

BEFORE THE PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF an application by the Anglican Diocese of Wellington for the refurbishment, strengthening and extension to the heritage-listed building known as All Saints Church, 338 Church Street, Palmerston North

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID FORREST
DATED 11 DECEMBER 2020**

Introduction

[1] My full name is David James Forrest. I am the principal and sole director of Forrest Planning Limited, having assumed that position over two and a half years ago following 20 years as a director, and the principal planner, of Good Earth Matters Consulting Limited.

[2] I have more than forty years of experience as a planner and resource management practitioner. This experience encompasses work on a wide range of environmental issues in both the public and private sectors. Local Government experience includes several years as the County Planner for the (then) Hurunui County Council, Deputy City Planner for the Palmerston North City Council (1988-90) and over 27 years as the Consultant District Planner for the Tararua District Council. As a senior local authority planner, an independent Commissioner, and a consultant, I have been involved in preparing, reporting on, or determining hundreds of resource consent applications, several which involved listed heritage buildings.

[3] My qualifications are a B.A. Hons (1st class) in Geography and Master of Science in Resource Management. I am a member of the Resource Management Law Association (RMLA) and a Fellow of the New Zealand Planning Institute (FNZPI).

[4] I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses issued by the Environment Court Practice Note. I agree to comply with the Code of Conduct. I am satisfied that the matters addressed in this Statement of Evidence are within my areas of expertise. I am not aware of any material facts that have either been omitted or altered or might detract from the opinions expressed in this Statement of Evidence.

Executive Summary

[5] I do not repeat in this evidence my analysis of the activity classification and the listing and individual consideration of the Plan policies in the Assessment of Environmental Effects.

[6] My evidence is primarily evaluative and focusses on new information, considers the submissions, and attempts to address the heart of the dispute with the final step being a cost-benefit analysis.

[7] I present, with the assistance of Mr John Maassen the Applicant's lawyer (as a joint enterprise), a planning/legal synthesis that conveys the intent of the policies as a whole which in turn govern my evaluation of the Application. I then apply my expertise and experience to the evaluative task.

[8] To satisfy the requirements of District Plan Policy 1.4 (second bullet point), I use my understanding of the Applicant's evidence and apply a fair and reasonable assessment of the Applicant's self-expressed needs (recognising that it is the church congregation's aspiration to sustain their Christian faith and community) to carry out a cost-benefit (C-B) analysis across all the dimensions listed in that policy. My weighting methodology is set out in my analysis. The C-B method and weighting I have applied, informed by the policy framework, acts as a proxy for my RMA s104 analysis. It conclusively falls on the side of granting consent.

Background – the Application and Evidence Relied Upon

[9] I have been assisting the All Saints Church Building Advisory Board (CBAB) with the RMA/District Planning aspects of the present Application since September 2016. I have led the development of the Application.

[10] I confirm the conclusion of the activity status assessment in the Application, namely that the Proposal as a whole is to be considered as a **discretionary** activity under the Palmerston North City Council's District Plan ('the Plan').

[11] I confirm that the relevant objectives and policies of the Plan are those as considered in the table attached as Appendix I to the Application and in the Heritage Impact Assessment attached as Appendix G to the Application and my assessment of them in the Application.

[12] In preparing this statement of evidence, I have relied upon the evidence prepared by the following witnesses for the Applicant:

Vince Neall

David Chapple

Matt Soong

Nigel Dixon

Suzanne Fordyce

David Moxon

Gerald Coogan

John Brown

Gary Dowse

[13] I have also relied upon the preliminary legal analysis that will form the basis of legal submissions to be presented by the Applicant by Mr John Maassen.

The Submissions

[14] The Application was publicly notified, which was appropriate.

[15] The Council received 101 submissions with approximately 95 submissions in support.

[16] Some of the submissions in support are from congregants, and many of the submissions in support are thoughtfully constructed and give insight into:

(a) The congregation's rationale for the change. Specifically, I refer to the recognised sense of place of the church as expressed in the submissions and the fact that the area of land upon which the church is located has been occupied by the Anglican Church for over 140 years. The operation of the church's mission in and from that place is a recognised and important aspect of its heritage, as is the desire to occupy the existing church building provided it can be made more welcoming, hospitable, and versatile. Central to that desire is the long standing and widely held view that the entrance to the church needs to portray and fulfil the Church's mission.

- (b) The trade-offs and costs and benefits of the Proposal and why they favour approval

[17] Of the other six submissions, some are ambiguous in their position. However, those in opposition mostly come from what I refer to as the 'fabric conservationists'.

[18] In the case of Heritage New Zealand, its submission concludes:

Heritage New Zealand understands and appreciates the agenda of the Church in making the Church more usable, contemporary and open to the public, however, we agree with the Council's heritage consultant that: 'the proposal as it stands does not represent the minimum level of intervention necessary to achieve these outcomes'.

[19] The quote refers to a statement in a report by the Council's heritage consultant Ms Chessa Stevens. I regard that comment by Ms Stevens as a premature, unqualified assessment not necessary to a notification assessment of the scale of effects. I note:

- (a) Ms Dangerfield at Heritage New Zealand should know from the extensive consultation with HNZ that *usable, contemporary and open to the public* is an inadequate representation of the outcomes that the All Saints Congregation aims for in this Proposal;
- (b) No provision in the District Plan sets a threshold of the *minimum level of intervention necessary*.

[20] The submissions, almost without exception, acknowledge:

- (a) That earthquake strengthening the Church is a highly beneficial outcome;
- (b) The new design, appropriately, does not mimic or replicate the the existing design;
- (c) The new design is appropriate
- (d) That the re-design will achieve the Church's aims.

(e) The Proposal maintains legibility of the tower and the integrity of the northern facade most visible from The Square;

(f) The Proposal preserves a substantial part of the heritage of the site and the Church's exterior and interior.

(g) It is essential to preserve the continuity of a living Church in its current location.

[21] The submissions disclose the heart of the dispute the Panel must resolve which I summarise as follows:

(a) The 'fabric conservationists' aim for protection that is informed by the ethic that preservation of the fabric is essential and allows only for minimal, necessary, interventions (in the sense of 'essential'). That is, of course, consistent with an entire authorised discourse on heritage that is summed up in the ICOMOS Charter. That approach tends to be dominated by the views of experts on heritage who are almost universally educated in a conservation ethic.

