outcome of the section 32 analysis led the Council to conclude that the addition of heritage features to the Inventory of Protected Features and also the recognition of heritage landscape through objectives, policies, methods and assessment matters, were necessary to achieve an effective level of protection of the District's heritage values. It was further concluded that such values should be recognised and provided for when assessing resource consents for subdivision and development.

Plan Change 3 was notified on 10 June 2005, with submissions closing on 5 August 2005. The summary of submissions was notified on 6 December 2005, with further submissions closing on 23 January 2006.

A total of 80 original submissions and 23 further submissions were received with regard to the Plan Change. Submissions received sought various forms of relief, including but not limited to: the inclusion of additional features and trees in the Plan Change/District Plan; the removal/deletion of features and trees included in the Plan Change/District Plan; amendment of the District Plan category for features included in the Plan Change; clarification of features/trees included in the

Plan Change; general protection for trees and features which meet an identified threshold; amendment and/or deletion of references to heritage landscapes in the District Plan/Plan Change; amendment of the Issues, Objectives and Policies of Part 13 of the District Plan; and amendment to the Heritage Landscapes definition.

A hearing to consider the submissions received to Plan Change 3 was held in Queenstown between Monday 4 and Wednesday 6 September 2006. This Hearings Panel (also referred to as the "2006 Hearings Panel") consisted of Mr Neville Marquet (Chairperson), Councillor Christine Kelly and Councillor John Wilson.

Further to hearing submissions, the 2006 Hearings Panel recommended to the Council decisions on submissions received.

As part of their recommendation, the Hearings Panel recommended that the Council reject all those submissions which sought that additional heritage items (including features and trees) be included in the Plan Change. This recommendation was made on the basis that such submissions were not deemed to be within the scope of the Plan Change.

With respect to determining the scope of a submission, reference is made to Clause 6 of First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 (referred to as "the Act") which states:

"6. Making submissions

Any person, including the local authority in its own area, may, in the prescribed form, make a submission to the relevant local authority on a proposed policy statement or plan that is publicly notified under clause 5."

The submissions that can be considered are therefore limited, in that they must be "on" the plan change.

In the case of Plan Change 3, the purpose of the Plan Change was to research the addition of heritage features (including trees) to the Inventory of Protected Features contained in Appendix 3 of the District Plan and ensure recognition of heritage landscapes.

Accordingly, for a submission to be deemed to be within the scope of Plan Change 3, the submission must relate to:

- The addition of heritage features/trees to the Inventory of Protected Features;
- The heritage features/trees that Plan Change 3 proposed would be added to the Inventory of Protected Features; or
- The provisions regarding Heritage Landscapes that Plan Change 3 proposed would be added to the District Plan.

While the 2006 Hearings Panel concluded that a submission seeking the addition of a feature or tree to the Inventory of Protected Features could be deemed to be on or within the scope of the Plan Change, they however concluded that in considering whether the submissions are within the scope of the Plan Change or not, the Council also needs to consider whether making a decision to accept such submissions would be fair and reasonable.

Landowners of items that were sought to be included in the Plan Change by way of a submission were not originally sent a copy of the public notice. This was because at that point such landowners were not deemed to be affected by the Plan Change. In addition, at the time of the notification of the summary of submissions, other than the public notification (by way of newspaper advertisement and press releases), the affected landowners were not contacted to ensure they were aware of the submissions to include heritage items contained on their land. Hence, potentially affected landowners had not been made aware of the Plan Change process or been given a fair opportunity to participate in it.

In conclusion, the 2006 Hearings Panel considered as a matter of fairness that submissions seeking that additional items be included in the Plan Change were not on or within the scope of the Plan Change.

The 2006 Hearings Panel's recommendations were considered by the Full Council at its meeting held on 15 December 2006. At this meeting, the Council decided to accept the Hearings Panel recommended Decisions in part, rejecting those parts that related to submissions which sought that additional heritage items be included in the Plan Change and accepting all other parts of the recommended Decisions.

The Council decided to reject part of the recommended Decisions. The Council shared the 2006 Panels concern that the landowners of the additional items sought by way of submission, had not been given the appropriate opportunity to participate in the Plan Change process. However, the Council considered it was still possible to give those landowners a fair opportunity. As a result, the Council resolved to extend the timeframe for further submissions relating to those original submissions which sought the inclusion of additional items in the Plan Change. As part of this extension of timeframe, all landowners of additional items were sent letters notifying them of this process.

The extension of timeframe for further submissions was notified on 10 January 2007, with submissions closing on 7 February 2007. A total of 45 additional further submissions were received.

3 List of Submitters

The following submitters lodged submissions on Plan Change 3 with respect to including additional heritage items in the Plan Change:

Original Submitter	Submission Number	Page Reference
Arrowtown Village Association	3/2.1 - 3/2.2	39 & 40
Karen Boulay	3/5.1	42
Jo Boyd	3/6.1	43
Jay Cassells	3/10.3 - 3/10.6	18 & 21
Jay Cassells	3/11.10 - 3/11.11, 3/11.15 & 3/11.17	22, 23, 24 & 26
Gordon Christie	3/12.1 - 3/12.3, 3/12.6	44, 45 & 46
P A & W A Cody Family Trust	3/14.1	46
Katie Deans	3/18.5	47
Sharon Duncan	3/20.2	48
Neil Farrin	3/21.1	49
David Finlin	3/22.1 - 3/22.4	50, 51, 52 & 53

Chiga Fukuda	3/24.1	54
Carolyn Gee	3/25.1, 3/25.2, 3/25.5, 3/25.8	27, 29, 30 & 31
Jackie Gillies	3/26.2	54
John Glover	3/27.1	33
Jill Hamel	3/29.1	33
Patsy Lambert-Robinson	3/36.1	55
Pam Maclean	3/37.10 -3/37.11, 3/37.15, 3/37.17	22, 23, 24 & 26
Anne Maguire	3/38.1	35
Gordon Bailey	3/45.2 - 3/45.11	56, 57, 58, 59 & 60
Gordon Bailey	3/46.2 - 3/46.4	61, 62 & 63
Duncan Field	3/51.1 - 3/51.2	64
Duncan Field	3/52.1 – 3/52.2	65 & 66
Queenstown and District Historical Society	3/54.2	36
Barry Robertson	3/55.2	66
Kirsty Sharpe	3/57.1	67
Dorothea Ramsey	3/60.1	54
Barbara Syme	3/61.1	38
Keith & Brenda Taylor	3/63.1	64
Brian and Nelda Thompson	3/66.2	68
Wakatipu Environmental Society	3/69.1	66
Mary Hansen	3/76.1	69
Murray & Sandra McClennan	3/79.1	70

Further Submitter	Submission Number	Page Reference
Bruce Albiston, NZ Historic Places Trust (Southern Region)	3/29.1.1, 3/54.2.1	34 & 36
Ken Gousmett on behalf of the QLDC	3/10.4.1 – 3/10.5.1, 3/45.8.1, 3/45.11.1	21 & 60
Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch	3/37.15.1, 3/37.17.1, 3/38.1.1	24, 26 & 35
Pam Maclean	3/37.11.1	24
Donald McLeay	3/11.10.1	22
Peninsula Road Ltd	3/57.1.1	67
Queenstown and District Historical Society	3/10.4.2, 3/10.5.2, 3/27.1.1, 3/29.1.2, 3/37.15.2, 3/37.17.2, 3/38.1.2,	21, 24, 26, 33, 34 & 35
Harry Renfree	3/11.10.2	22
Transit New Zealand	3/25.2.1, 3/37.11.2	24 & 29
Wensley Developments Ltd.	3/14.1.1	46

Additional Further Submitter	Submission Number	Page Reference
Marjory Anderson	3/10.3.8	18
Gordon Bailey	3/2.1.1, 3/6.1.2, 3/11.11.1, 3/12.1.1, 3/12.2.1, 3/12.3.1, 3/14.1.4, 3/18.5.1, 3/21.1.1, 3/36.1.1, 3/45.3.1, 3/45.7.1, 3/45.8.2, 3/45.9.1, 3/45.10.1, 3/45.11.2, 3/46.2.1, 3/46.3.1, 3/46.4.1, 3/51.1.2, 3/55.2.2, 3/57.1.3,	24, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 54, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 & 66

	3/24.1.1 & 3/60.1.1	
Gordon Bailey on behalf of the Wanaka Cemetery Trustees	3/51.1.1	64
Tony Balfour & Sarah Bultitude	3/38.1.3	35
Digby & Merren Bennett	3/10.3.17	18
Karen Boulay	3/5.1.1	42
J Boyd & N Gutzewitz	3/6.1.1	43
Ivan L Bulling	3/10.3.11	18
Jewell & Jay Cassells	3/10.3.20, 3/10.4.3, 3/10.5.3 & 3/10.6.1	18, 21 & 39
Matthew Cody	3/14.1.3	47
Warren Cooper	3/10.3.9	18
Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board	3/45.4.1, 3/45.5.1 & 3/45.6.1	58 & 59
Brian David Field	3/10.3.10	18
Sarah & Tom Flynn	3/14.1.2	46
Carolyn Gee	3/25.2.2	29
Lynley G Hansen	3/26.2.1	55
Helen Ellise Fels Hayes	3/10.3.12	18
C M & B W V Hercus	3/10.3.16	19
Susan Jessie	3/10.3.23	19
Rata Jones & Julie Jackson	3/10.3.22	18
Kingston Acquisitions Ltd	3/25.1.1, 3/25.5.1 & 3/25.8.1	27, 30 & 31
Luckie Estate	3/10.3.3	18
Russell Lund	3/22.1.1	50
Clifford (Paddy) Mathias	3/11.10.3 & 3/37.10.1	22
Jennifer Mary McBride	3/10.3.19	18
Murray J & Sandra A McClennan	3/79.1.1	70
Sirene Millar & Reiana Tainui	3/10.3.7	18
Paxton Pacific Group Ltd	3/10.3.4	18
Peninsula Road Ltd	3/57.1.2	67
Queenstown Airport Corp Ltd	3/54.2.2 & 3/76.1.1	36 & 69
R Gould Family Trust	3/10.3.5	18
Justin Reid	3/22.4.1	53
Barry Robertson	3/55.2.1	66
E M Sanders	3/10.3.18	18
Philip & Jocelyn Sanford	3/10.3.13	18
Philip Scott	3/2.2.1	40
Silverdale Estates Ltd	3/10.3.1	18
Penelope Susan Stalker	3/10.3.6	18
Pamela Steel of Domicile Development Ltd	3/10.3.14	18
Russell Steel of Domicile Development Ltd	3/10.3.15	18
Mike Stewart	3/10.3.2	18
Karen Tangaere & George Binnersley	3/10.3.24	18
Peter & Jane Tate	3/10.3.21	18
B & N Thompson	3/66.2.1	68
Paul Wilson	3/54.2.8 & 3/76.1.2	36 & 69

4 The Hearing

The Hearing to consider submissions on Plan Change 3 – Heritage Part II, which sought that additional items be included in the Plan Change, commenced at 9am on Monday 19 March 2007 at the Copthorne Hotel in Queenstown and ran until 20 March 2007. The Hearings Panel consisted of Commissioner Mr Trevor Shiels (Chairperson), Councillor Gillian MacLeod and Councillor Lou Alfeld. In attendance at the hearing were Ms Natasha van Hoppe (Consultant Planner), Mr Scott Figenshow (Council Senior Policy Analyst) and Ms Kiri-Anne Whiteman (Secretary).

The following provides a summary of the verbal and written evidence presented to the Panel during the proceedings of the hearing:

4.1.1 Robbie Caldwell on behalf of Kingston Acquisition Ltd [3/25.1.1] [3/25.5.1] [3/25.8.1] Rail between Kingston and Fairlight Engines, Carriages and wagons at Kingston Weir and Piping for Rail, Tank, Kingston

Robbie Caldwell presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Kingston Acquisitions Ltd (referred to as "KAL").

KAL owns the Kingston Flyer and associated engines, carriages and railway lines, and the lease on the water source referred to as the weir and piping supplying water from the hill to the railway water tank.

Mr Caldwell noted that when KAL purchased the train and assets, special conditions were agreed upon and included in the Sale & Purchase documentation to stipulate that neither KAL nor any subsequent purchaser will be empowered to remove the train from its Kingston/Fairlight base. KAL has therefore locked these heritage assets into the Kingston/Fairlight environment in perpetuity.

Mr Caldwell stated that while KAL is not opposed to the protection of any of the items identified, it is opposed to not being able to maintain, repair and enhance the items.

KAL supports the Planners Report recommendation with respect to protecting the railway as a category 3 item as this will allow the owners and operators to operate effectively.

KAL also supports the Planners Report recommendation to protect the 2 engines and 4 carriages as a Category 1 item.

KAL however maintains that whatever category the rolling stock are categorised, KAL and operators must have the autonomy to move them to any position on the Kingston/Fairlight railway for the purpose of ongoing train operation. This includes moving them outside the QLDC District boundary.

If the rolling stock was not allowed to be moved inter-district, KAL could not continue its plans to upgrade and beautify the lake front amenities for the benefit of the residents, tourists and heritage enthusiasts. Further, the wagons would not be able to be stored with similar historical items in an appropriate heritage collection site to be developed out of the

District. It could also result in the closure of train operations and non-maintenance of these assets.

KAL supports the protection of the weir under the District Plan but opposes the protection of the piping. The original piping connecting the weir to the water tank has been upgraded a number of times. It is now a modern alkathene pipe which has no historical significance, apart from it connecting the historical weir and tank.

For the reasons stated KAL requests that the Council:

- Allows unfettered movement of engines, carriages and rolling stock to any point along the Kingston/Fairlight railway line or to any future replacement storage facilities located alongside the line.
- Does not include the piping connecting the weir to the water tank in the Inventory of Protected Features.

4.1.2 Richard Black on behalf of Tony Balfour and Sarah Bultitude [3/38.1.3] Stone Stable, Lot 9 DP 301885, Littles Road

Richard Black presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Tony Balfour and Sarah Bultitude.

Tony Balfour and Sarah Bultitude seek that the existing stone stable located within Lot 9 DP 301885 not be included within the Inventory of Protected Features. The long term intentions of Mr Balfour and Ms Bultitude are to enhance the building by way of respectful restoration works.

Mr Black stated that the stable is currently in a dilapidated state and requires remediation work. This is intended to occur in the very near future, with the landowners engaging a conservation architect to help. Irrespective of the Plan Change, resource consent will be required to undertake these enhancements and as such Council retains discretion over any proposed alterations. It has also always been the intention to involve the NZ Historic Places Trust (referred to as "NZHPT").

Mr Black noted that the landowners are currently in the process of applying for resource consent. Further the NZHPT has indicated that it will provide written approval for this consent process.

Mr Black's evidence further identified that classifying the building as a heritage feature under the District Plan places an unnecessary constraint and increased cost on the future restoration of the building. Due to a consent notice being attached to the Certificate of Title, there is already a high level of involvement from both NZHPT and the Council, irrespective of Plan Change 3.

It was noted that the building has not been identified in any other submission other than the submission by Anne Maguire. The NZHPT has not identified in any submission that the stable warrants protection. Further, the building is not registered on the NZHPT register.

Mr Black concluded that in relation to the stone stable the Plan Change:

- Is not necessary in achieving the purpose of the Act;
- Does not assist the Council in carrying out its function of the control of actual or potential effects;
- Is not the most appropriate means of controlling actual or potential effects; and
- Would not achieve the stated objectives and policies of the District Plan.

Mr Black's evidence further considers that the Plan Change does not promote sustainable management. Instead, by placing additional restrictions on the restoration of the subject building, adverse effects will result in that the stone stable may become neglected. Such effects are considered contrary to Section 5(a)-(c), 6(a)-(c), 7(a)-(d) and (f) of the RMA.

In his written evidence, Mr Black concludes that the stone stable should not be included as a protected feature.

However, upon review of the Planners Report and further to questioning by the Hearings Panel, Mr Black concurred that a category 3 listing would probably be fair, although he stated that he did not think that it was necessarily required.

**4.1.3 Warwick Goldsmith on behalf of R Gould Family Trust [3/10.3.5]
Brisbane and Park Streets Precinct**

On behalf of R Gould Family Trust, Warwick Goldsmith stated that the submitter supports the Planners Report and did not wish to be heard.

**4.1.4 Warwick Goldsmith on behalf of Paxton Pacific Group Ltd [3/10.3.4]
Brisbane and Park Streets Precinct**

On behalf of Paxton Pacific Group Ltd, Warwick Goldsmith stated that Mr Cassells has confirmed that his submission does not relate to Paxton Pacific Group's property. If however the submission of Jay Cassells did relate to their property they would support the recommendation of the Planners Report.

**4.1.5 Jay Cassells [3/10.3] [3/10.3.20] [3/10.4] [3/10.4.3] [3/10.5] [3/10.5.3]
Brisbane and Park Streets Precinct
Boatshed, Slipway and Old Ticket Office, Frankton Marina**

Jay Cassells presented verbal evidence in support of his submissions.

With respect to his submissions that sought the addition of a precinct for Brisbane and Park Streets, Mr Cassells stated that the Plan Change is supposed to reflect the view of the community. It however comes down to being inside the Plan Change or not.

Mr Cassells made reference to Plan Changes 6, 8 and 10 and requested that if Plan Change 3 is not sufficient to deal with the heritage values of the Brisbane and Park Streets

area, that they be considered in Plan Change 10 (and to some extent Plan Changes 6 and 8).

If the proposed precinct was outside the scope of the Plan Change, Mr Cassells agreed with the Planners Report recommendation to deal with the precinct issue through another process.

Upon questioning by the Hearings Panel it was confirmed that there are 3 buildings currently protected in the subject area. Mr Cassells further stated that the issue is with the potential density and that high density units should not occur in the area. He noted that some buildings that have been lost in the area should have been protected.

In conclusion, Mr Cassells noted that he does not agree that his submission is outside the scope of the Plan Change.

With respect to his submissions relating to the boatshed and ticket office, Mr Cassells noted that the Boatshed Restoration Group is very grateful that the buildings are recommended to be protected. They support the recommendation in the Planners Report.

He further stated that relocating the ticket office within the reserve would support the committee's intent. Their primary concern however is with the boatshed and slipway. He also noted that the whole bay area has had a lot to do with historic navigation.

4.1.6 Mr Holloway on behalf of Jennifer McBride [3/10.3.19] Brisbane and Park Streets Precinct

Mr Holloway presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Jennifer McBride.

Ms McBride supports the submission of Jay Cassells with respect to including the Brisbane and Park Streets area as a precinct.

In his evidence Mr Holloway stated that Ms McBride agrees with the recommendation in the Planners Report that more detailed work be carried out to establish criteria for a precinct and to then assess the area for inclusion as a precinct. Ms McBride is keen to seek a way to preserve the character of the area as one of established homes which possess a quality environment for local families; preserves the green feel of the area; and has developments that are sympathetic to the size, type and scale of existing buildings.

Mr Holloway commended to the Panel that the area does have a very special feeling that is worth preservation. The proximity to town, closeness to the gardens and easy access to the lake provide very considerable amenity value. It is also an area that is a very real neighbourhood.

In summary, Mr Holloway concluded by stating that the attractiveness of the area as a place to live could be enhanced by characterizing it as a precinct to recognise these special values. It is important to encourage landowners to preserve and enhance some of the older quality buildings in the area which, if not immediately, then in years to come could have real heritage value to the town. To do this we must provide a context or theme for the whole neighbourhood.

4.1.7 Jackie Gillies on behalf of the Historic Places Trust [3/54.2.1] Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road

Jackie Gillies presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

The NZ Historic Places Trust submitted that the features on Arranmore Farm be protected under the District Plan.

In her evidence Ms Gillies provided background on the history of the farm complex, which is also referred to as the McBrides Farm. In this historical account it was noted that the woolshed was originally built as a grain barn.

Ms Gillies also provided an individual assessment of all the features contained within the farm complex. This included assessment of the buildings as a group, of the woolshed, barn, dairy, smithy, house, sheds and gardens. Of all of these features Ms Gillies identified the group, woolshed and barn as being the most significance. In addition she noted that the space between the buildings and the function of this space (including past functions) is also of importance.

Of relevance to this hearing was the assessment of the woolshed and barn. The assessment identified that the woolshed has heritage significance as a result of:

- Age – Very early construction (1860's);
- Rarity – Built as a grain barn;
- Construction similar to ancient barns in Northern Europe, familiar to early settlers;
- Has changed over time, with each change representing new agricultural needs/practices;
- Association with early Queenstown character.

Assessment of the barn identified the following heritage significance:

- Early construction;
- Possible association with important early Queenstown characters;
- Unusual 2-storey form;
- Possibly relocated Hallensteins Mill at Kawarau Falls, which if proven then connection is highly significant.

Ms Gillies evidence also stated that all of the buildings, both individually and as a group, are capable of re-use, whether this is directly associated with the functions of the Airport or separate from this for tourist use, educational or community use.

Ms Gillies written evidence concluded that these buildings, both individually and as a group, deserve to be protected due to their considerable heritage significance and are capable of sympathetic re-use in order to maintain them for the foreseeable future.

Further to questioning by the Panel, Ms Gillies stated that she considers a category 2 protection to be a reasonable balance between protection and re-use. She further stated that she considers that additional buildings on the property could work if they were carefully placed. She would however not like to see any of the buildings relocated.

Ms Gillies considers the farm to be the best example in the area. It was noted that the other two buildings (smithy and dairy) were protected as they were seen as having more significance at that time as they are made of stone.

**4.1.8 Robert Makgill on behalf of the Queenstown Airport Corporation Ltd [3/54.2.2]
[3/76.1.1]**

**Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road
Trees at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road**

Robert Makgill presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of the Queenstown Airport Corporation Ltd (also referred to as "QAC").

Mr Makgill's evidence identified the land subject to the QAC's submission and noted that in addition to being referred to as the Arranmore Farm, the parcels are also referred to as the McTaggart Block and the Events Centre Reserve.

The QAC opposes the recommendation of the Planners Report to include the barn and woolshed on the subject land in the Inventory of Protected Features; supports the recommendation to not include the trees on the subject land in the Inventory of Protected Features; and opposes the recommendation that the trees be included in a list of items that can be assessed at a later stage for inclusion in the District Plan.

The QAC opposes the recommendation to protect the woolshed and barn because:

- It is inconsistent with section 31(1)(a) of the RMA insofar as it fails to consider whether heritage classifications can be integrated with a proposed redevelopment and rezoning of the land for aviation purposes;
- It fails to recognise that the woolshed and barn are in a dilapidated state and poor structural condition; and
- It fails to comply with clause 10(1) of the First Schedule of the RMA insofar as it fails to include the reasons for rejecting QAC's submissions.

In his evidence, Mr Makgill further stated that the positive benefits that might be gained from listing the buildings as heritage items must be considered against the adverse effect that the listing will have on the operational capability of the Airport, now and in the future. It was submitted that the benefits to heritage would only be minor while the adverse effects on the Airport operations would be significant.

The QAC does not agree that the trees should be included in a list of items that can be assessed at a later stage for inclusion in the District Plan because the trees are located within the 5 to 15m transitional slope. Unless the trees are regularly pruned there is a danger that they will grow through the transitional slope and become a potential hazard to aircraft. The QAC purchased the land the trees are on so that it could be used for aviation

purposes and also to allow for the removal of the trees so that they do not pass through the transitional slope of the Airport's designation. Significant pruning in the past to ensure that they do not intrude through the transitional slope has significantly alerted the original form of these trees. The Airport is not in the position to allow the trees to grow freely under transitional slopes.

Further to questioning by the Panel, Mr Makgill further noted that:

- The Airport land needs to be retained as a secure area, therefore the QAC does not believe that the airport can provide free public access to the subject buildings; and
- If the items were deemed to be in good condition and able to be retained, that would be done. However, this is not the case with respect to these buildings.

In summary, the QAC seeks that the woolshed, barn and trees not be included as heritage items in the District Plan and that the trees not be included in a list of items that be assessed at a later stage for inclusion in the District Plan.

4.1.9 Gordon Bailey on behalf of Paul Wilson [3/54.2.8] [3/76.1.2] Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road Trees at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road

Gordon Bailey presented verbal evidence on behalf of Paul Wilson.

Mr Wilson's submission related to the protection of the buildings and trees located on the Arranmore Farm.

Mr Bailey noted that he had a discussion with arborist David Glenn about the trees. Mr Glenn stated that they do need significant work and would require reassessment after this work, otherwise it may not be worthwhile to list them.

Mr Bailey further stated that there is no protection of these trees under QLDC District Tree Policy (also referred to as "Council's Tree Policy"). Therefore, Council has no influence over these trees other than through this Plan Change process. He further emphasised the need to be consistent with assessing trees, in particular through the use of the STEM and the trigger score for inclusion. To date STEM is the most recognised system for assessing trees. It takes into account a lot of different characteristics of trees.

Mr Bailey stated the subject trees may be able to come up to the STEM score trigger with arboriculture and tidy-up work.

4.1.10 Ken Gousmett [3/10.4.1] [3/10.5.1] Boatshed, Slipway and Old Ticket Office, Frankton Marina

Ken Gousmett presented written and verbal evidence in support of his submission.

Mr Gousmett submitted additional information in his submission with respect to the Old Ticket Office in the Frankton Marina.

In his evidence, Mr Gousmett referred to the report prepared by Neil Clayton. He noted that the important aspect is that the Old Ticket Office is only part of the existing cottage. The larger portion on the lakeside was added on around 2001. Mr Gousmett submitted that this addition has no historical value and that the proposed description under Ref 16 should be amended to make it clear that the Old Ticket Office is only a portion of the existing cottage.

Mr Gousmett also referred to reports prepared by Janet Stephenson of the NZ Historic Places Trust (referred to as "NZHPT") and Guy Williams also of the NZHPT, which support Mr Gousmett's request.

Mr Gousmett noted that the current location of the Old Ticket Office is not considered to be significant as it has been moved from the Steamer Wharf to its present location. Further, an appropriate use may be found for it in its present marina location, but with the flexibility over its exact location as provided for in the Reserve Management Plan. The proposed description under Ref 16 should be amended to make provision for the relocation of the Old Ticket Office within the marina reserve, if it was considered appropriate to do so.

Further to questioning by the Panel, Mr Gousmett noted that:

- He seeks clarification as to which part of the ticket office is protected;
- The central part of his submission is to ensure protection is for the old ticket office only and not the addition of the cottage;
- He does not have any particular concern over the slipway; and
- The marine relationship is the important aspect to the ticket office.

4.1.11 Barry Robertson [3/55.2] Poplars, Domain Road

Barry Robertson presented verbal evidence in support of his submission. Mr Robertson's original submission related to the Poplar trees on Domain Road.

