



The Bermuda National Trust

The Bermuda Plan 1992 Planning Statement

REVIEW

Environmental Committee, Marine Environmental Committee, Preservation Committee
Dorcas Roberts
May 2006



The Act

Enforcement

In 2004 the Bermuda National Trust participated in a review of the 1974 Development and Planning Act. To ensure that the next Development Plan for the Island achieves what it aims to accomplish we feel that it is extremely important that the Act be reinforced in combination with the new policy, particularly in light of the apparently inexhaustible rate of development and the proportional loss of Bermuda's open space.

The most apparent weakness of the Act is the lack of ability it provides the Ministry to undertake successful effective enforcement. The Trust recognises that many violations of environmental laws often occur as a result of lack of awareness or comprehension of what these laws are seeking to accomplish. Whilst the National Trust strives to increase environmental awareness we acknowledge that it is responsibility of Bermuda's residents to make themselves aware of the law and act in accordance with its regulations. However, lack of prosecution encourages illegal development due to the incentive of considerable financial benefits.

The Ministry must be enabled to apply significant fines and penalties that would introduce a fear of prosecution to serve as an effective deterrent. Any penalty has to exceed the maximum profit to be gained from an infraction.

Retroactive Permission

The present inability to effectively enforce Legislation means that it actually makes financial good judgment to break the law. Retroactive developments and in many cases, the resulting destruction of protected areas is used as a way to nullify Conservation Areas and facilitate future development contrary to the Development Plan.

The Trust feels that Retroactive permission should no longer be offered. If this is unavoidable, application fees for retroactive development must be extortionate and any penalties exceed the net financial gain. Alternatively, the Applicant is made to put back the site as it was and bear the cost of doing so.



Section 34

The authorisation in March 2006 of excavation works within the Chaplin Estate, Warwick, providing the go ahead for a second access road has resulted in the dissection of a large tract of Woodland Reserve. The woodland was permanently protected by Section 34 protection, and by permitting this amendment has set a damaging precedent. The agreement specifically stated that the owner of the land agreed “not to undertake, suffer or permit any act or destruction of the woodland”. Additionally the development, in this case, was not necessary as there was suitable alternative existing access out with the boundaries of the protected land to the properties that the new road will act to serve. The development of such a road was in variance with the Agreement made under section 34 of the Development and Planning Act 1974 and the 1992 Planning Statement.

As it has transpired that permanent Section 34 Agreements can be changed or undone completely the National Trust reluctantly feels that we can no longer rely on Section 34 Agreements as a way to protect land in private ownership. Ultimately, no future applications, contrary to planning regulations, should be approved using the assertion that placing other lands into a Section 34 Agreements will protect them as conciliation. Section 34 no longer guarantees that these lands are in fact protected.

The Trust feels that the Board should no longer take into account an agreement under Section 34 of the Act as a condition to grant approval.



Application Procedures

Advertising

When planning applications are advertised in the Government Gazetteer, presently the Bermuda Sun Newspaper, details of affected Conservation Areas, Protection Areas and information regarding site coverage and date of sub-division should be published.



Planning Statement

Section 2 - The Maps

As a result of the absence of any universally applicable machinery for compensation, the Development Plan Appeals Tribunal often makes concessions when landowners object to restrictive zonings at the time of the draft Plan.

The consequential environmental impact of the loss to a Conservation Area resulting from these compromises is proportionately greater than the gain of the landowner. Open space value tends to decline exponentially in response to fragmentation. Fragmentation of a woodland area is the principal reason for the loss of the areas carrying capacity as a habitat.

Establishing Zoning

The methodology used to attain geographic information employed to establish the Conservation maps must be done with at least one site visit from a Planning Officer for verification purposes. This would mean that the maps reflect exactly what is on the ground. The establishment of unquestionable Conservation Areas can help to remove the mentality of compromise, at the Tribunal stage and the resultant damage. It would also help to nullify future claims by landowners that their land was incorrectly zoned at the time of conception of the Plan.

The Conservation maps of the next Development Plan and the methods used to ascertain the content of the maps ought to be indisputable.

Restrictive Conservation Areas

The Bermuda National Trust has for more than 20 years been concerned about the issue of the disenfranchisement of property owners due to the implementation of Development Plan and subsequent restrictive zonings.

