

ATTACHMENT A – EXPERT CONFERENCING ON GLENPANEL HOMESTEAD – 05 December 2023

Participants: Bruce Weir and Robin Miller

Note: The experts come from different backgrounds as follows:

Bruce Weir: Urban Design / Regeneration

Robin Miller: Heritage

Issue	Agreed Position	Issues, Questions, Disagreements or reservations, with reasons/consequences
Heritage values of the Glenpanel Homestead.	<p>We agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage plays a pivotal role in placemaking and identity; 2. The detail provided in Part 7 (Historic Heritage Significance) of the Origin <i>Heritage and Archaeological Values Assessment Report</i> (January 2022) is robust and relevant – specifically that the values of the Homestead are intrinsically linked to its surrounding grounds. 	<p>There was broad discussion about how limitations in the assessment scope (Shotover River to Lake Hayes) resulted in limited heritage focus in masterplan development – versus other placemaking attributes (such as geomorphology and landscape).</p> <p>Of particular note was the role of the Glenpanel Homestead in a wider 'heritage trail' which extends the Lake at Frankton (wharf), airport (including the demolished Brunswick Flour Mill), Shotover River Bridge, Ferry Hotel, Threepwood Estate and out to Arrowtown. The summary of Section 7 from the Assessment details the 'group' value of the buildings at Threepwood, but the same principle could be extended to grand farm complexes along a route – which includes the inter-relationship of these other heritage features.</p>
What constitutes the “setting” of the Glenpanel Homestead?	<p>We recognise and agree with the District Plan definition of heritage which includes a buildings setting.</p> <p>Consequently, given the buildings 'grand' nature, we agree the setting around the building needs to be generous and should seek to encompass as many as possible 'group' features (other buildings, driveway etc.)</p>	<p>Discussion was held over the entry drive and associated landscape being part of the setting – although elements may in fact be on separate titles.</p> <p>Although the value of existing trees is not within the competence of both experts, it was acknowledged that concept of the 'entry drive' should be celebrated – ideally as a pedestrian-centric (walking, cycling) link.</p> <p>The Collector Road along the Homestead frontage should effectively act as an extension of the setting. As such, the Entry Drive does not need to visually terminate on the Homestead itself.</p>

Issue	Agreed Position	Issues, Questions, Disagreements or reservations, with reasons/consequences
Adaptive reuse of the Glenpanel Homestead	<p>We agree that adaptive reuse of the Homestead is essential to the economic viability of maintaining the heritage asset and setting.</p> <p>We agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Homestead and setting is an important community node and focal point – although this does not necessarily mean public ownership (private is acceptable). • Quality redevelopment of the Homestead could be incentivised and encouraged by enabling additional quality, urban development. 	<p>Discussion was held over how surrounding development will impact value of the Homestead (and vice versa) and the need for a holistic approach to development of heritage assets. The 'enabling development' concept to make heritage retention attractive is considered an appropriate approach ...</p> <p>No agreement was reached over the best mechanism to achieve this but that planning latitude and discretion are required.</p>
Appropriate protection of heritage values of the Glenpanel Homestead when considering the proposed receiving environment.	It was agreed that heritage values of the Homestead cannot be divorced from the homestead's grounds.	<p>Discussion was held around the significance of a formal productive rural landscape (shelterbelt planting, fencing) imposed over landscape characteristics as an integral part of heritage values.</p> <p>While not agreed, it was broadly accepted that a level of change could be anticipated so long as development 'showcased' the homestead and setting (ie higher buildings require greater setback).</p> <p>It was acknowledged that quality development (such as that being undertaken at Ayrburn) could effectively extend the heritage values of the homestead itself.</p>

