



P.O. Box 169 Greytown 5712
greytownheritagetrust@gmail.com
www.greytownheritagetrust.co.nz

SWDC Spatial Plan Review Submission - 23 April 2021

About Us

1. Greytown Heritage Trust is a group of committed volunteers advocating for and preserving the unique history, character and heritage features – the buildings, trees and streetscape – of Greytown in South Wairarapa; New Zealand's first planned inland town.
2. Greytown Community Heritage Trust (the Trust) was established in 1993 with five founding members and \$10 in capital. The Trust Deed was signed on 1 April 1994 by Alfred Eastwood, Max Edridge, Judith Lee, Alan Wilks and Alisoun Werry.
3. The Trust Deed outlines these aims:
 - To encourage and facilitate the preservation of Greytown's contextual, cultural and environmental heritage within the 'Town Centre Precinct'.
 - To promote awareness of heritage sites and provide education on heritage issues relating to Greytown.
 - To support and promote local historic research.
 - To encourage and facilitate the preservation of historic and notable trees, in and around Greytown.
 - To be instrumental within the Greytown district in advancing any of these aims.
4. The Trust worked with South Wairarapa District Council (SWDC) to create the guidelines for the historic precinct in Greytown (Town Precinct), running from the Kuratawhiti/Jellicoe Streets intersection in the north to Wood Street further south.
5. The Trust was subsequently involved in instigating the Design Guide for the Greytown Residential Extension (North Street to Humphries Street). The Residential Extension received overwhelming community support with several requests to have it extended to other streets in Greytown.

Our Comment

6. We do not believe the document presented for consultation provides adequate information for us to make informed comment. This needs to be addressed so that we can provide meaningful comment.
7. In particular, the diagram showing Greytown Residential Growth Options is not easily understood. The key to the diagram is confusing – for example the green could be 1-10 dwellings on lots greater than 1200 sqm OR it could be Conservation land – it can't be both. This needs to be clarified and the diagrams reissued for consultation, we consider that this is critical. Similarly Soldiers Memorial Park (and other parks) seem to be coded for Residential, we assume that this is not the intention. Greytown School is shown in a similar manner.
8. The diagram for GF should be reissued, correctly coded and at a larger scale so that it is easily read.
9. The black lines around GE, GA, GC and GB are not identified in the key,
10. The red outline of GF and GB in places merges with the 21-100 potential dwellings per lot creating further confusion.
11. For the lots coloured red, is the 21-100 dwellings the number of dwellings per existing lot? If this is the case this would imply multi storey buildings (well in excess of the maximum two storey buildings or the current density which are present in Greytown currently).
12. We would like to see proposed densities addressed for GA (which surely must be known as the subdivision is underway), GB, GC, GD and GE.
13. We note the Spatial Plan is for residential only and does not consider the impacts of this growth on commercial (particularly Main Street Town Centre Precinct) and industrial. Until recently our population was pretty static with moderate growth in recent years - 2,103 in 2006; 2,238 in 2013, 2,466 in 2018. This growth needs to be supported by appropriate commercial growth in order to avoid ad hoc and character destroying development. Governors Green is an example of what can happen at the Gateway to Greytown when development occurs in an ad hoc nature. We do not understand how residential growth can be considered in isolation from industrial or commercial. We would like to see Industrial, Commercial and Residential considered together so that a holistic view of the future can be seen – we would like to be involved in the conversation around this.
14. We reiterate our comments from our earlier submission – particularly surrounding Density, Building Height (repeated below):

Building Height

15. The existing allowable maximum height is far too tall for Greytown (it appears to have been included in the current district plan to cater for Masterton). There are no buildings in the whole of Greytown which are of a height greater than two stories. The traditional most important buildings in town (Churches, the Borough Council, the Cinema, the Bank) should remain the tallest buildings. The Churches in early Greytown were a central focus for residents. They are set within larger grounds and their plantings and curtilage are important.
16. The Trust believes buildings should be restricted to a maximum of two-stories with their height restricted to a height appropriate to location (e.g. in the residential area this would be lower than the

Town Precinct). Lower height limits should also be included for the industrial area (does Farmlands really need to be that tall?).

Density

17. The Trust is concerned about the extent of the residential infill and the current minimum section sizes. There are now no remaining one-acre blocks left on Main Street. Subdivision is threatening the remaining half and quarter acre blocks. The Trust would like to see a quarter acre minimum lot size for Main Street. The typical residential pattern for early Greytown was low density, with space for orchards, large vegetable gardens, the keeping of hens. The early survey pattern of one acre lots was underlying and over-time these lots have been developed or subdivided typically down to quarter acre sections. Even with the considerable increase in density, a sense of spaciousness remains. The streets are a major contributor. This feeling of space or low density is extremely important to the character of Main Street and is highly vulnerable with the current District Plan rules.
18. The Trust would like to see greater use of laneways and infill commercial development in the Heritage Precinct. The Trust would like to see the heritage/commercial precinct extended to the former Arbor retirement house/Turkey Red (also known as Middle pub, Green Man or its original name, Forester's Arms), and at the existing heritage precinct extended through to West Street.

Fertile Land

19. We are concerned that highly versatile (GF, GC and part GB) and versatile land (part GB) (which we understand is highly productive land) as shown on page 8 of the 'Supporting Information to the High Level Residential Growth Options Matrix Analysis' is planned for residential growth. We believe that this and should be safeguarded as productive land and less versatile land used for residential growth instead (ego GD, GE, GA). We note that all the land Greytown sits on and much of GB, GF and GC are prone to liquefaction and flooding, and we do not believe this should be the reason not to keep it as fertile land – in fact it supports using GA, GD for residential growth.

Ribbon Residential

20. We do not believe GE (the road to Woodside Station) should be developed further than it is already. This will detract from the rural nature of the area and particularly the rail trail. The rail trail is already being compromised by residential development either side of it.

Fundamental Concern

21. Our fundamental concern is around how this growth is to be supported (by Industrial and Commercial areas).
22. The Greytown Heritage Trust would like to be consulted further on this – initially when the diagrams are resolved.

Frank Minehan
ACTING CONVENOR