(b) A resource management assessment relies on the wider planning discipline. That discipline enables an effects assessment against multiple interests and values that always exist in urban planning. Hence it is intrinsically multidisciplinary. It identifies and evaluates those interests in the context of a community Plan. 'Fabric conservation' is but one of the 'interests' to be evaluated when considering the Proposal against the 'norms' of the community developed District Plan.

[22] I place myself firmly in the camp of being able to make a comprehensive resource management assessment. I consider it appropriate to do so not only because I am a planner by training and experience but also because:

(a) Planners are equipped professionally to perform the wide evaluative task that RMA s104 demands. Intrinsic to the statutory assessment process is the evaluative role of planners. That role is not to simply restate the opinions of technical experts, particularly when such opinion is beyond the scope of their technical expertise ;

(b) An assessment informed by an ethic of conservation does not encompass the necessary scope required to complete a statutory evaluation, including such things as the balance of heritage preservation and property rights referred to in the District Plan;

(c) Ceding evaluation to technical experts is contrary to the process of comprehensive planning and the rule of law inherent in the development and application of community Plans as *King Salmon*¹ and the *Davidson*² decisions show;

(d) In the case of heritage, there are no intrinsic values that warrant attention because the heritage is a non-natural material artefact. Heritage has as its function the enhancement of social and cultural dimensions of human wellbeing and hence is anthropocentric. In that regard I adopt the following concept of heritage management that is helpful from a planning perspective and consistent with RMA s 5 and the District Plan;

"How people in the present use, manage, value, memorialise, connect with and create meaning from the tangible places, objects and things that comprise their inheritance from the past – as part of an individual, group or national identity formation and belongingness".³

In a domain like heritage management, therefore, the trade-offs that arise means community Plans are a political act of setting norms under the superior but inconclusive and relatively non-directive provision of RMA Part 2 s 6(f). I say "inconclusive" because as *King Salmon* notes "inappropriate" is contextual to the values to be protected and the extent of protection.⁴ Therefore, the local community needs to develop its

1

Environmental Defence Society Incorporated V The New Zealand King Salmon Company Limited [2014] NZSC 38 [17 April 2014]

² *R J Davidson Family Trust V Marlborough District Council* [2018] NZCA 316 [21 August 2018]

³ Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John Jameson Jnr & John Schofield (Eds). *The Heritage Reader* Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, Introduction, p1

⁴ *Ibid*

evaluation framework for assessing "appropriateness", and this is the critical demand of Part 2 s 6(f). The key passages from *King Salmon* upon which I rely are:

“Both part 2 of the RMA and provisions in the NZCPS refer to protecting the areas such as outstanding natural landscapes from "inappropriate" development – they do not refer to protecting them from any development. That suggests that framers contemplated that there might be "appropriate" development in such areas and raises the question of the standard against which "inappropriateness" is to be assessed;

We consider that the term "inappropriate" is used in the context of protecting areas from inappropriate subdivision, use or development, the natural meaning is that "inappropriateness" should be assessed by reference to what it is that is sought to be protected.”

(e) The planning approach followed in the development of community plans is more democratic and enables an appropriate degree of self-determination. That, in my opinion, is more likely to sustain communities and preserve heritage as a culturally determined matter than narrow and imposed solutions from expert disciplines.

The trajectory of the demolition of older Churches in Palmerston North

[23] Traditional congregations with brick Churches are in most cases facing a perfect storm of what I perceive to be contemporary ecclesial socio-economic conditions in an increasingly secular society, including:

- (a) Aging congregations;
- (b) Limited economic resources with no funding lines other than parish contributions;
- (c) Expensive buildings to maintain;

(d) Uneconomic costs to achieve earthquake strengthening across church administrative units. In the Anglican case that is a Diocese. This widespread reality is established by the GNS assessment in Vulnerability analysis of unreinforced masonry churches (EQC 14/660) - Final Report found at the link [here](#);

(e) The emergence and attraction of evangelical churches with contemporary liturgies in modified or purpose built auditorium type buildings,

[24] Some or all of these contemporary ecclesial socio-economic conditions have contributed to the loss of at least two churches in Palmerston North with some architectural and heritage merit but not protected by the Plan as follows:

(a) St Paul's Methodist Church building at 264 Broadway Avenue demolished in 2020 because it did not meet earthquake standards.⁵

(b) The Trinity Methodist Church at 114 Cuba Street demolished in 2003 because of earthquake risk;⁶

Community Support for the Proposal

[25] The Proposal has been refined over an extensive period. It has almost universal approval from the congregation. It also has extensive support from the community. Whilst there has been, and will continue to be, various responses to the changes proposed, generally the Proposal is supported.

[26] The Council has committed a significant amount of public funds (around \$300,000) to the Proposal in recognition of the wider community benefits that will flow from preserving most of the heritage of the site. That is powerful evidence of community support for this Proposal as an appropriate balance between heritage preservation and supporting the Church's liturgical, apostolic and missional needs

⁵ See historical photograph on the link [here](#) and a related newspaper article link [here](#). Demolition images are at the link [here](#)

⁶ The image archive from the Manawatu heritage website is [here](#)

The relevant values and the special issue of assessing those values in the case of a church

[27] An application under the heritage provisions of the Plan calls for consideration of a suite of interrelated, and sometimes conflicting, values or wellbeings including environmental, social, cultural, and economic effects (both positive and adverse) . In both the Plan analysis and the cost-benefit analysis of this evidence, I attempt to assess all of these in my evaluation.

[28] A key question to address is "to whom are these costs and benefits to apply and be assessed, and by what standard?" I consider the Plan answers this question. In my opinion one must consider these matters both from the perspective of the landowner as well as from the perspective of the public interest. Hence the Plan's invitation to balance private property rights and public interests. Whilst acknowledging the need to define landowner needs and economic viability as guided by the owner's assessment, the Plan recognizes the need for partial demolition to ensure the continued and long term sustainable use of the building by meeting the needs of owners.⁷ Besides, how can the community justify substituting its assessment for that of the owner?.

[29] The difficulty of assessing values, needs and costs and benefits becomes particularly acute with a church. A Church is a sacred place with a spiritual function. It is a place of identity. It is a place of worship. It is not an economic activity against which utilitarian values can be applied with confidence as to whether the change is necessary.