At present there are no economic incentives for property owners to retain protective zonings on their land. In fact, such zonings diminish property value. At the same time, they increase the value of neighbouring properties by offering the amenity of, for example, undevelopable



woodland next door. Development is therefore rewarded and conservation is penalised. Traditionally, good land stewards have been disadvantaged because their property ended up being the only lands worth conserving as woodland or nature reserve by the time of the most recent Development Plan. Some 23 years ago, the Trust became particularly concerned about this issue, as it was clear that the 1983 Development Plan was going to raise problems in this regard.

One approach to this problem would be to consider implementing financial incentives that would cause property owners to place a greater value on Conservation Areas by receiving benefits, such as grants etc. from retaining such zoning. This would also enable landowners that really want to save their land for future generations, but can't necessarily afford it, to do so.

A number of other countries/islands/states dedicate funds raised through taxes on development and property sales either to purchase open space or compensate landowners for the loss of development rights. This approach would be particularly appropriate for arable land in Bermuda. Another option is flexible tax categories: New Hampshire has a system of very low tax for existing use. A landowner wishing to develop pays a tax. The Nantucket Land Bank Plan is a model we have previously submitted to Government as being exemplary. In that small island, many of the coastal areas and open spaces are publicly owned, thanks to the money generated by taxing property sales and development

We feel that such models need to be fully explored for implementation in Bermuda. Whereby it could be established if such a model could be employed to make it possible for Government to buy property with Conservation Areas or compensate the owner of the property by buying the development rights on a certain area, enabling the landowner to retain the property use.

Development of Brownfield Sites - Baselands

As outlined in the Ministry of the Environment's "State of the Environment" 2005 report, in 2001, six percent of Bermuda's land mass (approximately 800 acres) is predominantly comprised of former baselands. We note also from this report that these lands are to be incorporated in the next Development Plan, potentially to provide higher density forms of residential development.



The baselands have the potential to meet many of Bermuda's future needs. As the loss of open space is directly proportional to the increase of residential development the Trust feels that these predominantly unused Brownfield sites can serve to alleviate development pressure on high quality open space elsewhere in Bermuda.

However, Morgan's Point poses an unprecedented opportunity to provide an unparalleled quantity of Open Space that could be enjoyed by all.

Any zoning designation of Morgan's Point should be very carefully considered to meet the unique potential this site offers. The establishment of the zonings for the former baselands need to taken into consideration together with Bermuda as a whole, e.g. traffic, energy, sewage etc.

Adjacent Non-compatible Zonings

The Bermuda National Trust has expressed frequent concerns regarding misuse of an area of land zoned Agriculture and Nature Reserve within Devonshire Marsh, continuing into its fourth year with no effective resolution. The property is 2.39 acres of land zoned Agriculture/Open Space with a 0.36 acre (15 percent) section zoned Industrial. This section of Industrial zoned land, bordered on its western edge by Nature Reserve and the northern edge by Agricultural land, is the only developable area of the whole site. Such a limited industrial area, bordered by Nature Reserve and Agricultural Land (and associated set-backs), was bound to be conflicting. This type of conflict is undoubtedly why the abuse of Conservation Areas within Devonshire Marsh is widespread.

When drafting the maps and identifying Development Zones and Conservation Areas it has to be taken into account the incompatibility and consequences of assigning certain adjacent zones/areas.

2.5 Sites Subject to a Development Zone and a Conservation Area



For a Conservation Area where development is prohibited, Agriculture and Woodland Reserve, for example, paragraph 2.5 can allow encroachment onto these areas.

Sub-paragraph (3) “In the opinion of the Board the size or configuration of a development area imposes exceptional limitation on the size of a residential development, the Board may permit a detached house development to encroach upon a Conservation Area”

Both Agricultural and Woodland Reserve Zoning provisions (Section 11) expressly state that development is prohibited, but nevertheless provide Section 2.5(3) with priority.

However, Section 7 of the Statement provides the provisions for the subdivision of land. Section 7.5 (1) expressly states that the subdivision of land including Conservation Areas must provide adequate development areas beyond the boundary of the Conservation Area (with the exception of Woodland), so that the subsequent development cannot adversely impact the Conservation Area. This provision should mean that Section 2.5 (3) is not applicable to any parcel of land subdivided following the commencement day of the Development Plan, 1992.

