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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, 21 November 2017 and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 27 February 2018, as true and correct records.

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."
Pukekohe Rail Station Building

File No.: CP2018/05288

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Ms Christine Madsen, Franklin Heritage Forum will speak seeking support to save the Pukekohe rail station building.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Correspondence regarding the station is attached.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:
a) receive the presentation regarding the Pukekohe Rail Station building and thank Christine Madsen for her attendance.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Letter to the chair of the Heritage Advisory Panel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pukekohe station article</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pukekohe station photos</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tam White - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Heritage <heritage@ps.gen.nz>
Date: 26 March 2018 at 10:04:50 AM NZDT
To: <mike.lee@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: Pukekohe Rail Station Building

Hello Mike Lee,

We are an umbrella organisation covering the old Franklin area plus the south east part of Manukau City and North Waikato District and advocate for heritage organisations, to identify, protect and promote the heritage of the Franklin and surrounding districts. This enables the people of the area to better understand and appreciate their history and to share it with others into the future.

Our Franklin Local Board representatives are invited to our meetings.

We have worked with Auckland Council to help research the Pukekohe Heritage Survey but at present our major concern is for the future of the town’s Historic Railway station. I am hoping you or a representative from the Auckland Heritage Advisory Panel may assist us in the investigation to save this part of our history.

We have managed to arrange a workshop meeting between interested parties and the Franklin Local Board for Tuesday 17th April at 11.30am in Pukekohe. All correspondence to date tells us the station is in a sorry state and to use Kiwi Rails words:-

“It is likely the existing station will need to be moved from its current site or demolished. Kiwi Rail is aware of local interest in the building, and it is currently in discussions with interested parties. However, the efficient use of Pukekohe as a station will be the primary determinant of the future of the building.”

We now understand it can stay in place until electrification arrives in Pukekohe.

A group of people interested in saving the building on its present site have set up a Friends of Pukekohe Rail Station Building Facebook page
https://www.facebook.com/friendsofpukekoherailstationbuilding
where the Forum and others have been posting photos and comments.

The present station has provided the people of Pukekohe with rail services and shelter from the rain since 1913. Because Pukekohe doesn’t have an information centre or a museum telling the history of the district, the building could be used as a museum and café for locals and tourists to this southern Auckland town.

We are attempting to arrange a visit to view the inside of the building. I have been inside previously, when the station was still in use and was pleasantly surprised that so many of the original features are still in place.

I have details of the station from the Pukekohe Heritage Survey, the Paera - Drury Structure plan and the Heritage Assessment Report prepared for the Heritage Unit of Auckland Council in July 2017 by The Heritage Studio, Architectural & building Conservation. This incorporates the 2010 report commissioned by Franklin District Council. See:-
https://1drv.ms/f/s!AgoeRyVbZXQt3BT4plB5OD7eY

These reports confirm the importance of saving this important part of Pukekohe heritage for future generations.

We have made a submission to Plan change 7 Auckland Heritage since, despite its district importance, this building was not included in the plan. We have corresponded with Bill Cashmore,
Andrew Bayly, Kiwi Rail, Auckland Transport and had articles published in our local "Post" Newspaper.

As a community we would like to see, as shown by the plan displayed at the station, it being left where it is and used for its original purpose, or the uses suggested above.

Attached information was written in December 2017.

Christine Madsen
Secretary Franklin Heritage Forum
268 Logan Road
RD2
Pukekohe 2677
heritage@ps.gen.nz
This email is to let you know that Auckland Council’s PROPOSED Plan Change 7 was notified on Thursday 16th November and is now open for submissions until the 15th December.

There are a total of 47 places and 3 areas across the region which have been put forward for heritage scheduling, following planning review. Those which may be of interest closest to our Franklin geographic area of interest are:

- St Andrews Vicarage, Church and Memorial Arch, Pukekohe
- St Pauls Anglican Church, Buckland
- Pukekohe Municipal Chambers, Pukekohe
- Franklin County Council Chambers, Pukekohe

Also, a bit beyond Pukekohe but that may be of interest to you too are:

- Waiuku Town Centre Historic Heritage Area
- Old Papakura Central School
- Papakura Courthouse and Lock-up
- Papakura First Presbyterian Church 1926 and 1859 buildings
- Papakura Centennial Plunket and Restrooms
- Papakura - Karaka War Memorial

You will see that the Pukekohe Train Station does not feature on this list. A response from Kiwi Rail says is likely the existing station will need to be moved from its current site or demolished. KiwiRail is aware of local interest in the building, and it is currently in discussions with interested parties. However, the efficient use of Pukekohe as a station will be the primary determinant of the future of the building.