[30] Today, we are appropriately encouraged to maintain a high level of sensitivity and respect of cultural artefacts of tangata whenua. I also consider that it is appropriate to apply a high degree of sensitivity to expressions of values by faith communities concerning their places. That faith body is the repository of knowledge concerning the reasons for the Proposal and the significance of those reasons to the Applicant. For that reason, the professional team assisting the Applicant has spent a considerable amount of time listening to the All Saints

⁷ Section 17.3., Policy 1.4

congregation and its representatives. The Panel has detailed statements of evidence concerning the reasons for the Proposal from the Church's perspective.

[31] These reasons have an in-depth theological and liturgical rationale that it is easy to under-appreciate or misunderstand. Yet they remain critical to understanding the social and cultural benefits to the Congregation of the Proposal.

Acknowledgment of Heritage Effects

[32] I acknowledge and accept the professional assessment that there will be more than minor adverse heritage effects associated with the demolition of the baptistery. That was made explicit in the Application in respect of the assessment by John Brown. I note however, that it is an assessment based on an architectural authenticity that represents the core, public heritage, value placed on the building. It is not an accurate statement of the measure of loss of social and cultural values to the Congregation. As the evidence of Dr Moxon powerfully demonstrates, there has always been incongruous elements to the baptistery's arrangement that are contrary to past and contemporary ideas of Christian mission. I would not characterise the loss of that existing arrangement as a material loss to the heritage of the church in the context of a Christian place of worship involving those associated special social and cultural values.

[33] The Conservation Report by Ian Bowman attached to the Application also shows that the Proposal does not meet the ethic of conservation and the Church has not attempted to hide that fact. However, the report was important nevertheless to inform design refinements and to identify the heritage values the Proposal beneficially preserves

[34] In assessing the scale of the heritage effects, it is almost universal for heritage experts to assess the scale of the loss of heritage from a demolition or partial demolition in isolation. That is not what the Plan or the RMA requires. I consider the assessment involves an examination of the costs and benefits of the Proposal in its entirety. This proposal is not only to demolish the baptistery wall. It is a proposal that includes the expenditure of significant private funds to carry out structural changes to the building that will have as its consequence an enduring and sustainable building fabric.

[35] A consequence of this Proposal is that much of the heritage associated with the building fabric and virtually all of its internal components will be preserved. That is an outcome strongly encouraged by the Plan. The heritage effects must be considered in terms of the **overall retention** of significant heritage values as envisaged in Policy 1.4 of the Plan. If one does not do so, then one ignores the reality that, were it not for the Proposal, the building would have to be demolished soon under the requirements of other legislation, namely the Building Act. I discuss this further in that part of my evidence addressing costs and benefits.

[36] I consider that Proposal's effects on heritage outcomes when considered in terms of the Plan's objectives and policies is on the positive side of the cost–benefit ledger.

The District Plan

[37] When considering an application for resource consent and any submissions received to it, a consent authority must, subject to Part 2, have regard to—

- (a) any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity; and
- (ab) any measure proposed or agreed to by the Applicant to ensure positive effects on the environment to offset or compensate for any adverse effects on the environment that will or may result from allowing the activity; and
- (b) any relevant provisions of—
 - (i) a national environmental standard:
 - (ii) other regulations:
 - (iii) a national policy statement:
 - (iv) a New Zealand coastal policy statement:
 - (v) a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement:
 - (vi) a Plan or proposed Plan; and

(c) any other matter the consent authority considers relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the Application.

[38] Any evaluation under s 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) must be focused on the relevant provisions of the Plan. As the Plan is recent (Operative 13 May 2019) and complete, there is no need for a detailed examination of the purpose and principles of, or to have recourse to, Part 2 of the RMA other than to recognise that the structure of the Plan has its origin in the relevant sections of Part 2. The Plan does not merely posit a blanket avoidance of adverse effects on heritage to achieve complete protection. That can be seen in the Plan's direction to evaluate all effects both positive and adverse whilst recognising that buildings and heritage resources require change and adaptation to remain assets that the owners wish to sustain and conserve. The explanation to section 17.3 of the Plan says as much when it states that the Council "*...also recognises the importance of maintaining the on-going economic viability of these items [scheduled buildings or objects]. To encourage this, measures have been included within the Plan which enable scheduled buildings to be adapted for present-day usage while ensuring that any associated works are undertaken in a sensitive fashion*". To me, that is an appropriate and sensible policy position for the Council to adopt. It is common sense. Without ongoing and sufficient (i.e. sustainable) functionality, scheduled heritage buildings have no future. There is no compulsion to sustain buildings under the RMA. There is, however, and conversely, an obligation to demolish or make safe buildings that are earthquake-prone under the Building Act 2004. The Plan recognises this reality and does not merely acknowledge adaptation but enables adaptation and change where it is appropriate considering all the costs and benefits of the Proposal.

[39] The Plan conventionally sets out Objectives, Policies and Explanations. It is necessary to reconcile these provisions systematically into a coherent statement relevant to what is proposed in the Application in the context of what sustainable heritage management looks like and what evaluative process is to be followed to ensure a well-reasoned assessment.

[40] The importance of scrupulous attention to detail in the interpretation of the Plan is evident from the approach I take in my evidence. That interpretative exercise calls for a combined planning and legal analysis. This co-developed synthesis of the Plan's strategy is as follows:

The identification and selection of publicly significant heritage for regulatory control will be made by assessing heritage across a range of values beyond merely building fabric and grading according to importance.⁸ That is sustaining the community's social and cultural inheritance, and its transmission as a social project has a variety of dimensions that must include maintaining as a preferential option the social and cultural 'performance' that lead to the original building and site.⁹ That is achieved by allowing the sector of the community that established the heritage building and place a fair opportunity to meet their largely self-determined future needs¹⁰ in an appropriate way¹¹, including partial demolition¹². That is done by encouraging adaption of heritage rather than completely demolishing it—primarily where that also protects the property from long-term neglect and natural disasters and sustains a large proportion of the existing heritage.¹³ Adaptation is preferred and generously considered to secure continued use to recognise that more broad sense of heritage and its transmission and because it is the best means to secure the long term preservation of heritage. The appropriateness¹⁴ of change as a measure of sustainability recognises that the limits of heritage preservation is deliberately contextual¹⁵ and involves considering a complex of social and cultural and environmental dimensions. That must recognise in a balanced way¹⁶ that the justification for the public appropriation of the original physical form of buildings as an anchor for those heritage values and social memory has limits on its interference with property rights.¹⁷ The analysis of a proposal involves as a procedural safeguard that the systematic assessment of options available, including social, cultural economic and environmental costs and benefits.¹⁸ That will be achieved through a resource consent, and the worst classification is a full discretionary

⁸ Policy 1.2 and Appendix 17D.