The Bermuda Plan 1983 - Planning Statement, Section VII, paragraph 48, sub-paragraph (c) - states that subdivision of land shall be designed so as to “maintain the integrity of any Arable Land Reserve Area and Woodland Reserve Conservation Area”. In addition, special provisions 204 & 205 for subdivision within a Woodland Reserve and Arable Reserve Environmental Protection Area, paragraph 3, sub paragraph (2) states “that the Board shall refuse an application for subdivision, or the development that is likely to take place, may adversely affect either – (a) the quality and character of a Woodland Reserve Area; or (b) the potential agricultural productivity of an Arable Land Reserve”.

As previously stated the National Trust feels that the next Plan has to have a strong predilection for the protection of remaining open spaces from development and provide the provisions of future Conservation Areas with priority. As such, provision 2.5 (3) should be removed or provided only under the condition that the lot was in existence prior to the



enactment of both the 1992 Development Plan and the commencement day of the 1983 Development Plan.

Lot Size of Sites Subject to a Development Zone and a Conservation Area

Site coverage as defined in the Statement: “The area of the lot which is covered by all buildings and other roofed structures, including appurtenances at grade level which have a solid and permanent roof, such as verandahs, porches and covered patios, notwithstanding that one or more sides of the appurtenance is not enclosed.”

If development provisions are provided within future Conservation Areas, to minimise environmental degradation a smaller maximum site coverage should be applied, taking into account both hard and roofed surfaces. Or consideration should be given to having two categories (primary and secondary) of site coverage for sites containing a Conservation Area.

Section 3 – Details of Planning

If plans are submitted to the Board and any of the characteristics that are used to determine the suitability of the site for the use and the form of development proposed (as detailed in Section 3.3) or any statements, seeking grounds for support is found to be deliberately misrepresented then the application should not be put forth to the Board and the applicant penalised.



Section 4 – Environmental Analysis

4.3 Site Analysis Report

A site analysis report should always be required (remove “may”) for all proposals that potentially impact the cases mentioned in sub-paragraphs (a)-(d). In addition, a site analysis should be required for all development applications for lots containing one or more Conservation Areas.

4.5 Environmental Impact Statement

An environmental impact statement should always be required (remove “may”) for all developments outlined in sub-paragraphs (a)-(h).

Additional development applications that necessitate environmental impact statements:

- Docks.
- Development that would necessitate dredging and/or impact corals, mangroves or sea grass.
- Applications seeking to develop out-with the provisions of the Planning Statement.

For all developments in locations of:

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest, e.g. caves.
- International Conservation Sites.
- Listed buildings.
- Protection Areas.
- World Heritage Sites.

4.6 Environmental Impact Statement - Contents

Sub-paragraph (d) ought to be more specific and include:

- Marine flora and fauna.
- Location of any landmarks or places of historical interest.
- Caves.
- Traffic.
- Noise.

Section 6 - Design and Landscaping



The Department of Planning's Landscape Guide has established that both visitors and residents alike place a high importance on Bermuda's vegetation and scenic character. The National Trust agrees that due to the pace of development on the Island and the resultant loss of vegetation, that landscaping for new development must be considered as a high priority to ensure that the Island sustains its rural character.

6.12 Landscaping Schemes

One potential helpful measure to ensure compliance with approved landscaping schemes would be to implement 'Landscaping Bonds'. These bonds would be compulsory for development applications as outlined in 6.12 (1) (a)-(c), to be returned on completion. Additional applications that warrant landscape schemes should include: Large-scale developments that exceed identified site coverage. Bonds would be required to be proportional to the net value of the project (five percent).

Consideration should be given to the implementation of "Landscaping Bonds" as a condition of approval for large scale developments, developments that will result in an increase in site coverage of more than 50 percent, sub-divisions that require a new estate road and the development of a vacant site.

Section 7 – Subdivision

7.4 Design of Subdivision

(2) When a plan is submitted for the subdivision of a parcel of land that includes a Conservation Area, a new provision should be included that the plans submitted should always conform to subparagraphs (a)-(c), (e) and (f).

Subdivision plans submitted for a lot that contains one or more Conservation Areas should include a topographical survey, plans showing the location, species and condition of existing vegetation, a site analysis report, notional building positions for each vacant lot and engineering drawings and cross sections of any new estate road.



(3) The Board assesses the suitability of a subdivision so that they are satisfied that the subdivision has been designed in a manner, which protects natural features and Conservation Areas, as outlined in 7.4(1) (b). If a subdivision is approved whilst taking into account notional development at the time of approval it is reasonable that any future development applications can be measured against them.