Mr Robertson stated that the trees are located on his private property and not on road reserve. He is concerned about protecting himself from Council's activities (i.e. road changes and topping of trees). His main concern however is retaining amenity.

The trees currently provide protection, privacy and amenity for all landowners of the 4 lots located behind the trees. Mr Robertson noted that while the trees may not have high heritage value they do have high amenity value.

4.1.12 P A & W A Cody Family Trust [3/14.1] Trees on Lakefront near 885 Frankton Road

Written evidence from P A Cody on behalf of the Trust was presented to the Panel. This evidence stated that, following the Planners Report on the subject trees, the Trust seeks assurance from the committee that in the event of any modifications or alterations to these trees, the property owners adjacent to the trees will be notified beforehand.

5 Summary of Submissions and Panel's Decisions

5.1 Features

5.1.1 Brisbane and Park Streets Precinct

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/10.3] submits that the area enclosed by Brisbane and Park Streets should be a precinct and that the District Plan be amended accordingly.

Silverdale Estates Ltd [3/10.3.1], **Mike Stewart** [3/10.3.2], **Luckie Estate** [3/10.3.3], **Paxton Pacific Group Ltd** [3/10.3.4], **R Gould Family Trust** [3/10.3.5], **Sirene Millar & Reiana Tainui** [3/10.3.7], **Marjory Anderson** [3/10.3.8], **Warren Cooper** [3/10.3.9], **Helen Hayes** [3/10.3.12], **Pamela Steel** [3/10.3.14], **Russell Steel** [3/10.3.15], **Rata Jones & Julie Jackson** [3/10.3.22], **Karen Tangaere & George Binnersley** [3/10.3.24] and **Peter & Jane Tate** [3/10.3.21] oppose the submission of Jay Cassells. Reasons for opposition include:

- *There is no consistent style and therefore no overarching aesthetic, architectural, social or historical significance.*
- *While some individual properties may have some heritage values it can not be said for all the properties.*
- *If individual properties have significant heritage values then protection of the properties should be sought on an individual basis.*
- *Would restrict or inhibit the demolition or redevelopment of any existing dwelling in the proposed area.*
- *Would diminish property values.*
- *Is unjustified and unfair on current owners.*
- *Is unnecessary and excessively onerous on the property owners that do not have properties with any heritage value.*
- *Existing District Plan provisions are already restrictive enough.*
- *There will be no incentive for people to develop their properties. They will deteriorate.*
- *The area desperately needs a face lift, not further restrictions.*
- *There are no objectives, policies or rules proposed for the area and it therefore is questionable how the precinct will be implemented.*
- *The value of an area as purely residential does not determine the area as a place of heritage value.*
- *Opposed to the precinct being extended to Hobart Street/Frankton Road.*

Penelope Stalker [3/10.3.6], **Brian David Field** [3/10.3.10], **Ivan Bulling** [3/10.3.11], **Philip & Jocelyn Sanford** [3/10.3.13], **Digby & Merren Bennett** [3/10.3.17], **E M Sanders** [3/10.3.18], **Jennifer McBride** [3/10.3.19] and **Jay Cassells** [3/10.3.20] support the submission of Jay Cassells. Reasons for support include:

- *The proposed precinct area should be extended to include Hobart Street.*

- *Property values will not decrease as the area, if protected, will continue to be a significant and sought after area to reside in.*
- *It has not been demonstrated that there is any legal impediment to the inclusion of an area. In the absence of such arguments the reason that it is said that PC3 will not allow a Precinct is that it is too difficult to do so.*
- *Other processes may be available to have an area of Special Character debated and identified, however if so these were not being used by Council despite the clear message from the community.*
- *Simply identifying individual items has the limitation that the cumulative effects of them cannot be taken into account.*
- *The area's special character is made up of a number of factors including the private residential nature, its historic, amenity and location.*
- *There is a community benefit in maintaining and enhancing the character of the area.*
- *It is not intended that the built environment be frozen. Nor that other activities be discouraged. It is not intended to interfere with property rights.*
- *It is intended that the special character of the area be better appreciated, protected and enhanced for the benefit of the whole community.*
- *It is acknowledged that the special character of the area may not be readily apparent to those who look for a preponderance of old buildings or some other common feature.*
- *Taken all together, the characteristics give the area something that is increasingly rare.*
- *Nothing in the proposal will prevent development except of the most egregiously speculative kind.*
- *Proposed name: The Gardens Residential Precinct. Area: all that area contained in and bounded by Park St to the West, South and North and Brisbane St to the East. Objective: to recognise, maintain and enhance the special character of the area. Character: its use; location; light, air and sun; presence of a number of historical buildings or sites; history of area; presence of trees and gardens; bird life; street frontages, views and amenity; low traffic and parking pressure; pride of residents; services and infrastructure; and the cumulative effect of all of the above. Guidelines: Any development of properties within the area should be such that the effects of it maintains or enhances the character of the area. Review: every 5 years.*

Barbara & Murray Hercus [3/10.3.16] and **Susan Jessie** [3/10.3.23] seek other forms of relief and neither support nor oppose the submission of Jay Cassells.

Consideration

A precinct is a defined area (as identified on the planning maps and in the Inventory of Protected Features) which is comprised of a number of significant heritage features, in particular heritage buildings, and/or public amenity space and which is recognised for its: urban and heritage amenity; aesthetic, architectural and historic significance; and/or a unique form and quality.

The preparation of the Plan Change included the identification and assessment of individual heritage features (including heritage trees) and heritage landscapes. There were

no precincts included in the Plan Change process. This omission is reflected by the lack of criteria for the assessment of a precinct.

The Panel notes that in his evidence Mr Cassells considered that the submission was on the Plan Change.

The identification and addition of a precinct, as requested by Jay Cassells and the further submitters, is considered to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. As a result the submissions cannot be considered.

It is however recommended that the matters identified in the submissions be considered through a separate Council process. In particular, it is recommended that a process be initiated to:

- Identity criteria to assess the value of a potential precinct against;
- Assess the proposed Brisbane and Park Street Precinct in accordance with the identified criteria; and
- Further to this assessment, identify and evaluate options available to address the concerns and issues raised in the relevant submissions.

As a consequence, the Panel recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be accurately assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5).

Decision

That the submission of **Jay Cassells** [3/10.3] and further submissions of **Penelope Stalker** [3/10.3.6], **Brian David Field** [3/10.3.10], **Ivan Bulling** [3/10.3.11], **Philip & Jocelyn Sanford** [3/10.3.13], **Digby & Merren Bennett** [3/10.3.17], **E M Sanders** [3/10.3.18], **Jennifer McBride** [3/10.3.19], **Jay Cassells** [3/10.3.20] and **Barbara & Murray Hercus** [3/10.3.16] are rejected.

That the further submissions of **Silverdale Estates Ltd** [3/10.3.1], **Mike Stewart** [3/10.3.2], **Luckie Estate** [3/10.3.3], **Paxton Pacific Group Ltd** [3/10.3.4], **R Gould Family Trust** [3/10.3.5], **Sirene Millar & Reiana Tainui** [3/10.3.7], **Marjory Anderson** [3/10.3.8], **Warren Cooper** [3/10.3.9], **Helen Hayes** [3/10.3.12], **Pamela Steel** [3/10.3.14], **Russell Steel** [3/10.3.15], **Rata Jones & Julie Jackson** [3/10.3.22], **Karen Tangaere & George Binnersley** [3/10.3.24], **Susan Jessie** [3/10.3.23] and **Peter & Jane Tate** [3/10.3.21] are accepted.

Reason

The proposal for a precinct is outside the scope of the Plan Change.

5.1.2 Boatshed, Slipway and Old Ticket Office, Frankton Marina

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/10.4] and [3/10.5] submits that the Inventory of Protected Features should be expanded to include the boatshed, slipway and old ticket office at Frankton Marina.

Queenstown and District Historical Society [3/10.4.2] and [3/10.5.2] supports the submission of Jay Cassells and submits that this structure forms a distinctive part of the engineering and transportation history of the District, so as to warrant protection to enable it to be sustained into the future.

Ken Gousmett on behalf of QLDC [3/10.4.1] and [3/10.5.1] submits additional information with respect to the submission of Jay Cassells to ensure that the hearings committee has access to all relevant information. In particular, the report prepared by Neil Clayton (titled 'Historicity of a Boatshed and Cottage at Frankton') and the report prepared by Tim Bradford (titled 'Structural Review of the Frankton Marina Slipway Building') are relevant, together with the Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve Management Plan.

Jay Cassells [3/10.4.3] and [3/10.5.3] submitted further in support of his original submission.

Consideration

The boatshed, slipway and old ticket office at the Frankton Marina identified by Jay Cassells have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that these features have a moderate overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the buildings have high historic, social and representative value and moderate architectural and context value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that these features be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

Further to evidence presented to the Panel by Mr Gousmett, it is however acknowledged that protection is intended for the original ticket office only and not for the adjoining additions. This therefore needs to be clearly provided for in the amendments to the District Plan and as per the plan tabled during the Hearing proceeding by Mr Cassells (attached as Attachment 6).

Further to this decision, the Panel recommends that the Council update the Heritage Register to ensure that it reflects Rebecca Reid's more recent assessment work (undertaken for the purpose of decisions on this Plan Change) and that with respect to the ticket office it includes the plan attached as Attachment 6.

Decision

That the submissions of **Jay Cassells** [3/10.4] and [3/10.5] and the further submissions of **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/10.4.2] and [3/10.5.2], **Ken Gousmett** [3/10.4.1] and [3/10.5.1] and **Jay Cassells** [3/10.4.3] and [3/10.5.3] are accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Structures and Features

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>16</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>Boatshed, Slipway and original Old Ticket Office (as identified in the Heritage Register), Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve</u>	<u>Sections 59 & Part Section 39 Block XXI Shotover SD</u>		<u>291033110</u>		<u>2</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the features have been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.1.3 Paddy Mathias Place

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/11.10] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.10] submit that the structures and grounds known as Paddy Mathias Place at Arthurs Point be added to the District Plan so as to obtain the highest level of protection.

Donald McLeay [3/11.10.1], **Harry Renfree** [3/11.10.2] and **Clifford (Paddy) Mathias** [3/11.10.3] and [3/37.10.1] support the submission of Jay Cassells. Mr McLeay submits that this presents a means whereby the significance of the early settlers of the District may be recognised. Mr Renfree submits that the Barnett family owned this property from circa 1905 to 1955 and it is historic in the Queenstown area. Mr Mathias submits that the house should stay as it is.

Consideration

The structures and grounds known as Paddy Mathias Place, as identified by Jay Cassells and Pam Maclean, have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the house, sleep out and grounds of Paddy Mathias Place have a moderate to high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the features have high historic, social, context, rarity and representative value and moderate architectural value.

As a result of the assessment Ms Reid recommends that these features be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

The Panel however does not consider it appropriate to list the grounds of Paddy Mathias Place in the Inventory of Protected Features. Any alteration to the grounds in the way of plantings, earthworks, or constructions of any nature or degree would require a resource consent for a discretionary activity. This is considered inappropriate for a residential property. The Panel however recommends that the Council undertake assessment of the options and practicality of protecting property grounds and gardens.

Decision

That the submissions of **Jay Cassells** [3/11.10] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.10] and further submissions of **Donald McLeay** [3/11.10.1], **Harry Renfree** [3/11.10.2] and **Clifford (Paddy) Mathias** [3/11.10.3] and [3/37.10.1] are accepted in part.

Those parts of the submissions which are accepted relate to protecting the house and sleep out contained within the Paddy Mathias Place. Those parts of the submissions which are rejected relate to the request to also protect the grounds of Paddy Mathias Place.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Buildings
Dwellings

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
62	39	House and sleep out, Paddy Mathias Place, Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point	Section 123 Block XIX, Shotover SD		2910720700		2

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist the house, sleep out and grounds known as Paddy Mathias Place have been assessed as warranting protection under the District Plan. The Panel however does not consider it appropriate to protect the grounds given the nature of works associated with a residential property.

5.1.4 Frankton Track

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/11.11] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.11] submit that the path known as the Frankton Track be added to the District Plan so as to obtain the highest level of protection.

Pam Maclean [3/37.11.1] supports her original submission.

Transit NZ [3/37.11.2] opposes in part the submission of Pam Maclean. The Frankton Track should be developed in the future to provide an improved transport route for pedestrians and cyclists. It should not be protected under the District Plan.

Gordon Bailey [3/11.11.1] opposes the submission of Jay Cassells stating that it is too difficult to protect and would restrict Council options.

Consideration

The Frankton Track, as identified by Jay Cassells and Pam Maclean, has been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that this feature has a low overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the feature only has a moderate context value and a low historic and social value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that the feature not be included in the District Plan.

It is noted that Transit's further submission has been accepted as a result of rejecting Jay Cassells original submission and as a result the Panel has not considered the reasons for Transit's further submission.

Decision

That the submissions of **Jay Cassells** [3/11.11] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.11] and the further submission of **Pam Maclean** [3/37.11.1] are rejected and that the further submissions of **Transit NZ** [3/37.11.2] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/11.11.1] are accepted.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the feature has been identified as not warranting protection.

5.1.5 Queenstown Bowling Club

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/11.15] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.15] submit that the Bowling Club buildings and grounds be added to the District Plan so as to obtain the highest level of protection.

Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch [3/37.15.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/37.15.2] support the submission of Pam Maclean and submit that this building has particular significant heritage value on account of its age, location and historic associations. It is in good condition, so worthy of continued protection for the contribution it makes to the tangible remnants of the District's past.

Consideration

The Queenstown Bowling Club building and grounds, as identified by Jay Cassells and Pam Maclean, have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the bowling club pavilion and grounds have a moderate to high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the features have high historic, social, context and rarity value and moderate architectural value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that these features be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

The Panel however does not consider it appropriate to list the bowling club grounds in the Inventory of Protected Features. Any alteration to the grounds in the way of plantings, earthworks, or constructions of any nature or degree will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity. This is considered inappropriate given the nature of maintenance and upkeep work required for a bowling club.

Decision

That the submissions of **Jay Cassells** [3/11.15] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.15] and further submissions of **Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch** [3/37.15.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/37.15.2] are accepted in part.

That part of the submissions which is accepted relates to protecting the bowling club building under the District Plan. That part of the submissions which is rejected relates to the request to also protect the bowling club grounds.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Buildings
Public

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
65	35	Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion, located within the grounds of the Queenstown Gardens.	Part Sections 4-5 & 7 Block 11 Queenstown Town		2910507200		2

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the Queenstown Bowling Club building has been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan. It is not however considered appropriate to protect the bowling club grounds given the nature of works associated with a bowling club.

5.1.6 Chinese Settlement Relics/Sites, Arrow River

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/11.17] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.17] submit that any relics or sites of Chinese settlement on the Arrow River be added to the District Plan so as to obtain the highest level of protection.

***Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch** [3/37.17.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/37.17.2] supports the submission of Pam Maclean and submits that these buildings have particular significant heritage value on account of their age, location and historic associations. They are in good condition, so worthy of continued protection for the contribution they make to the tangible remnants of the District's past.*

Consideration

The submissions of Jay Cassells and Pam Maclean are very broad and do not provide detail as to exactly which features along the Arrow River should be protected. The river covers a large area and due to its historical connections with mining there are many sites and features along this river that have historical relevance.

In the report from heritage specialist Rebecca Reid on the submissions to the Plan Change, Ms Reid concludes that the information provided in these submissions was too vague and too wide to be able to be accurately assessed at this stage (refer to Attachment 3). She further noted that such sites would fall under the archaeological provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993.

The Panel therefore recommends that these submissions be included in a list of items that at a later date can be accurately assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow greater time to identify and research the proposed inclusion.

Decision

That the submissions of **Jay Cassells** [3/11.17] and **Pam Maclean** [3/37.17] and the further submission of ***Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch** [3/37.17.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/37.17.2]* are rejected.

Reason

The submissions are very broad and do not provide detail as to exactly which features along the Arrow River should be protected. An accurate assessment was therefore unable to be carried out.

5.1.7 Rail between Kingston and Fairlight

Submission

Carolyn Gee [3/25.1] seeks that the rail between Kingston and Fairlight be registered and protected as a heritage item. It is the last remaining section of the Kingston to Lumsden branch line, which was completed in July 1878.

Kingston Acquisitions Ltd [3/25.1.1] opposes the submission and states that due to operational needs the location of the rail may need to be relocated in the future. Concern is also expressed regarding the practical ability to undertake maintenance when an asset is protected, for example the sleepers are replaced as required. They also note that the railway is predominantly located within the Southland District, therefore the entire railway would not be subject to protection under the Plan Change. The portion of railway that is located within the Southland District is not protected. Seeks that the Council not include the railway line in the District Plan.

Consideration

The railway between Kingston to Fairlight, as identified by Carolyn Gee, has been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the feature has a high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the railway has high historic, social, context, rarity, representative and technological value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that this feature be included in the District Plan as a category 1 item.

As identified in the submission of Kingston Acquisition Ltd, only part of this railway falls within the Queenstown Lakes District Council boundary, with the remainder of the rail falling in the Southland District Council boundary. As a result, only that section of the rail located within the Queenstown Lakes District can be considered under this Plan Change.

That part of the Railway which falls within the Southland District Council boundary is not protected. The Plan Change could therefore be considered ineffective in only protecting part of the railway (i.e. that part in the Queenstown Lakes District). However, given its heritage significance it is considered that protection of part of the rail is effective in achieving the outcomes sought by the Plan Change and ensures recognition of at least part of the heritage feature.

KAL is also concerned about the practical ability to undertake maintenance when the railway is protected.

The outcomes of the heritage assessment concluded that the rail should be protected as a category 1 item. Alteration of a category 1 or 2 item is a Discretionary Activity, while the alteration of a category 3 item is a Controlled Activity. Demolition is a Prohibited Activity for a Category 1 item, a Non-Complying Activity for a Category 2 item and a Discretionary Activity for a Category 1 item.

Given the constraints that a category 1 or 2 protection would place on the owner of the rail, the Panel considers that the railway should be protected as a category 3 item. This would ensure the feature's significant heritage values are protected and recognised, while providing the opportunity for the owners to maintain it at an appropriate level, thereby ensuring its ongoing preservation.

Decision

That the submission of **Carolyn Gee** [3/25.1] is accepted in part and that the further submission of **Kingston Acquisitions Ltd** [3/25.1.1] is rejected.

That part of Carolyn Gee's submission which is accepted relates to protecting that part of the railway within the Queenstown Lakes District. That part of the submission which is rejected relates to the request to protect the railway where it falls within another District.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
3 Kingston
Structures

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
407	39	The railway from Kingston to Fairlight (up to the QLDC District boundary)	Lot 2 Pt Lot 1 DP 318661; Blk I, V, XII Kingston SD; Secs 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-15, 20, 23 & 24 Blk VI Town of Kingston; Sec 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 25, Pt Sec 3, 5, 9 Sec 1; SO7617; Sect 1-3 SO10898 SO 10760; Run 593.		2913102800		3

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the feature has been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.1.8 Telephone Wire, Kingston to Halfway Bay

Submission

Carolyn Gee [3/25.2] seeks that the telephone wire running from Kingston to Half Way Bay be registered and protected as a heritage item.

Transit NZ [3/25.2.1] opposes in part the submission of Carolyn Gee as telephone posts near the State Highway can be a hazard for motorists. Allowing redundant telephone posts in close proximity to the Highway to remain would provide an unnecessary risk to road users.

Carolyn Gee [3/25.2.2] seeks protection of the telephone wire and states that the land concerned is owned by Peter Spencer (from Auckland) and is managed by Angus Ross (of Kingston) and is on land known as Greenvale Station.

Consideration

The original submission of Carolyn Gee did not provide any detailed information as to the exact location of the feature.

In the report from heritage specialist Rebecca Reid on the submissions to the Plan Change (refer to Attachment 3), Ms Reid concluded that this item could not be located. Ms Reid was therefore unable to assess the feature. She however noted that locals advised that it exists from about halfway to Halfway Bay.

In her further submission Carolyn Gee states that land concerned is managed by Angus Ross. During the extended period of further submissions the Council contacted Angus Ross to ensure the owners of the land were aware of the proposal. A submission was not received from Mr Ross or the owners further to notification by the Council.

Further attempts to assess the feature were made, but its exact location has still not been confirmed. However, even if the feature was otherwise determined as warranting protection under the District Plan, it is considered that the monitoring and enforcement of the protection of the feature would be difficult.

The Panel concluded that the feature not be protected under the District Plan as it could not be confident about the identification of the feature and due to the impracticalities associated with protection of this feature.

With respect to the submission of Transit, it is noted that the feature is not located near a State Highway. However, as Transit's submission opposes the protection of the feature, the submission is accepted.

Decision

That the submission of **Carolyn Gee** [3/25.2] and further submission of **Carolyn Gee** [3/25.2.2] are rejected and that the further submission of **Transit NZ** [3/25.2.1] is accepted.

Reason

The submission did not provide enough information and detail to allow for an accurate assessment and justification for protection. Further, if the item was to be protected it is considered that enforcement and monitoring of the feature would be difficult.

5.1.9 Engines, Carriages and Wagons at Kingston

Submission

Carolyn Gee [3/25.5] seeks that the 2 engines, 4 carriages and numerous wagons at Kingston be registered and protected as heritage items.

Kingston Acquisitions Ltd [3/25.5.1] supports the inclusion of the 2 engines and 4 carriages in the list of protected features. However it opposes the inclusion of the other rolling stock (referred to as numerous wagons). The submitter proposes to remove this rolling stock as soon as replacement storage facilities are available and beautify the waterfront property. The submitter and the operators must retain the right to shift all stock to any position on the line as required as part of their operation (including outside the District). Requests that the Council include the 2 engines and 4 carriages and not include the other rolling stock in the District Plan.

Consideration

The engines, carriages and wagons in Kingston, as identified by Carolyn Gee, have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the features have a high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the engines, carriages and wagons have high architectural, historic, social, context, rarity, representative and technological value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that the engines and carriages be included in the District Plan as a category 1 item and the wagons as a category 2 item.

As a result of the heritage significance of the engines and carriages, as identified in the assessment, the majority of the Panel consider that they should be protected under the District Plan. It is however acknowledged that the rail stock/wagons are not stationary items and will not necessarily always be located in the one location. In particular, there is a desire to relocate the wagons outside the District. Due to the difficulty and practicality of protecting such movable items, the Panel does not consider it appropriate to protect the wagons.

Decision

That the submission of **Carolyn Gee** [3/25.5] is accepted in part and that the further submission of **Kingston Acquisitions Ltd** [3/25.5.1] is accepted in part. That part of the original submission which is accepted relates to protecting the 2 engines and 4 carriages and that part of the original submission which is rejected relates to not protecting the other rolling stock/wagons.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
3 Kingston
Structures

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
408	39	Engines (2) and carriages (4), located in the vicinity of the Kingston railway, including the Kingston Railway Station.	Lot 2 Pt Lot 1 DP 318661; Lot 1 DP 306647; Blk I, V, XII Kingston SD; Secs 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-15, 20, 23 & 24 Blk VI Town of Kingston; Sec 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 25, Pt Sec 3, 5, 9 Sec 1; SO7617; Sect 1-3 SO10898 SO 10760; Run 593; Lot 9DP 306647; Lot 4DP 318631		2913102800 2913104205 2913109901 2913104206 2913104209 2913104210		1

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Commissioner Shields dissented from this decision, doubting that District Plan heritage protection was appropriate for moveable items such as these.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the engines and carriages have been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan. It is however not considered practical to also protect the wagons.

5.1.10 Weir and Piping for Rail Water Tank, Kingston

Submission

Carolyn Gee [3/25.8] seeks that the weir and piping supplying water from the hill to the rail water tank be registered and protected as a heritage item.

Kingston Acquisitions Ltd [3/25.8.1] opposes the inclusion of the weir and piping and states that the water supply is required for the train operation until a new town supply is installed. Concern is that once the new town water supply is operational, the pipe work through the submitter's site may need to be removed. Requests that the Council not include the weir and piping supplying water from the hill to the rail water tank in the District Plan.

Consideration

The weir and piping for the Kingston rail yard water tank, as identified by Carolyn Gee, have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the features have a moderate overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the weir and piping have high historic and social value and moderate archaeological and technological value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that the water weir and piping be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

Alteration of a category 2 item is a Discretionary Activity, while the demolition is a Non-Complying Activity. Given the outcome of the assessment of the features, it is considered appropriate that a resource consent (as either a Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity) is required for alteration to the weir.

In its evidence, Kingston Acquisition Ltd however noted that the piping has been replaced on a number of occasions and is now of modern materials. Hence, apart from it connecting the historical weir with the railway water tank, it has no historical significance. As a result the Panel does not consider it appropriate to include the piping in the protection.

Decision

That the submission of **Carolyn Gee** [3/25.8] is accepted in part and that the further submission of **Kingston Acquisitions Ltd** [3/25.8.1] is accepted in part. That part of the original submission which is accepted relates to protecting the water weir and that part of the original submission which is rejected relates to not protecting the connecting piping.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
3 Kingston
Structures

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
409	39	Water weir, but not the piping, which supplies the Kingston rail yard water tank, located above the Kingston Wharf approximately 100m from an unnamed stream.	Section 1 Block X Part Section 8 Block 1 Kingston SD, Scenic Reserve, Balance at 29280-43500		2913101801		2

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the water weir has been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan. However, due to the lack of historical significance, it is not considered appropriate to also protect the piping.

5.1.11 Kinloch Lodge Precinct

Submission

John Glover [3/27.1] seeks amendment to the Plan Change to include a heritage precinct affecting the land occupied and immediately adjoining the former Glacier Hotel (Kinloch Lodge) so to ensure the integrity of the relationship between the structure and its context is maintained. The assessment work undertaken by the Working Party and independent experts gave very high importance to the townscape and contextual setting of the structure. The Plan Change as proposed will not preserve or protect these values.

Queenstown and District Historical Society [3/27.1.1] supports the submission of John Glover and submits that the buildings making up Kinloch Lodge are tangible evidence of a significant element in the District's history, on account of its association with early tourism and shipping services on the Lake. The buildings and their spatial relationship to each other and the Lake are important.

Consideration

As discussed under 5.1.1 of this report, the preparation of the Plan Change included the identification and assessment of individual heritage features (including heritage trees) and heritage landscapes. No precincts were included in the Plan Change process. The identification and addition of a precinct, as requested by John Glover, is therefore considered outside the scope of the Plan Change. As a result the submission cannot be considered.

The Panel however recommends that the Council look into the idea of protecting Kinloch as a precinct under the District Plan. As a consequence, it is recommended that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be accurately assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5).

Decision

That the submission of **John Glover** [3/27.1] and further submission of **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/27.1.1] are rejected.

