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Purpose
As one of council’s engagement mechanisms with diverse communities, the demographic advisory panels provide advice to the governing body and council staff within the remit of the Auckland Plan on the following areas:
- Auckland Council’s regional policies, plans and strategies
- Regional and strategic matters including those that Council-Controlled Organisations deal with any matter of particular interest or concern to diverse communities.

Outcomes
The panel’s advice will contribute to improving the outcomes of diverse communities and social cohesion as set out in the Auckland Plan. The panel will advise through their agreed strategic agenda and detailed work programme.

Strategic agenda and work programme
The panel must develop a work programme and set a strategic agenda for the term. The agendas should be focused and integrated across the panels for collaborative input into shared agendas, particularly on the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan and annual plans. The panel should advise on council’s organisational strategies relevant to diverse communities. The governing body and council staff should work with the panel for the development of their strategic agendas and work programme. An appropriate committee will approve the panel’s work programme and any subsequent major changes to it.

Submissions
The panel must not make formal submissions to Auckland Council on council strategies, policies and plans, for example, the annual plan. In its advisory role to the council, the panel may have input to submissions made by the council to external organisations but do not make independent submissions, except as agreed with the council. This does not prevent individual members being party to submissions outside their role as panel members.

Review
The form and functioning of the panels may be reviewed prior to or after, the end of the panel’s term in September 2019.
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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, 25 June 2019, 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."
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update on draft content for the end of term reporting and feedback received so far from panel members to inform future operations of the panel.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) receive the initial findings of the survey
b) provide additional feedback to confirm the panel's overall recommendations.

Horopaki
Context
2. The council’s sector and demographic advisory panels are a mayoral appointment and their term therefore ends one month before the council elections. The purpose of the Heritage Advisory Panel has been to provide advice to the governing body and council staff within the remit of built and cultural heritage issues addressed in the Auckland Plan on the following areas:

- council policies, plans and strategies
- regional and strategic matters
- any matter of particular interest or concern to heritage communities.

3. A survey has been distributed to panel members by email to capture views on the key achievements of the Heritage Advisory Panel over the 2016-2019 term as well as feedback on what improvements could be made to the way the panel operates. This feedback will be used to develop an end of term report to the current council and recommendations to the incoming mayor to inform future arrangements.

4. Initial feedback from the survey will be shared at the meeting.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
5. A report will be presented to the governing body that incorporates panel members' views on key achievements of the panel during the 2016-2019 term.

6. Recommendations for changes to the Heritage Advisory Panel will be developed in response to survey feedback and will be presented to the incoming mayor later this year.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carol Hayward - Principal Advisor Panels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Noel Reardon - Manager Heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Watercare Heritage Survey

File No.: CP2019/10647

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To inform the panel on progress with the Watercare Heritage Study findings.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In conjunction with Watercare staff, a survey has been undertaken of potential heritage assets.
3. Staff will present the findings of the survey.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) receive the presentation.

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>
Evaluation Methodology

File No.: CP2019/15112

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To report back on the completion of updates to the methodology and guidance document for evaluating historic heritage and historic heritage evaluation template.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The evaluation methodology and template were originally developed as supporting documentation for the historic heritage scheduling framework in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan in 2012-2013.

3. The panel were advised in November 2017 of a review commencing to the existing methodology and evaluation documents. Two members of the panel were nominated to sit on the project reference group (Allan Matson and John Burns).

4. Refinements have now been made throughout the methodology guidance document, in particular the new or expanded content on:
   - the evaluation process
   - physical description
   - undertaking a comparative analysis
   - integrity and rarity
   - guidance sections for a number of criterion indicators
   - preparing a statement of significance
   - identifying geographic thresholds
   - defining extent of place and
   - trees, gardens plantings and other features of the setting.

5. Moving forward, appendices will be developed over time to include supporting content such as, examples of places meeting specific criteria and examples of well-crafted statements of significance.

