SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION







FORM 13 - Pursuant to Sections 95A, 95B, 95C, 96, 1 of 2 127(3), 137(5)(c) and 234(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991

Submitter

Name SIMON BYRNE

Contact Person
(If different from above)

Postal Address

Home Phone

Cell Phone

Email

Details of the Proposal to which this Submission Relates

Name of Applicant

MAGTERTON DISTRICT COONCIL / RUSSEZ MOOPER

Address of Proposal

Application No.

Description of Proposal

Proposal

Proposal

Details of Submission

My submission:	
Supports the whole proposal	Supports part of the proposal Opposes part of the proposal
In the event this application is subject to be heard in respect of your submission. Yes No If others make a similar submission I will compresenting a joint case with them at the hear	nsider

Submission Statement

The specific parts of the Proposal that this submission relates to.

Please see attached.

Decision you want the Council to make:

Grant the Consent

Decline the Consent

Grant the Consent with Conditions

Signature

To be signed by the submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter.

Name S 10/0 840NE

Date 10/2/2025.

Important notes for the Submitter

- In accordance with the Privacy Act 1993, submissions will be made available for viewing by Council
 and members of the public.
- This form is for your convenience only. You may make a submission that addresses the points above in a letter or other suitable format.
- Submissions will not be returned, so please keep a copy.
- 4. A copy of your submission must be sent to both Council and to the applicant.

Town Hall Submission statement

Author Simon Byrne, Date 10 Feb 2025

I oppose the Application to demolish the Town Hall for the following reasons:

- There are parts of the building that have significant "heritage" values that should be preserved.
- The council has assessed the cost of retaining the most important part of the Municipal Building's facade at a cost that does not seem excessive (circa \$3m), but then decided to demolish all the buildings.
- The option to demolish the Town Hall part of the building, but retain the Municipal Building (as a standalone building) has not been adequately investigated, but it is potentially the BEST option.
 - a. At one time it was generally assumed that the Town Hall could be demolished separately from the Municipal Building at a relatively low cost (\$200k, see the "Dave Borman" public presentation and video). There does not appear to have been any detailed work that challenges this assumption (such as a detailed structural engineers report). In addition, it was proposed the Municipal Building (with its current footprint) could be retained and earthquake strengthened at relatively low cost (\$2m).
 - A report including plans to strengthen the Municipal Building separately from the Town Hall was prepared by LGE Consulting Engineers in Sep 2016.
- 4. I do not agree that the perceived benefit from building a new Town Hall on the site in any way counter balances the demolition of a Heritage Building. There are alternative places to build a new Town Hall, and it is entirely possible a better location exists with better access and parking etc.
- 5. After the discovery the buildings were earthquake prone and below the safety level for staff, it is my opinion the issue of retaining one of the most recognizable and attractive buildings in Masterton should have been the council's (particularly the politicians) priority, and not the building of a new Town Hall.
- 6. Whilst "risk" has been given as a reason for not retaining the Municipal Building I am unaware of any significant actions to "de-risk" such a project, such as invasive testing, soil/foundation testing etc.