I believe a letter was sent to some Historical Societies across Auckland but The Franklin Heritage Forum were not included.

I hope other members of the Community could respond to Kiwi Rail, Auckland Transport, and Auckland Council showing that as a community (if this is your wish) it should be used in its present position for the purpose it was built for, shelter, toilets and perhaps a Coffee shop with provision for future use. Once it’s gone we will not be able to get it back.

For further Information, please contact

Christine Madsen
Secretary
Franklin Heritage Forum
268 Logan Road
RD2
Pukekohe 2677
092389063
Pukekohe's Historic Railway Station

Is It At The End Of The Line?
Pukekohe Rail Station Building

Heritage Advisory Panel
17 April 2018

Attachment B

Item 5

“Pukekohe has no museum. The station would make an ideal museum, a perfect place to celebrate the district’s heritage in a building which encapsulates so much of our history.”

By Rebecca Glover

Efforts are in train to preserve part of our history.

It’s the last stop, the terminus of the rail line that Auckland Transport seems reluctant to electrify, in the district that the super city was desperate to devour yet curiously keen to neglect. Pukekohe station is having a makeover.

Work has been proceeding to expand and improve the area around the station. Plans are afoot for a flash new glass and steel structure to shelter commuters waiting for the sparse train connections, but that is likely to be at the expense of the century-old existing station.

Pukekohe’s railway station has played a vital part in the development of the district; it has important architectural connections, is one of few remaining examples of its kind, and many locals would like to see it saved. With the rapid growth of the area in recent years there’s a case for preserving reminders of our past, believes Christine Madison, of Franklin Heritage Forum.

The Forum is a networking group of museums and historical societies around the old Franklin district. They helped with the Pukekohe Heritage Survey and also earlier with the Franklin District Council Heritage Strategy suggesting buildings to be listed for preservation.

The station, however, was missing from the list. Christine has been lobbying on behalf of the station, but feels she’s been shunted aside.

The station has become enmeshed in a ‘pass the parcel’ debate; Auckland Transport (AT) leases the building but KiwiRail owns it. KiwiRail is aware of local interest in the building, and it is currently in discussions with interested parties. However, the efficient use of Pukekohe as a station will be the primary determinant of the future of the building,” reads an official statement from the national transport operator.

In an email to Christine, AT states “it has been agreed to relocate the building and investigation into relocation works are underway. Unfortunately, at this stage no further details are available”. Replying to an appeal for help, Auckland councillor and deputy mayor Bill Cashmore points out “this is KiwiRail property and council can only lobby”.

If the station is to be relocated, the Forum would like to know where. “We can’t get a firm answer from anyone,” Christine says. “But our preferred option would be to reinstate its heritage status and for it to remain where it is.”

The Forum reckons there are good reasons for restoring the old building in situ. Built after local MP William Massey advocated strongly for a replacement to the previous station, it became a reality following his election as Premier in 1912. As the main trunk line pushed through the North Island it revolutionised travel and freight movement and town centres relocated round the railroad, as was the case with Pukekohe and Tuakau.

So highly was rail valued at the time that much effort was put into designing stations that were both functional and aesthetically pleasing. Pukekohe’s was one of a series designed by architect George Troup, whose crowning achievement in railway architecture is the magnificent Dunedin station.

Pukekohe’s significance rests on its rarity as one of the few surviving island-platform stations on the North Island main trunk. It is an example of a classic provincial station and retains a high level of integrity, despite changes over the years.

The station once accommodated newsstands, a refreshment room, porters’ room, parcel and luggage room, station master’s...
office, and a ladies' waiting room complete with fireplace. Kauri floorboards, tongue and groove wall and ceiling linings, moulded architraves and skirting boards, timber ceiling roses and a ticketing hatch are original features still in existence.

In the heyday of rail it would have been a bustling scene, with greetings and farewells, eagerly awaited packages arriving and locally grown produce steaming off to markets. The town owed its prosperity in no small measure to the railway.

"Trains were the arteries and veins which carried away and brought goods of all description into our town, even ice cream in insulated green canvas bags," recalled a former resident.

The railway was an essential conduit for freight and passengers between the productive farming hinterland and city markets. For many years from 1927, extra staff were taken on annually to handle rail traffic generated during the potato season.

