

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Heritage Advisory Panel will be held on:

Date: Tuesday, 25 July 2017
Time: 5.30pm
Meeting Room: Level 2 Reception Lounge
Venue: Auckland Town Hall
301-305 Queen Street
Auckland

Heritage Advisory Panel

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Cr Mike Lee
Members	Elizabeth Aitken-Rose
	Graeme Burgess
	John Burns
	Leyton Chan
	Helen Geary
	Rau Hoskins
	Sally Hughes
	Allan Matson
	Jane Matthews
	Dr Ann McEwan
	Claudia Page
	Bill Rayner
	Sherry Reynolds
	David Veart
	Lorraine Wilson

(Quorum 10 members)

Tam White
Senior Governance Advisor
19 July 2017
Contact Telephone: (09) 890 8156
Email: tam.white@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose

- Provide advice to the council in relation to:
 - the direction and content of strategies, policies and initiatives
 - any matter that the panel considers to be of particular interest or concern to the historic heritage of Auckland
- To deliver advice for improving the promotion and management of historic heritage of the Auckland region
- Advise Auckland Council on council processes and mechanisms for engagement with the historic heritage community, including owners of heritage buildings in Auckland.
- To recommend historic heritage expert membership and provide advice to the Auckland Urban Design Panel.

Scope

To provide a forum for the consideration of issues affecting historic heritage of the Auckland region and provide advice to the council.

Priorities

The priorities for the panel include:

- Historic Heritage Plan
- Issues relating to the Unitary Plan
- Council processes
- Input into the Auckland Urban Design Panel.

Membership

The panel's spokesperson is its chairperson.

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1	Apologies	5
2	Declaration of Interest	5
3	Confirmation of Minutes	5
4	Extraordinary Business	5
5	Newmarket Heritage Station Building	7
6	Council Heritage Assets Repairs/Renewals Fund	9
7	Review of Scheduled Archaeological Sites	11
8	Heritage Managers Update	15
9	Consideration of Extraordinary Items	

1 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

- a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 23 May 2017, as a true and correct record.

4 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-
 - (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
 - (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
 - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
 - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

Newmarket Heritage Station Building

File No.: CP2017/14071

Item 5

Purpose

1. To receive a presentation on the Newmarket Heritage Station building's restoration.

Executive summary

2. Mr Brent Lancaster, General Manager Project Management office Kiwi Rail will present on the station's restoration.

Recommendation/s

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

- a) receive the presentation
- b) thank Mr Brent Lancaster, General Manager Project Management office Kiwi Rail for his attendance and presentation.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Tam White - Senior Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage

Council Heritage Assets Repairs/Renewals Fund

File No.: CP2017/14051

Purpose

1. To present on work undertaken by the Built and Cultural Heritage Unit to address critical repair/renewal issues with Council-Owned Heritage Assets, and to support improving levels of service for Council Heritage Assets over the Long-term Plan (LTP) period.

Executive summary

2. In Chapter Four of the Auckland Plan, Council pledged to understand, invest in, and empower collective stewardship of its historic heritage. Specific actions included identifying all Council-owned heritage properties on a register and to prepare a conservation plan for each of these properties by 2030¹.
3. The Heritage Unit has been making continual progress on building a Heritage Assets Register and gathering data on the condition of Council-owned heritage. The Built Heritage Assets Register contains 326 buildings and structures. The Register includes a wide variety of heritage places, including:
 - Community Halls and Theatres
 - Community Centres and Houses
 - Art Galleries
 - Pools
 - Libraries
 - Corporate Accommodation
 - Cemetery buildings and structures
 - Buildings in Parks and Reserves, including bookable baches, caretakers houses, outbuildings, and park structures
 - Historical Buildings in Community Leases
 - Heritage Buildings in Commercial Use
4. About 55% of the Built Heritage Assets Register has been surveyed, and the condition has been reviewed. From this work it is clear that several critical repair issues exist within the Built Heritage Portfolio. The most critical repairs involve addressing weathertightness issues and repair/replacement of degraded components. The first issue is critical to retaining the building as fit for any kind of service, the second is usually central to retaining its heritage value.
5. Work has been undertaken to determine the probable costs of outstanding and based on this review we find that addressing weathertightness issues and replacement of degraded heritage materials will cost \$12 million over 10 years.
6. Staff will be inputting this information into a Long-term Plan request.

Recommendation/s

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

- a) receive the presentation and report.

¹ Auckland Plan Implementation Framework, Action 7.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Tanya Sorrell - Team Leader Built & Cultural Heritage Policy
Authoriser	Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage

Review of Scheduled Archaeological Sites

File No.: CP2017/13629

Purpose

1. To provide members of the Heritage Advisory Panel with a progress report on the review of scheduled archaeological sites that is being undertaken by the Heritage Unit.

Executive summary

2. The purpose of this programme is to ensure that places in the heritage schedule are accurately described, located and mapped, are assigned to the appropriate category, have a baseline monitoring record, and meet the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) criteria for inclusion in the schedule. Details of the proposed review were presented to the Panel on 10 May 2016.

Progress to date

3. Staff have completed site visits for the Upper Harbour, Kaipatiki and Devonport-Takapuna local board areas. This has involved 27 visits to sites on private property and 45 on public land. Site visits are also underway in some other local board areas, including Rodney and Papakura.
4. Inconsistent entries, minor inaccuracies or incomplete information, and incorrect, missing or inconsistent descriptors or other attributes have been amended for all visited archaeological sites. These proposed changes to the AUP have been made using the Clause 20A provision of the RMA (correction of minor errors to an operative policy statement or plan).