6. Cara Francesco from the Heritage Unit will be present at the meeting to discuss the item.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) receive the updated methodology and evaluation template documentation.
**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland’s historic heritage
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Version 2
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Located on a rise with panoramic views of the Manukau Harbour, Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill and Hillsborough, the Pah estate has always been valued for its landform, outlook and soil. The site is said to have been that of an extensive fortified pa, occupied by a hapu of the Waiohua tribe. The pa, known as Whataroa, was one of a number destroyed following a great battle at Titirangi around 1750.

The Pah farm provides important evidence of the progressive European development of the landscape from William Hart’s pioneering farming beginnings in the 1840s to a significant agricultural park owned and managed by some of Auckland’s most significant businessmen during the 1880s to 1890s, as well as later use for school, religious and community functions first by St John’s College, and then the Sisters of Mercy.
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1 Overview

This methodology guides the process of evaluating the significance of historic heritage places against the criteria in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) to determine if a place meets the thresholds for scheduling which are specified in the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).\(^1\) Its purpose is to ensure that there is consistency in the way places are evaluated and that evaluations contain a sufficient level of detail so that subjectivity is minimised, and evaluations are consistent, defensible and transparent.

Heritage specialists and Mana Whenua representatives are key users, however, there are a number of other interested parties to whom the methodology and guidance is relevant. This includes resource management professionals, decision-makers, community interest groups, land owners and other interested parties.

Anyone evaluating a historic heritage place for potential inclusion in the historic heritage schedule should have regard to this methodology and guidance. Evaluations that do not meet the standards set out in this document are unlikely to contain the level of detail required to support good decision-making.

2 Introduction to the AUP historic heritage framework

The statutory framework for the identification and evaluation of Auckland’s significant historic heritage places can be found in section B5.2.2 of the AUP. Policies 1-5 identify criteria and thresholds that determine whether a place is eligible to be included in Schedule 14.1: Schedule of Historic Heritage (the schedule). Places recommended for inclusion in the schedule must have considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria and have considerable or outstanding overall significance to the locality or a greater geographic area.

The AUP takes a place-based approach to historic heritage. This holistic, multidisciplinary approach considers multiple values that contribute to the significance of a historic heritage place. The place-based approach acknowledges the diversity of Auckland’s historic heritage and the range of forms it takes, including landscapes, features, sites and settings. A place-based approach allows for a full understanding and appreciation of the values and overall significance of each historic heritage place. A place-based approach is in accordance with recognised good heritage practice\(^2\), both within New Zealand and internationally.

---

\(^1\) Eligibility does not automatically guarantee that a place will be scheduled. A planning analysis followed by decision-making from the elected council are subsequent steps prior to notification.

\(^2\) ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, Revised 2010
2.1 Evaluation process

The process of evaluating historic heritage significance involves the following steps:

1. Undertake historical research on the place and comparable places, the historical and physical context, and physical form/type/style
2. Visit the site to assist with understanding the place
3. Prepare a comparative analysis
4. Evaluate the place against the significance criteria
5. Prepare a statement of significance
6. Recommend whether the place meets the overall threshold for scheduling as a Historic Heritage Place (Category A or B) or Historic Heritage Area (HHA)
7. If the place is considered to meet the threshold for scheduling, define the extent of place recommended for scheduling, the primary feature(s) and any exclusions, based on the heritage values of the place identified in the evaluation
8. Obtain a peer review of the evaluation and incorporate any subsequent amendments\(^3\)

These steps are interrelated and iterative. Sometimes new information or analysis in later steps will take the evaluator back to an earlier step for revisions.

3 Historical summary

The historical summary is a brief history that builds understanding of the place and its development over time. This section will include information on relevant historical contexts, associations and themes. For example, if the place is a State House, it may be relevant to include information on the origins of State housing, social welfare, the First Labour Government, various government departments, the architects, other areas of State housing, the significance of the location, other iterations of the State housing programme, and/or international examples.