During the world wars the station saw troops off, some never to return, while others arrived. As an eight year old in 1945 Brian Golding remembers the sight of American troops pouring off the train and marching through town. Locally grown vegetables, processed at the dehydration factory located where The Warehouse now stands, were shipped out through the station making a massive contribution to the war effort.

After World War II, improved roads and motor transport heralded the decline of the railways, with deregulation and the burgeoning of private cars in subsequent years seemingly moving much of the country's traffic on to Auckland's motorways instead. The station serves as an active reminder of the focal point for a once thriving and active meeting place and commercial centre.

Standing on the same site since 1913, Pukekohe Station is one of the town's more important historic buildings, believes the Heritage Forum. While acknowledging the need for considerable repair and restoration, they suggest the station could become an attraction in its own right like other stations that have dodged the wreckers' ball.

"Travel along the southern line and you'll pass restored stations like Remuera, Papatoetoe and Parnell. Out west, Swanson and Glen Eden stations have been turned into cafes while still functioning as railway stations," says Christine.

"Astoundingly for a town of over 30,000, Pukekohe has no museum. The station would make an ideal museum, a perfect place to celebrate the district's heritage in a building which encapsulates so much of our history. Young people today are more interested in learning about our past than our generation was.

"We need to preserve our heritage as the area grows. If we don't do it now, it will be lost for ever."
Auckland Emergency Management Recovery Planning

File No.: CP2018/04684

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To introduce the Panel to Auckland Emergency Management's work on planning for disaster recovery.
2. To seek insight and advice from the panel about how to ensure the interests and visions of the community are understood when planning for disaster recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. This interactive session has been developed to promote a whole of council approach to recovery planning. It allows participants to learn about the hazards and risks Auckland faces and the disaster recovery challenges we might encounter. It also asks participants for their insight on how Auckland Council can ensure an inclusive and effective approach to disaster recovery and how we could address these before a major disaster occurs.
4. Planning for disaster recovery is connected to council wide plans as it requires all departments to consider how their roles and responsibilities are likely to change following a major disaster event in Auckland, as well as how they might contribute to achieving successful recovery outcomes.
5. The Heritage Advisory Panel is requested to identify what disaster recovery priorities, challenges and opportunities might look like for Auckland communities.
6. Auckland’s Resilient Recovery Strategy will provide the strategic oversight needed to establish recovery plans after a disaster event has occurred. The Strategy will include information about Auckland’s social, economic, natural and build environments and the key assumptions, challenges and opportunities we would be likely to face across the four environments.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
7. The ideas, suggestions and advice gathered from this panel will be used to inform the principles and priorities outlined in the ‘Resilient Recovery Strategy’.
8. The Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy will be presented to the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee on 29 August 2018 for approval to begin the consultation process.
9. Depending on interest, staff can present to the panel to introduce the Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy and seek feedback and comment if required.
10. The Final Resilient Recovery Strategy will be completed on or by 28 November 2018.

Discussion questions
- What challenges are people likely to encounter during disaster recovery?
- What could be done to reduce the impact of disasters on the community?
- How could recovery planning better incorporate the priorities, needs and values of different groups?

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:
a) provide advice regarding the Resilient Recovery Strategy.
Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Stephanie Blackford - Emergency Support Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To confirm the Panel’s work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. At previous workshops the Panel has developed a work programme identifying areas where it wishes to concentrate.
3. The workshops have had the following objectives:
   - Reach a consensus of which actions are priorities for the Panel.
   - Develop actions under each of the concepts generated at the first workshop.
   - Allocate tasks.
4. The following questions have guided the workshops.
   - What would the benefit of the action be?
   - What steps need to be taken to achieve the ideas?
   - What resources would be necessary?
   - Do you need any additional information?
   - How would the actions be carried out?
5. The following is a list of the actions that have emerged from the workshops. What would be useful is for a discussion on what Panel members will do to support each of these actions. To help the discussion, below each action are comments about how this could progressed. Some of the actions are more in the officer space to implement, some are a combination of officers and panel members’s involvement and some can be led by the Panel member.

Research:
1. Current work.
   Support work underway by Heritage Unit.
   **Officer Comment:**
   Heritage Unit research: Officer led – David Bade.
   Officers will report regularly to the Panel. The Panel could provide advice on the direction of work, on potential sources of information and then to advocate for the results of the work.
2. External agencies.
   Identifying what each local board, school, historical society, library is doing in the heritage space as both a base of information and a source of what actions are occurring in the heritage space.
   **Officer Comment:**
   Lead: Panel Member/officer.
   Each member, through their contacts to provide a list of information and actions which officers can collate. Officers can also obtain heritage actions through local board plans.
**Funding:**

   HAP to provide submission to Long Term Plan to:
   a) Raise the regional historic heritage fund
   b) Partition the built heritage acquisition fund, say ⅓ into heritage incentives programme
   c) Support council’s heritage fund

**Officer Comment:**

This action has been competed with the Panel’s submission and presentation to the Long Term Plan / Auckland Plan process. The Panel through its delegate will also be involved in consideration of submissions to the Auckland Plan process.