⁹ Policies 1.4, 1.5 and the definition of “Cultural” and “Use” values in Appendix 17D.

¹⁰ Section 17.2, 4th Bullet Point and the implementing policies in Section 17.3.

¹¹ Policy 1.5.

¹² Policy 1.4.

¹³ Policy 1.7.

¹⁴ Policy 1.5 and the definition of “Cultural” and “Use” values in Appendix 17D

¹⁵ *King Salmon* at [98]-[105] considers the meaning of ‘appropriateness’

¹⁶ Section 17.2 4th Bullet Point and Policies 1.4 and 1.5

¹⁷ Policy 1.8 and the values in Appendix 17D.

¹⁸ Policy 1.4, 2nd Bullet Point.

classification recognising the need to consider the costs and benefits of every Proposal on its merits to assess appropriateness with no jurisdictional gateways.¹⁹

[41] That synthesis is not presented as unassailable but demonstrates, in my opinion, a fair attempt to analyze and grapple with the text of the Plan in a disciplined way to create a coherent vision of sustainability appropriate to the evaluative task

[42] Other key features of the Plan are:

(a) No highly directive 'effects-avoidance' policies and no definitive limits on change.

(b) A policy regime that applies across all heritage categories so that the assessment method is the same for all categories except that one must recognize a Category 1 building has outstanding heritage values in any evaluation.

Cost-Benefit, Alternatives and Values Assessment

[43] An element of the Plan is the requirement for an assessment of costs and benefits to be performed in decision-making on any resource consent application involving a scheduled heritage building. That is a procedural safeguard rather than a standard to measure the appropriateness of the Proposal itself. Instead, it is identified as a necessary tool for decision-making intended to secure the robust examination of the merits of partial demolition where substantial heritage is otherwise preserved.

[44] The assessment of the costs and benefits is both qualitative and multi-factorial, and in the case of the Church's needs requires accounting for the cultural and spiritual needs of the community as expressed by this Christian community and its theological imperatives.

¹⁹ Rule 17.8.

[45] The Assessment of Environmental Effects did not initially consider any alternatives as none were possible that adequately met the needs of the Congregation. At the invitation of Heritage New Zealand, Gerald Cogan and Matt Soong modelled various options that preserved the baptistery wall, but they rapidly concluded that no alternative solution could be made to fit the Congregations' requirements. They can answer questions on that issue at the hearing. I understand this alternative was dismissed based on:

- (a) Theological and apostolic grounds.
- (b) Site limits.
- (c) Poor functionality for ceremonies including weddings and funerals

[46] I have, as a comparative exercise, undertaken a cost-benefit evaluation using a conceptual design that preserves the baptistery and pushes the entrance and everything else to the side of the Church so there is a side entrance on the western façade operating as the main entrance to the Church.

[47] I call this alternative the "notional alternative" and it is very notional since it has not been developed into a design. The Plan does not require an assessment of a notional alternative, but it has some use as a counterfactual for consideration purposes.

[48] The major limitation is this: the Anglican Diocese is emphatic that it will not spend scarce funds from the Diocese to achieve an outcome that does not serve the requirements of the Church that the integrated solution in the Proposal achieves. It cannot call upon the church members for their voluntary support to preserve buildings that are not fit for their apostolic purpose and therefore, cannot secure the appropriate ministry and cannot support growth and development of the Christian community.

[49] A real possibility, as a counterfactual to the approval of this Proposal, is continued non-use of the All Saints Church and ultimately demolition as required by the Building Act. In that regard, I note that:

- (a) The Rev. Sue Fordyce gives evidence for the Diocese that it has reached a firm position not to spend funds on buildings not fit for the

Church's missional and apostolic purpose. That seems inevitable given the straining impact of earthquake strengthening across the Diocese will force any organization to examine its priorities.

(b) The Church is required by the Council to either bring the building up to NBS standards or it must be demolished.

(c) The Church is in a high pedestrian location as defined by the Plan and therefore the importance of imminent strengthening or demolition is heightened.

(d) Because of the ecclesial socio-economic conditions, the upgrade option already has built-in compromises compared with a new build which a significant part of the Congregation considered before approving this Proposal because it represented better stewardship of the Church's scarce resources.

[50] To reflect this reality, I have evaluated, in a separate column, the consequences arising from the 'do nothing' option. That in my opinion recognizes the reality that I have described above that the notional alternative will not be implemented. Besides, the community is also unlikely to want to repeat the lengthy process that has resulted in this Application.

[51] In assessing the Architectural Values of the notional alternative, I have assumed that an adequate contemporary design can be developed that sits comfortably with the existing building. However architectural merit is not simply form but its ability to function for its intended purpose. There is considerable doubt about that. This approach therefore seems over-generous and that reveals the difficulties of providing notional alternatives.

[52] In establishing this notional alternative, I emphasize that I do not consider there is any persuasive burden on the Applicant to demonstrate alternatives at all or to a detail equivalent to the Application. The notional alternative analysis shows convincingly how the notional alternative would not support the social and cultural values of importance to the Applicant. In that sense, it is not "possible" as an alternative within the meaning of Schedule 4 clause 6 (1) (a) of the Resource Management Act. Equally, the Plan does not require other options to be evaluated.

[53] For those who insist there are alternatives I note that I have not seen any designs that begin to establish an evidential threshold that can be tested against the requirements of the Church. That leaves to one side the obvious point that any such design would have the following features:

- (a) Has not been through any consultative process with the Congregation that the facility is intended to serve.
- (b) Has not been through a public submission process.
- (c) Is not able to be consented through this current process

[54] The CBAB, the All Saints Congregation, and I have developed a framework of values relevant to the Application in order to carry out a cost-benefit evaluation. The importance of identifying values as distinct from facts has long been recognized in planning literature [Davidoff and Reiner (1962)]. Clarifying and reconciling the potentially conflicting values implicit in the current Proposal, is essential in a situation such as this where objectivity [external building fabric removal] and subjectivity [the congregation's spiritual and community values] appear to collide head-on. A detailed explanation of the framework of values is to be found in Appendix A of this evidence.