Reason

The submission is outside the scope of the Plan Change.

5.1.12 Bridge Abutments, McChesney Creek, Arthurs Point

Submission

Jill Hamel [3/29.1] submits that the abutments of the 1875 bridge over McChesney Creek, Arthurs Point be included in the Inventory of Protected Features. It is a good example of the early development of good roading systems for drays and wagons at a very early period in the province.

Bruce Albiston of the NZ Historic Places Trust [3/29.1.1] and Queenstown and District Historical Society [3/29.1.2] support the submission of Jill Hamel. The Historical Society submits that this structure forms a distinctive part of the engineering and transportation history of the District, so to warrant protection to enable it to be sustained into the future.

Consideration

The old McChesney bridge abutments, as identified by Jill Hamel, have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the feature has a moderate overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the bridge remains have moderate archaeological, historic, social and technological value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that the bridge remains be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

Decision

That the submission of **Jill Hamel [3/29.1]** and the further submissions of **Bruce Albiston of the NZ Historic Places Trust [3/29.1.1] and Queenstown and District Historical Society [3/29.1.2]** are accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Structures & Features

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
104	39	The old McChesney bridge abutment remains, located by the one-way bridge by Arthurs Point Hotel, Arthurs Point	Crown Land Block XIX Shotover Survey District		2907150900		2

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the feature has been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.1.13 Stone Stable, Lot 9 DP 301885, Littles Road

Submission

Anne Maguire [3/38.1] submits that the stone stable located at Lot 9 DP 301885 on Littles Road be a protected feature. It is over 100 years old and in great condition.

Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch [3/38.1.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/38.1.2] supports the submission of Ann Maguire and submit that this building has particular significant heritage value on account of its age, location and historic associations. It is in good condition, so worthy of continued protection for the contribution it makes to the tangible remnants of the District's past.

Tony Balfour & Sarah Bultitude [3/38.1.3] seeks that the existing stone stable within Lot 9 DP 301885 not be included in the District Plan. The long term intention is to enhance the building by undertaking respectful restorations. The existing stone stable structure and materials will be retained where possible. The building is currently in a dilapidated state and requires remediation work. Jackie Gillies has been engaged to help. Resource Consent will be required and as such Council retains discretion over any proposed alterations. Further, it has always been intended to involve the NZHPT during this process. The submitters have no intention to demolish or wilfully neglect the building. Classifying the building under the District Plan places an unnecessary constraint and increased cost on the future restoration of the building, potentially making it impractical to undertake the restoration.

Consideration

The stone stable on Littles Road, as identified by Ann Maguire, has been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the feature has a moderate to high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the stable has high context, rarity and representative value, moderate to high technological value and moderate architectural, historic, social and technological value.

As a result of the assessment Ms Reid recommends that the stone stable be included in the District Plan as a category 2 item.

Based on the outcomes of this assessment the Panel considers that the building should be protected under the District Plan. However, to ensure the ongoing preservation of the building it is considered that a category 3 listing would be more appropriate. It is noted that the representative for the submitter addressed the Panel and noted that he did not oppose a category 3 listing.

Decision

That the submission of **Anne Maguire** [3/38.1] and further submission of **Historic Places Trust Queenstown Lakes Branch** [3/38.1.1] and **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/38.1.2] are accepted and that the further submission of **Tony Balfour & Sarah Bultitude** [3/38.1.3] is rejected.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Buildings
Rural

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
105	29	Stone Stable, located on the former Littles farm, Littles Road, Wakatipu Basin	Lot 9 DP 301885		2907108801		3

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the feature has been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.1.14 Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road

Submission

Queenstown and District Historical Society [3/54.2] seeks protection of the heritage features on the historic Arranmore Farm on Grant Road. It is one of the District's earliest farms and contains part of the stone stable and woolshed built from timber brought from Glenorchy. Part of the old smithy also exists. These are all likely to be over 100 years old.

Bruce Albiston of the NZ Historic Places Trust [3/54.2.1] supports the submission of the Queenstown and District Historical Society. All of the historic buildings of the Arranmore Farm, including the barn/woolshed, stable/barn and three small timber sheds, and the historic trees and gardens, are all worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

Queenstown Airport Corp Ltd [3/54.2.2] seeks that the features not be protected, stating that the subject area is within Queenstown Airport land designation. Part of the airport purpose was to develop the subject area for aviation use.

Paul Wilson [3/54.2.3] supports the submission, stating that an appropriate level of heritage protection should be established for the features at Arranmore Farm. Further research is being conducted for the reuse/restoration of the site.

Consideration

The Arranmore Farm on Grants Road is also known as the former McBrides Farm. Currently under the District Plan there are two buildings, the smithy and dairy, which are protected on the site of the former McBrides Farm. These buildings are listed in the Inventory of Protected Features as Ref 119 as category 2 items.

The site also contains a barn and woolshed which were also associated with the former McBrides Farm. These two buildings have been assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3).

This assessment was carried out in accordance with the assessment criteria established for the Plan Change and concluded that the buildings have a moderate to high overall heritage value. In particular, the assessment identified that the buildings have high historical, social and context value, moderate to high rarity and representative value and moderate architectural value.

As a result of the assessment, Ms Reid recommends that these buildings, being the woolshed and barn, be included in the District Plan as category 2 items. Based on the outcomes of this assessment, the Panel considers that the barn and woolshed contained on Arranmore Farm be included in the District Plan Inventory of Protected Features.

The Panel also notes that the balance of the evidence presented from the experts supports the protection of these buildings.

In considering the evidence the Panel concluded that it was appropriate to deal with the Heritage Plan Change on the basis of the District Plan and the Airport designation as they stand. It would be inappropriate to speculate on what might later happen at the airport by way of any other Plan Change, resource consent, or designation. Listing the buildings in the Inventory of Protected Features will not prevent QAC from giving effect to its present designation.

The Panel further notes that Clause 10(1) of the First Schedule requires the decision to state reasons. Any alleged deficiencies in the reasons stated in the Planners Report are irrelevant to Clause 10(1).

In considering the submissions and evidence, the Panel notes that as a whole area, including the trees, gardens and buildings, the farm has significant heritage value as a whole context. However, consideration of the features as a whole is outside the scope of the Plan Change. The Panel therefore makes reference to its discussion under 5.1.1 above with respect to its recommendation to the Council to further investigate the matter of precincts under the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Queenstown and District Historical Society** [3/54.2] and further submissions of **Bruce Albiston of the NZ Historic Places Trust** [3/54.2.1] and **Paul Wilson** [3/54.2.3] are accepted and that the submission of **Queenstown Airport Corp Ltd** [3/54.2.2] is rejected.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Buildings - Rural

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
119	33	McBrides Farm Buildings: consisting of Original Smithy, and Dairy, Barn and Woolshed, 64 Grant Road, Frankton Flats	Dairy and Woolshed: Lot 9 DP 22121 Block I Shotover SD Smithy: Lot 1 DP 27775 Block I Shotover SD Barn: Pt Section 60, Block I Shotover SD		2910210500 2910210000 2910210001		2

Reason

Further to assessment by a heritage specialist, the features have been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.1.15 Pig and Whistle Building

Submission

Barbara Syme [3/61.1] submits that the Pig & Whistle building in Queenstown should be protected. The building's unique position with the flowing creek and outdoor gardens adds character and atmosphere to a town that is rapidly becoming impersonal. Would be a great loss to Queenstown if it is lost to an over sized building block. We need some small areas to remind us of what Queenstown used to be like.

Consideration

The Pig and Whistle, as identified by Barbara Syme, was assessed by heritage specialist Rebecca Reid (refer to Attachment 3). However since this assessment the building has been demolished and as a result can no longer be protected.

Decision

That the submission of **Barbara Syme** [3/61.1] is rejected.

Reason

The building has been demolished.

5.1.16 Other Features

Submission

Jay Cassells [3/10.6] submits that Inventory of Protected Features should be expanded to include other features and trees to be advised.

Jay Cassells [3/10.6.1] supports his original submission.

Consideration

Jay Cassells seeks additional features and trees to be included in the Inventory of Protected Features. However information on these items has not been provided. Detail of the proposed features and trees needs to be provided to be able to assess the appropriateness of including such features in the District Plan. Failure to do so means that such features cannot be assessed.

Decision

That the submission of **Jay Cassells** [3/10.6] and further submission of **Jay Cassells** [3/10.6.1] are rejected.

Reason

No information or detail has been provided regarding the additional features and trees sought for inclusion in the Plan Change.

5.2 Trees

5.2.1 Wellingtonias, Arrowtown Camp Ground

Submission

Arrowtown Village Association [3/2.1] requests that the Wellingtonias in the Arrowtown Camp Ground cabin area be added to the Inventory of Protected Trees. The trees are of significant value to the community and having them registered will enhance their future survival.

Gordon Bailey [3/2.1.1] supports the submission stating that they are worth preservation.

Consideration

The trees identified by the Arrowtown Village Association have been assessed by approved arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

A total of four Wellingtonia and two Pines were assessed.

In this assessment, three of the Wellingtonias scored 174, while one scored a little lower with 168. These are considered relatively high scores in comparison to other trees within the District. The trees scored highly based on their form, vigour, vitality, age, stature, role in the setting and the lack of other trees in close proximity, drawing greater attention to the Wellingtonias.

Each of the Pine trees assessed scored higher than the Wellingtonias with a score of 180 each. The trees scored highly based on their form, vigour, vitality, age, occurrence as a species, function, role in the setting and due to the lack of other trees in close proximity.

As a result of this assessment Mr Glenn has recommended that each of these trees, being the four Wellingtonias and the two Pines, be protected under the District Plan.

It is however noted that the submitter has only sought inclusion of the Wellingtonias within the District Plan. The inclusion of the Pine trees is therefore deemed to be outside the scope of the submission. Hence, the Panel did not discuss the Pine trees and did not form a view on them.

Decision

That the submission of **Arrowtown Village Association** [3/2.1] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/2.1.1] are accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
2 Arrowtown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Arrowtown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
276	27	Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) (4), Arrowtown Camp Ground cabin area, being located close to cottage 7, cottage Witz end, cabin 4 and between cabin 4 and the road	Sections 1-6 Block XXII, Section 38 Block VII, Lot 43 DP 12741, Lot 25 DP 12525	2918200100

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Wellingtonias identified by the Arrowtown Village Association each scored highly and have therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.2 Mature Trees next to Greek Fir Ref 269, Old Manse Grounds

Submission

Arrowtown Village Association [3/2.2] requests that the mature trees next to the Greek Fir (ref 269) in the grounds of the Old Manse on Manse Road be added to the Inventory of Protected Trees. The trees are of significant value to the community and having them registered will enhance their future survival.

Philip Scott [3/2.2.1] submits that the description is not specific and that the trees need to be named.

Consideration

The trees within the Manse Road property have been assessed by approved arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

As a result of the assessment, he noted that much of the vegetation consists of semi mature trees, as well as a large Cedar and two Redwoods. He concluded that the minor vegetation would not fit the profile of protection of the District Plan. However, the Cedar and Redwoods were worth evaluating.

The STEM assessment of the Cedar concluded that although it is a mature tree of some size it has suffered badly in the past, resulting in severe dieback and is not in a condition that would warrant inclusion the District Plan.

The STEM assessment of the Redwoods concluded that both were magnificent trees in their own right, with one scoring 162 and the other scoring 180. These are considered relatively high scores in comparison to other trees within the District. The trees scored highly based on their form, vigour and vitality, age and stature.

As a result, Mr Glenn recommends that the two Redwoods be protected under the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Arrowtown Village Association** [3/2.2] is accepted and that the further submission of **Philip Scott** [3/2.2.1] is rejected.

And that the following amendments be made to the District Plan

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
2 Arrowtown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Arrowtown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>277</u>	<u>27</u>	Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) (2), "The Old Manse", 51 Manse Road	<u>LOT 1-4 DP 342248</u>	<u>2918410007-10</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Assessment under the STEM evaluation identified that the two Redwoods warrant protection under the District Plan.

5.2.3 Trees, 5 Huff Street

Submission

Karen Boulay [3/5.1] submits that the trees located at 5 Huff Street be added to the Inventory of Protected Features. The lower part of the property contains at least 30, mostly native, trees of about 30 years of age. A former Principal of the High School planted these trees with help from the science teacher.

Karen Boulay [3/5.1.1] supports her original submission, stating that central Queenstown is devoid of large stands of native trees. Because these trees are mainly native, they attract many native birds to feed and visit regularly. The sound of these birds is important and should not be lost to central Queenstown.

Consideration

The submission of Karen Boulay is considered to be rather broad and does not provide any detail as to exactly which trees in this location should be included in the District Plan.

Arborist David Glenn attempted to assess the trees identified by the submitter and concluded that the trees are mostly minor trees of a native variety that are not significant enough to be included in the District Plan at this stage (refer to Attachment 4).

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be accurately assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time for the trees to mature and time to accurately identify and research the proposed inclusion.

Further to Mr Glenn's assessment, the Panel notes concern in the assessment of groups of trees and young trees under the STEM evaluation method. It considers that the STEM is more appropriate for individual trees and mature trees. However, the Panel notes that groups of trees may have characteristics that the individual tree may not.

On further consideration, the Panel considers that while the Objective for trees under Part 13 of the District Plan is appropriate, it does not consider that the Implementation Method is appropriate, with the Objective recognising heritage and amenity values and the Implementation Method only recognising heritage values. The Panel therefore recommends that the Council direct some attention to the Implementation Methods for trees so that both heritage and amenity trees can be considered and implemented.

Decision

That the submission of **Karen Boulay** [3/5.1] and further submission of **Karen Boulay** [3/5.1.1] are rejected.

Reason

Not enough information has been provided in the submission to enable the proposed trees to be assessed accurately. In addition the trees at this stage are considered too young for inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.4 Wellingtonias, Boyd Road

Submission

Jo Boyd [3/6.1] seeks to add the avenue of Wellingtonias on Boyd Road to the Inventory of Protected Features so that they will be enjoyed by generations to come. The trees were planted in 1986, and are potentially important heritage trees being very long lived. They should be considered because of their iconic value and the link they have with the area's heritage. The trees are in very good condition and at maturity they will be visible for many kilometres.

Jo Boyd [3/6.1.1] submitted in support of her original submission, stating that although the trees are only semi mature they will become landmarks in time and wishes that they be protected so that they can achieve this, knowing that they can live to 300 years of age and are one of the largest tree species in the world. The trees are situated on either side of Boyd Rd and are situated on Council roadside and not the submitter's property.

Gordon Bailey [3/6.1.2] submitted that he agrees with the outcomes of the arborist's assessment.

Consideration

The Wellingtonia trees identified in the submission by Jo Boyd were considered in the preparation of this Plan Change as Ref 18.

The trees were assessed in accordance with the STEM evaluation method as part of the preparation of the Plan Change and scored a total of 96 under this assessment. This score was considered to be low and as a result the trees were not included in the Plan Change.

Further to receiving Jo Boyd's submission the trees have been re-assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4). In this assessment, the trees also scored 96. Mr Glenn concludes that the trees are semi-mature (young) and therefore recommends that they be reassessed at a later date.

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be re-assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time for the trees to mature.

In the mean-time, the Panel notes that as the trees are located on Council land (road reserve) they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

The Panel also makes reference to the discussion under 5.2.3 above with regards to the assessment of groups of trees and young trees under the STEM evaluation method and its subsequent recommendation to the Council.

Decision

That the submission of **Jo Boyd** [3/6.1] and further submission of **Jo Boyd** [3/6.1.1] are rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/6.1.2] is accepted.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the trees did not score highly enough to warrant protection.

5.2.5 Major Trees around Wanaka Lake Edge and in Eely Point Area

Submission

Gordon Christie [3/12.1] and [3/12.3] submits that the list of trees to be protected in Wanaka is very minimal. If all trees within Council land or reserves are not protected then there are many trees that should be covered in this review, including all the major trees around the Wanaka lake edge and in the Eely Point area. These trees are iconic to Wanaka, particularly in autumn.

Gordon Bailey [3/12.1.1] and [3/12.3.1] opposes the submissions of Gordon Christie stating that it would be impossible to do. Further, it is a Council reserve so the trees are subject to QLDC District Tree Policy protection.

Consideration

The submissions by the Gordon Christie are very broad and do not provide any detail as to exactly which trees in the identified areas should be included in the District Plan.

As a result, arborist David Glenn was unable to assess the trees. Without assessment, it cannot be determined whether the trees warrant protection or not.

Further to this, the Panel notes that while the Plan Change only included the addition of four trees in the Wanaka area, there are roughly between 50 to 60 trees in the Wanaka area already protected under the District Plan. This includes a number of trees on the Wanaka foreshore including Wellingtonias and Swamp Cypress trees.

In addition, it was noted that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Christie** [3/12.1] and [3/12.3] is rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/12.1.1] and [3/12.3.1] is accepted.

Reason

Not enough information has been provided in the submissions to enable the proposed trees to be assessed accurately. Without assessment it cannot be determined whether the trees warrant protection or not.

5.2.6 Poplars opposite Wanaka Showgrounds around to Edgewater

Submission

Gordon Christie [3/12.2] submits that the list of trees to be protected in Wanaka is very minimal. If all trees within Council land or reserves are not protected then there are many trees that should be covered in this review, including the poplars opposite the Wanaka showground and around to the Edgewater. These trees are iconic to Wanaka, particularly in autumn.

Gordon Bailey [3/12.2.1] opposes the submission of Gordon Christie stating that it is a Council reserve so the trees are subject to QLDC District Tree Policy protection.

Consideration

The submission by Gordon Christie is very broad and includes poplars trees of a variety of ages and condition.

Arborist David Glenn attempted to assess these trees and concluded that he could not identify any particular tree that warranted inclusion in the District Plan (refer to Attachment 4).

Further to this, the Panel notes that while the Plan Change only included the addition of four trees in the Wanaka area, there are roughly between 50 to 60 trees already protected in the Wanaka area.

In addition, it was noted that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Christie** [3/12.2] is rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/12.2.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the trees could not identify any particular tree that warranted protection.

5.2.7 Poplars and Blue Gums above Stoney Creek Subdivision

Submission

Gordon Christie [3/12.6] submits that there are many other trees which enhance the landscape. Seeks that the Poplars and Blue Gums in the paddocks above the Stoney Creek subdivision be considered as part of the natural landscape and be protected in the event of any future subdivision.

Consideration

The submission by Gordon Christie lacks detail as to the exact location and number of the proposed trees.

Arborist David Glenn attempted to assess these trees and concluded that the trees located in the paddock behind the Stoney Creek subdivision are all over mature and he consequently does not recommend inclusion of these trees in the District Plan (refer to Attachment 4).

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Christie** [3/12.6] is rejected.

Reason

The submission lacks detail as to the exact location of the trees. However, an assessment concluded that the trees located in the paddock behind the Stoney Creek subdivision are all over mature and do not warrant inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.8 Trees on Lake Front near 885 Frankton Road

Submission

P A & W A Cody Family Trust [3/14.1] seeks that the trees identified in the aerial photo attached to submission (on the lake front near submitter's property at 885 Frankton Road) be protected under the Plan Change. These trees protect the beach area from prevailing westerly wind; the beach area is one of few beach areas on Frankton Arm and is used by families and tourists; the trees screen the residents to the east from the marina; the trees provide considerable practical and restorative purposes; the special environment created by these trees has huge personal, family and public benefit.

Wensley Developments Ltd [3/14.1.1] *opposes the submission of P A & W A Cody Family Trust, as it is understood the trees in question are located on foreshore reserve. If that is the case, they are under the control of the Council and any proposal affecting them would require consideration by the Council, which would involve consideration of the matters raised in the submission. If any of the trees referred to are on privately owned land, heritage protection is inappropriate and unwarranted. There is no justification for protecting just this group of trees on the Frankton foreshore in isolation from other trees on the Frankton foreshore.*

Sarah & Tom Flynn [3/14.1.2] *support the submission, stating that although the trees are on Council land the area and the surrounding trees should be recognised and protected for future generations. The trees are of great importance because of the benefit of shelter from*

wind, erosion to the foreshore, marine life and water ecosystems. The future development planned in the area could easily compromise this area with removal of trees and landscaping as in other areas of Frankton.

Matthew Cody [3/14.1.3] submits that the trees in question provide significant shelter from the prevailing winds for children, families and over 120,000 annual users of the Frankton Track. The trees provide significant erosion protection and contribute to the preservation of the beach and foreshore from the constant wave lapping motion.

Gordon Bailey [3/14.1.4] submits that he agrees with the outcomes of the arborist's assessment.

Consideration

The submission of the Cody Family Trust lacks detail as to exactly which trees in this location should be included in the District Plan.

Arborist David Glenn however attempted to assess these trees and concluded that they are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan due to their poor condition and lack of maturity (refer to Attachment 4).

The Panel notes however, that, as the trees are located on Council land, they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **P A & W A Cody Family Trust** [3/14.1] and further submissions of **Sarah & Tom Flynn** [3/14.1.2] and **Matthew Cody** [3/14.1.3] are rejected and that the further submissions of **Wensley Developments Ltd** [3/14.1.1] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/14.1.4] are accepted.

Reason

An assessment concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan due to their poor condition and lack of maturity.

5.2.9 Smoke Trees along Frankton Road

Submission

Katie Deans [3/18.5] submits that the Smoke trees along Frankton road be protected.

Gordon Bailey [3/18.5.1] opposes the submission, stating that he agrees with the outcomes of the arborist's assessment and that the trees will be subject to QLDC District Tree Policy protection.

Consideration

The submission of Katie Deans is considered to be rather broad and does not provide any detail as to the exact location of these trees on Frankton Road.

Arborist David Glenn attempted to assess the trees identified by the submitter and concluded that they do not warrant inclusion in the District Plan (refer to Attachment 4). Mr Glenn considers the trees to be more shrubbery than tree and although they are useful vegetation for screening they do not warrant protection under the District Plan.

However, the Panel notes that, as the trees are located on Council land (road reserve), they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Katie Deans** [3/18.5] is rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/18.5.1] is accepted.

Reason

An assessment concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.10 Chestnut Tree, 93 Thompson Street

Submission

Sharon Duncan [3/20.2] seeks the protection of the Chestnut Tree at 93 Thompson Street as it is over 130 years old. Longevity in Queenstown is to be protected as it is so rare.

Consideration

The tree identified by Sharon Duncan has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Chestnut tree scored 138. In particular, the tree scored highly for its vigour, vitality and age, and due to the lack of other trees in close proximity, drawing greater attention to it. The Chestnut was also identified as having good form and being a species of infrequent occurrence.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn has recommended that the tree be protected under the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Sharon Duncan** [3/20.2] is accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>239</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>Sweet Chestnut tree (Castanea sativa), 93 Thompson Street, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 43 DP 7926</u>	<u>2910664600</u>

And that the planning maps be amended accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Chestnut tree scored well and has therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.11 Trees on QLDC Reserve next to 297 Dublin Bay Road

Submission

Neil Farrin [3/21.1] submits that the trees on the QLDC reserve next to 297 Dublin Bay Road be considered for heritage status. The trees were planted by the original owners of the house in 1950.

Gordon Bailey [3/21.1.1] opposes the submission.

Consideration

Arborist David Glenn carried out an assessment of trees contained within the Dublin Bay reserve and concluded that they do not warrant inclusion in the District Plan and would not evaluate well under the STEM method.

However, the Panel notes that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Neil Farrin** [3/21.1] is rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/21.1.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the trees in the identified reserve concluded that the trees do not warrant protection under the District Plan.

5.2.12 Gum Trees, adjacent to Sherwood Manor Hotel, Frankton Road

Submission

David Finlin [3/22.1] submits that the two gum trees on Frankton Road, adjacent to the Sherwood Manor Hotel, are worthy of inclusion in the Plan Change.

Russell Lund [3/22.1.1] opposes the submission, stating that the site will be redeveloped. It is zoned for visitor accommodation and the trees are right in the view path of the proposed units. The existing visitor accommodation units are directly below the tree canopy and would sustain serious damage if the trees were felled/toppled in a storm.

Consideration

The trees identified by David Finlin have been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, both of the two Eucalyptus trees scored highly, with one scoring 168 and the other scoring 174. In particular, the trees scored highly based on their form, function, age, stature, role in the setting and due to the lack of other trees in close proximity, drawing greater attention to the two gums. The higher scoring tree of the two also scored highly for its vigour and vitality.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn has recommended that the trees be protected under the District Plan.

Based on the outcomes of this assessment, the Panel considers that the trees should be included in the District Plan.

Under Rule 13.2.3.2(ii) of the District Plan any work involving a tree or group of trees listed in Appendix 3 of the District Plan as heritage trees will be a Discretionary Activity. Work under this Rule includes the removal of any protected tree; significant trimming of any protected tree; the construction of any building or laying of overhead or underground services within 5m of the base of any protected tree; or any works, including paving, within the drip line of any protected tree. This is considered appropriate given the significance of the trees.

Decision

That the submission of **David Finlin** [3/22.1] is accepted and that the further submission of **Russell Lund** [3/22.1.1] is rejected.

And that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>240</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>Eucalyptus gunnii trees (2), adjacent to the Sherwood Manor Hotel, Frankton Road, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 10 DP 19906, Section 1 SO 22048, Part Lot 45 DP 19559</u>	<u>2910311500</u> <u>2910311601</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the two Eucalyptus trees scored highly and have therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.13 Snow Gum, Glenorchy Road, Bobs Cove

Submission

David Finlin [3/22.2] submits that the Snow Gum on Glenorchy Road, opposite the entrance to Pat & Sue Farry (Punatapu), Bobs Cove, is worthy of inclusion in the Plan Change.

Consideration

The Snow Gum tree identified in the submission of David Finlin was considered in the preparation of this Plan Change as Ref 35.

The tree was assessed in accordance with the STEM evaluation method, as part of the preparation of the Plan Change and scored a total of 138 under this assessment. In addition to the assessment, consultation was undertaken with the landowner who was opposed to the inclusion of this tree in the District Plan. Based on a relatively average STEM score and the opposition from the landowner the tree was not included in the Plan Change.

Further to receiving David Finlin's submission the gum tree has been re-assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4). In this assessment, the tree scored 150. In particular, the tree was identified as having very good form, good vigour and vitality, having an important role in its setting and being a species of rare occurrence. It also scored highly for its stature and age. As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the tree is spectacular and recommends its inclusion in the District Plan.

Mr Glenn further recommends in his report on the Plan Change submissions that a trigger of 120 (STEM score) or greater should be considered for determining inclusion in the District Plan.