4. Special projects.

Advocate to council to fund special projects for heritage economic benefits research – impact on Auckland and with Government support nationally.

**Officer Comment:**

Further discussion is required to elaborate on this action.

5. Research

Publishing research results of economic benefits.

**Officer Comment:**

This is tied in with 1.

6. Heritage Festival

Advocate for increase in funding for Heritage Festival, using feedback and impact research from 2017 Festival.

**Officer Comment:**

This was included in the Panel’s Long Term Plan submission, action 3.

7. Local Boards

Advocate to local boards to increase heritage specific funding/grants.

**Officer Comment:**

This is connected to Action 2 and can be advanced through Action 12.

**Advocacy Publicity:**

8. Advocacy Groups.

Support advocacy group by invitation to present to Heritage Advisory Panel.

**Officer Comment:**

Panel members to identify an advocacy group to present at the next meeting. Panel member to make initial approach to group and then officers to follow up.

9. Raise profile of Heritage Advisory Panel

Internal (Council and Local Boards).

**Officer Comment:**

Officers to include a profile of the Panel in internal and external communications. Members to identify other methods for this to occur.
10. **Publicise heritage outcomes**
   - Identify and develop good news heritage stories.
   - Become a voice for heritage causes.

   **Officer Comment:**
   Members could identify good news stories and provide information and develop a broad outline of message. Officers can assist with the writing up of the story and finding the appropriate mechanism get the story out.

11. **Invite presentations**
   Could be a source for heritage news/stories.

   **Officer Comment:**
   Panel members to identify which group to be invited to present to the Panel and make the initial approach. Officers to then follow up.

**Governance:**

12. **Local Boards.**
   Panel to advocate that each Local Board to have a heritage portfolio holder. Invite two Local Board’s at a time, to Heritage Advisory Panel meetings to discuss their issues.

   **Officer Comment:**
   Several local boards do have a heritage portfolio holder. Officers will follow up to identify these holders and invite them to the Panel meeting.

13. **Appoint Heritage Advocate Councillor(s) to liaise with Minister Arts Culture and Heritage.**

   **Officer Comment:**
   Further discussion is required as to how this could occur.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) confirm the Panel’s work programme (i.e. the list of actions set out in the agenda report).

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Manager's Report

File No.: CP2018/05268

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To raise issues of potential interest to Panel members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

Long-term Plan and the Auckland Plan
2. Sally Hughes presented to the Governing Body and can provide a verbal debrief if required. A copy of the presentation is attached as Attachment A.

Issues raised by Panel members
3. The following issues were submitted by Allan Matson:

   “Historic Heritage Priorities
   Now that we are through the process of submissions on the Auckland Plan and Long-Term Plan, I am interested to discuss where we’re actually at now, before any proposed changes take effect. I thought a useful starting point for discussion might be the attached table.

   • Re Priority 1, Action 1 – Develop and publish a strategy and action plan for the future management of Auckland’s historic heritage. Timing 2012.
     The Panel worked on a “Heritage Plan” some years ago. Perhaps Noel could provide an update on the status of that plan.

   • Re Priority 1, Action 3 – Provide a comprehensive and coordinated information service for Auckland’s historic heritage. Timing 2015.
     Perhaps Noel could provide a verbal description of the current information provision, and Sherry perhaps some comment on coordination with HNZPT.

   • Re Priority 2, Action 1 – Develop a suite of incentives to conserve heritage, in partnership with private owners and developers. Timing -2015.
     Given that the Long Term Plan process has just been completed, could Noel provide the latest figures he has that summarise the available suite of incentives, in particular, financial ones?

