

MITIGATION

4.21.1 District Wide Rules

The district wide rules apply throughout the District, and all land use activities must be considered in terms of each of the district wide rules. The district wide rules are:

(A) 4.22 Outstanding natural features and landscapes - NOT APPLICABLE

(B) 4.23 Areas of Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Significant Habitats of Indigenous fauna - NOT APPLICABLE

(C) 4.24 Soil Resource - NOT APPLICABLE

(D) 4.25 Mineral Extraction - NOT APPLICABLE

(E) 4.26

Heritage:Non Complying Activity

(F) 4.27 Transportation - NOT APPLICABLE

(G) 4.28 Natural Hazards - NOT APPLICABLE

(H) 4.29 Subdivision of Land - NOT APPLICABLE

(I) 4.30

Demolition or Removal Activities :restricted discretionary activity, unless Rule 4.26 Heritage applies.

(J) 4.30A Relocated Buildings - NOT APPLICABLE

(K) 4.31 Public Open Space - NOT APPLICABLE

(L) 4.32 Infrastructure - NOT APPLICABLE

The greatest effect this proposal has is on Heritage. These effects have been sufficiently assessed by Bonisch Consultants (pages 8 - 11) and NZ Heritage Properties Ltd's 177-page Heritage Impact Assessment. It should be noted that the Heritage Impact Assessment we funded has shown the Club Hotel and Sir Joseph Ward are very different to what was originally thought to be true by history groups and Heritage NZ.

To mitigate these effects we initially suggested terraced gardens with

central stairs and a gate. The gate was never intended as an entrance to the site or festival nor is it required as a Fire Exit under our Fire Plan. The gate served as an accessway for volunteers to use when maintaining the gardens. As mentioned in the AEE (3: Description of Activity), the site is 1.4 metres higher than the footpath and, we believe, the terraced gardens address that aspect in an attractive manner. The fence provides a place to display images and information. Simon Tonkin has informed us that because we had steps, we had to provide disabled access, this resulted in the ramp illustration we provided. We are willing to adapt the frontage to suit the needs of Council and the community. It is our understanding that Council can place conditions on the Resource Consent Approval. For us, a more simplistic and cost-effective option would be to terrace the gardens and have no pictures on the fence (eliminating the need to have access) and have Interpretive Panels at ground level like the Don Street/Ex-Todd's development. No signage would breach the District Plan signage rules.

Our long-term vision would be to have the retaining wall behind a row of shipping containers that are adapted to look similar to old style shops, ie, rolled corrugated verandahs, exterior cladding, and display windows to showcase Bluff (and the Club Hotel's) history. Salvaged materials from the Club Hotel could be used in these 'shops'. We have not proposed this as part of this application as we have limited time, money, and people to start, what would be, another project. The simplified gardens, with no steps or ramp, would be easiest to adapt in the future. We are willing to store some salvaged items for future use as this long-term vision is realistically achievable once the issue of the Club is resolved and the site is freehold.

With regard to the streetscape, it would be difficult for anyone to truly mitigate the effect of removing a two-storey building from the streetscape and our only option will be to provide a clean, well-maintained, and attractive frontage. The Coles Consulting report we provided does not present the property as a viable site to rebuild on without great cost due to possible liquefaction.