(4) Paragraph (3) states “the approval of subdivision showing notional building positions shall not restrict any subsequent application which may be submitted for the approval of a residential development”, should be removed or changed so as to exempt lots that contain Conservation Areas.

Consequently, any development application for a lot (containing one or more Conservation Areas) should always be considered taking into account subdivision plans that illustrated notional buildings.

Subdivision plans (for a vacant lot or a lot containing one or more Conservation Areas) showing notional buildings should be subsequently used to restrict future applications for approval for residential development. Alternatively, a suitable mechanism should be considered where-by a sub-division and in-principle planning permission may be granted concurrently.

7.5 Subdivision Affecting Conservation Areas

7.5(2) (3) Woodland as it now stands appears to be ineffective as a Conservation Area. Please refer to our comments in 11.WDL.

7.8 Undersized Lots

Include “subject to Section 7.5”, or equivalent, to ensure that to approve an undersized lot the Board is satisfied that there is an adequate development area beyond the boundaries of all Conservation Areas and that any subsequent development shall not adversely impact a Conservation Area.



Section 8 – Roads

8.1 Design

Include a provision in this section to insure that all new roads and driveways be aligned and designed to avoid damage or destruction of a Conservation Area and to retain any historical features or landmarks, for instance, a significant Bermuda stonewall.

8.4 Sharing Existing Roads

Applicants should be “made” (remove “encouraged”) to utilise existing estate roads where possible.

8.8 More than One Point of Access to a Road

To permit more than one point of access the Board must be satisfied that the access is best designed to be sited out with the boundaries of all Conservation Areas and retain any historical features or landmarks.

Section 9 – Parking

9.5 Less Parking

If there is grounds to support that it will be beneficial to a Conservation Area, historical feature or landmark, it should be at the Board's discretion to approve less parking as specified in paragraph 9.4(1).



Section 10 – Development Zones

At this time we feel that there is an opportunity to take a strategic look at the Bermuda Residential Building Code 1998, in conjunction with the Development Plan. We feel that Bermuda would vastly benefit from a “Green Building Code” ensuring, for one, that all new developments incorporate more environmentally friendly sewage treatment measures. Consideration should be given to require large developments, such as Belmont Hills, to include wastewater treatment facilities. Energy and water efficiency should also be incorporated to alleviate the strain that predicted future development would necessitate of Bermuda’s amenities and the resultant environmental damage. Alternatively, consideration should be given to providing incentives for proposed developments that propose to utilise “Green Building” methods.

RUR - Rural

The Rural Development Zone serves to identify Bermuda’s remaining tracts of open countryside. The development standards of the zone, as detailed in 10.RUR.6 (a) (c) (d) states that the “siting, scale and massing of development are compatible with, and sensitive to the physical characteristics of the land”, “development minimises the impact on the topography of the land” and “is not detrimental to the natural visual quality of the area”. In a recent objection the Trust did not feel a 9,000 square foot building met this criterion, however these provisions are discretionary and this building was approved.

There is a need for more definition of the development standards and regulations controlling the scale and massing of residential development in a rural area.

TOU - Tourism

Ideally, as part of an overall tourism and planning strategy, that could serve to supplement the Development Plan, applications that seek to develop existing derelict tourism facilities should be encouraged ahead of undeveloped lands or lands set aside for other purposes.

10. TOU.5 Development Standards



More detailed site coverage and development standards should be established for tourism development, for instance number of storeys, density etc.

10. TOU.6 Conversion of Existing Tourism Accommodation for Residential Use

(1) There should no longer be a provision that permits the use of Tourism zoned land for residential use. In recent years there have been a number of large developments on tourism lands and the diminished remaining land should serve purely for future tourism development.

(2) If provisions are still included for residential development, the density of development permitted within Tourism zoned land should not exceed what is permitted in the most common surrounding Residential Zone.

IND – Industrial

10. IND.1 General Directions to the Board

Include a provision directing the Board to consider the impact on a surrounding Protection/Conservation Area and Listed buildings when determining an application for Industrial Development.

10. IND.3 Light Industrial Only

If lands within Devonshire Marsh remain to be zoned as Industrial, then it should be stipulated that in order to protect the neighbouring Conservation Areas only light industrial forms of development be permitted.

10. IND.4 Development Standards

Include development regulation that the minimum setback for industrial development from a Conservation Area should be 20 feet and protective fencing installed.