Substantive changes

5. Staff have defined or amended extents for all visited sites that had undefined or incorrectly defined site extents; addresses and legal descriptions have been updated to reflect the defined or amended extents.
6. Primary features and exclusions (non-heritage features within the place extent) have been identified for all scheduled Category A and B sites.
7. Subject to Council approval these proposed changes will be made as part of a future plan change.

Review of sites

8. Staff have reviewed 72 archaeological sites within the completed local board areas to determine if they meet the AUP criteria and thresholds for scheduling. Of these, 27 have been identified for possible removal from Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage. They have little or no physical integrity or cannot be relocated. In some cases they have been miss-identified, or recorded from hearsay, whilst others have been destroyed by development before or since they were scheduled.
9. Intangible sites, or places with little or no integrity, can potentially still be of value or significance to Mana Whenua. Mana Whenua will be engaged to provide feedback on these sites and it may be that some warrant recognition on a Mana Whenua schedule. Once this process is completed officers will then report to the planning committee on potential plan changes.

Site specific research

10. As part of this review staff undertook extended research on a number of scheduled sites in order to confirm or define the site location, or to obtain further information regarding significance.

11. One example is the freshwater spring known as Takapuna (schedule ID 01164). The spring, which is associated with the founding canoe traditions, is mapped as being within the Torpedo Bay Navy Museum site in the District Plan. Staff had a great deal of difficulty finding a source of information identifying the specific location of the spring. Staff were eventually able to determine that the Takapuna spring, now reportedly covered over and diverted into the storm water outlet, is located in the rear yard of 62 King Edward Avenue, just to the northwest of the museum. The location has been corrected and a statement of significance drafted for the place.
12. Another example is Tauhinu pā. The supposed site of Tauhinu pā (schedule ID 00754) is located at the mouth of Hellyers (Oruamo) Creek. Tauhinu pā is of considerable traditional significance to Ngāti Whātua. It was the site of two decisive battles, and has associations with important Ngāti Whātua ancestors.
13. Staff concluded that the small pā at Hellyers Creek is not Tauhinu and have identified Tauhinu pā as being a much larger pā site located at the mouth of Paremoro Creek, in Sanders Reserve. That pā is not currently included in Schedule 14.1. Staff have visited the Paremoro Creek pā with a representative of Ngāti Whātua and proposed to undertake a significance evaluation of the place and to add it to the Heritage Schedule by way of a future plan change. Staff understand that Tauhinu pā has also been nominated for scheduling as a site of significance by Ngāti Whātua. Ngāti Whātua representatives have examined the evidence and agree that the correct location of the pā is in Sanders Reserve.
14. Staff's proposal is to leave the Hellyers Creek pā in the heritage schedule and to amend the name of the place, which is understood to be Taipo pā.

Monitoring of scheduled places

15. Records of sites visited as part of the schedule review including New Zealand Archaeological Association ArchSite site records will be updated with an accurate description and location, assisting with future condition and policy effectiveness monitoring. This work is still in progress.

Additional outcomes

16. Visits to scheduled places in private ownership have provided a valuable opportunity to engage with owners and occupiers and to provide them with information regarding the location and appropriate management of historic heritage places. In some cases owners have been aware of additional information about heritage places which is not within the public realm. An unexpected finding has been that a high proportion of property owners (perhaps 90%) are unaware that they have a scheduled place on their property.

Review of Category A* sites

17. Staff have not yet completed a review of A* sites to reassign these to either Category A or B. This task will be addressed after errors, substantive changes and eligibility reviews have been completed for all local board areas.

Next Steps

18. Clause 20A amendments have now been completed. The timeframe for future plan changes to the AUP is currently unknown.

Recommendation/s

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

- a) receive the report.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Robert Brassey – Principal Specialist Cultural Heritage
Authoriser	Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage

Heritage Manager's Update

File No.: CP2017/13869

Purpose

1. To raise issues of potential interest to Panel members.

Executive summary

2. Issues Raised by Panel members.
 - Heritage NZ: Sherry Reynolds – Community Heritage Networking evening.
 - Helen Geary: An issue I would like to raise for discussion by the Panel is the general plight of churches in Auckland. Congregations are so small these days, and heritage churches need a lot of resource to maintain them. Smaller churches (and usually wooden) are easier to repurpose and move.
 - Graeme Burgess: What position the heritage team are taking with regard to seismic upgrading of heritage structures under the new regulations before they come into effect, is there a policy framework, is there an impact assessment study?
 - Elizabeth Aitken Rose: Requests an update on the Auckland Plan Refresh process:
Feedback from the Heritage Panel Advisory Panel will be included as part of the "Auckland Plan Refresh Early Engagement Summary" which will form part of the discussion at the 17 and 20 July Planning Committee Workshops. A verbal update will be supplied if there is anything to report.
 - and an update on the St James. Discussions are still underway with the owners of the theatre.
3. Special Character Appeal. This appeal was heard on 27 and 28 June. Of interest was that Housing NZ's case did not include heritage evidence but concentrated on two matters: whether Council had the scope to make the change to the objective that it did and the impact that the change would have on its operations.

Recommendation/s

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

- a) receive the Manager's report.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage
Authoriser	John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places