[55] The Proposal has been assessed using a Likert type 5-point rating system encompassing both positive and negative values (from -2 to +2).

[56] The results of that assessment are set out in Appendix B.

[57] It is established on the evidence produced by the Applicant that the alternative fails so badly to meet the requirements of the Church that it will not be pursued or implemented. If the proposed work is not done, then the risks to the heritage values of the Church are heightened. That being the case, and as previously discussed, I have chosen to add a third rating column which recognizes the reality that, should the alternative be required, this would result in almost certain neglect and increasing seismic vulnerability of the church building.

[58] The outcome of the assessment shows, overwhelmingly, that granting consent to the Proposal would sustain the Church and its values in an absolute sense when compared with the notional alternative. Even if one were to allow for

a greater weighting to be given to the heritage impacts of removing the baptistery, in my opinion, the outcome would be the same.

Urban Design

[59] There is no separate urban design assessment of the Proposal however urban design considerations informed the architectural design.

[60] Urban design has developed as an important discipline to assess urban projects in Palmerston North. The Council has a “Placemaking Plan 2018/2020” setting out the place making strategy for Palmerston North. Interestingly it has a picture of the lane beside the All Saints Church on its front cover. While the publication is primarily concerned with placemaking in public spaces it has a relationship to sites where public values are claimed.

[61] That publication has an emphasis on restoring vitality to public spaces and landowners and communities engaging with public places. That is consistent with academic commentary on place-making. For example, as Jan Gehl the architect and urban designer said "First life, then spaces, then buildings – the other way around never works"²⁰. That idea is entirely congruent with the aims of the Church in this Proposal. The Church has an ethic of life and participation at the core of its mission. It is also notable that both the Council and urban design practice emphasises the need to enliven places and spaces through community-initiated projects that meet the community’s needs.

[62] The cost-benefit assessment encompasses place-making values.

[63] This idea of breathing life into the Church is central to the design of this Proposal. The existing front façade is not attractive from an urban design perspective as it lacks activation and legibility. The Proposal will in my opinion assist in meeting the objectives of the Council’s “Placemaking Plan” because:

- (a) It re-vitalises the Church and thus breathes life into this crucial quadrant of the Square;

²⁰ See the 11 principles for creating great community places [here](#) from the Project for Public Places

- (b) The Proposal activates the street frontage;
- (c) The Proposal invites serendipitous engagement through opportunities for prayer or reflection;
- (d) It makes visible the activity of the Church both liturgically and in the form of spaces for gathering;
- (e) It enables the Church to be an attractive venue for other community events;
- (f) It represents a significant commitment to the place with the consequence people ensure its success;
- (g) Encourages and supports the public activity in the locality;
- (h) There will be more visible performance of faith and its ceremonies by this faith community

Conclusion

[64] The Planner's task is to respect and thoughtfully consider all views made known through the planning process. I have attempted to do that and remain convinced that the objectives and policies of the Plan and the sustaining of the church's heritage values are best achieved by granting consent. The Panel will appreciate that through voluntary support from CBAB members and generous professional assistance and through the support of the Diocese the All Saints Congregation has put forward a courageous and visionary Proposal that has been through a detailed and iterative process of development. I encourage the Panel to grant consent

[65] I attach, as Appendix 3, a proposed suite of conditions.



David J Forrest

Appendices

A – Values-Based Planning; An Explanatory Framework for All Saints

B – Values Assessment Matrix

C - Offered Conditions

APPENDIX A

Values Based Planning; An Explanatory Framework for All Saints

1. The PNCC District Plan's provisions, against which the resource consent will be assessed, identifies a range of values attaching to the existing building and site as well as to the needs of the Church community.
2. Those values include, of course, the heritage values and how they are impacted by the proposed development. In addition, there are the values associated with the proposal that better enable the building to perform its intended function. These values are self-defined by the All Saints congregation and recognise the Church's role as a worshipping and apostolic community.
3. The values or purposes of the Proposal have been identified and categorised within a coherent framework . First, the core values and aims were developed into the following seven value categories:
 - (a) Spiritual/theological/liturgical and apostolic (SP);
 - (b) Church Community (CC);
 - (c) Place-Making (PM);
 - (d) Structural Safety (St);
 - (e) Financial Viability (Ec);
 - (f) Architectural (Arch);
 - (g) Heritage Values (Her).
4. Within each main category a number of sub-categories expressing aims or values that the Proposal advances are identified. Each of the main seven value categories are

addressed below by first introducing the basic idea of the value category and then summarising the value sub-categories.

Spiritual/Theological/Liturgical and Apostolic Values

5. The first question that any church has to ask itself is “why are we here?” and “what are we about?”. Any expenditure or effort on buildings is subject to these fundamental questions. It has been a long-standing view of the community that the entrance to the Church does not fulfil or portray its mission. This call for change started in 1982 when the then vicar now a bishop, Brian Carrell talked about improving the entrance to All Saints Church. The Church has addressed this question continuously since then with greater urgency as the issue with the building’s seismic status has become more acute. The Conservation Plan prepared on behalf of the Church identifies the Church’s self-defined objectives under these basic categories:
 - (a) Be a welcoming open church;
 - (b) Be a hospitable church;
 - (c) Be a versatile church facility;
 - (d) Be an accessible church;
 - (e) Be a safe church for the community;
 - (f) Be a practical church;
 - (g) Be a modern church.
6. All of those objectives are tied to the fundamental character of the All Saints Church mission and what it considers to be the contemporary expression of Christian community centred on a place of worship.
7. The values sub-categories that we are seeking to enhance and achieve under this Spiritual/Theological/Liturgical and Apostolic Value category are the following:

- (a) SP-V1¹ - Providing a central and welcoming entrance as opposed to the foreboding and illegible entrance of the current frontage. That change will also advance the apostolic mission to invite people to fellowship and worship;
- (b) SP-V2² - Providing an area adjacent to the Church which is sheltered and provides people with a hospitable place after major events including weddings and funerals. At that point, after the service, there is an opportunity for gathering, communication and exchange that is a special fruit of the service already conducted;
- (c) SP-V3³ - Providing additional spaces adjacent to the Church that afford opportunities for gathering and hospitality. The Church is a large church and not only can it host services but other events that celebrate appropriate activities such as singing, organ recitals and concerts;
- (d) SP-V4⁴ - The visibility of the Church to the outside world as part of its apostolic mission. The current church has a strong sense of enclosure which does not manifest Christian fellowship in action to the wider community. It is central to the apostolic mission of the Church that people passing the place of worship can look in and gain a sense of what the community is about and what its values are. These are only tangibly done through a building that displays internal elements of the Church.