INS – Institutional, GOV – Government, COM - Commercial



Include in the development standards of all the above zonings that when considering an application the Board be satisfied that the development will not have a detrimental impact on a Conservation Area, Listed building or Protection Area.



Section 11 – Conservation Areas

The National Trust was an objector and party to the subsequent appeal of a recent Retroactive Planning Application whereby horses were being kept within a portion of land zoned as Woodland Reserve. An issue that arose from this application was that nowhere in Bermuda Planning Legislation did it stipulate any provisions for horses. As such, we feel that to avoid further damage to sensitive areas and to prevent future misunderstandings, provisions must be provided in the next Plan for the keeping of horses and the associated infrastructure.

OSP - Open Space

This Conservation Area/Development Zoning is very broad and the provisions are open to interpretation, particularly sub-paragraph (k); “reserve land for the development needs of future generations”.

Each Development Plan serves to provide enough land for the projected population for the duration of that Plan. By stipulating that Open Space is for the retention for the development needs of future generations means that when the Plan is nearing the end of its duration, applications are submitted under the assertion that the purpose of the land is inevitably for development. Furthermore, the definition of “future generations” can be interpreted to mean that proposals for large-scale development can claim to meet sub-paragraph (k) and, as such, nullify the other primary considerations of the Board.

In the next Plan no stipulation should be made that the potential of the land is one day for development.

AGR – Agricultural Land

The principal threat to Bermuda’s agricultural industry is the diminishing quantity of land. Due to pressures placed on Agricultural Land from development it is essential that landowners be provided incentives to maintain and use that land for agricultural uses. Where applicable, owners of such land could be provided with a reduction of land tax or conversely, Government could



purchase and preserve valuable agricultural lots. Finally, it is vital that any policy that serves to protect Agricultural Land does so effectively.

11. AGR.1 Development Restrictions

Remove special provisions of 2.5(3) and 14.7, or provide only for a lot that was in existence immediately before the commencement day of the 1992 and 1983 Development Plans.

WDL – Woodland Reserve and Woodland

Any future Conservation Area that serves as woodland protection as set out in the Fourth Schedule of the Act cannot use the “quality” to establish the level of protection an area warrants. Ninety five percent of Bermuda’s flora is introduced consequently, other factors such as habitat value, amenity and the ecological carrying capacity of a forested area have to be more highly considered. Woodland, as it now stands, appears to be ineffective as a Conservation Area.

In addition, future Conservation Areas intended to protect woodland should allow provisions for a development setback. Developments proposed adjacent to woodland could result in large portions of the Conservation Area being damaged, or removed.

11. WDL.2 Development Restrictions

Remove provision 2.5(3), or provide only for any lot that was in existence immediately before the commencement day of the 1992 and 1983 Development Plans.

NAT - Nature Reserve

The setback of development should be increased to 20 feet or more.



Section 12 - Protection Areas

CAV – Cave

For applications affecting a lot containing or adjacent to a property that is a known cave location an Environmental Impact Assessment should be required. In addition, plans should be submitted to Department of Conservation Services and/or the Department of Environmental Protection for comment and advice.

HIS – Historic

HIS.2 Advisory Committee

The Board shall submit applications within a Historic Protection Area to the Historic Buildings Advisory Committee (remove “may”).



Section 13 – Other Forms of Development

COA – Coastline

Excessive Coastal Reinforcement / Foreshore Development

Recently there have been a large number of applications requesting coastal reinforcement. The Trust fears that if unregulated, parts of the Island's foreshore have the potential to develop into one large wall.

The Trust welcomes the proposal to establish shoreline development regulations based on the findings of the SWI Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment within the next plan. These regulations should not only include guidelines on the methods of foreshore construction but also stipulate in what circumstances coastal reinforcement is permitted and/or warranted. As such, we support the inclusion in the plan of scientifically established set- back distances for coastal development.

There is also a need to develop criteria and standards for marine docks, marinas, sea wall development and all development that will impact the marine environment. All applications must be submitted to the Marine Resources Board and the Department of Conservation Services for comment and advice. There should be no exceptions. This would ensure that the Development Applications Board is made aware of any potential detrimental impact that would result on the surrounding marine environment by providing permission. For example, if by providing permission for a dock that would then necessitate the translocation of coral, or dredging for instance, the DAB should be made aware of this and take into account.