Based on this re-assessment, which has identified that the tree has higher values than initially identified, the Panel considers that this tree should be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **David Finlin** [3/22.2] is accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>241</u>	<u>38</u>	Snow Gum (<i>Eucalyptus pauciflora</i>), Glenorchy Road, Bob's Cove	<u>Lot 6 DP 313833</u>	<u>2907307902</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

The re-assessment of the tree under the STEM evaluation method identified that the tree warrants protection under the District Plan.

5.2.14 Horse Chestnut, Driveway to Sutherland Farm, Gorge Road

Submission

David Finlin [3/22.3] submits that the Horse Chestnut, along the driveway to the Sutherland Farm on Gorge Road, is worthy of inclusion in the Plan Change.

Consideration

The tree identified by David Finlin has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the tree scored 120, which is the trigger David Glenn recommends for determining whether trees should be included in the District Plan or not, with a score of 120 or over suggesting a tree is worthy of inclusion.

While the Chestnut scored highly in this assessment for its age, it was identified as only having good form, stature, vigour and vitality, being a common occurrence for its species and playing a moderate role in its setting.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn recommended that although the STEM score of the Horse Chestnut was 120, the tree does not have the characteristics that would support it being included in the District Plan.

In considering the assessment, the Hearings Panel however concludes that as the tree scored the identified STEM trigger, it has been identified that the tree is worthy of protection under the District Plan. As a result, the Panel considers that tree should be protected.

Decision

That the submission of **David Finlin** [3/22.3] is accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>247</u>	<u>31</u>	Horse Chestnut (<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>), Gorge Road	Pt Sec 6 Blk XX Shotover SD	<u>2910723200</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

The STEM score of 120 identified that the Horse Chestnut tree warrants protection under the District Plan.

5.2.15 Oak Trees, 148 Kingston Road

Submission

David Finlin [3/22.4] submits that the Oak trees in farmland by the old white stone cottage, on the State Highway between Kelvin Heights turnoff and Boyd Road, are worthy of inclusion in the Plan Change.

Justin Reid [3/22.4.1] *opposes the submission stating that the item does not pertain to the property of 148 Kingston Road and should not be included in any plan change.*

Consideration

The Oak trees identified by David Finlin in his submission have been assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4).

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that these Oak trees are quite unremarkable and would not appear to score very well under a STEM evaluation. Mr Glenn therefore recommends that these trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **David Finlin** [3/22.4] is rejected and that the submission of **Justin Reid** [3/22.4.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Oak trees at 148 Kingston Road concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.16 Eucalypt Tree, Council Reserve, Panorama Terrace

Submission

Chiga Fukuda [3/24.1] and **Dorothea Ramsay** [3/60.1] request that the two Eucalypt trees located on the Council reserve on Panorama Terrace be added to the Inventory of Protected Features. The trees are used by birds and for wild weather protection.

Gordon Bailey [3/24.1.1] and [3/60.1.1] submits that most of the trees have now been cut down.

Consideration

The trees identified by the submitters have been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, both of the two Eucalyptus trees scored lowly, with one scoring 108 and the other scoring 102. In particular, the trees were identified as only having a good form, moderate to low stature, a moderate role in their setting and only having some vigour and vitality. They are thought to be of an average age and are a common occurrence for their species.

In addition to this assessment, Mr Glenn noted that the trees are located on extremely steep land and are likely to require work in the future. As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn has recommended that the trees are not suitable for inclusion in the District Plan.

Further, the Panel notes that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submissions of **Chiga Fukuda** [3/24.1] and **Dorothea Ramsay** [3/60.1] are rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/24.1.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Oak Trees in the Panorama Terrace reserve concluded that inclusion of these trees in the District Plan is not appropriate.

5.2.17 Oak Trees, Mrs Lynley Hansen Property, Frankton

Submission

Jackie Gillies [3/26.2] seeks inclusion of six oak trees on the property of Mrs Lynley Hansen, located adjacent to the Woolshed on Hansen Road in Frankton, within the list of protected trees. The oak trees are unusual in being planted in a group and because of their size and therefore their age. They have heritage value in being planted by the Hansen family adjacent to their original pre 1900 homestead.

Lynley Hansen [3/26.2.1] supports the inclusion of the Oak trees in the District Plan, however opposes any public access to view the trees as they are on private property and are in the vicinity of the submitter's home.

Consideration

The Oak trees identified by the Jackie Gillies have been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the six Oak trees were assessed as a group and scored a total of 156. In particular the trees were identified as having very good form, vigour and vitality. They also scored highly based on their age and were recognised for playing an important role in their setting.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the trees are in excellent condition and recommends that they be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Jackie Gillies** [3/26.2] and further submission of **Lynley Hansen** [3/26.2.1] are accepted and that the following amendment be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>242</u>	<u>31</u>	English Oak trees (Quercus robur) (6), Hansen Road, Frankton, located adjacent to the woolshed	Part Lot 2 DP <u>24234</u>	<u>2907148500</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the six Oak trees scored well and have therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.18 Eucalyptus Tree, Lake Hawea Foreshore

Submission

Patsy Lambert-Robinson [3/36.1] submits that a number of large eucalypts on the foreshore of Lake Hawea should be protected and labelled to tell their history. Reasons include: they are part of the history of the community; they are associated with the damming of Lake Hawea; the trees have grown into beautiful specimens; and the eucalyptus has recently been identified as an early native to Central Otago.

Gordon Bailey [3/36.1.1] opposes the submission and submits that it is a weed species in the area.

Consideration

The submission by the Patsy Lambert-Robinson lacks detail as to the exact location and number of the proposed trees.

Arborist David Glenn attempted to assess the Eucalyptus trees, however he could not locate any such trees that warranted inclusion under the District Plan (refer to Attachment 4).

However, the Panel notes that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Patsy Lambert-Robinson** [3/36.1] is rejected and that the further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/36.1.1] is accepted.

Reason

The submission lacks detail as to the exact location and number of the trees. However an assessment concluded that there were no Eucalyptus trees located on the Lake Hawea Foreshore that would warrant protection.

5.2.19 Sequoiadendrum giganteum, Old Bottle House Site

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.2] submits that the Sequoiadendrum giganteum at the site of the old Bottle House be included in the District Plan as a heritage tree.

Consideration

The tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Sequoia tree scored 186, which is considered a particularly high score. In particular, the tree scored highly based on its stature, function, visibility, role in its setting and most importantly its age and the fact that it is a solitary tree. It was also identified as having a good form, being an infrequent occurrence for its species, and having good vigour and vitality.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the tree is very worthy of inclusion in the District Plan. However, he does note that construction within the drip-line of the tree has caused some damage to the trees root system, requiring its health to be monitored in the future.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.2] is accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>244</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendrum giganteum), site of the old Bottle House, now Pounamu Developments, Frankton Road, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 5 DP 351561</u>	<u>2910410104</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the *Sequoiadendrum giganteum* scored highly and has therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.20 *Tilia x europea*, Earnslaw Park

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.3] submits that the *Tilia x europea* at Earnslaw Park be included in the District Plan as a heritage tree.

Gordon Bailey [3/45.3.1] submits that it is worth consideration.

Consideration

The tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Lime tree scored 168. In particular, the tree scored highly based on its function, age, role in its setting and most importantly the fact that it is a solitary tree. It was also identified as having a good form, being an infrequent occurrence for its species, having a moderate stature and having good vigour and vitality.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the tree is located in a very visible CBD green space and recommends that it be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.3] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.3.1] are accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>245</u>	<u>36</u>	Lime tree (<i>Tilia x europea</i>), Earnslaw Park, Queenstown	Sections 6/18, 27 Block XV Queenstown	<u>2910647100</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Lime tree scored highly and has therefore been identified as warranting protection under the District Plan.

5.2.21 Juglans regia, Walnut, St Peters Anglican Church

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.4] submits that the *Juglans regia*, Walnut at St Peters Anglican Church be included in the District Plan as a heritage tree.

Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board [3/45.4.1] *opposes the submission and requests that it not be accepted. Although the Board recognises and values the amenity of the site, it is considered that the protection of the tree is not justified. The Walnut is in poor condition and is likely to require replacement or significant remedial work in the near future.*

Consideration

The Walnut tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4).

In his assessment, Mr Glenn noted that the tree is in poor condition and has some serious flaws in its crown structure. As a result, he recommends that tree not be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.4] is rejected and that the further submission of ***Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board*** [3/45.4.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Walnut tree concluded that the tree is not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.22 *Ulmus glabra* 'Horizontalis' and *Aesculus hippocastanum* (Horse Chestnut) St Peters Anglican Church

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.5] and [3/45.6] submits that the *Ulmus glabra* 'Horizontalis' and the *Aesculus hippocastanum* (Horse Chestnut) at the St Peters Anglican Church be included in the District Plan as heritage trees.

Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board [3/45.5.1] and [3/45.6.1] opposes the submissions and requests that they not be accepted. Although the Board recognises and values the amenity of the site, it is considered that the protection of the trees is not justified. The trees are not of a size or significance to warrant protection at this stage. Although there is no current intention to remove or alter the trees, the addition of the trees to the Inventory would represent an unwarranted restriction on the parish's ongoing ability to manage the amenity of the site.

Consideration

The Horizontal Elm and Horse Chestnut trees identified by Gordon Bailey have been assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4).

In his assessment Mr Glenn concludes that the trees are small and have not reached a stature that would warrant their inclusion in the District Plan.

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be re-assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time for the trees to mature.

The Panel also makes reference to the discussion under 5.2.3 above with regards to the assessment of groups of trees and young trees under the STEM evaluation method and its subsequent recommendation to the Council.

Decision

That the submissions of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.5] and [3/45.6] are rejected and that the further submissions of **Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board** [3/45.5.1] and [3/45.6.1] are accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Elm and Chestnut trees concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.23 *Pyrus Communis*, Common Pear, Wanaka Station Park

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.7] submits that the nine *Pyrus Communis*, common Pear, at Wanaka Station Park be included in the District Plan as heritage trees.

Gordon Bailey on behalf of the QLDC [3/45.7.1] supports his original submission, however notes that some are in poor health.

Consideration

The nine Pear trees identified by Gordon Bailey have been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Pear trees were assessed as a group and only scored a total of 98. This is considered a very low score and reflects their moderate form, low stature, minor role and common occurrence as a species.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that although these trees are useful in their role in Wanaka Station Park reserve, they are not significant enough to warrant inclusion in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.7] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.7.1] are rejected.

Reason

Assessment of the Pear trees concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.24 *Pyrus Communis* (Pear), *Pyrus Sp.* (Eating Plum), *Ficus Sp.* (Fig) and *Aesculus hippocastanum*, Reserve Gorge Road/Stanley Street

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/45.8], [3/45.9] [3/45.10] and [3/45.11] submits that the *Pyrus Communis* (Pear), two *Pyrus Sp.* (Eating Plum), *Ficus Sp.* (Fig) and *Aesculus hippocastanum* at the reserve on the corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street be included in the District Plan as heritage trees.

Ken Gousmett [3/45.8.1] and [3/45.11.1] submits additional information with respect to the submission of Gordon Bailey to avoid a possible conflict between the Heritage Tree Register and The Remarkables Centre project. The reserve on the corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street adjoins the site of the proposed Remarkables Centre. The likely need for vehicle access across this reserve has been identified. The Council has resolved to complete the site master plan and building concept designs for The Remarkables Centre and this work is in progress. Until this is complete and any necessary access points defined, it would be preferable not to include the existing tree as a heritage item.

Gordon Bailey [3/45.8.2], [3/45.9.1], [3/45.10.1] and [3/45.11.2] opposes his original submission, stating that some of the trees have been cut down.

Consideration

The Pear, two Plum, Fig and Aesculus hippocastanum trees identified by Gordon Bailey have been assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4).

In his assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the trees are small and semi-mature. He recommends that they would be better protected by the type of reserve they are growing within and does not consider they warrant inclusion in the District Plan.

The Panel notes that as the trees are located on Council land they will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submissions of **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.8], [3/45.9], [3/45.10] and [3/45.11] are rejected and the further submissions of **Ken Gousmett** [3/45.8.1] and [3/45.11.1] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/45.8.2], [3/45.9.1], [3/45.10.1] and [3/45.11.2] are accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Pear, Plum, Fig and Aesculus hippocastanum trees concluded that the trees are not worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

5.2.25 Larix decidua (European larch), Wanaka Station Homestead

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/46.2] seeks amendment of the heritage tree list in the District Plan to ensure accurate information is shown and submits that the Larix decidua, European larch, at Wanaka Station Homestead be included in the District Plan.

Gordon Bailey [3/46.2.1] supports his original submission and states that a STEM assessment is required.

Consideration

The European larch tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Larch tree scored 120. In particular, the tree scored highly for its age and was identified as having a good form, good vigour and vitality an important function and an important role in its setting.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the European larch is a good tree and is worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.2] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.2.1] are accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
4 Wanaka and Environs
Heritage Trees – Wanaka

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
626	22	European larch (<i>Larix deciduas</i>), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka	Lot 8 DP 27278 Lot 14 DP 26147 Lot 9 DP 27278	2905401503 2905401400 2905401500

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Larch tree scored well enough to warrant protection under the District Plan.

5.2.26 Larix kaemferi (Japanese larch), Wanaka Station Homestead

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/46.3] seeks amendment of the heritage tree list in the District Plan to ensure accurate information is shown and submits that the *Larix kaemferi*, Japanese larch, at Wanaka Station Homestead be included in the District Plan.

Gordon Bailey [3/46.3.1] supports his original submission and states that a STEM assessment is required.

Consideration

The Japanese larch tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the Larch tree scored 132. In particular, the tree scored highly for its age and rare occurrence as a species. It was also identified as having a good form, vigour and vitality, an important function and an important role in its setting.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the Japanese larch is an unusual tree and is worthy of inclusion in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.3] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.3.1] are accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
4 Wanaka and Environs
Heritage Trees – Wanaka

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
627	22	Japanese larch (<i>Larix kaemferi</i>), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka	Lot 8 DP 27278 Lot 14 DP 26147 Lot 9 DP 27278	2905401503 2905401400 2905401500

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Larch tree scored well and therefore warrants protection under the District Plan.

5.2.27 *Cedrus atlantica glauca* (Atlantic cedar blue), Wanaka Station Homestead

Submission

Gordon Bailey [3/46.4] seeks amendment of the heritage tree list in the District Plan to ensure accurate information is shown and submits that the *Cedrus atlantica glauca* at Wanaka Station Homestead be included in the District Plan.

Gordon Bailey [3/46.4.1] supports his original submission and states that a STEM assessment is required.

Consideration

The Atlantic cedar blue tree identified by Gordon Bailey has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the tree scored 174, which is considered a relatively high score. In particular, the tree scored highly for its function, visibility and role in its setting and most importantly for its age and stature. It was also identified as having a good form, vigour and vitality and having an infrequent occurrence as a species.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the Atlantic cedar blue tree is a significant tree within the reserve and should be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.4] and further submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/46.4.1] are accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
4 Wanaka and Environs
Heritage Trees – Wanaka

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>628</u>	<u>22</u>	Atlantic cedar blue (<i>Cedrus atlantica glauca</i>), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka	<u>Lot 8 DP 27278</u> <u>Lot 14 DP 26147</u> <u>Lot 9 DP 27278</u>	<u>2905401503</u> <u>2905401400</u> <u>2905401500</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Cedar tree scored highly and therefore warrants protection under the District Plan.

5.2.28 Gum Tree, Wanaka cemetery

Submission

Duncan Field [3/51.1] submits that the Gum tree in the Wanaka Cemetery be included in the Plan Change.

Gordon Bailey on behalf of the Wanaka Cemetery Trustees [3/51.1.1] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/51.1.2] submits that the tree was removed in 2005.

Consideration

The Gum tree identified in the submissions of Duncan Field has been removed, hence protection is no longer appropriate or necessary.

Decision

That the submission of **Duncan Field** [3/51.1] is rejected and that the further submissions of **Gordon Bailey on behalf of the Wanaka Cemetery Trustees** [3/51.1.1] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/51.1.2] are accepted.

Reason

The Gum tree has been removed.

5.2.29 Liriodendron, Capell Ave/Skinner Cres, Lake Hawea

Submission

Duncan Field [3/51.2] and **Keith & Brenda Taylor** [3/63.1] submit that the Liriodendron at Lake Hawea, on the corner of Capell Avenue and Skinner Crescent, be included in the Plan Change. The tree was planted about 50 years ago; is about 10m high; has a wide canopy; has striking autumn foliage; and took 19 years to flower.

Consideration

The Liriodendron tree identified by the submitters has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the tree only scored 78. This is considered a very low score and reflects its moderate vigour and vitality, minor function, low stature, minor role in its setting and its common occurrence as a species.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the tree does not warrant inclusion in the District Plan. He however recommends that it be reviewed at a later stage.

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be re-assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time for the tree to mature.

Decision

That the submissions of **Duncan Field** [3/51.2] and **Keith & Brenda Taylor** [3/63.1] are rejected.

Reason

Assessment of the Liriodendron tree concluded that it is not currently worthy of protection under the District Plan.

5.2.30 Tall Red Oak next to Buckingham Green, Arrowtown

Submission

Duncan Field [3/52.1] submits that the tall Red Oak tree next to Buckingham Green in Arrowtown be included in the Plan Change. It is centrally located and enjoyed by all and is the largest of the few mature trees in the main street.

Consideration

The Red Oak tree identified by Duncan Field has been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment the tree scored 114, which is lower than the recommended trigger of 120. In particular, it was recognised for being a solitary tree, therefore drawing attention to it. It was however identified as only having a moderate form, a low stature and being of an average age.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that it is a semi-mature tree that may warrant inclusion in the District Plan at a later date and therefore recommends that it be reviewed at a later stage.

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be re-assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time for the tree to mature.

Decision

That the submission of **Duncan Field** [3/52.1] is rejected.

Reason

Assessment of the Red Oak tree concluded that it is currently not worthy of protection under the District Plan.

5.2.31 Norway Spruce, Courthouse, Queenstown

Submission

Duncan Field [3/52.2] and **Wakatipu Environmental Society** [3/69.1] submit that the Norway Spruce tree next to the Queenstown Courthouse be included in the District Plan.

Consideration

The Norway spruce identified in the submissions of Duncan Field and Wakatipu Environmental Society has been removed, hence protection is no longer appropriate or necessary.

Decision

That the submissions of **Duncan Field** [3/52.2] and **Wakatipu Environmental Society** [3/69.1] are rejected.

Reason

The Norway spruce tree has been removed.

5.2.32 Poplars, Domain Road

Submission

Barry Robertson [3/55.2] seeks inclusion of the Poplars along the Domain Road frontage as protected features.

***Barry Robertson** [3/55.2.1] supports his original submission and the retention of existing trees along the Domain Road boundary of 108 - 112 Domain Road.*

***Gordon Bailey** [3/55.2.2] opposes the submission.*

Consideration

Arborist David Glenn assessed the Poplar trees along Domain Road and concluded that the Poplars are of a variety of maturity, types and condition and that he does not consider any individual tree to be worthy of inclusion in the District Plan (refer to assessment of Tree 43 under Attachment 4).

In considering this submission, the Panel notes Mr Robertson's concerns. However, in applying the STEM analysis there is no basis for including the trees in the Plan Change. The Panel considers that these concerns need to be addressed through some other Council process. The Panel therefore recommends that the Council investigate options for protecting groups of trees, in particular amenity trees (refer to discussion under 5.2.3 above).

Decision

That the submission of **Barry Robertson** [3/55.2] and further submission of **Barry Robertson** [3/55.2.1] are rejected and that the submission of **Gordon Bailey** [3/55.2.2] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the Poplar trees concluded that they are not worthy of protection under the District Plan.

5.2.33 Significant Trees around Lake Edge, Kawarau Falls Lakeside Holiday Park

Submission

Kirsty Sharpe [3/57.1] requests protection of the trees at the Kawarau Falls Lakeside Holiday Park and an assessment of the trees when a proposal for resource consent is lodged. The significant trees around the lake edge of the property are worthy of retention. One of the trees was planted over 20 years ago in memory of Bill Clarke. This tree should stay regardless.

***Peninsula Road Ltd** [3/57.1.1] and [3/57.1.2] opposes the submission of Kirsty Sharpe, in particular the non-specific reference to "significant trees around the lake edge" without identifying which trees are being referred to and why the trees deserve heritage protection. The land on the lake edge of the property is Council foreshore reserve and does not form part of the Kawarau Falls Lakeside Holiday Park. It is possible that the trees being referred to are on Council land, in which case heritage protection is not necessary. If specific trees are going to be protected, those specific trees should be identified, with reasons given justifying heritage protection. Some trees on the site already have the benefit of heritage protection. It may be that those are the trees being referred to.*

Gordon Bailey [3/57.1.3] submits that most of the trees have now been cut down.

Consideration

The submission of Kirsty Sharpe lacks detail as to exactly which trees in this location should be included in the District Plan.

Arborist David Glenn however attempted to assess these trees and concluded that it appears that the significant trees on the site are already protected under the District Plan (refer to Attachment 4).

Currently, three trees on the site are listed in the Inventory of Protected Features, being the Magnolia (Ref 169), Red Horse Chestnut (Ref 170) and Walnut tree (Ref 171).

In addition, the Panel notes that any of the trees which are located on Council land will be managed in accordance with the Council's Tree Policy. This policy was adopted by the Council on 26 May 2006 and specifies those principles, policies and objectives regarding Council's ongoing protection and management of the District's tree resources.

Decision

That the submission of **Kirsty Sharpe** [3/57.1] is rejected and the further submissions of **Peninsula Road Ltd** [3/57.1.1] and [3/57.1.2] and **Gordon Bailey** [3/57.1.3] are accepted.

Reason

Not enough information has been provided in the submission to enable the proposed trees to be assessed accurately. However it appears that the significant trees within the site are already protected under the District Plan.

5.2.34 Walnut Tree at Pinewood Gardens

Submission

Brian & Nelda Thompson [3/66.2] requests that the two Walnut trees at Pinewood Gardens be included in the District Plan. These trees are situated beside the protected Oak tree, are of a similar age and are very old.

***Brian & Nelda Thompson** [3/66.2.1] support their original submission, stating that they were sighted by a QLDC arborist and deemed worthy of being heritage trees.*

Consideration

The Walnut trees identified by Brian & Nelda Thompson have been assessed by arborist David Glenn (refer to Attachment 4).

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that both trees are poor specimens with dieback and inherent crown weakness. Based on this assessment, he recommends that they not be included in the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Brian & Nelda Thompson** [3/66.2] and further submission of **Brian & Nelda Thompson** [3/66.2.1] are rejected.

Reason

Assessment of the Walnut trees concluded that they are not worthy of protection under the District Plan.

5.2.35 Trees at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road

Submission

Mary Hansen [3/76.1] submits that the group of trees at Arranmore Farm (at the end of Grants Road) including Walnuts, Horse Chestnuts, Elms and Black Poplars should be registered. Some are more than 100 years old and were probably planted by the McBride family who were the first farmers on Frankton Flats.

Queenstown Airport Corp Ltd [3/76.1.1] opposes the submission stating that the subject area is within Queenstown Airport land designation. Part of the airport purpose was to develop the subject area for aviation use. The area contains trees which intrude on runway compliance as part of Civil Aviation rules.

Paul Wilson [3/76.1.2] supports the submission, stating that an appropriate level of heritage protection should be established for the trees at Arranmore Farm. Further research is being conducted for the reuse/restoration of the site.

Consideration

The submission of Mary Hansen lacks detail as to exactly which trees should be included in the District Plan in this location.

Arborist David Glenn however attempted to assess these trees and concluded that while they represent a good vegetation cover, individually they are not in particularly good condition (refer to Attachment 4). Mr Glenn recommends the trees be re-assessed at a later stage when more detailed information can be provided.

The Panel therefore recommends that this submission be included in a list of items that at a later date can be accurately assessed for potential inclusion in the District Plan through a separate plan change process (refer to Attachment 5). This would allow time to accurately identify and research the proposed inclusion.

In considering this submission, the Panel notes that as a whole area, including the trees, gardens and buildings, the farm has significant heritage value as a whole context. However, consideration of the features as a whole is outside the scope of the Plan Change. The Panel therefore makes reference to its discussion under 5.1.1 above with respect to its recommendation to the Council to further investigate the matter of precincts under the District Plan.

Reference is also made to the Panel's discussion under 5.1.14 above with regard to the subject property.

Decision

That the submission of **Mary Hansen** [3/76.1] and further submission of **Paul Wilson** [3/76.1.2] are rejected and that the further submission of **Queenstown Airport Corp Ltd** [3/76.1.1] is accepted.

Reason

Assessment of the trees within the Arranmore Farm property concluded that while the trees represent a good vegetation cover, individually they are not in particularly good condition (refer to Attachment 4) and that they should be re-assessed at a later stage when more detailed information can be provided.

5.2.36 Elm Trees, Section 25D Block VII Shotover SD

Submission

Murray & Sandra McClennan [3/79.1] submits the nine Elm trees at the rear of their property (being Section 25D Block VII Shotover SD) for tree protection. The largest tree is approximately 60 feet tall and is visible from the Crown Range lookout. Believe that the trees are of historical significance. The property was first settled in the 1860's. Believe that the oldest tree is approximately 120 years old.

Murray & Sandra McClennan [3/79.1.1] support their original submission.

Consideration

The Elm trees identified by Murray McClennan have been assessed by arborist David Glenn in accordance with the STEM evaluation method (refer to Attachment 4).

In this assessment, the trees were assessed as a group and scored a total of 150. In particular, the trees scored highly due their vigour and vitality, visibility and age. They are also recognised for having a good form, infrequent occurrence as a species and a notable stature.

As a result of this assessment, Mr Glenn concludes that the trees are worthy of protection under the District Plan.

Decision

That the submission of **Murray McClennan & Sandra** [3/79.1] and further submission of **Murray McClennan & Sandra** [3/79.1.1] are accepted and that the following amendments be made to the District Plan:

Appendix 3
Inventory of Protected Features
1 Queenstown and Environs
Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	Valn Ref
<u>246</u>	<u>26</u>	Elm trees (<i>Ulmus procera</i>) (9), <u>196 Hogans Gully Road</u>	<u>Section 25D Block</u> <u>VII Shotover SD</u>	<u>2907129700</u>

And that the planning maps be updated accordingly.

Reason

Under the STEM evaluation, the Elm trees scored well and have therefore been identified as warranting protection.

Attachment 1: Recommended Amendments

(Note for the purpose of these decisions, only the changes recommended by these decisions have been shown here.)