Church Community Values

8. The spiritual values are crucial to the Congregation's identity. However, worship is only part of the Congregation's activities and there are other needs that have to be met as part of the redevelopment. These have been generically described as Church

¹ Sp-V1 - Spiritual Value No. 1.

² Sp-V2 - Spiritual Value No. 2.

³ Sp-V3 - Spiritual Value No. 3.

⁴ Sp-V4 - Spiritual Value No. 4.

Community Values for want of a better term. The value sub-categories are summarised below:

- (a) CC-V1⁵ - Being in the heart of Palmerston North. The All Saints Church community has a powerful tradition as one of the first of occupants of a centrally located allotment in Palmerston North. There is a strong wish to remain where we are and to respect the traditions that exist both around the site and in the existing building;
- (b) CC-V2⁶ - A familiar place of worship. The Church does need a place of worship. It operates as a magnet for people wishing to gather. Closing the doors in 2013 resulted in a 40% drop in attendance simply as a result of the absence of the appropriate space in which to gather.
- (c) CC-V3⁷ - Ready access to facilities including toilets. An important aspect of the design is creating linkages to the rear of the Church. The toilets are at the rear of the Church. The design provides for a side entrance into that linkage so that you do not have to leave by the Church's front doors. Access to these facilities for young families and older people is particularly important. Providing a covered space enables people to feel comfortable and to meet their needs in a discreet comfortable way;
- (d) CC-V4⁸ - Connection to the rear of the Church. The engine room for non-worship activities are the facilities at the rear of the Church. This includes the hall, the large cooking facilities and other side rooms. A central element of the design is creating linkages between these facilities and what will be the new 'front end' of the Church. This creates all sorts of efficiencies and benefits and adds to the life of the Church.

⁵ CC-V1 – Being in the heart of Palmerston North.

⁶ CC-V2 - A sense of Place.

⁷ CC-V3 - Access to facilities.

⁸ CC-V4 - Connecting to the facilities behind the Church.

Place-Making Values

9. Place-making is an urban initiative to increase the vitality and activity occurring in public spaces and those spaces adjacent to them. The reason for that is that active enjoyable public spaces contribute enormously to the community wellbeing. All Saints Church by reason of its central location can contribute to the liveability and vitality of Palmerston North's most central space, The Square. The Palmerston North City Council has a place-making initiative and interestingly, the feature photograph is of people walking down the alley way adjacent to the All Saints Church.

10. There is a coincidence between increasing the redevelopment of All Saints Church and achieving these place-making goals. These are reflected in the values and purposes that have contributed to the final design proposal. The value sub-categories are summarised below:
 - (a) PM-V1⁹ - Activation of the frontage. Activation means that the interior and the exterior spaces are inviting and visibly show the activity that is occurring within the building. The high level of glazing in the proposal means that the following activities are visible to the public:
 - (i) Worship;
 - (ii) Hospitality and gathering;

An additional benefit is that the heritage fabric and elements of the building are also made visible to the public;
 - (b) PM-V2¹⁰ - Street level activity. Activity at the street level is achieved because there are areas where people can gather protected from the elements during ceremonies marking significant life events. We all have memories of weddings and funerals where people are gathered and all of these events are critical to the function and life of the community and their visibility at the street level is important;

⁹ PM-V1- Activation of the frontage.

¹⁰ PM-V2 - Activity at street level.

- (c) PM-V3¹¹ - Legibility. The building and the spaces around it need to be legible which means that people are able to visually see where the linkages are and how they relate to each other. Improved legibility will encourage greater understanding of how to access the building both as a place of worship and also the rear parts of the building;
- (d) PM-V4¹² - Sovereignty. Place-making is a grass roots movement where communities themselves contribute to place-making by portraying their identity. The new improvements are an All Saints Church Congregation based initiative to portray essential Christian values and to further the apostolic mission. The essence of place-making is the sovereignty of communities to express themselves and that is appropriately allowed for by this proposal while respecting the substantial portion of the existing building fabric.

Structural Safety Values

- 11. Making the Church safe is an essential and self-evident requirement. The option that has been selected is the least invasive and will be the least visible both internally and externally. The Anglican Diocese requires at least 67% of the New Building Standard (“NBS”) for seismic resilience. We discovered that the engineering method that we liked could achieve 100% of NBS. That means that there is improved safety but also some degree of redundancy built in the event that standards change which could always happen. The sub-values that have informed this value category are the following:
 - (a) St-V1¹³ - Safety. The work will dramatically improve the safety of people within the Church and in public spaces such as footpaths. Public safety is a pre-eminent consideration. This section of Church Street is designated as a high foot traffic area which means that public safety on the footpath and down the alley ways is also important. Achieving 100% of the NBS is a significant step towards providing a safe environment;

¹¹ PM-V3 - Legibility.

¹² PM-V4 - Self-defined activity.

¹³ St-V1 - Safety.

- (b) St-V2¹⁴ - Preserves heritage. The benefit of the structural work is it preserves most of the existing heritage elements from significant seismic events. That includes protecting the tower which is a distinctive element of the Church. The engineers say that removing the baptistry provides the opportunity to install a concrete platform that will provide a secure basis for the strengthening of the tower. The only material change to the fabric not affected by the redevelopment is the removal of the pinnacles and the replacement of them with modern facsimiles. These cannot be strengthened to an appropriate standard;
- (c) SC-V3¹⁵ - Legally Compliant. The new building will comply with all relevant regulations and laws and provides some redundancy in the event of increasing regulatory standards;
- (d) SC-V4¹⁶ - Future proofing. The engineering technique that is proposed provides a further element of redundancy. The wires used for tensioning could be replaced with other materials rather than steel such as carbon fibre. These future materials may further increase the resilience of the building to seismic activity and be used with relatively small incremental costs.