When an application receives approval the applicant must be made aware in writing that a condition of approval is subject to obtaining all the necessary permits, for instance, when it is necessary to obtain a dredging permit from the Ministry of Works & Engineering.



Section 14 - General Provisions

14.2 Matters upon which the Plan is Silent

When applicable to a Protection Area or Conservation Area, the Board should be satisfied, before permission is granted, that a proposal is not in conflict with the aim of the protection the land or building is supplied with.

14.7 Existing Lots in an Agricultural Land Conservation Area

No residential development should be approved on Agricultural Land. If it is found necessary to include such a special provision in the next Plan it should not be applicable to any lot that was not in existence prior to the commencement day of the 1983 Development Plan.

14.11 Statutory Undertakers

If development is sought by a statutory undertaker that could potentially have a detrimental impact on a Conservation Area/Protection Area or Listed building an Environmental Impact Assessment should be required.

In certain cases, such as development within a Conservation/Protection Area or development that affects a historical feature or an area of landmark status, the highway authority should apply for permission or seek advice from the Department of Planning.



Historic Buildings

The Historic Buildings Advisory Committee (HBAC) should be established as a statutory body to review and provide advice for all development applications affecting matters of historical interest and in doing so would provide the body and their decisions with statutory power. All applications that have a bearing on a Listed building or Historic Protection Area's must be submitted to HBAC for review and comment.

Listing

As a result of our objection to the demolition of number 22, Crow Lane, Pembroke, and the subsequent 5-story building to go up in its stead, we established that the Listed building protection on number 22 was removed.

Number 22 was one of several old buildings along East Broadway that protected the original townscape and architectural scale of the entrance to Hamilton. The adjacent building, number 26 Crow Lane, is the Grade 1 Listed 'Queen of the East', and in fact once part of the same property as number 22, built by George Darrell in the 1700's. We felt that the construction of a 5-story building adjacent to this historic building would ultimately impact the building and detract from its setting. Additionally the construction work necessary at this site poses a physical threat to the Queen of the East.

In March 2005 we learned that since 2001 seven Listed buildings had been removed from the List thereby removing the protection under the 1974 Development and Planning Act. In December 2005 number 22 Crow Lane was demolished.

The Trust feels that any proposal to de-list a building by an owner should be made through a formal planning application, or other such means, to ensure public notification. This would require that the application be advertised and therefore give an opportunity for public representation before a final decision to de-list is made. De-listing at the owners' request, without any public notification, does not enable the public to know if the List has been amended or the grounds for such a decision.



The next Statement should provide provisions for development applications in a lot adjacent to a Listed building site so as to ensure that the proposed development will not pose a physical threat to the building or detract from its setting.

The Board should be enabled to take into account, when considering an application concerning a lot neighbouring a Listed building, the potential impact to that the building and its surroundings as a condition to grant approval.

Grading System

When considering a proposal that would effect a Listed building the a grading system that indicates the scope of development appropriate for each building, stipulated in the Development Control Guidance Notes “Alterations or Additions to Listed Buildings and/or buildings located within Historic Areas”. However, the grading system has no statutory status and the grades serve only to provide a general idea of the development suitable.

*“In reviewing an application affecting a Listed Building or buildings located in Historic Areas, the Development Applications Board (DAB) **may** refer to this Development Control Guidance Notes to ensure that the proposal preserves or enhances the historic building.”* Development Control Guidance Notes 2003

The next Statement must incorporate the provisions set out in the Development Control Guidance Notes 2003, so as to provide further support for the protection of Listed buildings.

Promoting Appreciation

The Trust serves to promote the appreciation Bermuda’s built heritage and as such, applauds the efforts made by Government in an attempt to lessen the negative attitude of the public and Listed building owners toward the Listing process. Stricter development controls are most likely the cause, however, the Interest Free Loan Scheme available to Listed building owners is sure to alleviate this.



We also wish to provide support for incentives, such as, reduced land tax for Listed buildings, the sale of transferable development rights and further grants for Listed building owners.

City of Hamilton

In March 2003, the Trust wrote to the Minister of the Environment requesting if the Ministry was willing to finalise the Listing process within the City, as unfortunately, only the Anglican Cathedral is listed within the City limits.

Due to the constant pressures for redevelopment within the City, it is imperative that certain buildings are acknowledged as being architecturally or historically significant and thereby protected under the Act through Listing.