Appendix 3

Inventory of Protected Features

1 QUEENSTOWN AND ENVIRONS

Structures and Features

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>16</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>Boatshed, Slipway and original Old Ticket Office (as identified in the Heritage Register), Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve</u>	<u>Secs 59 & Pt Sec 39 Blk XXI Shotover SD</u>		<u>291033110</u>		<u>2</u>
<u>104</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>The old McChesney bridge abutment remains, located by the one-way bridge by Arthurs Point Hotel, Arthurs Point</u>	<u>Crown Land Block XIX Shotover SD</u>		<u>2907150900</u>		<u>2</u>

Buildings Dwellings

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>62</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>House and sleep out, Paddy Mathias Place, Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point</u>	<u>Section 123 Block XIX, Shotover SD</u>		<u>2910720700</u>		<u>2</u>

Public

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>65</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion, located within the grounds of the Queenstown Gardens</u>	<u>Pt Secs 4-5 & 7 Blk LI Queenstown Town</u>		<u>2910507200</u>		<u>2</u>

Rural

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>105</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>Stone Stable, located on the former Littles farm, Littles Road, Wakatipu Basin</u>	<u>Lot 9 DP 301885</u>		<u>2907108801</u>		<u>3</u>

119	33	McBrides Farm Buildings: consisting of Original Smithy, and Dairy, Barn and Woolshed, 64 Grant Road, Frankton Flats	Dairy <u>and Woolshed</u> : Lot 9 DP 22121 Block I Shotover SD Smithy: Lot 1 DP 27775 Block I Shotover SD Barn: Pt Section 60, Block I Shotover SD	2910210500 2910210000 <u>2910210001</u>	2
-----	----	--	--	---	---

Heritage Trees – Queenstown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref
<u>239</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>Sweet Chestnut tree (Castanea sativa), 93 Thompson Street, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 43 DP 7926</u>		<u>2910664600</u>
<u>240</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>Eucalyptus gunnii trees (2), adjacent to the Sherwood Manor Hotel, Frankton Road, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 10 DP 19906</u> <u>Sec 1 SO 22048. Pt</u> <u>Lot 45 DP 19559</u>		<u>2910311500</u> <u>2910311601</u>
<u>241</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>Snow Gum (Eucalyptus pauciflora), Glenorchy Road, Bob's Cove</u>	<u>Lot 6 DP 313833</u>		<u>2907307902</u>
<u>242</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>English Oak trees (Quercus robur) (6), Hansen Road, Frankton, located adjacent to the woolshed</u>	<u>Part Lot 2DP 24234</u>		<u>2907148500</u>
<u>244</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron giganteum), site of the old Bottle House, now Pounamu Developments, Frankton Road, Queenstown</u>	<u>Lot 5 DP 351561</u>		<u>2910410104</u>
<u>245</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>Lime tree (Tilia x europea), Earnslaw Park, Queenstown</u>	<u>Secs 6/18 27 Blk XV Queenstown</u>		<u>2910647100</u>
<u>246</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>Elm trees (Ulmus procera) (9), 196 Hogans Gully Road</u>	<u>Sec 25D Blk VII Shotover SD</u>		<u>2907129700</u>
<u>247</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>Horse Chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum), Gorge Road</u>	<u>Pt Sec 6 Blk XX Shotover SD</u>		<u>2910723200</u>

2 ARROWTOWN AND ENVIRONS

Heritage Trees – Arrowtown

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref
<u>276</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) (4), Arrowtown Camp Ground cabin area, being located close to cottage 7, cabin 4 and between cabin 4 and the road</u>	<u>Secs 1-6 Blk XXII, Sec 38 Blk VII, Lot 43 DP 12741, Lot 25 DP 12525</u>		<u>2918200100</u>
<u>277</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) (2), "The Old Manse", 51 Manse Road</u>	<u>LOT 1-4 DP 342248</u>		<u>2918410007-10</u>

3 KINGSTON

Structures

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref	NZHPT Cat	QLDC Cat
<u>407</u>	<u>39</u>	The railway from <u>Kingston to Fairlight (up to the QLDC District boundary)</u>	<u>Lot 2 Pt Lot 1 DP 318661; Blk I, V, XII Kingston SD; Secs 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-15, 20, 23 & 24 Blk VI Town of Kingston; Sec 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 25, Pt Sec 3, 5, 9 Sec 1; SO7617; Sect 1-3 SO10898 SO 10760; Run 593.</u>		<u>2913102800</u>		<u>3</u>
<u>408</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>Engines (2) and carriages (4), located in the vicinity of the Kingston railway, including the Kingston Railway Station.</u>	<u>Lot 2 Pt Lot 1 DP 318661; Lot 1 DP 306647; Blk I, V, XII Kingston SD; Secs 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-15, 20, 23 & 24 Blk VI Town of Kingston; Sec 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 25, Pt Sec 3, 5, 9 Sec 1; SO7617; Sect 1-3 SO10898 SO 10760; Run 593; Lot 9DP 306647; Lot 4DP 318631</u>		<u>2913102800</u> <u>2913104205</u> <u>2913109901</u> <u>2913104206</u> <u>2913104209</u> <u>2913104210</u>		<u>1</u>
<u>409</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>Water weir, but not the piping, which supplies the Kingston rail yard water tank, located above the Kingston Wharf approximately 100m from an unnamed stream.</u>	<u>Sec 1 Blk X Pt Sec 8 Blk I Kingston SD Scenic Reserve Balance at 29280-43500</u>		<u>2913101801</u>		<u>2</u>

4 WANAKA AND ENVIRONS

Heritage Trees – Wanaka

Ref No	Map Ref	Description	Legal Desc	NZHPT Ref	Valn Ref
<u>626</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>European larch (Larix deciduas), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka</u>	<u>Lot 8 DP 27278</u> <u>Lot 14 DP 26147</u> <u>Lot 9 DP 27278</u>		<u>2905401503</u> <u>2905401400</u> <u>2905401500</u>
<u>627</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>Japanese larch (Larix kaemferi), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka</u>	<u>Lot 8 DP 27278</u> <u>Lot 14 DP 26147</u> <u>Lot 9 DP 27278</u>		<u>2905401503</u> <u>2905401400</u> <u>2905401500</u>
<u>628</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>Atlantic cedar blue (Cedrus atlantica glauca), Wanaka Station Homestead site, Homestead Close, Wanaka</u>	<u>Lot 8 DP 27278</u> <u>Lot 14 DP 26147</u> <u>Lot 9 DP 27278</u>		<u>2905401503</u> <u>2905401400</u> <u>2905401500</u>

Attachment 2: Additional Items Sought by Submission

The following tables list items which have been sought for inclusion in the Plan Change by way of submission.

Table 1: Additional Features

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Addition Sought
10.3	Jay Cassells	New precinct – area enclosed Brisbane & Park Streets
10.4 & 10.5	Jay Cassells	Boatshed & slipway at Frankton marina
11.10 & 37.10	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	The structures and grounds known as Paddy Mathias Place at Arthurs Point
11.11 & 37.11	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	The Frankton Track
11.15 & 37.15	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	Bowling Club buildings and grounds (in Queenstown Gardens)
11.17 & 37.17	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	Any relics or sites of Chinese settlement on the Arrow River
25.1	Carolyn Gee	The rail between Kingston and Fairlight
25.2	Carolyn Gee	Telephone wire running from Kingston to Half Way Bay
25.5	Carolyn Gee	2 engines, 4 carriages & numerous wagons in Kingston
25.8	Carolyn Gee	Weir and piping supplying water from the hill to the rail water tank [at Kingston]
27.1	John Glover	New Precinct – area immediately adjacent to and occupied by the Kinloch Lodge
29.1	Jill Hamel	Abutments of the bridge over McChesney Creek, Arthurs Point
38.1	Anne Maguire	Stone stable on Lot 9 DP 301885 at Littles Road
54.2	Queenstown Historical Soc	Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road
61.1	Barbara Syme	Pig & Whistle building, Queenstown

Table 2: Additional Trees

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Addition Sought
2.1	Arrowtown Village Ass	Wellingtonias in the Arrowtown Camp Ground cabin area
2.2	Arrowtown Village Ass	Mature trees next to the Greek Fir (ref 269) in Old Manse grounds, 51 Manse Road
5.1	Karen Boulay	Trees at 5 Huff Street
6.1	Jo Boyd	Wellingtonias, Boyd Road
12.1	Gordon Christie	All major trees around the [Wanaka] Lake edge
12.2	Gordon Christie	The poplars opposite the [Wanaka] showground and around to Edgewater
12.3	Gordon Christie	The trees in the Eely point area
12.6	Gordon Christie	The poplars and blue gums in groups in the paddocks above the Stoney Creek Subdivision
14.1	P A & W A Cody Family Trust	Trees on the lake front near 885 Frankton Road
18.5	Katie Deans	Smoke trees along Frankton Rd
20.2	Sharon Duncan	Chestnut Tree at 93 Thompson St
21.1	Neil Farrin	Trees on QLDC reserve next to 297 Dublin Bay Road
22.1	David Finlin	Two gum trees on Frankton road adjacent to the Sherwood Manor Hotel
22.2	David Finlin	Snow Gum, Glenorchy Road, Bobs Cove
22.3	David Finlin	Horse Chestnut, along driveway to the Sutherland Farm on Gorge Road

22.4	David Finlin	Oak trees in farm land by old white stone cottage, SH between Kelvin Heights turnoff and Boyd Road, 148 Kingston Road
24.1 & 60.1	Chiga Fukuda & Dorothea Ramsay	Eucalypt trees on Council reserve (Lot 39 DP 16397) adjacent to Panorama Terrace
26.2	Jackie Gillies	6 Oaks on the property of Mrs Lynley Hansen, adjacent to Hansen Road, Frankton
36.1	Pasty Lambert-Robinson	Eucalyptus Trees on the Lake Hawea foreshore
45.2	Gordon Bailey	Sequoiadendrum giganteum at the site of the old Bottle House
45.3	Gordon Bailey	Tilia x europea at Earnslaw Park
45.4	Gordon Bailey	Juglans regia - Walnut - at St Peters Anglican Church
45.5	Gordon Bailey	Ulmus glabra 'Horizontalis' at the St Peters Anglican Church
45.6	Gordon Bailey	Aesculus hippocastanum - Horse Chestnut at St Peters Anglican Church
45.7	Gordon Bailey	9 Pyrus Communis - common Pear - at Wanaka Station Park
45.8	Gordon Bailey	Pyrus Communis - Pear - at reserve corner Gorge Road / Stanley Street
45.9	Gordon Bailey	2 Pyrus Sp - Eating Plum - at reserve corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street
45.10	Gordon Bailey	Ficus Sp. - Fig - at reserve corner Gorge Road and Stanley Street
45.11	Gordon Bailey	Aesculus hippocastanum at reserve corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street
46.2	Gordon Bailey	Larix decidua (European larch) at Wanaka Station Homestead
46.3	Gordon Bailey	Larix kaemferi (Japanese larch) at Wanaka Station Homestead
46.4	Gordon Bailey	Cedrus atlantica glauca (Atlantic cedar blue) at Wanaka Station Homestead
51.1	Duncan Field	Gum Tree in Wanaka cemetery
51.2 & 63.1	Duncan Field & K & B Taylor	Liriodendron, cnr Capell Ave & Skinner Cres, Lake Hawea
52.1	Duncan Field	Tall red oak next to Buckingham Green, Arrowtown
52.2 & 69.1	Duncan Field and Wakatipu Environmental Society	Norway Spruce, Courthouse, Queenstown
55.2	Barry Robertson	Poplars, Domain Road
57.1	Kirsty Sharpe	Significant trees around lake edge within the Kawarau Falls Lakeside Holiday Park
66.2	B & N Thompson	Walnut Tree at Pinewood Gardens
76.1	Mary Hansen	Tress at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road – walnuts, horse chestnuts, elms, black poplar
79.1	Murray McClennan	Nine Elm trees on submitters property (Section 25D Block VII Shotover SD)

Attachment 3: Features Assessments

**Queenstown Lakes District Council
Heritage Inventory Research and Assessments
For Plan Change 3 (Part II)**

July 2006

Introduction

Natasha Van Hoppe contracted Rebecca Reid of Telltale on 10 July 2006 to undertake additional research and assessments of heritage items that came up in the submissions to the Queenstown Lakes District Council as part of the process for Plan Change No. 3 Heritage (Part 2) during 2005- 2006.

An initial list of 17 heritage sites (Appendix 1) were provided as part of the contact brief to be assessed using the Councils established Criteria for assessment and selection of heritage structures. (Appendix 2). The sites were located in Kingston, Queenstown, Frankton and Arthurs Point – Littles Road.

During the course of the research the heritage item list was reduced to 12 items due to the following reasons (refer Appendix 3 for summary of heritage assessments for Heritage Plan Change 3, July 2006). The former ticket office, Frankton was added to the list during the research phase and this was considered under the Boatshed and slipway entry.

- 1) **The Earnslaw Slip and winch shed at Kelvin Heights.** It was ascertained that this item is already listed on the QLDC See Ref; 3/37 Category 2.
- 2) **Any relics of the Chinese settlement on the Arrow River.** It was decided that the information provided in this submission was too vague and too wide to be able to be accurately assessed at this stage. (note such sites would fall under the archaeological provisions of the HPA 93, and an archaeological survey would be warranted)
- 3) **Telephone wire running from Kingston – Halfway Bay.** This item could not be located in the timeframe and needs to be accessed by boat. It was therefore unable to be assessed at this stage. (Locals have advised that it does still exist from about halfway to Halfway Bay.
- 4) **Stone remains at Allen Stream Kingston.** It was ascertained that this was not in the QLDC boundary.
- 5) **Old Farm buildings on land above the Stoney Creek subdivision, Wanaka.** It was ascertained that these buildings have already been considered by Council at an earlier stage.
- 6) **The two stone huts and remnants of a stone building** on Marcus Taylors property (Lot 2 DP 11834) at Gibbston. (it is thought that these buildings and ruins are those associated with the Gibbston Hotel. These were assessed and already proposed as protected items in the plan change 3 in 2005.)

Heritage Assessment Methodology

Background

Heritage assessment criteria had been previously decided upon by Council and included;

Archaeological Value
Architectural Value
Cultural and Spiritual Value
Historic and Social Value,
Townscape and Context Value
Rarity and Representative Value
Technological Value

Note; Rarity and representative value are two different values and ideally should be separated. In this document however they are grouped and if it is one or the other then this is stated.

An inventory sheet was set up that provides a summary of information and includes a quick reference to the "Heritage Assessment." A box, on the first page of each register entry, includes the above values. The criteria that apply to a particular site are ticked and given a rating from moderate – high. Criteria that are not considered to apply are left un marked.

Method of Analysis

1) The 12 sites worked on had already been identified through the submission process as described above. The sites were assessed against a customised assessment form comprising date of construction, legal description of the land, principal building material, location, use, and condition of the place. Historical background and any known site modifications is included. The template assessment form includes a quick reference heritage assessment box (for consistency this was based on heritage assessments done in July 2005).

2) Assessment criteria developed for this project was applied. (refer appendix 2) Based on the historic research achieved in the timeframe for this project (based on 3 hours per site), the significance of each site was determined.

Some of these assessments would have ideally had some professional architectural or archaeological input but this was not possible given the tight timeframe of the work required. The comments and significance rating applied to each criteria have been solely the work of the contractor

Statement of Significance

The Statement of Significance found on the first page of each of the entries, states exactly why the place is important and provides the reasoning as to why it should or should not be listed on the heritage register. It provides a summary of the historical, social and physical elements of the place that have been assessed as making the place special or not and attempts to put it in context when compared to other heritage places. (where possible) It echoes the assessment criteria headings in the Heritage assessment box that are ticked. These have also been given a rating of moderate to high based on evidence provided in the entry and the contractors own knowledge of the site as compared to other historic sites known in the local regional or national context.

(Note: this grading system was developed by Council and the local heritage working party in 2005).

The system developed had an Overall **Heritage Value** provided and this varies from; **Moderate, Moderate – High, High**. The contractor used the statement of significance as an important guide in evaluating the overall heritage value and then applied the findings to the QLDC ratings of 1,2, or 3 as already developed in the QLDC Partially Operative District Plan (March 2004) Heritage section 13.

A rating of 1 includes “places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance.” In order to score a 1 for this project, the site would have an overall rating of HIGH backed up by strong evidence in the significance statement. It would also usually be of local, regional and national importance to achieve this status but this could also be achieved through it being of significant regional importance backed up by other heritage criteria findings.

A rating of 2 “warrants permanent preservation because of its significance to the district.” In order to score a 2 for this project, the site would have an overall rating of Moderate, or Moderate – High or High. It would be of local and/or regional significance to the district.

A rating of 3 “preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged “A score of 3 for this project has been applied to those items that have an overall rating of Low or Moderate.

I have attempted to provide consistency in providing assessments and QLDC ratings of these 12 heritage sites for this project, however there is an element of subjectivity in any assessment process and differences in opinion when applying these assessment criteria.

While more historical research may reveal new information on some of these sites, the contractor is confident that these heritage assessments, as described in the following report are consistent and appropriate for the recommended protection in the QLDC District Plan.

Disclaimer

Given the short amount of time (approximately 3 hours per site) available to undertake the historical research and assessment of these 12 sites, the information provided does not always provide a thorough history of each site. It is however an attempt to provide an overview of the history and significance of the sites providing direction for further reading or research at a later date.

While local people have been consulted where possible it should be noted that local sources may provide further information on individual sites. Research to this date, in the interests of expediency, has used mainly archival and secondary sources. This has included; the Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown, the National Archives Regional Office, Dunedin the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Dunedin Area office and the Land Information office, Dunedin. In some cases, easily accessible information has been extensive through public sources and others have been limited.

Every endeavor has been made to produce accurate and factual information throughout this project, however there are likely to be some gaps and inconsistencies that could be remedied with further consultation with landowners or knowledgeable locals.

It is hoped that this document will be used as a planning tool as well as an advocacy one to help guide future protection and provide an increase in understanding of the significance of these special places.

Special thanks to the Lakes District Museum staff at Arrowtown for their access to their archives and help with this project.

Rebecca Reid

Telltale
Promoting and Interpreting Our Heritage
31 July 2006

Appendix one

Heritage Plan Change 3 - Features requiring assessment

The following features require assessment as per the criteria (attached) used for the preparation of the Plan Change:

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Submitters Notes
10.4	Jay Cassells	Boatshed & slipway at Frankton marina	
11.10 & 37.10	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	The structures and grounds known as Paddy Mathias Place at Arthur's Point	
11.11	Jay Cassells	The Frankton Track	
11.12 & 37.12	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	The Earnslaw slip and winch shed at Kelvin Heights	
11.15 & 37.15	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	Bowling Club buildings and grounds (in Queenstown Gardens)	
11.17 & 37.17	Jay Cassells & Pam Maclean	Any relics or sites of Chinese settlement on the Arrow River	
12.8	Gordon Christie	The old farm buildings on land above the Stoney Creek subdivision	One of the few old buildings remaining in the near urban environment. Is a significant building, in good repair, and of good natural appearance.
25.1	Carolyn Gee	The rail between Kingston and Fairlight	The last remaining section of the Kingston to Lumsden branch line, completed in July 1878.
25.2	Carolyn Gee	Telephone wire running from Kingston to Half Way Bay	
25.5	Carolyn Gee	2 engines, 4 carriages & numerous wagons in Kingston	
25.8	Carolyn Gee	Weir and piping supplying water from the hill to the rail water tank [at Kingston]	
25.9	Carolyn Gee	Old stone house remains at Allen Stream, just south of Kingston on the Western side of the valley	
29.1	Jill Hamel	Abutments of the old 1875 bridge over McChesney Creek, Arthur's Point	A good example of early development of good roading system for drays and wagon at a very early period in the province.
38.1	Anne Maguire	Stone stable on Lot 9 DP 301885 at Littles Road	
54.2	Queenstown Historical Soc	Features on Arranmore Farm, Grants Road	Stone stables, old woolshed, and old smithy.
61.1	Barbara Syme	Pig & Whistle building, Queenstown	Unique position with the flowing creek and outdoor gardens add character and atmosphere to a town that is becoming impersonal. Need some small areas to remind us of what Queenstown used to be like.
78.1 & 78.2	Andrew Dalziel	The two stone huts and remnants of a stone building on Marcus Taylor's property (Lot 2 DP11834)	Need category 1 protection.

Appendix two

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION OF HERITAGE STRUCTURES

1. Historic and Social Value

- Whether the feature reflects characteristics of national and/or local history.
- With regard to local history, whether the feature represents important social and development patterns of its time, such as settlement history, farming, transport, trade, civic, cultural and social aspects.
- Whether the feature is significant in terms of a notable figure, event, phase or activity.
- The degree of community association or public esteem for the feature.
- Whether the feature has the potential to provide knowledge and assist in public education with regard to Otago and New Zealand History.

2. Cultural and Spiritual Value

- Whether it is of special significance to takata whenua.
- Contribution to the characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, religion or other belief which is held by a particular group or community.

3. Architectural Value

- Whether the building or structure has architectural or artistic value.
- Whether the feature represents a particular era or style of architecture or significant designer.
- Whether the style of the building or structure contributes to the general character of the area.
- The degree to which the feature is intact.
- Whether the building or structure has undergone any alteration, thereby changing the original design.

4. Townscape and Context Value

- Whether the feature plays a role in defining a space or street.
- Whether the feature provides visual interest and amenity.
- Degree of unity in terms of scale, form materials, textures and colour in relation to its setting and/or surrounding buildings.

5. Rarity and Representative Value

- Whether the feature is a unique or exceptional representative of its type either locally or nationally.
- Whether the feature represents a way of life, a technology, a style or a period of time.
- Whether the feature is regarded as a landmark or represents symbolic values.
- Whether the feature is valued as a rarity due to its type, style, distribution and quantity left in existence.

6. Technological Value

- Whether the building has technical value in respect of the structure, nature and use of materials and/or finish.
- Whether the building or structure is representative of a particular technique.

7. Archaeological Value

- Significance in terms of important physical evidence of human activities which through archaeological investigation could provide knowledge of the history of Otago and New Zealand.

Appendix three

Summary of heritage assessments for Heritage Plan Change 3, July 2006

Heritage item	Location	Overall Heritage assessment	QLDC category recommended
Boatshed & slipways & former shipping ticket office	Frankton marina Reserve	Moderate	Category 2 (both buildings)
Arranmore farm buildings	Grant Road, Frankton	Moderate – Hgh	Category 2
Frankton Walking track	Frankton	Low	No category recommended
Paddy Mathias buildings and grounds	Arthurs Point	Moderate- High	Category 2
Old McChesney Bridge abutements	Arthurs Point	Moderate	Category 2
Littles stone stables	Littles Road	Moderate – High	Category 2
Bowling Club Buildings & grounds	Queenstown Gardens	Moderate – High	Category 2
Pig and Whistle building	Ballarat street , Queenstown	Low	No category recommended
Kingston – Fairlight railway	Kingston	High	Category 1 (note; only part of the rail occurs within the QLDC boundary)
Two engines, carriages and numerous wagons	Kingston	Engines and carriages =High Wagons = moderate	Engines/carriages, Category 1 Wagons; category 2
Water weir, reservoir and piping	Kingston	Moderate	Category 2

NAME (including former names)

Boatshed and slipway, and cottage (part former ticket office)

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
<p>Archaeological Value</p> <p>✓ Architectural Value Moderate</p> <p>Cultural/Spiritual Value</p> <p>✓ Historical/Social Value High</p> <p>✓ Townscape/context Value Moderate</p> <p>✓ Rarity/Representative Value High representative value</p> <p>Technological Value</p> <p>OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate</p>	<p>Boatshed and slipway circa 1934.</p> <p>Ticket office; original built 1869, but shifted and reconstructed in 1936.</p>
	<p>ARCHITECT/BUILDER</p> <p>MATERIALS Boatshed, timber frame with corrugated iron cladding. Ticket office; weather board and ply cladding later.</p>
	<p>LOCAL AUTHORITY LISTINGS QLDC</p> <p>Local Authority rating recommended Category 2 (both buildings)</p>
	<p>LEGAL DESCRIPTION</p> <p>TYPE/USE Boat building and repairs Accommodation (ticket office)</p>
	<p>CURRENT OWNERS</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITION Average</p>

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

These two buildings by the lake at the Frankton marina together, represent a link with Wakatipu's maritime past. The remnant ticket office (although relocated) is the oldest building remaining to have had a close functional relationship to the early shipping services on the lake. It therefore has rarity value, there being no other buildings of this era in the Queenstown – Frankton Bay.

The boatshed and slipways represent the days when leisure craft were a prominent feature on the water during the 1930s – 50s era. Its industrial style of architecture, (still largely in tact) reflects its function as a storage shed and later boat building and maintenance site. The fact that the building is still used for the purpose it was designed, provides an important continuity of use from past to present. (QLDC plans to upgrade the present marina and the incorporation of a restored boatshed, ticket office and slipway still servicing wooden boats would provide an excellent connection to past uses.)

While the ticket office has been added onto and altered somewhat to be used as accommodation for boaties beside the slipway, it is considered to have retained enough of its original fabric to warrant protection and enable full restoration should this be desired. It has the potential to represent a tangible reminder of the importance of shipping on the lake in an era when road transport was at its infancy.

The two buildings sit in context in the landscape, with their direct relationship to the lake and the recreational pursuits that were carried out from here through the different eras.

DESCRIPTION

Boatshed and slipway building

The boatshed is an asymmetrical gable ended wood frame structure clad with corrugated iron. It has a lean – to on the north gable end. It is thought that some of the walls have been re-clad in the past 35 years. The roof appears to be mostly original now rusting corrugated iron with two original cowl ventilators in place. There is a large door opening with the top panel hinged flap in existence.¹ Inside there is half a wooden floor (1.5 metres above the beach level.) for working and storage. There appears to be one workable slipway of rails entering the shed with evidence of another slipway beside not in working order.

Cottage (part former Ticket Office)

This building consists of a single gabled form (part of original Queenstown shipping office) on the south west end pierced with a six light astragalled double-hung window. There is a two storey addition facing the lake front. This later addition has a verandah at the south end and a set of 6 narrow windows to the lake.