Financial Viability Value

12. Good stewardship dictates that whatever is undertaken is financially viable for present and future generations. We have spent a lot of time refining the design including the method of earthquake strengthening to achieve the lowest cost possible. For example, we have changed the use of MacAllory bars to wires saving enormous expense. Even with that effort the total cost is going to be very significant and (over \$7 million) about 73% of that total cost represents cost of achieving structural stability and safety. The Anglican Diocese has made it plain that it will not approve significant expenditure on a building that is not fit for purpose. The Anglican Diocese has neither the will or resources to support initiatives that are not supportive of the fundamental mission of

¹⁴ St-V2 - Heritage preservation.

¹⁵ St-V3 - Legal compliance.

¹⁶ St-V4 - Future proofing.

the Church. The value sub-categories that have informed the financial viability aspects of the development include the following:

- (a) Ec-V1¹⁷ - Diocesan approval. The proposal has Diocesan approval because in combination with the structural strengthening (which is a significant portion of the total cost) other features will be built into the design that meet the Christian mission as summarised in the Spiritual (Sp) and Church Community (CC) values;
- (b) Ec-V2¹⁸ - Financial risk management. The proposal represents the least financial risk for the All Saints Church Congregation. The reason for that is that this proposal provides for a modern church and meets contemporary needs. Therefore, the proposal represents the best option for maintain the vitality and strength of the All Saints Church Congregation. That is an essential element for creating a financially viable building programme that involves not only upgrading but also maintaining the facility.

Architectural Values

- 13. The architectural elements of the new addition incorporate many of the important values already listed above. The form of the design is governed by the need to functionally promote those values. The design achieves that goal very well. The ‘look’ is a matter of design and matters of design can elicit responses ranging between love and hate with no particular rational basis for either response. It is a subjective response. Any design that meets the functional requirements is likely to elicit the same responses. Through consultation we have achieved a unity of purpose to promote this design.
- 14. Before advancing the design, we consulted with Heritage New Zealand. The most important message that they conveyed to us was that any new addition should not mimic the style of the existing building which would be completely false. It needed to be a contemporary component that was distinctive and new and could not be confused with original elements. We took on board that message. Around the world you can see

¹⁷ Ec-V1 - Diocesan approval.

¹⁸ Ec-V2 - Financial risk management.

existing churches that have had additions to them of distinctive and contemporary style in just the same way as this proposal. The values that therefore have informed the architectural design are the following:

- (a) Arch–V1¹⁹ - Contrast. Creating a contrast with the existing building so that the new addition is both contemporary and distinctive but which relates to the existing building in a symbiotic way;
- (b) Arch–V2²⁰ - Organic. The material is organic in the sense of portraying naturalness as a contemporary value that celebrates nature and life. That vernacular also sits comfortably in contrast to the heraldic vernacular portrayed by the existing All Saints Church;
- (c) Arch–V3²¹ - Honest materials. The use of honest contemporary materials that provide a contrast to the masonry work but which sits with that in a complementary way;
- (d) Arch–V4²² - Visibility of the tower. Retaining the visibility of the tower as a clean form is a key value. An early design of the additions was further refined by removing a portico adjacent to the tower to maintain the integrity of the tower as it is a distinctive and important architectural element of the All Saints Church.

Heritage Values

15. The architectural elements of the All Saints Church have heritage value. It is important however not to think of heritage as only building fabric. The area on which the Church sits has been occupied for over 140 years by the Anglican Church and the operation of the Church's mission in that place is an important aspect of the heritage of that place. In addition, an often overlooked element of the heritage of the All Saints Church is the contents within the Church. These cannot all be enumerated here. Of particular significance is the fact that the memorabilia of the Wellington regiment that travelled to Gallipoli is inside the All Saints Church. The Church is an important treasury of

¹⁹ Arch–V1 - Contrast.

²⁰ Arch–V2 - Organic.

²¹ Arch–V3 - Honest materials.

²² Arch–V4 - Visibility of the Tower.

historical elements that are part of Palmerston North's history. The proposed development will retain 97% of the external fabric and almost 95% of the internal elements of the Church. The only changes are the removal of the font and the foundation stone. The glass windows in the baptistry will be relocated within the Church and not lost. This preservation of the predominance of the heritage fabric is a significant achievement with this redevelopment proposal.

16. The organ is also a heritage item. It was constructed in about 1923 by Croft & Son in Auckland. Because of the way in which the strengthening is designed the organ does not need to be removed and stored. Removal and storage significantly elevate the risk of the organ losing its functionality. The heritage values that have therefore informed the redesign include the following:

- (a) Her-V1²³ - Fidelity to tradition and the place;
- (b) Her-V2²⁴ - Preservation of the internal elements;
- (c) Her-V3²⁵ - Preservation of most of the external fabric.

²³ Her-V1 - Fidelity to tradition and the place.

²⁴ Her-V2 - Preservation of the internal elements.

²⁵ Her-V3 - Preservation of most of the external fabric.

APPENDIX B: Values Assessment Matrix

Value Category	Value Sub-category	Description	Witness and Relevant Section of Statement of Evidence	Rating of Proposal	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Side entrance only: existing church frontage, with baptistery intact, remains unobscured	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Consequence of doing nothing allowing that it comes with the risk of demolition or neglect
Spiritual/theological/ liturgical and apostolic (SP)	SP-V1	A welcoming processional central entrance	Moxon at 12-14;17 Dixon at 7; 9 Soong at 6; 14-20 Neall at 75; 77 Brown at 106	+2	-2	-2
	SP-V2	Non-worship Communion	Dixon at 9 Neall at 77	+2	0	-2
	SP-V3	Post worship - gathering and hospitality	Dixon at 7; 9-10 Neall at 77 Soong at 14-20 Cogan at 29 Fordyce at 23-29	+2	0	-2
	SP-V4	The visibility of the Church to the outside world as part of its apostolic mission	Moxon at 15-16 Dixon at 9 Soong at 14-20 Neall at 77 Fordyce at 30	+2	-1	-2
Church Community (CC)	CC-V1	Being in the heart of Palmerston North	Moxon at 15-16 Dixon at 9-10 Neall at 78 Fordyce at 32	0	0	0
	CC-V2	A sense of place	Moxon at 15-16 Dixon at 7; 9 Neall at 78 Fordyce at 31-34	+1	0	-2
	CC-V3	Access to facilities.	Neall at 78 Cogan at 30-35 Soong at 22	+2	+2	-2