Resource Consent Processes for Scheduled Items
I am interested to discuss the process by which scheduled items progress from consent application through to completed development, and whether there is anything the Panel might usefully advise Council on in this regard. There’s not much point in discussing imaginary scenarios and real situations provide the best opportunity for looking at these processes. We could look at two particular current issues involving scheduled items; the Civic Administration Building in Aotea Square and the former Windsor Castle at 144 Parnell Road

These are both live consents and the Panel should of course limit itself to Council’s publicly held information, i.e. information lodged with any resource consents in both cases.
The Civic Administration Building
I’m concerned by the second paragraph of the attached sales pitch which reads: “A complete renovation and restoration of The CAB: An all new double glazed exterior facade with state-of-the-art materials used throughout while being faithful to its modernist architecture.” This sounds an explanation for not retaining fabric of heritage significance as it may (perhaps) not be “reasonably practicable”. Perhaps Noel could update the Panel on Love & Co’s latest publicly disclosed intention as evidenced through the RC process.

It is important that Council exercise leadership in heritage matters, and given the status of the building, its development carries a degree of reputational risk for Council. The CAB has been an agenda item over a long period of time and I think it remains within the mandate of the Panel to give such further advice as it considers useful.

The Windsor, 144 Parnell Road
This is a current consent (notified on March 22) involving adaptive reuse of a significant heritage building. It is both scheduled with Auckland Council and listed with Heritage NZ, and I’m interested to hear a description of how heritage information is introduced through the RC process and how it is brought to bear within the decision making process. The particular building in question simply provides a useful and realistic lens through which to look at the process.”
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) receive the Heritage Manager’s report

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Presentation to Governing Body 21 March 2018</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authoriser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Advisory Panel
Feedback
Draft Auckland 30 year Plan
Presentation 21 March 2018

Auckland Plan:

Legal

- Does not set a strategic direction that integrates historic heritage with other objectives, or outline a high-level objective that will achieve either a strategic direction or objectives for historic heritage.
- Does not recognise and provide for historic heritage as a matter of national importance under S6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Generally

- As a matter of national importance, historic heritage deserves much greater attention in the Auckland Plan than this draft gives it (which is almost nothing)
- Both the natural environment and historic heritage are of great importance to the people of Auckland and BOTH require clear content.
- The existing Auckland Plan content was worked on by the wider heritage community and is robust. There is no explanation for moving away from a specific chapter on historic heritage as is included in the current plan.

Outcome Statement

- The Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome is confusing and unclear.
- Historic heritage is limited to a subset of cultural heritage in the outcome and has no visibility within the outcome statement:
  Aucklanders preserve, protect and care for the natural environment as our shared cultural heritage, for its intrinsic value and for the benefit of present and future generations.
- Relationship between the natural heritage and our historic heritage is confused. Historic heritage is not a component of the natural environment.
- The outcome uses the term cultural heritage. This term is not commonly used as it is confusing – it is often used to exclusively mean archaeological sites (or Māori archaeological sites). Cultural Heritage also refers to non-place based heritage like language, objects, and performing arts, but there is no relationship between anything in this chapter to these things.
- The importance of our built heritage is not included in the outcome.
Chapter Content

- None of the four directions under the “Environment and Cultural Heritage” outcome reference historic heritage at all. Direction 1 could easily do so, but it only addresses Auckland’s environment and ecosystems.
- Only one of the focus areas under the “Environment and Cultural Heritage” outcome references heritage at all, and it continues the error of using the term “cultural heritage” instead of referring specifically to historic heritage.
- The one focus area that does relate to heritage (Focus area 4) is dominated by environmental case studies, and does not address the protection of historic heritage in a meaningful way.

Outcome sought:

- The existing Auckland Plan content should be re-drafted to fit within the reviewed plan, retaining its clarity and emphasis.
- Historic heritage be separated from generic references to either “the environment” or “cultural heritage” and addressed either in a separate outcome or clearly within the existing outcomes.
Points for the Heritage Advisory Panel presentation on the LTP:

- Support the continued funding of the Heritage portfolio.

- Support for an increase in funding for the Heritage festival – this is already an extremely popular festival well attended and could be supported more by Council with additional funding.

- The panel supports the council increasing the budget for repairs and conservation of its own heritage assets.

- Support the continuation of funding towards the Heritage Grants programme and the Built Heritage Acquisition Fund however that the total amount be redistributed.

- The Panel suggest that the Heritage Grants fund be increased to $1 million (currently $80,000 pa) with the budget reallocated from the Built Heritage Acquisition Fund (budget currently approximately $3m pa). The Panel believes that an increase in funding towards the grants programme would be more effective at protecting a broader range of heritage and a built heritage acquisition fund is appropriate when the only option left is Council purchase.

- The only demand on the Acquisition fund is St James (Council resolution to contribute $15 million). The Panel suggests that this contribution is separately identified.