HISTORY

The boatshed and slipway and former ticket office are sited on former New Zealand Railways Department land adjoining the former Frankton steamer wharf. (there is no sign left of this wharf) This wharf built in 1878 by the Wakatipu Steam Shipping Company, was once of immense importance to the district, handling all the cargo such as timber, mining equipment, wool and bagged grain in and out of the district.² Frankton had been a shipping port since the earliest days of the gold rush in the early 1860s when a number of early sailing vessels were plying the lake. Prior to the Frankton wharf, these boats berthed at jetties one of which appears to be close to or on the site of the exiting boatshed and former ticket office.³

With the absence of good road networks for some time between Frankton and Queenstown and Kingston and Queenstown, the Frankton shipping services continued to be a vital link in the freight, mail and passenger communication systems. The lake steamers were particularly important up until the opening of the lake road (from Kingston) in 1936. The New Zealand Railways Department had purchased the steamer services and assets from the Lake Wakatipu Steam Ship company in 1902.⁴ With the consequent fall off in demand for steamer freight due to improved road access into the area in the late 1930s, the Railways Department closed the Frankton wharf in 1941.⁵

Boatshed and slipways

According to the Neil Clayton report, the existing boatshed was constructed by a Queenstown builder. The land is reported to have been leased from the Railways Department about 1934-35 to the late Mr Frederick George Duncan, lawyer of Dunedin. Duncan is said to have acted in a private capacity to the Queenstown officer in charge at the time, Captain G.A Herbert.⁶

There have been suggestions also that the boatshed building may have incorporated parts of a good shed built circa; 1901 and relocated from the original Frankton wharf.⁷

The construction of the boatshed by Duncan was undertaken in response to local objections to the Duncan family practice of mooring their boat, the *Sans Souci* in the South eastern corner of the

¹ Neil Clayton, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the QLDC, May 2001, p 17

² *ibid*, p 9

³ *ibid*, J. Kinder, *The Remarkables and the Outlet of Lake Wakatipu*, undated watercolour reproduce in monochrome, in R Collins, *Pictures of Southern New Zealand*, John McIndoe, Dunedin 1979, p 35 as cited in Clayton, p 9.

⁴ Meyer, R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963, p 90

⁵ *ibid*

⁶ Neil Clayton, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the QLDC, May 2001, p 9

⁷ Janet Stephenson, Heritage Advisor, NZHPT, submission on draft Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve Management Plan, 19 March 2001, from Ray Clarkson pers comm..

Queenstown bay. The two slipways were constructed as part of the boat shed for their two boats. The heavier slipway (still active) on the north east side of the shed was for their 36 foot motor launch *Sans Sounci*. The lighter slipway on the south west side was used for a 15 foot tender, the *Wait a Minute*.⁸

The boatshed was the largest most elaborate structure in the Wakatipu at that time.⁹ In the 1950s, the Duncans passed on the boatshed and next door accommodation to the Late Mr Horace Tomkies. The Tomkies operated the tourist launches *Muratai II* and the *Moana*. During the 1980s the boatshed serviced the *Lion*, (the Walter Peak Station ferry) *Molyneaux*, *Aloha*, and *Leanne* amongst others.¹⁰

Maintenance and restoration of a variety of launches continues today providing some historical connection to the original use of the boatshed.

Former ticket Office

The ticket office building, used by the Steamer service in Queenstown until 1936 dates back to around 1869 when it had been constructed by J. W. Robertson & Co as a general store. Part of the building was used as an office from 1885 when the Lake Wakatipu Steam Shipping Company was formed. It is thought the building originally stood on Beach Street Queenstown on Lots 22 and 23, Block XV, Town of Queenstown)¹¹ In 1936 the office was sold to Major P. Mackenzie of Walter Peak Station.¹² Part of the office is said to have gone to Walter Peak and another part was moved by barge in three sections to Frankton. Fittings of any value were removed prior to sale and only the shell of the building was left.¹³ This was re-erected as a two bedroom cottage.¹⁴ Frederick Duncan and family were said to have purchased part of the building originally sold by the Railways Department. They "*regarded it in purely utilitarian terms, simply a quick source of holiday accommodation and an alternative to living aboard their launch.*"¹⁵

The Duncans rebuilt the structure on the southeast side of the boatshed building. The interior was relined and renovated to provide living and sleeping accommodation, a kitchen and small bathroom. An internal door connected to it directly to the boatshed next door. The Duncan's used the building as a holiday cottage until the early 1950's. They then disposed of both the boatshed and cottage to the late Mr Horace Tomkies and his son Ray, who operated tourist launches *Muratai II* and the *Moana*.

There were further alterations and additions to the building in 2001.¹⁶

While the ticket office has had some original materials removed or covered and had a large addition on the lake side, there is still a surprising amount of the original fabric left.¹⁷ Guy Williams, heritage adviser for NZHPT provided a report on original fabrics remaining in 2001. The following is a brief summary.

- Original single gabled form and bulk of the building remains
- Framing – original rafters, ceiling joists, studs and joists
- At least some flooring and possible all maybe intact.
- Exterior cladding (weatherboarding) at apex of eastern end, nailed with cut nails.
- Window at the western end
- Interior linings – Early 12" wide square dressed planks on eastern wall; 4 " tongue and groove linings on north and south walls at east end of building.

⁸ Neil Clayton, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the QLDC, May 2001, p 10

⁹ *ibid*

¹⁰ Neil Clayton, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the QLDC, May 2001, p 16; Ray Clarkson notes, 1/3/2001, held in Frankton marina File NZHPT, Dunedin Area Office.

¹¹ See photo of old shipping offices in Queenstown, 1936 in Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963, p 59

¹² Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963, p 90

¹³ NZR file823/17, District Engineer, Invercargill to Chief Engineer, Wellington in Archives NZ, cited in Clayton, p15

¹⁴ Ray Clarkson notes, 1/3/2001, held in Frankton marina File NZHPT, Dunedin Area Office.

¹⁵ Neil Clayton, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the QLDC, May 2001, p 6

¹⁶ *ibid*

¹⁷ Janet Stephenson, Heritage Advisor, NZHPT, submission on draft Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve Management Plan, 19 March 2001, p 1.

- Ceiling – 4 “ tongue and groove ceiling lining is visible in the ceiling space (currently covered with gib board).¹⁸

The building is still fundamentally authentic. It is still possible to deduce much of the original detailing and restore the building to something like its original form. The fact that the building was shifted to this site in the 1930s provides an example of the re-use of old buildings for new purposes. Its siting near the lake provides a link to its historical context and relationship to the maritime history of the Wakatipu.¹⁹

SOURCES

Clayton, Neil, *Historicity of a boatshed and cottage at Frankton, Lake Wakatipu*, prepared for the Queenstown lakes District Council, May 2001

Meyer, R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963

Ray Clarkson notes, 1/3/2001, held in Frankton marina File NZHPT, Dunedin Area Office.

Stephenson Janet, Heritage Advisor, NZHPT, submission on draft Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve Management Plan, 19 March 2001

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

¹⁸ Janet Stephenson, Heritage Advisor, NZHPT, submission on draft Frankton Marina Recreation Reserve Management Plan, 19 March 2001

¹⁹ *ibid*

NAME (including former names)

Paddy Mathias House, sleep out and grounds

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Arthurs Point, below the Arthurs Point camp ground on Arthurs Point Road.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	At least 1921, possibly earlier. (circa 1900?)
✓ Architectural Value Moderate	ARCHITECT/BUILDER ?
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Wood construction
✓ Historical/Social Value High	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
✓ Townscape/context Value High	LISTINGS
✓ Rarity/Representative Value High rarity, High representativeness	Local Authority rating recommended
Technological Value	LEGAL DESCRIPTION Section 123 Block XIX, Shotover SD
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate – High	TYPE/USE House and small farmlet
	CURRENT OWNERS Paddy Mathias
	CURRENT CONDITION Good

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

Paddy Mathias's cottage, out buildings and surrounding land encapsulate what was once more typical of a small farm holding in the Wakatipu District. Literally unchanged for most of the the past century, this small block represents an historical link to small farming and early leasehold properties.

The simple colonial cottage and sleep out built, at the latest, by circa 1920s, demonstrates the typical style of architecture for a rural property²⁰ at this time. It is largely in tact and in its original layout and form. (It has remained unchanged during Paddy Mathias 50 years on the property). There are no other exact examples of such a building in its rural context and setting within the district.

The cottage and property is associated with prominent early settlers of Arthurs Point, the Barnetts, who came to the area around the turn of the nineteenth century for mining. It is also associaterd with a notable local character, Paddy Mathias who settled in the District 70 years ago to work in the agricultural business. His property reflects a practical and down to earth lifestyle with much of his fruit and vegetables grown on the property.

This landscape dotted with a few historic buildings set back from the main road is now a rarity due to the intense growth and subdivision in the immediate area. It represents one of the last private open spaces at Arthurs Point- authentic and mostly unchanged for about a century.

²⁰ Note, input from an registered architect for the architectural description has not been attained. More description could reveal a different assessment for architectural value.

DESCRIPTION

The cottage and grounds belonging to Mr Paddy Mathias sit on 2.08 hectares and are surrounded by pine trees around the entire boundary.

The two bedroom cottage is relatively small, simple colonial style with six pane double hung windows to the front and sides. There is a small separate one room hut of the same era of the house. This has been used as a sleep out and sits beneath historic fruit trees to the west side of the cottage.

There is a run of concrete block sheds to the rear of the cottage, including workshop, storage and toilet. (a later addition, circa 1950s?)

The cottage is surrounded by farm land that borders the Arthurs Point Road to the north. . It is split into three paddocks as well as a fenced section containing an orchard and a substantial vegetable garden.

HISTORY

An early Shotover District Survey map (SO1489) drawn by Francis Howden in 1865, shows a paddock on the site of Paddy Mathias place and a race course further up on the terrace. There is no sign of any buildings at this early stage.

The land was first surveyed off as a small holding for Janet Barnett in May 1922.²¹ The original surveyors field book drawings (28/10/1921) shows two buildings on the site in 1921.²² A relative of the Barnett family states that his grandparents moved onto this property circa 1900 – 1901. Alfred Penrose and Janet Carmichael (nee Mckinnon) Barnett raised 12 children here. The children all attended the Arthurs Point School and many continued to live and work in the area. Alfred Barnett was involved as a contractor to the Archilles/Phoenix Mining companies at Bullendale and Skippers.²³ The Barnett family had an association with this property for about 56 years. It can be assumed that there was a residence on the property from circa 1900 and while it is possible that part of the remaining cottage was their house, at this stage the evidence is not totally clear.

The Barnett family were the first to appear on the land title information as occupants of the five acre property under occupation lease on the first of July 1922 for one pound per year. Janet Carmichael Barnetts name is on the lease²⁴. On the 10 July 1941 Janet transferred to George Edward Barnett, miner of Arthurs Point.²⁵ George was one of their many children. He was born in 1901 and was employed by the rabbit Board for a time.²⁶ The lease was transferred to Flora Margaret Barnett, widow, in 1951.²⁷ In February 1956 the lease was transferred to Clifford Bloefeld Mathias,(Paddy) a farm labourer from Queenstown. Paddy now owns the property (refer OT 14C/1126)

Paddy Mathias came to the Wakatipu District in 1936 from Middlemarch where he had been working as a farm hand. He was part of the first blade shearing gang in the district made up of four men. His work took him around many of the Wakatipus high country runs such as Cecil Peak Station, Walter Peak, Mt Nicolas Halfway Bay, and Glencoe Station on the Crown Terrace. As well as shearing Paddy worked for the rabbit board for many years. In 1956 he leased this property and he has now lived on this land for 50 years. Paddy is now in his early 90s and continues to live simply and look after a number of pet sheep. He is a well known identity to Queesntown locals and was often spotted on a Friday riding an old black bike into Queenstown to pick up his groceries up until the mid 1990s.

It is difficult to date the house exactly but it is at least 85 years old.²⁸ It appears very much unchanged from the era it was thought to have been built and is well kept simple wooden two bedroom cottage. A lean-to bathroom accessed from outside still contains the old copper for heating the water.

There are some very historic fruit trees around the house including, a number of pear and plum trees. There has been little development on the grounds that make up 3 paddocks, a large garden and an

²¹ Plan of Sec 123, Blk XIX Shotover Survey District, Department of lands and Survey, by A. L. H. Hay 1922.

²² Surveyors field note book, 918, p 4, held at land Information New Zealand.

²³ Submission information supplied by Donald H. McLeay, as part of QLDC Plan Change 3. January 2006

²⁴ Land Title Deed, 182/104, Section 123, Block XIX, Shotover Survey District.

²⁵ *ibid*

²⁶ Submission information supplied by Donald H. McLeay, as part of QLDC Plan Change 3. January 2006

²⁷ Information from Occupation Lease certificate, Vol 182/104

²⁸ Surveyors field note book, 918, p 4, held at land Information New Zealand

orchard. The Pine trees on the property boundary to the road are thought to have been planted by George Barnett to break the wind coming down the gorge.²⁹ This has given the property significant shelter and privacy.

SOURCES

Certificate of Title OT 14C/1126, Land Information New Zealand.

Discussion Paddy Mathias and Becky Reid 30 July 2006.

Howden, Francis, Shotover District Survey map (SO1489)1865

Land Title Deed, 182/104, Section 123, Block XIX, Shotover Survey District, Land Information New Zealand.

Plan of Sec 123, Blk XIX Shotover Survey District, Department of lands and Survey, by A. L. H. Hay 1922.

Submission information supplied by Donald H. McLeay, as part of QLDC Plan Change 3. January 2006

Surveyors field note book, 918, p 4, held at land Information New Zealand

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

²⁹ Pers comm., Paddy Mathias, 30 July 2006

NAME (including former names)

Frankton walking track

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Track runs from the end of Peninsula Street in Queenstown to the Frankton marina.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	Uncertain of exact date of construction.
Architectural Value	ARCHITECT/BUILDER
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS
✓ Historical/Social Value Low	LOCAL AUTHORITY LISTINGS
✓ Townscape/Context Value Moderate	Local Authority rating recommended
Rarity/Representative Value	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Technological Value	TYPE/USE
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Low -	CURRENT OWNERS
	CURRENT CONDITION

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Frankton track is an important component of the recreational opportunities close to Queenstown and is part of the network of tracks in the Wakatipu district. While the track passes some sites and locations of historical sites and places of interest, the heritage value of the track itself is difficult to ascertain. While it is likely that an historical track existed close or along part of the existing feature before the road was in place, there has been little evidence found at this stage that clearly shows this.

The Frankton track does have landscape value in that it provides open space along the strip of the Frankton arm providing a buffer zone between the lake and the intense housing and apartments that have been constructed between the Frankton Track and the Frankton Road.

The Frankton track has high recreational values that are protected under its status as a recreation reserve. As a heritage feature in itself, it is the opinion of the assessor that the Frankton track does not have strong enough historic value to merit a heritage listing on the District Plan.

DESCRIPTION

The Frankton Track is approximately 5 kilometres and runs along the north side of the Frankton arm of Lake Wakatipu from Peninsula Street to the Frankton Domain.

HISTORY

An early Frankton survey map in 1863³⁰ shows a track marked from the Frankton Flats to the lake edge approximately where the Frankton marina is today. It is unclear whether the track continued on at this stage into Queenstown however it is likely that a horse/dray track was in existence not long afterwards. Early photographs, circa 1905 show the road running past the original Frankton wharf (just south of the marina) that was relied on for transfer of grain onto the lake steamers. It appears that at this point the road

³⁰ Plan of the Town of Frankton, District surveyor, 1863, held in the Lakes District Museum, N 837

was basically where the track is today. For the most part however, various photos held in the Lake District Museum, Arrowtown show evidence that the Frankton Road was higher above the lake edge than the existing Frankton track today.

From the Queenstown end at Peninsula Street there were some historic industrial sites including a Brick kiln belonging to Walter Hales who capitalised on the clay deposits found nearby.³¹ The Peninsula Street Reserve just before the start of the track is said to have been formed by clay excavations from the brick works.³² Near to the brickworks was a Fellmongery where James Gardner tanned hides and supplied the district with leather supplies.³³

Until quite recently the old piles from the original Frankton wharf were visible just south of the marina at Frankton which added historical interest. These have now gone. A rock with a plaque mounted by the Queenstown District Historical Society marks the spot.

The Frankton track was gazetted as a foreshore reserve in 1967³⁴ and has been a walking track for many years. It also provides access to the sewerage pipes from Queenstown to the Lower Shotover. Today it is classified as a Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and is managed by the QLDC via the Sunshine Bay, Queenstown Bay, Frankton, Kelvin Heights Foreshore Management Plan.

SOURCES

Lakes District Museum Photograph archive, EL 4537 and EL 4332

Lawrence Barry, *Beaten trails, A guide to some of the historic walks and trails around Queenstown*, A Mountain Scene publication in conjunction with the Queenstown Borough Council, 1979

Plan of the Town of Frankton, District surveyor, 1863, held in the Lakes District Museum, N 837

Salmond, D. J., *Hearts of Gold, Memories of old Queenstown*, Otago Daily Times, Dunedin, 1962

QLDC, *Sunshine Bay, Queenstown Bay, Frankton, Kelvin Heights Foreshore Management Plan*, Boffa Miskell Partners Ltd, 1991

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

³¹ J.D. Salmond, *Memories of old Queenstown*, Otago Daily Times, Dunedin, p 49

³² Barry Lawrence, *Beaten trails, A guide to some of the historic walks and trails around Queenstown*, A mountain scene publication in conjunction with the Queenstown Borough Council, 1979, p 8

³³ J.D. Salmond, *Hearts of Gold, Memories of old Queenstown*, Otago Daily Times, Dunedin 1962, p 49

³⁴ QLDC, *Sunshine Bay, Queenstown Bay, Frankton, Kelvin Heights Foreshore Management Plan*, Boffa Miskell Partners Ltd, 1991, p 58

NAME (including former names)

Bowling Club Pavilion and grounds

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Queenstown Gardens

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	1904 opened bowling club and green
✓ Architectural Value Moderate	1908 Pavilion erected
Cultural/Spiritual Value	
✓ Historical/Social Value High	ARCHITECT/BUILDER ?
✓ Townscape/context Value High	MATERIALS Wood construction
✓ Rarity/Representative Value High rarity value	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
Technological Value	LISTINGS
	Local Authority rating Category 2 recommended
	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate- High	TYPE/USE Bowling club pavilion and bowling greens.
	CURRENT OWNERS Wakatipu Bowling Club?
	CURRENT CONDITION Good

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Queenstown bowling club pavilion and associated greens, set in the Queenstown gardens, reflect a strong social history associated with over a hundred years of bowling in the Wakatipu district. There is a high degree of community association with the bowling club facilities, reflected in the very long list of locals and visitors who have recreated within this gardens setting for over a century.

While both the pavilion and the greens have had alterations over the years to progress the bowling club and its membership, they still reside in their original setting and remain as a significant visual and historic component to the Queenstown gardens landscape.

The Bowling pavilion has been altered and added to over the years, however the historic double storied section of the building still retains its original form in terms of scale, height and construction materials. (Downstairs windows modernised) The original style of the building with its top viewing room and lower functional area can still be clearly read. Its architecture is representative of a turn of the century design associated with a sporting activity and the pavilion is now considered to be unique and rare in the Wakatipu Basin.

DESCRIPTION

The Queenstown bowling club pavilion consists of an historic two storied wooden building with a single story wing addition of a later era. (1980s)
There are two bowling greens surrounded by gardens and walkways.

HISTORY

On the 19th May 1904, the Mayor of Queenstown, Mr Hotop chaired a meeting in the Garrison Hall, Beach street to discuss the idea of forming a bowling club. The committee that was formed, then requested funding from the Government Tourist Department to build a bowling surface ('sward') in the Queenstown Gardens. The Tourist Department agreed to provide the grounds, a roller and a water supply under the proviso that the Club would lease the grounds from the Queenstown Borough Council on a 3 year term.³⁵

By November 10th 1904, the Wakatipu Bowling Club was officially formed and the green was completed.³⁶ On December 7th 1904, the new green and club was officially opened by the first president of the club, Mr Walter Searle (proprietor of the Eichardts hotel). Twenty six financial members gathered for the occasion.³⁷ The Mayor, Mr Hotop stated " *that the green was constructed by the Government in the hopes of increasing tourist traffic, in as much as it would be a source of attraction to bowlers from various parts*"³⁸

In 1906 the Government Tourist Department took over the Gardens from the Council and this included the bowling green and its upkeep. With the growing attraction of bowling in the area, the Tourism Department erected a club house in 1908. *This was described as "a magnificent two storied structure, with an internal stairway and a windowless overview area [which] also served as a place for the band to meet and play for visitors to the gardens."*³⁹

An early photograph held in the Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown (EL 863) shows the building at what is thought to be the opening. This attractive wooden building had ornate wooden railings upstairs with open views both to the bowling green and the tennis courts (that appear to already exist) on the other side. Downstairs there was a wide, open arched walk through between the two amenities. The facilities were upgraded in 1925 by the Tourist Department and the internal stairs were removed to the outside. The upper viewing area was glassed in and converted to a tea kiosk which was leased out. A locker room was also built downstairs.⁴⁰ A circa mid 1950s photo however shows the building little altered from the outside, apart from one part of the upstairs that had been closed in.⁴¹

In the late 1960s the bowling club took over the lease of the tea kiosk and the upstairs was given a major clean out and turned into clubrooms also. Growing membership and pressure for better facilities saw the locker room upgraded, and a bar installed but conditions were still cramped. In 1983 a modern lounge was added. (the single storey wing) During this era the upstairs section was leased to the tennis club next door and a viewing platform overlooking the courts was added.⁴²

The Grounds

Bowls, tennis and croquet were activities on offer at the site, possibly from the clubs inception and in 1942 a ticket boy was employed by the Tourist Department to manage these sports.⁴³ In October 1936, a new green was opened (adding to the original built in 1904) and the two greens were named the Ben Lomond (in front of the pavilion) and the Remarkables, in relation to the views of the respective mountains from the gardens setting. The Tourist Department managed the greens until the late 1960s when the club took over. Various upgrades occurred over the years with automatic sprinklers, lighting, seating and sun shelters were constructed. An all weather, state of the art, modern artificial green was opened on September 13th 2003.⁴⁴

Membership was affected by the two World Wars and the 1930s depression but in general the interest in bowls continued to be strong in the Wakatipu. Today the facilities are still well used and cared for and reflect a long history of bowling in the Wakatipu area.

³⁵ W.O. Todd, 100 years history, Queenstown Bowling Club, 1904 – 2004, The Centennial Publication of the Queenstown Bowling Club Inc.

³⁶ *ibid*

³⁷ *ibid*

³⁸ Lake Waktip Mail , 9/12/ 1904

³⁹ W.O. Todd, *100 years history, Queenstown Bowling Club*, 1904 – 2004, The Centennial Publication of the Queenstown Bowling Club Inc.

⁴⁰ *ibid*

⁴¹ LDM photo collection EL 372B

⁴² W.O. Todd, *100 years history, Queenstown Bowling Club*, 1904 – 2004, The Centennial Publication of the Queenstown Bowling Club Inc

⁴³ *ibid*

⁴⁴ *ibid*

SOURCES

W.O. Todd, 100 years history, Queenstown Bowling Club, 1904 – 2004, The Centennial Publication of the Queenstown Bowling Club Inc

Lake Wakatip Mail , 9/12/ 1904

Photo archives, Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown.

FILE NOTES

Note; This structure has not been assessed by a conservation architect, who may consider the architectural rating differently to the current assessment.

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

NAME (including former names)

Kingston to Fairlight Rail way

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Between Kingston and Fairlight railway stations, Otago/Southland.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	Rail from Invercargill to Kingston opened on 10 July 1878.
Architectural Value	ARCHITECT/BUILDER NZ
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Timber and steel
✓ Historical/Social Value High	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC (for section within council boundary only)
✓ Townscape/Context Value High	SDC from QLDC boundary to Fairlight.
✓ Rarity/Representative Value High representative value and High rarity value	LISTINGS
✓ Technological Value High	Local Authority rating recommended
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE High	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
	TYPE/USE Railway line used for heritage tourism operation, Kingston Flyer.
	CURRENT OWNERS Kingston Acquisitions Ltd
	CURRENT CONDITION Good

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The completion of the Great Northern Railway from Invercargill to Kingston was a huge achievement for the region, boosting the economy and greatly aiding the development of agriculture, tourism and business throughout the Otago/ Southland district. In particular the lake – rail connection and depot that formed at Kingston played a pivotal role in the progress of the Queenstown Lakes District.

The last remaining section of rail between Kingston and Fairlight is a tangible reminder of the importance of transportation and communication in an era where roads were still not built. The rail- lake connection was heavily relied upon by local communities to receive provisions and maintain contact with the outside world. Kingston provided that vital link with the rail head and transport network beyond to Southland and Otago and grew around its position as a lake port. It is unique in New Zealand being the only railway that serviced an inland lake and its' steamers. It is therefore deemed to be of national, regional and local significance. Today a steam powered steamer can still meet a steam powered train at Kingston.

The railway line has rarity value being the last section remaining of the original Invercargill to Kingston line instigated by the New Zealand Railways Department.

There is a strong community identity and association with the rail heritage in relation to Kingston and this has been demonstrated over the years by community action that resulted in retaining the locomotives, rail tracks and other functional rail related historical features.

The building of the railway was a technological feat at the time and this section of rail (that reached the highest point on the entire Invercargill to Kingston line and had one of the steepest grades) demonstrates the technical skill required to construct a railway over such terrain.

The Kingston – Fairlight railway combined with the Kingston Flyer operation is arguably the most intact and authentic example of the steam train age in New Zealand.

As part of the wider rail heritage landscape the railway makes an important contribution to the overall Kingston vista which encapsulates a snap shot of an important transport era.

DESCRIPTION

The intact and still operating railway line runs from Kingston to Fairlight and covers 13.6 kilometres. The line follows the original as laid down in 1878.

HISTORY

It was the discovery of gold in Otago in the early 1860s and the increasing need for transportation and communication networks in the province, that prompted the Southland Provincial Council to build a railway. Gold diggers from the Victoria goldfields in Australia were arriving at the southern port of Bluff in order to make the shortest route at the time to the Otago goldfields.⁴⁵ By 1863 the construction of the Great Northern Railway was underway from Bluff to Invercargill. In 1871 the line had reached Winton and the construction of the line through to Kingston was authorised by Central Government the same year via the Railways Act 1871.⁴⁶ The Winton sawmill was contracted to supply all the sleepers for the railway to Kingston and the line was built to a standard 3 foot 6 inch gauge and was completed and opened on the 10 July 1878.⁴⁷

Such was the significance of the event, the Queenstown Borough Council and Lake County Council declared a public holiday. Some two hundred people travelled from Queenstown to Kingston on the 'Jane Williams' and a special train ran from Invercargill comprising three engines and twenty two carriages, carrying 1200 people.⁴⁸ As the train drew into Kingston, music from the Queenstown Instrumental Band welcomed passengers.⁴⁹ Three 10 ton 0-6-0 saddle-tank locomotives and 12 six wheel carriages had been ordered for the passenger service on this new line back in 1875.⁵⁰

The 87 mile railway line from Invercargill to Kingston cost £241, 509.⁵¹ Platelayers were paid eight shillings per day, while servicemen were paid six shillings. While the final 20 miles of line was being constructed from Garston to Kingston, there were up to 90 tents in the Garston camp.⁵²

The Kingston railway line ended on the Kingston wharf that became a key transfer point for gold, timber, grain, wool and stock being supplied from the isolated mines and the high country runs based around Lake Wakatipu.

