

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS IN CHRISTCHURCH
TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHĪ**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on
Plan Change 13 (Heritage) to the
Christchurch District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AMANDA EMMA OHS ON BEHALF OF
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

HERITAGE ITEMS

17 June 2025

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

1. My name is **Amanda Ohs**. I am Senior Heritage Advisor at the **Christchurch City Council**.
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the Council which responds to submissions seeking the removal (“de-scheduling”), amendment or addition of Heritage Items and settings in Schedule 9.3.7.2, in terms of Policy 9.3.2.2.1 Identification, assessment and scheduling of heritage items. I reaffirm that I am complying with the Environment Court’s Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in presenting this summary of my evidence and responding to the submitter’s evidence.
3. For scheduled heritage items and settings, my evidence is based on an understanding of the heritage values of these places as outlined in the Statements of Significance and relevant information held in Council heritage files including historical documentation and conservation management plans. For non-scheduled places I have relied on heritage research documentation in Council’s heritage files, and including in some instances, additional research and advice provided to Council by Dr Ann McEwan.
4. In regard to my evidence for submissions seeking de-scheduling, I have also relied on the evidence of the range of experts who have provided the Council with quantity surveying, heritage engineering and conservation architecture advice.
5. In the following paragraphs, I summarise my opinion on the various changes to the Schedule sought by submitters.
6. I do not support the removal or the expansion sought of the Papanui War Memorial Avenues (Heritage item 1459) because I consider they meet the scheduling policy. I support an amended name for the heritage item which clarifies that the tree avenues, plaques and road reserve are included in the item.
7. I support amendments of heritage settings: 684 (Riccarton Tea House) with revision of what is sought, and heritage setting 423 (Dwelling, 27 Glandovey Road) because these amendments reflect the current environment and still provide for the heritage values of the scheduled heritage item.

8. I support changes to the Statement of Significance for 47 Rue Balguerie (Heritage item 1152) but do not support an amendment of the heritage setting as there have been no changes to the setting that justify its removal.
9. I do not support the scheduling of the 20th Battalion and 20th Regiment War Memorial or 111 Hackthorne Road as I do not consider they meet the threshold for scheduling.
10. I do not support the scheduling of the Barnett Avenue Pensioner flats or the Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library as these have been demolished. Although the Former Law Courts, the Princess Margaret Hospital and the Burnside Stable (Former quarry stables) meet or are likely to meet the threshold for scheduling in terms of their heritage significance, it is not appropriate to schedule them at this time for reasons related to current works, potential engineering and financial factors, and owner support.
11. I support the scheduling of the Teddington (Allandale) Lock up and setting as this meets the scheduling policy.
12. I do not support the removal of 9 Ford Road (1439), 129 High Street (1403), 159 Manchester Street (1402), 35 Rata Street (1433), 25 proposed baches in Taylors Mistake, or all (operative and proposed) scheduled Taylors Mistake baches as sought through submission (#96) as I consider these are justified for scheduling.
13. I do not support the removal of heritage items 463 (Antonio Hall - Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and setting); or 602 (Daresbury and setting), however I do support a reduction in the extent of heritage item 463 (Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and Setting) to exclude the original homestead building and central wing which have been destroyed by fire and are beyond repair. Based on the evidence of Stephen Hogg, I consider the accommodation wing and chapel are repairable. I consider the proposed amended item meets the threshold for scheduling as a significant heritage item.
14. I consider that necessary works for repair and strengthening of Daresbury homestead at 9 Daresbury Lane will retain its heritage values (with some reduction of technological value) and overall significance. I have reviewed the submitter evidence dated 6 June 2025 and do not consider there is any information contained within that alters my evidence in regard to Daresbury.

I support a reduction of the setting of Daresbury in order to recognise the recent residential subdivision and development that has occurred within the area of setting to the north of the Wairarapa Stream.

15. I support a remapping of the boundary of proposed heritage item Sydenham Cemetery to include the entrance gates and site of the former sexton's dwelling.
16. I provided evidence for PC14 (paragraphs 60-63) regarding Spreydon Lodge, which is relied on in the PC13 evidence of Marcus Langman (paragraph 45). My opinion regarding Spreydon Lodge remains unchanged.

CORRECTIONS TO EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

17. The following corrections are required to my Evidence in Chief:
 - 17.1 Amend paragraph 107. This relates to planning advice which has now been superseded. The paragraph should be replaced with 'I note that with the operative and notified heritage scheduling in place, in order to promptly address the safety issues, the owner may be able to apply for retrospective resource consent for the demolition of the fire damaged west and central sections.'
 - 17.2 Delete paragraph 130 which was included in error and refers to a Council heritage grant scheme for which there is no provision for in Council's current Long Term Plan.

RESPONSE TO SUBMITTER'S EVIDENCE – OTTO SNOEP

18. I have reviewed the evidence of Otto Snoep dated 17 June 2025, and do not consider there is any information contained therein that alters my evidence in regard to supporting the scheduling of baches which are currently scheduled or proposed for scheduling.
19. In Part 2 of his evidence, Otto Snoep provides commentary on the Statement of Significance for the baches. In response, I consider that the Statements of Significance for the baches are based on adequate, reliable primary research sources and provide an objective assessment using the heritage values set out in Appendix 9.3.7.1 and the thresholds set out in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 Identification, assessment and scheduling of heritage items.
20. I consider that the built fabric of the baches (including later alterations and additions) evidences their historical values (Mr Snoep, paragraph 16.4).

There is no requirement in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 for heritage items to be unmodified, and heritage conservation practice recognises the evidence of time and the contributions of all periods.¹

21. Although the Statements of Significance note that the baches are built along the coastline, in response to Mr Snoep (paragraph 16.21), I consider that these could be amended to explicitly state that the baches occupy public land as that is relevant information.

Date: 17 June 2025

Amanda Ohs

¹ ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value 2010, 5. Respect for Surviving evidence and knowledge.