

DDPR_feedback_0407s	
Name	Jeremy Hawker
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 10:19:56 am
Notes	Hawker
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Historic Heritage
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Neutral
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	HH-P1 Recognise historic heritage
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	1. We are amazed that an individual can nominate properties that are not their own and without the approval of the owners, having undertaken work via, we assume google maps, and then imposing on the owner an unsolicited visit, to collect information, including photographic records from neighbouring properties. We believe multiple listing by a non owner or resident should be altered to include owners approval.
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	HH-P2 Historic heritage scheduling
Q6	Feedback/Comments
	HH 154 NEW LISTING Name (Original) Morgan Farm Lime kiln While the description in the text mentions items these are not located in the attached maps, just a general area. This makes what is proposed and what is mapped difficult to understand for consideration. Stonewalls listed indicate they are around the building area, are the boundary stonewalls not included. If this is the case all well and good, if they are included, then as stated they are boundary walls and as such three other properties and owners are impacted as they are shared barriers. The condition of the walls is of mixed nature, some clearly have been rebuilt and include material from different periods, including bricks, and machinery parts, in our ownership one section has collapsed due to stock activity and we are aware that there are other portions that in time will collapse due in part to rabbit activity burrowing beneath the stone, and will subsequently be re stacked. They are of mixed quality, while they are old they have also been repaired numerous times.
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	HH-P2 Historic heritage scheduling
Q8	Feedback/Comments
	HH 154 NEW LISTING Name (Original) Morgan Farm Lime kiln We are supportive of the inclusion of the kiln, the Dairy, associated stone buildings, the stone walls while aesthetically pleasing are of mixed quality and are rough stacked stone. As current owners we have no intention of altering them, but they do not provide a stock barrier to most domesticated animals.
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	Supporting documents?
Q12	If you need more space, or have other general comments, please leave them here
	As current owners of this property, we purchased with full knowledge of the heritage values and assets located on the site. We value the property and have great respect for the previous series of owners that have maintained and kept the property functioning as a small lifestyle block. Due to the modest size and the lack of capital spent over the years the current buildings have been maintained as functioning service areas, for the purpose of storage and work. They have clearly been maintained in materials available throughout the history of NZ with respect for the past but with an application of practicality and pragmatism. These values we respect but are not confident that inclusion in the district Plan allows for the past common-sense approach to a working site.

<p>The kiln is listed as in good order having been carved into the existing bluff and lined with fire bricks. While the opening and exit are visible a significant portion of the chimney is blocked by years of debris that has been accumulating in it we assume as waste from previous occupiers of the site.</p> <p>The Waitaki District Council has issued a LIM for the property at 29 Shrimski Street, nowhere in that document are the buildings of heritage nomination listed. This raises question on the competence and record keeping ability of the authority given these buildings are over 140 years old, visible from any aerial record. If the WDC does not have a current record of these buildings, why would we as owners have confidence that they can maintain any future records.</p>
--

DDPR_feedback_0410s	
Name	Jeremy Hawker
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 10:36:32 am
Notes	Hawker
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	General Rural Zone
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Neutral
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	GRUZ-O2 Character of the General Rural Zone
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	The township of Deborah, was formed on an old local Quarry Reserve, and the ground on the site is predominantly limestone. It is not highly fertile and the stone sits close to the surface and above. The township is already in sections with a variety of houses apart from an area at the southern end of the township. Why is this area considered General rural, and not considered Settlement or General residential given the land is in separate titles.
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here