The opening of the railway line to Kingston and its connection to a lake port was a huge achievement for the region, boosting the economy and greatly aiding the development of agriculture, tourism and business throughout the Otago/ Southland district.

Before road access the rail was totally relied upon to move, freight, stock and people to and from Southland and Lake Wakatipu. The steamers plying Lake Wakatipu connected with the steam rail transport at Kingston and this was solely relied upon until 1936 when some of the load was taken on the new road between Queenstown and Kingston. However the train – steamer link continued with mixed passenger and freight carriages up until the 1970s.⁵³

In 1970, the Lumsden to Kingston line faced closure but the Railways Department, prompted by public opinion, decided to keep it open as a freight/passenger service. In 1979 the Kingston Flyer train was

⁴⁵ Alister Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, Kingston Community Centre 2003 (3rd edition), p 37

⁴⁶ Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963. p 19

⁴⁷ Alister, Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, Kingston Community Centre 2003 (3rd edition) p 38

⁴⁸ Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963. p 19

⁴⁹ Alister, Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, Kingston Community Centre 2003 (3rd edition) p 38

⁵⁰ Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963. p 19

⁵¹ *ibid*

⁵² *ibid*

⁵³ NZ Railfan, March 1977 volume 3/ no. 2.

discontinued and the line closed. The floods of 1978 seriously damaged the railway lines and bridges and the cost of repair was considered to be too high.⁵⁴ The Kingston Flyer was transferred to Invercargill between 1979 and 1982 but the Kingston community put the pressure on and saved the railways water tower, turntable and tracks. In 1982 the Kingston Flyer returned to run on the 13.6 kilometre line between Kingston and Fairlight. This section of rail has always been notable for the range of scenic backdrops and series of sweeping curves as the line climbs over a glacial moraine valley just south of Kingston. (This is one of the steepest grades on the whole line at a grade of 1 in 62.)⁵⁵ This section of rail is also significant in that it reaches the highest point on the line between Invercargill and Kingston at 1196 feet.⁵⁶

The Kingston Flyer and the traditional pastoral scene that it passes through has become “a kiwi icon and a cherished monument to rail heritage”⁵⁷

The rail between Kingston and Fairlight and the Kingston Flyer that still operates upon it, continues today to be a very popular and scenic trip for tourists and anyone interested in historic steam train transportation.

SOURCES

Fraser Alister, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, Kingston Community Centre 2003 (3rd edition)

Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963

NZ Railfan article, *The Kingston Flyer 25 years of service* March 1977 volume 3/ no. 2.

Queenstown and District Historical Society Courier, Volume 5

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

⁵⁴ Alister Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, Kingston Community Centre 2003 (3rd edition), p 42

⁵⁵ Meyer.R. J. *All Aboard, Iron horses to Wakatipu and Shipping on the Lake*, New Zealand Railway and Locomotive Society Inc. Wellington, August 1963. p 19

⁵⁶ *ibid*

⁵⁷ Reid McNaught, cited in NZ Railfan, March 1977 volume 3/ no. 2.

NAME (including former names)

Two engines, carriages and numerous wagons in Kingston

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Located on the rail down by the Kingston Railway Station and near the Kingston wharf.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	Engines; 1925 and 1927 Carriages; 1898, 1909, - 1920s Meat wagons; c:1960s
✓ Architectural Value High	ARCHITECT/BUILDER
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Steel and wood
✓ Historical/Social Value High	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
✓ Townscape/context Value High	LISTINGS
✓ Rarity/Representative Value High rarity, High representative	Local Authority rating recommended
✓ Technological Value High	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE High	TYPE/USE Engines and carriages used in Kingston Flyer operation. Wagons are parked up.
	CURRENT OWNERS Kingston Acquisitions Ltd
	CURRENT CONDITION Good

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The steam engines and the accompanying carriages that today operate as the Kingston Flyer, provide arguably the most authentic steam train experience in New Zealand. They are the key component of the historic steam rail operation and have the potential to educate visitors on the significance of early steam transportation networks in the development of the Otago/Southland area.

Kingston grew around its position as a lake port and the rail to lake connection. The existence of wagons, engines, and carriages located from the railway yard to the Kingston wharf, provides an opportunity to create that historical link. These rail heritage features sit in context with the immediate surroundings and create an authentic visual scene.

The engines have technical value, being an intact representation of a particular class of steam engine (AB Pacifics) in New Zealand in the 1920s. These two engines also have rarity value, being two of only six remaining in the country. The Kingston Flyer has become a symbolic feature for Kingston and this is backed by a strong community association with and connection to the towns rail heritage.

The carriages represent different eras and classes of travel from the 1890s through to the 1960s. Their architecture reflects the typical passenger carriage of the day under the New Zealand Railways Department. The interiors are mostly intact with lighting, seating, luggage racks and rail memorabilia in the style that they were designed.

The rolling stock that remains in good working order, in what can be termed "the Kingston railway precinct" has local, regional and national significance and combined with the group of authentic rail heritage features provides one of the strongest in tact historical connections to a small towns past of any town in New Zealand.

DESCRIPTION

There are 8 passenger carriages that are used for the Kingston Flyer operation. Two AB pacific engines and a number of meat wagons and goods wagons down by the wharf.

HISTORY

The Kingston Flyer operation was restored by the Government Railways and re-commenced running between Lumsden and Kingston in December 1971. The original "Kingston Flyer" engine was nicknamed due to its speed (60 km/hour). This engine like many others at the time, was dumped to become a flood bank near Lumsden⁵⁸ in 1928.⁵⁹ When the operation recommenced, two engines were purchased for the service. These engines are used to run the heritage steam train today – the Kingston Flyer and they pull up to 8 passenger carriages with a capacity of about 350 people. They weigh 86 tons, burn approximately 650kgs of coal and use 3600 litres of water per return journey to Fairlight.⁶⁰ Of the 151 originally built of this class of engine, there are only 6 left in New Zealand and two of them are at Kingston.⁶¹

Two engines

1. **AB 778**, was built and designed in New Zealand at the Addington workshops Christchurch in 1925.⁶²

AB 778 entered service on the 1 September 1925 and was one of only 10 constructed for the New Zealand Railways which were the last new steam locomotives built in Addington.⁶³

Many different boilers were fitted and overhauled on the train over the years. This train was the last AB to receive a full A grade overhaul at Hillside Workshops before the phasing out of steam. She was outshopped on the 25th May 1967.⁶⁴ The train operated out of Dunedin from new until 1958 when she was transferred to Invercargill. In 1968 she was sent to Greymouth to haul goods but was retired or written off in 1969. She was however used to heat the inter island ferry trains at Lyttleton for a time before being chosen to come back south to work on the Lumsden – Kingston tourist train in 1971. She was based at Lumsden before returning to Kingston to operate on the Kingston – Fairlight run which started in 1982.

2. **AB 795**, was built at Hillside workshops in Dunedin in 1927.⁶⁵

AB 795 entered regular service on the 8 July 1927. In December 1947 the original WAB (a heavy tank engine version of the AB) had been converted an AB class tender locomotive. The train was initially based in Dunedin from its inception through to 1968 when she was transferred to Greymouth. Her time on the Coast were short lived due to the introduction of D J class diesels the following year.⁶⁶

AB 795 claims fame as being one of the two trains that were used on Queen Elizabeth's IIs Royal Train from Greymouth to Otira on the 18th January 1954. Also on 25 January 1954 she worked the Royal Tour pilot train from Timaru to Dunedin.⁶⁷

This train led the charge on a VIP special run from Invercargill to Kingston on the 18th December 1971 when the new Kingston Flyer tourist train service opened from Lumsden.⁶⁸ It was based in Lumsden until 1979, before coming up to Kingston to operate on the Kingston – Fairlight run.

Carriages

There are 8 carriages used for passengers. These are in mostly in excellent condition and provide an insight into first and second class travelling of the day. They have been altered and restored over the

⁵⁸ Assessor, Uncertain as to exact location. According to Keith Sinclair, the train was later dug out and saved by local enthusiasts from Te Anau.

⁵⁹ Pers comm, Keith Sinclair

⁶⁰, The Kingston Flyer Brochure, Historical and Technical Information

⁶¹ Pers comm. Keith Sinclair

⁶² NZ Railfan, Volume 3/2, March 1977, p 44

⁶³ Brochure; The Kingston Flyer, Historical and Technical Information

⁶⁴ NZ Railfan, Volume 3/2, March 1977, p 43

⁶⁵ *ibid*

⁶⁶ *ibid*

⁶⁷ *ibid*

⁶⁸ *ibid*

years in the 1920's style of rail travel. They were constructed of a combination of teak, red pine and kauri. Some of the curved roofs are embossed tin plate. Carriage A 595 is the last remaining example of five gallery or "Birdcage" carriage built in 1898. It has 5 separate compartments and an open sided walkway closed in by a see through cage.⁶⁹

Carriage AA 1132 (now used as a refreshment carriage) was originally built as a ministerial car used by government ministers. It is thought to be the only one left of its kind. Built in 1909 it was wider than the others with palatial comfortable fittings such as a shower, lounge, and armchairs. In 1937 it was converted to a second class passenger train.⁷⁰

Wagons

There are a number of freight and goods wagons parked over by the Kingston wharf. Under the shelter accompanying the engine are two open trailers as well as an old Stationary steam engine (not originally part of the rail operation)

Parallel to the shelter are a series of five green wagons, known as "meat wagons." These were used to carry meat to and from meatworks (possibly in Southland) in the 1960s and had compartments at either end for the ice.⁷¹ While they are still said to be relatively common, these four wheel wagons have since been over-taken by new technology and they are no longer a sight on NZ railways. There are also 3 open goods wagons and a smaller trailer wagon.

SOURCES

Discussion between Keith Sinclair, Kingston Flyer staff and Becky Reid, 27 July 2006

Discussion with Russell Glendinning, Kingston Flyer train driver, and Becky Reid, 27 July 2006.

Discussion with Ken McAuliffe, Kingston Flyer staff and Becky Reid, 27 July 2006.

NZ Railfan, Volume 3/2, March 1977

The Kingston Flyer Brochure, Historical and Technical Information

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

⁶⁹ Brochure; The Kingston Flyer, Historical and Technical Information

⁷⁰ *ibid*

⁷¹ Pers comm, Russell Glendinning

NAME (including former names)

Water Weir, reservoir & piping, Kingston
(for supply of water to the Kingston water vat)

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Located in the bush above the Kingston wharf approximately 100 metres up an unnamed stream.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
✓ Archaeological Value Moderate	Dam/weir circa: 1877 Reservoir circa: 1897
Architectural Value	ARCHITECT/BUILDER
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Concrete
	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
	LISTINGS
✓ Historical/Social Value High	Local Authority rating Category 2 recommended.
Townscape/Context Value	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Rarity/Representative Value	TYPE/USE Weir/ reservoir for water supply
✓ Technological Value Moderate	CURRENT OWNERS
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate	CURRENT CONDITION Largely intact and functional.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The water weir, reservoir and piping at Kingston forms a key component of the early steam train operation that was the main form of transportation relied upon at the foot of Lake Wakatipu. Since the late 1870s the water supply was relied on to water the locomotives that serviced the lake port of Kingston. The water weir combined with the still intact historical features such as the water vat, coal crane, turntable and steam trains helps to complete the picture of an authentic, working steam train operation. These intact linkages provide historic value that is of local and national significance.

The water weir has some technological value being representative of a style of dam and reservoir construction that occurred locally in the 1870s and late 1920s respectively.

The dam and weir have archaeological value providing evidence of one of the practical and functional elements of the steam train operation and have the potential to increase our knowledge of steam rail history in New Zealand.

DESCRIPTION

The weir and reservoir constructed on an un-named stream above the Kingston wharf, consists of concrete dam with a water reservoir below. Gravity fed water pipes run steeply down through native bush and over to the water vat in the main Kingston rail yard. The features have had minor repairs over the years of operation but are still in working order and are used for the original purpose that they were designed.

HISTORY

These water supply features were and still are a vital part of the steam train operation. They played the important role of ensuring a continual water supply to the water tank in the rail yards at Kingston, to water the steam locomotives coming up from Invercargill and Lumsden. The water tank is still used today.

The dam was constructed in circa 1877? (reference) about 100 metres up into the bush on the unnamed stream closest to the wharf? The water was gravity fed through pipes to the railway tank to supply water to the steam trains. The water vat relies on a constant water supply from the dam for it to function. It is constructed of Kauri timber planks that are kept tight by the pressure of water within the tank pushing on the timber stays.⁷² By 1897 a water reservoir was constructed⁷³ just downstream of the dam which added to the water supply capacity. The first water vat had a 2000 gallon tank and this was replaced by the existing 6000 gallon tank in October 1927.⁷⁴

The water supply from the dam and creek were also relied upon by the early Kingston community, supplying water to the wharf, hotel⁷⁵ and some of the rail department houses.⁷⁶ In 1927, with the pending visit of the Duke and Duchess of York, the water supply was diverted from the blacksmith shop via a temporary pipe to the royal couples' carriage parked in Kingston overnight. This ensured that they had their own personal water supply however perhaps un be known to them it was coming from the same water source as everyone else's.⁷⁷

The snow fed stream has by all accounts been a reliable water source over the years however it was not unusual to have problems with freezing water pipes during the winter.⁷⁸

Keeping the water up to the steam trains at Kingston was a significant part of the whole rail transportation operation from 1878 – 1969. In 1971, the Kingston Flyer returned to the tracks between Lumsden and Kingston and the water vat was revitalised.⁷⁹ Between 1979 and 1982 the Kingston Flyer was discontinued, however it returned in 1982 to run between Fairlight and Kingston⁸⁰ as a heritage tourism operation. Today the water supply from the original weir and reservoir to the vat and the locomotives is still relied upon and is an important component of the continuation of the authentic vintage steam train – the Kingston Flyer.

SOURCES

Discussion with Russell Glendinning, rail historian by Becky Reid on 7 & 10 June 2005.

Alistair Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, A publication to mark the Kingston Community Centre Inc. to mark the Millennium. Kingston Community Centre 2003 (1st addition 2000)

NZ Rail file, National Archives Regional Office Dunedin. DABB D452/74a 239/8

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

⁷² Pers comm.. Russell Glendinning

⁷³ NZ Rail file, National Archives Regional Office Dunedin. DABB D452/74a 239/8

⁷⁴ *ibid*

⁷⁵ Pers comm. Russell Glendinning

⁷⁶ NZ Rail file, National Archives Regional Office Dunedin. DABB D452/74a 239/8

⁷⁷ *ibid*

⁷⁸ *ibid*

⁷⁹ *ibid*

⁸⁰ Alistair Fraser, *The Kingston Story 1800 – 2000*, p 42

NAME (including former names)

Old McChesney Bridge abutment remains
(Part of former structure, McChesney Bridge)

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Arthur's Point, Queenstown (one way bridge before Arthur's Point Hotel.)

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	
✓ Archaeological Value Moderate	
Architectural Value	
Cultural/Spiritual Value	
✓ Historical/Social Value Moderate	
Townscape/Context Value	
Rarity/Representative Value	
✓ Technological Value Moderate	
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate	

AGE/DATES	Circa; 1875
ARCHITECT/BUILDER	
MATERIALS	Schist
LOCAL AUTHORITY LISTINGS	QLDC
Local Authority Rating	Category 2 recommended
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	
TYPE/USE	Archaeological site
CURRENT OWNERS	
CURRENT CONDITION	Good , have had some modern concrete and cement mortar used in more recent repairs..

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The McChesney Bridge abutment remains are a reminder of the existence of the original bridge, constructed across this narrow gorge for horse dray traffic. Whilst a relatively short and narrow bridge, its construction over this gorge was vital to opening up the access from Queenstown to Arthur's Point and further up the Skippers Road to the Shotover goldfields.

The schist stone abutments demonstrate the construction techniques and materials typically used in the 1870s to support a small bridge designed for dray traffic. The structures are relatively intact and provide insight into the design, and technical skill required to ensure the longevity of the structure and the adjoining road formation.

They are a tangible reminder of the importance of early bridge linkages and roading networks that served to connect people with outlying areas of the Wakatipu District.

DESCRIPTION

The two abutments have no superstructure. They are built of stacked schist slabs, 6 m wide, 4 m high on the true left bank and are 7.2 m wide and 1.6 m high on the true right bank. About 3 m of stone work can be seen running back into the bank on the true left and 1.6 m on the true right to carry the road formation. They are 6 m apart on each side of the creek.⁸¹ A pedestrian bridge has been constructed on top of these abutments in 2006.

⁸¹ New Zealand Archaeological site record form SRF E41/236.

HISTORY

An 1865 topographic map, SO1489, drawn by Francis Howden, District Surveyor, shows a "Cut horse track" running up the line of the present Gorge Road, across McChesney Creek to the present site of the Edith Cavell Bridge which is marked Bridge and Toll house. The assumption can be made that there was no bridge across McChesney Creek in 1865, and the dray traffic to Skippers used the Frankton Ferry above the site of the present bridge over the Shotover.⁸² A timber decked truss bridge for dray traffic was built on the site of the present Edith Cavell Bridge across the Shotover in 1875.⁸³ It seems reasonable to assume that the bridge across McChesney Creek was built before or about the same time for dray traffic between Arthur's Point and Queenstown to serve the large population of miners in the Moonlight and at Skippers areas.⁸⁴

It is thought that the bridge takes its name from Mr James McChesney who arrived in the Wakatipu from Ireland in circa; 1866 to take part in the gold chase up Moke creek and the Arrow gorge.⁸⁵ Around the turn of the century he ran the Junction Hotel at Arthurs Point and was also the local storekeeper. His hospitality was well known in the district and he was said to be "*popular amongst the travelling public.*"⁸⁶

SOURCES

Howden Francis, SO1489, Map of Shotover District, 1865

Lake Wakatip Mail, Obituary, James McChesney 15/12/1905

New Zealand Archaeological site record form SRF E41/236.

Thornton, Geoffrey, *Bridging the gap, Early Bridges in New Zealand 1830 -1939*, Reed Publishing Ltd Auckland, 2001.

FILE NOTES

The remains have archaeological value having been constructed prior to 1900 and have protection under the HPA 1993. They are recognised as an archaeological site under the NZAA. Reference SRF E41/236.

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

⁸² *ibid*

⁸³ Geoffrey Thornton, *Bridging the gap, Early Bridges in New Zealand 1830 -1939*, Reed Publishing Ltd Auckland, 2001, p 263

⁸⁴ New Zealand Archaeological site record form SRF E41/236.

⁸⁵ Lake Wakatip Mail, Obituary, James McChesney 15/12/1905

⁸⁶ *ibid*.

NAME (including former names)

Little Stone Stable

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Located on the former Little Stone farm, Little Stone Road, Queenstown.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	Between circa 1883- 1901
✓ Architectural Value Moderate	ARCHITECT/BUILDER ?
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Schist stone, timber
✓ Historical/Social Value Moderate	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
✓ Townscape/context Value High	LISTINGS
✓ Rarity/Representative Value High rarity, High representative value.	Local Authority rating Category 2 recommended
✓ Technological Value Moderate- High	LEGAL DESCRIPTION Section 20 Block XIX and section 35 Block IV, Shotover SD
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate- High	TYPE/USE Past horse stabling/storage
	CURRENT OWNERS Little Stream Ltd
	CURRENT CONDITION Very good

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Little Stone stables provide an excellent example of the typical turn of the nineteenth century farm architecture. This in tact substantial stables is a rare visual reminder of the dependence of farming in the early development of the Wakatipu district. The Stables are a tangible reminder of the importance of horses in the daily workings of farms before the advent of modern technology.

The building is in very good condition, with the interior stabling layout still easy to define. It is one of few good condition, original stone stables remaining in the district.

It has technical value, demonstrating stacked stone construction and remains as a memorial to sound early building techniques.

The stables and farm land has an association with early local families in the district, more recently the Little Stone family who resided here and managed this land for almost 50 years. (Little Stone Road takes their name)

Visually, the Little Stone stables sits in context to its surrounds of farmland and the dramatic backdrop of the Remarkables Range in the distance.

DESCRIPTION

This is a substantial sized (7 bay) horse stable built of stacked schist rock with ship lap gable ends. There is a lean-to ship lap clad timber room off either end of the structure. The eastern end appears to have been a bedroom (some tongue and groove remaining and old wallpaper) perhaps for the stable hand and the west end appears to have been used as a stable/tack room.

The building is approximately 16 metres in length, has a main split stable door at the entrance and two double hung 6 pane windows to the front. There is also a door at either end of each gable and a small window at the top of each gable end. The interior floor is concrete but there is some evidence of large

schist slabs on the floor of one of the horse stalls. The interior walls are whitewashed over the stone. It has a corrugated iron roof. The horse stalls still have five of what appear to be the original 6 wooden divisions in place.

HISTORY

An historical title search of this farm (Section 20 Block XIX and section 35 Block IV), dates back to the 7 March 1883 when George Barnett (Shotover Farmer) acquired the land from the Crown. (George Barnett was brought up at Arthurs Point on the property currently beomging to Paddy Mathias). The area covered 81 acres, 3 rods, and 14 poles and was intersected by two water races.⁸⁷ Barnett was an early farmer in the District and his family had initially arrived here as miners. His name appears on a number of other parcels of land at this time dating back to 1865.⁸⁸ An early survey map of the Shotover District by Francis Howden, (SO 1489), in 1865 shows detail of the area with water races and a small portion of land marked farm, however it is difficult to ascertain the exact parcel of land. There does not appear to be a stables shown on this early survey map.

The farm was passed on to Colin Allan on 29 August 1890 and then to Edward Monson on 14 March 1901. By July 1938, Alice Louise Monson appears on the title as a widow along with John Joseph McNeill (storekeeper) of Queenstown and William Lawrence Bell of Invercargill.⁸⁹

On the 25 March 1950 the land is transferred to Thomas Andrew Little, a Cardrona farmer. The Littles settled on the land with their three children Bert, Catherine and Margaret after shifting from Cardrona where the children attended school. The late Robert (Bert Little) appears on the land title on 18 February 1973. The Littles farmed the property from 1950 – 1999 (49 years) when it was transferred to Little Stream Holdings Limited.⁹⁰ In 2001, they started to subdivide the property into lifestyle blocks.

It is unclear exactly when the stone stables was built, however is likely to date back to between 1883 and 1901. Its construction materials and style appears to date it to around the turn of the nineteenth century. Its size indicates to a certain extent the importance of stabling for horses in an era when these animals were the main mode of transport and were relied upon for early farm operations.

SOURCES

Certificate of Title, OT 78/114, Land Information New Zealand.

Clarke, David, Director Lakes District Museum, letter to Neil McDonald, Queenstown, 10/11/99

Howden, Francis, Shotover District Survey map (SO1489)1865

FILE NOTES

The exact dates of construction of the building have not been able to be sourced in the timeframe for this research. Future research may reveal a more certain date of construction.

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

⁸⁷ Certificate of title, OT 78/114

⁸⁸ David Clarke, Director Lakes District Museum, letter to Neil McDonald, Queenstown, 10/11/99

⁸⁹ Certificate of title, OT 78/114

⁹⁰ *ibid*

NAME (including former names)

Arranmore Farm Buildings
Former McBride's farm buildings

LOCATION/ADDRESS

At the end of Grants road on the Frankton Flats, Queenstown.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	Woolshed c; late 1860s Barn circa 1910?
✓ Architectural Value Moderate	ARCHITECT/BUILDER Mc Bride
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Smithy and dairy – stone Woolshed and barn - timber
✓ Historical/Social Value High	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
✓ Townscape/context Value High	LISTINGS Reference 119, The Smithy and dairy already proposed on Plan Change 3.
✓ Rarity/Representative Value Moderate- High rarity and representative value	Local Authority rating recommended
Technological Value	LEGAL DESCRIPTION Lot 9 DP 2212, Shotover SD
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Moderate- High	TYPE/USE Historic farm buildings
	CURRENT OWNERS Queenstown Airport Corporation Ltd.
	CURRENT CONDITION Average

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The complex of remaining farm buildings at Arranmore are a tangible reminder of the Wakatipu's link to early farm development, in particular early grain growing on the Frankton Flats.

The buildings and farm history reflect the foresight of a number of pioneering business men who formed a company and instigated grain growing on the Frankton flats. They provided incentives for early pastoralists by setting up the Brunswick Flour mill within the vicinity and providing cash injections that had the effect of boosting the local economy.

The construction of the barn during McBride's (timber miller) era, using recycled materials from the original 1866 flour mill, gives the building extra historical and architectural significance. The construction materials are thought to have been timber supplied by the sawmills at the head of the lake. This provides a further link to an important early industry in the Wakatipu.

The two substantial buildings, the barn/granary and the woolshed with their backdrop of the Remarkables provide interest and historical connection to this dramatic landscape setting.

The group of farm buildings on Arranmore provide a snap shot into farming practices from the first European settlement through to recent day farming. These remnant farm buildings are now a rarity in the Wakatipu district and together they create a visual reminder of the area's past dependence on farming.

DESCRIPTION

The Mc Brides Farm complex now known as Arranmore farm consists of a former smithy, dairy, woolshed barn and grounds and are located on Grant Road on the Frankton Flats about 7 km from Queenstown. The remains of the former smithy are on the left side of the road while the remainder of the other historic farm buildings are on the right side of Grant Road.

Woolshed

The woolshed building is a substantial timber framed building clad in horizontal weatherboards with a hipped roof and lean-to extensions to the south and south west. There are attached sheep yards to the west of the building.⁹¹

The principle (north west) elevation has a single central door, although it is evident from the vertical timber infill that this was once a large barn type door. There is a large double barn door at the right-hand end, which takes up the full height of the wall. There are five small windows of various types unevenly spaced down the wall. The north east elevation has a large double door and a single six light window.

The interior is still partitioned as a woolshed, with the slatted floors of the pens, the board and the wool handling space.⁹²

The expansive interior is timber framed, constructed from heavy framing beams and roof trusses which are a notable feature. The timber framing and lining of the ceiling is also significant and there are still shingles under the corrugated iron roof, with the battens visible from the interior.⁹³

Other huts

Near to the woolshed is a couple of huts one a single garage made from corrugated iron, another timber clad garage and a small single gable small wooden hut.