Value Category	Value Sub-category	Description	Witness and Relevant Section of Statement of Evidence	Rating of Proposal	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Side entrance only: existing church frontage, with baptistery intact, remains unobscured	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Consequence of doing nothing allowing that it comes with the risk of demolition or neglect
	CC-V4	Connecting to the facilities behind the Church	As in CC-V3 above	+2	+2	-2
Place-Making (PM)	PM-V1	Activation of the frontage	Moxon at 15-16 Soon at 6 Neall at 79-80	+2	-2	-2
	PM-V2	Street level activity	Moxon at 15-16 Neall at 80	+2	-1	-2
	PM-V3	Legibility	Cogan at 37 Neall at 80	+2	0	-2
	PM-V4	Sovereignty	Soong at 5 Fordyce at 31-34	+2	-2	-2
Structural Safety (St)	St-V1	Safety	Chapple at 7-17; 21-22 Newton at 5-7 Neall at 7; 29-44; 81	+2	+2	-2
	St-V2	Heritage preservation	Newton at 8 Neall at 81	+1	+2	-2
	St-V3	Legal compliance	Neall at 81	+2	+2	-2
	St-V4	Future proofing	Neall at 81	+2	-1	-2
Financial Viability (Ec)	Ec-V1	Diocesan approval	Fordyce at 8-10; 38; 42-47 Dixon at 8 Neall at 82	+2	-2	-2
	Ec-V2	Financial risk management	Fordyce at 35-38 Neall at 82	+2	0	-2
Architectural (Arch)	Arch-V1	Contrast	Cogan at 37 Neall at 84 Soong at 19; 24	+2	+1	-2

Value Category	Value Sub-category	Description	Witness and Relevant Section of Statement of Evidence	Rating of Proposal	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Side entrance only: existing church frontage, with baptistery intact, remains unobscured	Rating of Alternative (Counterfactual) Consequence of doing nothing allowing that it comes with the risk of demolition or neglect
	Arch-V2	Organic	Soong at 19; 23-24 Neall at 84	+2	+2	0
	Arch-V3	Honest materials	Soong at 24 Chapple at 21-22 Neall at 84	+1	+1	0
	Arch-V4	Visibility of the tower	Cogan at 19; Neall at 84	+2	+2	+2
Heritage Values (Her)	Her-V1	Fidelity to tradition and the place	Moxon at 15-16 Fordyce at 30 Cogan at 37-38 Dixon at 10 Neall at 16-28; 85-86	+1	+1	-2
	Her-V2	Preservation of the internal elements	Dixon at 8 Neall at 50-69	+2	+2	-2
	Her-V3	Preservation of most of the external fabric	Dixon at 8 Chapple at 24 Cogan at 17; 20 Neall at 48-49; 70-71	+1	+2	-2
TOTALS				43	10	-40

APPENDIX C

All Saints RC Offered Conditions

General and Administration

1. Except as modified by the following conditions, and subject to final design, the activity must be undertaken in general accordance with the information provided by the consent holder in the application dated June 2019 and held in the Palmerston North City Council file LU 5331.
2. The Consent Holder shall ensure that all contractors/staff are made familiar with the conditions of consent, work methodologies, and the relevant details of the Construction Management and Heritage Management Plans prior to commencement of work, as part of site induction processes. Copies of all documentation including the conditions and approved consent plans (CMP and HMP), are to be held in the site office and available at any time upon request.

Construction Effects

- 3 . At least one month before construction commences on the site, the consent holder must submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) for approval by the Senior Planner of the consent authority (PNCC). The CMP must include the following detail:
 - a. the planned construction methodology, sequencing, and approximate timeframe for construction;
 - b. management of dust;
 - c. management of noise and vibration;
 - d. management of construction traffic;
 - e. protocols or methods to enable protection of, or avoid damage to, the fabric of the church during construction (other than those parts of the building for which consent has been sought and granted);
 - f. details of a contact person available on site at all times during work. Contact details shall be prominently displayed at the entrance to the site so that they are clearly visible to the public at all times;
 - g. methods to be used to communicate to neighbours the proposed hours of construction, the activities outside of normal working hours including weekends and public holidays and methods to deal with concerns raised about such hours;
 - h. methods to record concerns raised about hours of construction activities and, where practicable, methods to avoid times which may have been identified as being particularly sensitive for neighbours.
4. The CMP must aim for the following outcomes, as far as practicable, during construction:
 - a. Construction noise received beyond the boundaries of the site does not exceed the limits prescribed in NZS6803:1999 Acoustics - Construction Noise.
 - b. The fabric of the building that is to remain is protected;
 - c. Impacts on traffic safety and the efficiency of the road network is minimised;
 - d. The safety of pedestrians is protected

APPENDIX C

Heritage Mitigation

4. A Heritage Management Plan (HMP), for approval by PNCC's Senior Planner, must be lodged together with the CMP and include details in respect of the re-purposing of the stained glass and font of the baptistery with the aim of achieving the following outcomes:
 - a. The stained glass windows are incorporated into the final Church design
 - b. The font is incorporated into the floor plan of the final Church design
 - c. Any interventions are fully recorded, with materials catalogued
 - d. That additional interventions are limited to those that are necessary to improve the accessibility and safety, including fire safety, of the Church
 - e. That any additional plant or machinery required should be fixed in a manner that avoids damage or obstruction of significant heritage fabric, particularly where this requires points of egress through the structure of the Church
5. A detailed record of the existing church is to be made prior to construction commencing.
6. An "as built" record of the church is to be made within a year of completion of construction.

Advice Notes

1. For the avoidance of doubt, following construction, none of the conditions imposed in this consent prevent or apply to works or activities required to enable ongoing operation or maintenance of the church and its activities on the site, including changes to street furniture or signage.
2. An archaeological authority must be obtained from Heritage New Zealand before any earthworks are undertaken on the site.