Issue	Agreed Position	Issues, Questions, Disagreements or reservations, with reasons/consequences
Appropriate spatial extent of the Glenpanel precinct	<p>We agree that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Matters pertaining to the Glenpanel Precinct is a separate (albeit inter-related) matter to the Homestead and its setting. 	<p>Discussion has held over the extent of the precinct. Mr. Miller felt the spatial extent of the Precinct is an urban design matter, but the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The notion of a precinct does not stop or start with planning boundaries but extends as far as the perception / association of the heritage values (including landscape) High quality upgrade of the Homestead (and ground) could support more intensive development around it. Creating a node for commercial community and residential activity (subject to appropriate setbacks) would be desirable in this location. Development could support additional height with the right design Development of buildings along the toe of Slope Hill, and away from the homestead would not necessarily adversely impact heritage values, but would need to be assessed on merit.
Appropriate bulk and location settings	<p>We agree that the proposed provisions (50% building coverage, 3m setback from road boundaries, 1.5m from other boundary's) are inappropriate.</p> <p>We agree that in order to achieve quality redevelopment / adaptive re-use of the Glenpanel Homestead and grounds, a degree of latitude and planning discretion is required – and that the heights of surrounding building needs to be viewed with respect to setbacks and assimilation of other existing features.</p>	<p>While no agreement was reached about the proportion of setback to building height, discussion was held around the implications of setting rigid criteria for development around the homestead.</p> <p>There was a discussion about how permissive provisions could be subject to applications that look to 'push the boundaries'.</p>

Issue	Agreed Position	Issues, Questions, Disagreements or reservations, with reasons/consequences
Design criteria for development within the Glenpanel precinct	<p>It was agreed that future development needs to be assessed on its own merits and impacts on heritage values. These include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural appropriateness • Proportions and roof forms • Materials • Traditional colour schemes 	<p>Broad discussion was held over the need to assess a specific proposal, and that it was better to incentivise quality outcomes than to enable poor outcomes.</p>
Retention of established trees within the Glenpanel precinct	<p>It was agreed that while both experts were not competent to assess the merits of specific trees, from a heritage perspective, retaining the heritage environment 'in the round' is merited.</p>	<p>It was acknowledged by both experts that, while not qualified to assess the trees themselves, the Homestead's landscape attributes could be distilled down into an ambience and not necessarily specific trees. As such, trees could be removed (if deemed necessary) to enhance an overall desired development outcome without compromising the integrity of the Homestead.</p> <p>Furthermore, the extent of the Homestead setting could be expanded' by employing similar attributes in the surrounding streetscapes.</p>
Highway setback	<p>We agree that a State Highway setback is inappropriate because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The homestead will largely be obscured from foreground development from the SH, and that; 2. Emphasis should be placed on providing pedestrian-centric 'green corridors' at right angles to the highway which act as visual gateways to the community node. <p>We further agree that the setbacks illustrated for the Homestead from the Collector Road are appropriate, particularly if landscape attributes of</p>	<p>Both experts acknowledged that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development along the SH will largely mask the homestead and grounds • That views and access points from the SH are primarily for pedestrian and cycling traffic • That the Collector Road acts as the 'front door' for the homestead and wider precinct particularly as a link route through the TPLM <p>On this basis greater emphasis should be placed on setbacks from the Collector Road.</p>

Issue	Agreed Position	Issues, Questions, Disagreements or reservations, with reasons/consequences
	the homestead grounds extend into the road corridor.	
Active travel leg through precinct	<p>As detailed above, we agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The primary Active Travel link for the Homestead and wider precinct is via the Collector Road; 2. That a strong pedestrian link should be made through from the highway to the Collector Road in close proximity to the homestead 	<p>BW detailed outcomes from the Urban Design/Transport JW conferencing with respect to proposed SH6 'urban treatment' on the northern side of the highway corridor, along with the requirements for a further mid-block (between signalised intersections) pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>RM detailed the desire to utilise the homestead entry driveway (and associated tree belt) as this pedestrian-centric link.</p> <p>Both acknowledged that the Collector Road provides the most legible and safe route for pedestrians and cyclists for the homestead and other heritage features in the wider TPLM area. While it was not fully agreed, there was general alignment that implementing a 'grand' landscape along this route would magnify heritage attributes.</p>
View shafts towards and away from Glenpanel	<p>It was agreed that viewshafts from the SH towards the homestead are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited, and; • Do not necessarily need to terminate on the homestead itself <p>We further agreed that the homestead and grounds should be 'showcased' and not subsumed by surrounding development.</p>	<p>There was general discussion about where development could occur in relation to the homestead without undermining the integrity of the asset, or the desire to create a focal point.</p>

Drafting changes proposed to the District Plan provisions (if any) and the technical reasons for those changes¹

Change proposed	Technical Reasons
-----------------	-------------------

¹ As required by Hearing Panel Minute dated 10 August 2023. Paragraph 9.11(f).

Possible Questions to be referred to other expert groups

Robin Miller 

Bruce Weir 