

**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.

**Heritage Advisory Panel  
Feedback  
Draft Auckland 30 year Plan  
Presentation 21 March 2018**

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 \$15million). The Panel suggests that this contribution is separately identified.