Barn/ Granary

This is a large two-story timber framed structure, rectangular in plan and clad in weather boards. There are windows only on the gable ends of the barn. The cladding is falling off and has in places been patched with corrugated iron.⁹⁴

On the North east elevation there is a large central opening at ground level. There are three evenly spaced openings on the upper level (two of which show evidence of having two paired six-light sash windows). The central first floor opening looks to be used to load grain into the barn. There is a small window at the central peak of the gable.⁹⁵

The south west elevation also has a single large opening on the ground floor, with three evenly spaced openings on the first floor. The central opening is covered with corrugated iron. The other two window-sized openings have lost their windows. The interior is partitioned and currently used to store grain.⁹⁶

Dairy

The dairy is a rectangular building constructed of stacked stone and then painted. It has a hipped corrugated iron roof and the ceilings are match lined. It is shown to exist in an 1959 deposited plan (DP 9617)⁹⁷

Smithy

The Smithy (located on the left of Grant Road, was constructed of stone but is largely in a ruined state. The old forge appears to be in the paddock nearby and it is currently being used as an implement shed.⁹⁸

⁹¹ New Zealand Historic Places Trust, *Mc Brides farm buildings* (former) draft historic report 2006

⁹² *Mc Brides Farm Buildings*, (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust, draft historic report 2006

⁹³ *ibid*

⁹⁴ *ibid*

⁹⁵ *ibid*

⁹⁶ *ibid*

⁹⁷ *ibid*

⁹⁸ *ibid*

Grounds

To the South East of the homestead are substantial plantings of mature trees. These include walnuts, chestnuts, elms and black poplars. Some are said to be more than 100 years old possibly planted by the Mc Bride family who were the first farmers on the Frankton Flats.⁹⁹

HISTORY

Pastoralism in the Wakatipu basin began as early as 1860 with the arrival of William Gilbert Rees and his companion Nicolas Von Tunzleman. By 1864 formal survey of the land made areas available for development.¹⁰⁰ The development of the Frankton flats was spearheaded by prominent businessman, Bendix Hallenstein¹⁰¹ who went into partnership with James W. Robertson (businessman and first mayor of Queenstown) to set up the Brunswick flour mill at Frankton in 1866. Their motive was to encourage wheat growing in the district and they assisted farmers by giving them cash advances. The Wakatipu District became one of the best wheat producers in the colony.¹⁰²

The Brunswick flour mill was cited near the Kawarau Falls at the outlet to Lake Wakatipu and was an important part of farming development from the 1866 – circa; 1886. Daniel McBride took over from Roberston upon his death in 1876 and then transferred to Thomas Hicks at the end of the first twenty one year lease.¹⁰³ All of these men along with Frank McBride, had been in business together previously in Victoria, Australia where they worked in the timber industry.¹⁰⁴ They were also involved in sawmilling at the head of Lake Wakatipu and had formed a company to advance agriculture particularly concentrated on the Frankton Flats where they established cropping farms.¹⁰⁵

According to land records, the land on which these remaining farm buildings stand was first granted to John R. Williams as an “agricultural area” A survey office plan shows a total of just over 49 acres which was surveyed in June 1866. (SO 6310). James William Robertson bought this parcel plus another 20 acres in 1872.¹⁰⁶ The shingles evident on the woolshed date it from around the mid to late 1860s. According to Lakes District Museum Director David Clarke, the use of iron became more common after the later 1860s in the Queenstown area.¹⁰⁷

After the death of Robertson in 1876, the land was transferred to Thomas Hicks in 1877 and then to Francis McBride in 1886 (OT34/34).¹⁰⁸ The block was incorporated into a 900 acre (365 hectare) holding owned by Mc Bride in 1898 (OT 116/112) The property was known as Antrim Farm and later as French farm.¹⁰⁹

The Brunswick Mill had closed about 1886 and Frank McBride later bought it¹¹⁰ and then dismantled it. It is thought that the timbers timbers and some of the windows were used to build the two storied structure (barn/granary) that still exists on Arranmore farm.¹¹¹

It is uncertain exactly when the barn was constructed here but it is suspected that it was around circa 1910.¹¹² From early photos of the Brunswick mill, you can see that the windows and the doors match those on the existing building.¹¹³ It can be reasonably safely concluded then that this building contains some of the original timber dating from the 1866 Brunswick mill. (The timbers from the mill are said to have come from the beech forests at the head of the lake. Given the dates of the barn and the woolshed

⁹⁹ *Mc Brides farm buildings* (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust draft historic report 2006

¹⁰⁰ Peter Petchey, Threepwood Lake Hayes, Wakatipu basin: “Archaeological Assessment” Southern archaeology, 2005, p5 cited in NZHPT *Mc Brides farm buildings*, a draft historic report 2006.

¹⁰¹ Bendix Hallenstein was born in Brunswick, Germany. After working in England he emigrated to Victoria Australia at the age of 22 and opened a store with his two brothers. In the early 1860s he moved to Invercargill and when the Wakatipu gold fields opened, to Queenstown. F.W.G. Miller, *Golden Days of Lake County, Whitcombe and Tombs Limited*, 1962 (first published 1949), p. 126

¹⁰² F.W.G. Miller, *Golden Days of Lake County, Whitcombe and Tombs Limited*, 1962 (first published 1949), p. 126

¹⁰³ *ibid*

¹⁰⁴ *Mc Brides farm buildings* (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust draft historic report 2006

¹⁰⁵ David Clarke research, Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown.

¹⁰⁶ *Mc Brides farm buildings* (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust draft historic report 2006

¹⁰⁷ *Mc Brides farm buildings* (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust draft historic report 2006

¹⁰⁸ *ibid*

¹⁰⁹ *ibid*

¹¹⁰ F.W.G. Miller, p127

¹¹¹ David Clarke research, Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown,

¹¹² *ibid*

¹¹³ *ibid*

and the likelihood of some recycling from the Brunswick mill, it is likely the timbers were sourced from here.)

The farm changed hands many times from the 1920s to 2005 and was last owned and ran as a farm by the Mc Taggart family from 1982 – 2005 when it was sold to the Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited. (OT14A/1070)¹¹⁴

SOURCES

David Clarke research, Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown

Miller, F.W.G., *Golden Days of Lake County*, Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1962 (first published 1949)

New Zealand Historic Places Trust, *Mc Brides Farm Buildings* (former) draft historic report 2006

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

¹¹⁴ *Mc Brides Farm Buildings* (former) New Zealand Historic Places Trust draft historic report 2006

NAME (including former names)

Pig and Whistle Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS

Ballarat street, next to Post Office in Queenstown

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT	AGE/DATES
Archaeological Value	1978 addition to post office. Existing building is a refurbishment of this.
✓ Architectural Value Low	ARCHITECT/BUILDER ?
Cultural/Spiritual Value	MATERIALS Timber construction
✓ Historical/Social Value Low	LOCAL AUTHORITY QLDC
✓ Townscape/Context Value Moderate	LISTINGS
Rarity/Representative Value	Local Authority rating No category recommended
Technological Value	LEGAL DESCRIPTION
OVERALL HERITAGE VALUE Low	TYPE/USE Bar/restaurant
	CURRENT OWNERS
	CURRENT CONDITION Partial demolition to one gable. (July 2006)

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

While this building is somewhat representative of the scale and height of buildings in the downtown area of Queenstown in the late 1970s, it does not meet the criteria to be deemed a significant heritage feature. Its value could be said to be more streetscape/aesthetic than historical with its connection in scale to the Post office building next door.

DESCRIPTION

This one story building is set back from the street and overlooks part of Horne creek that runs past the north side of the building. It has a large outdoor space for diners.

HISTORY

The Pig and Whistle building sits next to the north side of the Queenstown Post Office. The second Queenstown Post Office was built in 1938 out of greywacke blasted near the site. In 1978 major alterations to the Post office took place as well as large additions. A wing was added onto one side which is believed to have been used as the Post Bank. This wing is part of the Pig and Whistle building today. The Post Bank moved to new premises in Camp Street in 1991 and the building was opened as a bar. Various bar businesses operated from here over the years and the building was refurbished several times before the Pig and Whistle took over.¹¹⁵

In 2002, Ngai Tahu was given consent to demolish the Post Office and amongst other buildings, the Pig and Whistle, for a site redevelopment.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Information gleaned from Lakes District Museum Director, David Clarke as well as Queenstown photo evidence from the photo archives

¹¹⁶ibid.

SOURCES

Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown archives.

FILE NOTES

ENTERED BY: Rebecca Reid

DATE ENTERED: July 2006

Attachment 4: Tree Assessments

Attention Natasha Van Hoppe
Planning Consultant
PO Box
Auckland
26.07.06

Dear Natasha; Please find the attached files with the stem evaluations for the Queenstown Lakes District council Trees.

I have evaluated all those trees that are identifiable with the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM).

There is a need to consider at what stem score trees should be considered for the district plan.

It would be my contention that while some councils choose a stem score of 145 I think this would be too high for the Queenstown Lakes district Council and would recommend a score of 120 as a base.

Also I would consider looking at the type of land some trees are growing on and the protection this affords, for example trees on land designated reserves land by the 1977 Reserves Act section 42 provides for sufficient cover for most situations.

Tree 1

This Sweet Chestnut that I would recommend is included in the district plan (DP).

Tree 2a and 2b

These are two major Eucalyptus trees at the entrance to Queenstown centre on the Frankton road and should be included in the DP.

Tree 3

This is a Horse chestnut that has reached a score of 120 but does not have characteristics that would suggest to me that it be included in the DP at this time.

Tree 4

The Oak trees in this area are quite unremarkable and would not appear to score well by STEM, I would not consider these to be worth including in the DP.

Tree 5a and 5b

These are two Eucalyptus trees on a council reserve that is extremely steep and it is quite likely that the councils management in regard of trees will require work to be done to these trees making them unsuitable for inclusion in the DP.

Tree 6

The 6 Oaks are in excellent condition and I would include these in the DP.

Tree 7a and 7b

These two Yews are in a particularly visible place at the entrance to the QT CBD they should be included in the DP.

Tree 8

This particular Sequoia is a very worthy tree for inclusion in the DP however construction within its drip line has caused some root damage and the tree will require monitoring in regard to its health.

Tree 9

This is a particularly nice Lime tree in a very visible CBD green space and should be included in the DP.

Tree 10

This walnut has some serious flaws in its crown structure and I would not include it in the DP.

Tree 11

This Horizontal Elm has yet to reach a stature that would warrant inclusion in the DP.

Tree12

This is a semi mature (young) tree and has yet to reach a stature that would warrant inclusion in the DP.

Tree13

This small pear (semi mature) tree may be better protected by the type of reserve it is growing on.

Tree14

As above

Tree15

As above

Tree 16

As above

Tree1 17

Tree all ready removed.

Tree 18

A repeat of trees 5a and 5b

Tree 19

Difficult tree to assess due to access issues however it appeared to grade well below a stem of 120.

Tree 20

These trees rated a stem value of 150 they are worthy of inclusion in the DP.

Tree 21a
Sequoia should be added to DP.

Tree 21b
Sequoia should be added to DP.

Tree 21c
Sequoia should be added to DP.

Tree 21d
Sequoia should be added to DP.

Tree 21e
Pine should be added to DP.

Tree 21f
Pine should be added to DP.

Tree 22
This is a semi mature tree that may warrant inclusion at some later date, recommend re evaluate at next plan review.

Tree 23
These are a small row of Pines that did not evaluate well with Stem, although they form part of the entrance to the Dublin bay reserve I don't think these trees should be included in the DP.

Tree 24
These Pears are useful in their role in the Wanaka station reserve but not of significant enough value to include in the plan.

Tree 25
European Larch a good tree worthy of inclusion in the DP.

Tree 26
An unusual Larch worthy of inclusion in the DP.

Tree 27
This cedar is a significant tree with in the reserve and should be included in the DP.

Tree 28
Although this Eucalyptus rated a stem of 126 I do not feel it is necessary to include the tree in the DP. The tree will need regular maintenance by the QLDC and can be monitored.

Tree 29

The Liriodendron with a valuation of stem 78 does not warrant inclusion in the DP at this time. Needs reviewed.

Tree 30

Although there is a group of trees around the Greek Fir I did not identify any further trees that warranted inclusion in the DP at this time. I recommend they be revisited.

Tree 31

These are minor trees mostly a variety of natives that are not significant enough to be included at this time.

Tree 32

This is a broad and far ranging group of trees covering many trees of different species and maturity.

I would expect the QLDC tree maintenance plan would cover these trees as a group plus I would expect the status of the land apportionments some protection.

I would recommend not including these in the DP at this time.

Tree 33

The poplars mentioned are a variety of ages and condition. I could not identify any particular trees that warranted inclusion in the DP.

Tree 34

The reserve status of Eely point probably covers this group, which is mainly a small wood lot. I would not recommend including the wood lot at this time.

Tree 35

The trees in the paddock behind the stony creek subdivision are all over mature (in the latter stages of their life span) I would not recommend inclusion of these trees in the DP.

Tree 36

These are not worthy of protection due to poor condition and lack of maturity.

Tree 37

These are more shrubbery than tree and although they are useful vegetation for screening they don't warrant inclusion in the DP.

Tree 38

I have inspected a number of the Eucalyptus on the lake shore of Hawea but did not find any that warranted inclusion in the DP.

Tree 39

I have inspected this site and it appears that the significant trees on this site are already included on the DP.

Tree 40

These trees represent a good vegetation cover however individually they are not in particularly good condition .I would recommend a revisit at the next DP review.

Tree 41

Although these trees have some value due to their heritage status individually they are not significant enough to consider for inclusion in the DP.

Tree 42

Although the Hawthorne hedges are reasonably old and provide significant vegetation cover for the area Hawthorne are widely considered a noxious weed in New Zealand also the management of Hawthorne hedges requires trimming to maintain them or they can suffer canopy collapse, these trees have been poorly maintained in the past. I think it would be unwise for them to be included in the DP.

Tree 43

The poplars in this area are of a variety of ages (maturity) and types and condition, I did not view any individual trees worthy of inclusion in the DP.

Tree 44

The wellingtonia are semi mature (young) and should be considered for the district plan at a later review.

Tree 45

This appeared to be a reasonable size tree although graded to 102 by STEM. I would recommend revisiting the tree at the next DP review.

Tree 46

This is a spectacular tree which I would recommend including in the DP.

Your sincerely

David Glenn

Heritage Plan Change #3 –

Report on the following trees as per plan requirements

A. Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka and Hawea

ITEM	Stem score	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Stem score sheet number
1	138	Sharon Duncan	Chestnut Tree at 93 Thompson St	.1
2a	174	David Finlin	Two gum trees on Frankton road adjacent to the Sherwood Manor Hotel	.2
2b	168			.2.1
3	120	David Finlin	Horse Chestnut, along driveway to the Sutherland Farm on Gorge Road	.3
4	NA	David Finlin	Oak trees in farm land by old white stone cottage, SH between Kelvin Heights turnoff and Boyd Road, 148 Kingston Road	
5a	108	Chiga Fukuda	2 Eucalypt trees on Council reserve adjacent to property at 60 Panorama Terrace (Lot 39 DP 16397)	.4
5b	102			.4.1
6	156	Jackie Gillies	6 Oaks on the property of Mrs Lynley Hansen, adjacent to the woolshed on Hansen Road, Frankton	.5
7a	144	Gordon Bailey	2 Taxus Baccata 'Fastigiata' at the old Queenstown Primary School site	.6
7b	144			.6.1
8	186	Gordon Bailey	1 Sequoiadendrum giganteum at the site of the old Bottle House	.7
9	168	Gordon Bailey	1 Tilia x europea at Earnslaw Park	.8
10	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Juglans regia, Walnut, at St Peters Anglican Church	Tree in poor condition
11	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Ulmus glabra 'Horizontalis' at the St Peters Anglican Church	Small tree
12	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Aesculus hippocastanum, Horse Chestnut, at St Peters Anglican Church	Small tree look to reserves act 1977
13	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Pyrus Communis, Pear, at reserve corner Gorge Road and Stanley Street	Small tree look to reserves act 1977
14	NA	Gordon Bailey	2 Pyrus Sp, Eating Plum, at reserve corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street	Small tree look to reserves act 1977

ITEM	Stem score	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Stem score sheet number
15	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Ficus Sp, Fig, at reserve corner Gorge Road and Stanley Street	Small tree look to reserves act 1977
16	NA	Gordon Bailey	1 Aesculus hippocastanum at reserve corner of Gorge Road and Stanley Street	Small tree look to reserves act 1977
17	Gone	Duncan Field & WESI	Norway Spruce next to the Courthouse, Queenstown	Gone
18	Same as above	Dorothea Ramsay	2 Eucalypt trees located on Council reserve adjacent to 10 Longwood Place	Same as above site 4 and 4.1
19	NA	B & N Thompson	Walnut Tree at Pinewood Gardens	Access required but tree looks poor
20	150	Murray & Sandra McClennan	Nine Elm trees, at rear of property, 196 Hogan's Gully Road	9

B. Arrowtown:

	Stem score	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Stem score sheet number
21a	174	Arrowtown Village Ass	Wellingtonias and pine in the Arrowtown Camp Ground cabin area	10.1
21b	168			10.2
21c	174			10.3
21d	174			10.4
21e	180			10.5
21f	180			10.6
22	114	Duncan Field	Tall red oak next to Buckingham Green, Arrowtown	11

C. Wanaka:

	Stem score	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Stem score sheet number
23	NA	Neil Farrin	Trees on Council reserve next to 297 Dublin Bay Road	
24	78	Gordon Bailey	9 Pyrus Communis, common Pear, at Wanaka Station Park	12
25	120	Gordon Bailey	Larix decidua (European larch) at Wanaka Station Homestead	12.1
26	132	Gordon Bailey	Larix kaemferi (Japanese larch) at Wanaka Station Homestead	12.2
27	174	Gordon Bailey	Cedrus atlantica glauca (Atlantic cedar blue) at Wanaka Station Homestead	12.3
28	126	Duncan Field	Gum Tree in Wanaka cemetery	13
29	78	Duncan Field & K & B Taylor	Liriodendron, cnr Capell Ave & Skinner Cres, Lake Hawea	14

D. Other: Broad submissions

	Stem score	Submitter Name	Addition Sought	Stem score sheet number
30	NA	Arrowtown Village Ass	Mature trees next to the Greek Fir (ref 269) in Old Manse grounds, 51 Manse Road	No further trees identified that are suitable or worth including at this time re assess
31	NA	Karen Boulay	Trees at 5 Huff Street	Minor trees
32	NA	Gordon Christie	All major trees around the [Wanaka] Lake edge	To vague
33	NA	Gordon Christie	The poplars opposite the [Wanaka] showground and around to Edgewater	To vague
34	NA	Gordon Christie	The trees in the Eely point area	To vague
35	NA	Gordon Christie	The poplars and blue gums in groups in the paddocks above the Stoney Creek Subdivision	Specimens not worth including
36	NA	P A & W A Cody Family Trust	Trees on the lake front near 885 Frankton Road	Unsuitable

37	NA	Katie Deans	Smoke trees along Frankton Rd	Unsuitable
38	NA	Pasty Lambert-Robinson	The large eucalyptus trees on the Lake Hawea foreshore	To vague
39	NA	Kirsty Sharpe	Significant trees around lake edge within the Kawarau Falls Lakeside Holiday Park	Possible re quire more detail
40	NA	Mary Hansen	Trees at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road – walnuts, horse chestnuts, elms, black popular	Group of trees individually poor

E. Re evaluated trees

	Stem score	Submitter Name	Removal/Deletion Sought	Stem score sheet number
41	99	Gordon Bailey	Ref 200 – 6 Prunus Accolade on Coronation Drive	A.1
42	96	Barry Robertson	Ref 208 – Hawthorn Hedge	A.2
43	132	Paradise Rural Estates Ltd	Ref 209 – Poplars on Speargrass Flats Road	A.3
44	96	Jo Boyd	Wellingtonias on Boyd Road	A4
45	102	Gordon Bailey	Ref 211 - Pin Oak, Remarkable Lodge - is not considered worthy of such protection.	A.5
46	150	David Finlin	Snow gum at Glenorchy Road, opposite the entrance to Pat & Sue Farrys' (Punatapu), Bobs Cove	A.6

Attention Natasha Van Hoppe
Planning Consultant
Auckland
18.02.07

Dear Natasha; Please find the attached files with the stem evaluations for the Queenstown Lakes District council Trees.

I have evaluated the trees were necessary with the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM).

Trees at 51 Manse Road Arrowtown

The group of trees originally identified included all the vegetation surrounding another notable tree a large fir. .

However much of the vegetation consists of semi mature trees including Cedar, Eucalyptus, and Douglas fir as well as one large Cedar and two Redwoods.

The minor vegetation would not fit the profile of protection of the district plan however three trees the Cedar and two Redwoods were worth evaluating.

The Cedar is a mature tree of some size however it has suffered badly in the past as a result of severe dieback and is not in a condition that would be good enough for the district plan.

The Two Redwoods are both magnificent trees in their own right and I would recommend these be considered for inclusion in the district plan stem scores attached.

I will include both these trees on the national register with the RNZIH.

Pine wood Gardens Frankton

I have inspected the two walnuts promoted for the district plan by Mr. and Mrs.

Thompson however both walnuts are poor specimens with dieback and inherent crown weaknesses and should not be included.

Your sincerely

David Glenn

Condition Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Form	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very good	Specimen	15	c-1
Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very rare	15	c-2
Vigour & Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	15	c-3
Function	Minor	Useful	Important	Significant	Major	15	c-4
Age (yr)	10 yrs. +	20 yrs.+	40 yrs. +	80 yrs. +	100 yrs. +	21	c-5
sub-total points						81	c-t

Amenity Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Stature (m)	3 to 8	9 to 14	15 to 20	21 to 26	27 +	21	a-1
Visibility (km)	0.5 - 1.0	1.0 -2.0	2.0 -4.0	4.0 - 8.0	8.0 - >	9	a-2
Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10 +	Group 3 +	Solitary	21	a-3
Role	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15	a-4
Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	9	a-5
sub-total points						75	a-t

Notable Evaluation

<i>RECOGNITION</i>	Local	District	Regional	National	International	SCORE	CODE
<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27		
Stature							ns
Feature						3	ns-1
Form						3	ns-2
Historic							nh
Age 100+							nh-1
Association							nh-2
Commemoration							nh-3
Remnant							nh-4
Relict							nh-5
Scientific							nsc
Source							nsc-1
Rarity							nsc-2
Endangered							nsc-3
sub-total points							n-t
TOTAL POINTS						6	t-p

162

Standard Tree Evaluation Method Score Form. Copyright R.Flook, with permission to ITM Ltd.		
REMARKS: Tree at the front back gate		
Client:	QLDC	
Client reference:	N. Van Hoppe	
Contact:		Phone: Cell.ph.:
Address:	51 manse road Arrowtown	Fax: E-mail:
Tree species:	Sequoia	
Tree location:	Rear of property	

Condition Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Form	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very good	Specimen	21	c-1
Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very rare	15	c-2
Vigour & Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	21	c-3
Function	Minor	Useful	Important	Significant	Major	15	c-4
Age (yr)	10 yrs. +	20 yrs.+	40 yrs. +	80 yrs. +	100 yrs. +	21	c-5
sub-total points						93	c-t

Amenity Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Stature (m)	3 to 8	9 to 14	15 to 20	21 to 26	27 +	15	a-1
Visibility (km)	0.5 - 1.0	1.0 -2.0	2.0 -4.0	4.0 - 8.0	8.0 - >	9	a-2
Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10 +	Group 3 +	Solitary	21	a-3
Role	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15	a-4
Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	9	a-5
sub-total points						69	a-t

Notable Evaluation

<i>RECOGNITION</i>	Local	District	Regional	National	International	SCORE	CODE
<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27		
Stature							ns
Feature						9	ns-1
Form						9	ns-2
Historic							nh
Age 100+							nh-1
Association							nh-2
Commemoration							nh-3
Remnant							nh-4
Relict							nh-5
Scientific							nsc
Source							nsc-1
Rarity							nsc-2
Endangered							nsc-3
sub-total points							n-t
TOTAL POINTS						18	t-p

Total 180

Standard Tree Evaluation Method Score Form. Copyright R.Flook, with permission to ITM Ltd.			
REMARKS: Tree at the back left hand corner			
Client:	QLDC		
Client reference:	N. Van Hoppe		
Contact:		Phone:	Cell.ph.:
Address:	51 manse road Arrowtown	Fax:	E-mail:
Tree species:	Sequoia		
Tree location:	Rear of property		

Condition Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Form	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very good	Specimen	9	c-1
Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very rare	15	c-2
Vigour & Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	9	c-3
Function	Minor	Useful	Important	Significant	Major	3	c-4
Age (yr)	10 yrs. +	20 yrs.+	40 yrs. +	80 yrs. +	100 yrs. +	15	c-5
sub-total points						51	c-t

Amenity Evaluation

<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27	SCORE	CODE
Stature (m)	3 to 8	9 to 14	15 to 20	21 to 26	27 +	9	a-1
Visibility (km)	0.5 - 1.0	1.0 -2.0	2.0 -4.0	4.0 - 8.0	8.0 - >	9	a-2
Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10 +	Group 3 +	Solitary	15	a-3
Role	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	3	a-4
Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	3	a-5
sub-total points						39	a-t

Notable Evaluation

<i>RECOGNITION</i>	Local	District	Regional	National	International	SCORE	CODE
<i>POINTS</i>	3	9	15	21	27		
Stature						0	ns
Feature						0	ns-1
Form						0	ns-2
Historic						0	nh
Age 100+						0	nh-1
Association						0	nh-2
Commemoration						0	nh-3
Remnant						0	nh-4
Relict						0	nh-5
Scientific						0	nsc
Source						0	nsc-1
Rarity						0	nsc-2
Endangered						0	nsc-3
sub-total points						0	n-t
TOTAL POINTS						0	t-p

90

Standard Tree Evaluation Method Score Form. Copyright R.Flook, with permission to ITM Ltd.			
REMARKS: Planted with another walnut in poor condition also.			
Client:	QLDC		
Client reference:	N. Van Hoppe		
Contact:		Phone:	Cell.ph.:
Address:	Frankton road	Fax:	E-mail:
Tree species:	walnut		
Tree location:	Rear of property		

Attachment 5: Features and Trees Recommended to be Reviewed

As a result of the recommendations made in this report on the submissions received on Plan Change 3, the following table provides a list of items that are recommended to be reviewed at a later stage as part of a separate Plan Change process.

It is envisaged that in the mean-time information can be collated on these items so to provide for efficient and accurate assessment at the time of the preparation of that Plan Change.

Features/Trees to be Reviewed	
Features:	Relics or sites of Chinese settlement on the Arrow River
Trees:	Trees at 5 Huff Street, Queenstown Avenue of Wellingtonias, Boyd Road Liriodendron, Corner of Capell Ave and Skinner Cres, Lake Hawea Red Oak next to Buckingham Green, Arrowsmith Trees at Arranmore Farm, Grants Road, Frankton Flats Horizontalis and Horse Chestnut, St Peters Anglican Church, Queenstown
Precincts:	Brisbane and Park Streets Kinloch Lodge

Attachment 6: Frankton Marina Site - Plan