Places that reflect successive layers of history, such as those that have been used in a variety of different ways and/or with different physical expressions over a period of time, may have multiple contextual themes to address in this section.

This summary can be structured in a number of ways but is expected to include both chronological and thematic sections to contextualise the place. In the body of the

\(^3\) Where an evaluation forms part of a council process (such as a plan change), the peer review is expected to be undertaken by or on behalf of the Heritage Unit
evaluation, this section summarises information that is relevant to the significance of the place. A more detailed historical narrative can be included as an appendix and referred to in the summary, where relevant.

### 4 Physical description

The physical description describes the geographic context and physical fabric of the place. It includes the following sections:

- **Site visit**: Include the date of the site visit(s), who attended, and what was inspected.

- **Place location**: Aerial photographs showing the immediate and wider physical context of the place. Historical aerial photography should be included in an appendix. Identify the place and any other significant features on the aerial (i.e. use arrows, circle or similar).

- **Geographic/physical context**: Information about the location and qualities of the place. Describe the surrounding environment and geographic context, such as the pattern of development, use/character of surrounding areas, significant streets or features (e.g. tram stops, bridges, corner site), landmarks and/or relevant topographical and landform information. If it is relevant to understanding the place, include information on the natural environment, including the wider landscape. Visual or proximity links with other places or sites may also be relevant, such as the location of a natural spring relative to a settlement site. Annotated location maps can be helpful where it is necessary to relate the place to a wider landscape.

- **Site description**: Information about site size, topography, general layout of features, general spatial organisation on site, orientation, key site features such as boundary treatments or significant plantings.

- **Description (exterior or surface features)**: Include information on structure, form, style, fabric, key features, modifications, etc. Depending on the complexity of the place, this section can include subsections. Use the information from the historical summary to identify features that need to be made distinct for particular reasons (e.g. the barn where an important development in milking technology was made should be distinct from other accessory buildings on a farm). The following should be included in the description:
  - Site features in general: such as location, general dimensions, fabric, whether of a particular pattern or style, function, age (if known). A place with several features to describe may benefit from a diagram or annotated site plan
  - For buildings and structures: Include information on design or architectural style, number of stories, general form and orientation on
the site, roof form and fabric, materials, structure, details on cladding, fenestration, entrances, and any special exterior features. If it reflects an architectural style, note which key defining features of that style are present. If the building had a particular function, note what elements of the building illustrate that function. It may be useful to describe each elevation separately, but pictures, diagrams or architectural drawings can be used to illustrate more complex buildings

- For archaeological sites or places that include or may include archaeological sites or features\(^4\): Identify the site type/s (for example headland \(h\)); describe the features present, including any that contribute to the context of the place. Where relevant, provide a reasoned interpretation based on analogy or recorded history of what subsurface features are likely to be present. For example, a historic-era domestic settlement site will typically include rubbish pits or deposits of discarded artefacts and food refuse, an infilled well and latrine, and evidence of buildings and structures including postholes or footings

- Features associated with the setting: include fences, gates, outbuildings, steps, paths, driveways and other structures that contribute to the context of the place

- Notable trees and other important vegetation: include location, common name and scientific name (genus and species), approximate size (diameter at breast height \([dbh]\), overall height) and age, whether there is a designed or vernacular landscape and whether it follows a particular style\(^5\)

- **Description (interior or known sub-surface features):** Where there are known features of historic heritage interest these should be described. A description and photographs should be included in this section. Additional historical or contemporary photographs and/or drawings can be included in the appendix.

  - For buildings and structures: include information on layout, access arrangements, materials and distinctive features, including fixtures and fittings

  - For known\(^6\) sub-surface features or archaeological deposits: describe the deposits or features present, including any that contribute to the context of the place. Include information on stratigraphy (and soil composition where relevant), and the extent of any known disturbance

---

\(^4\) Note that this may include standing buildings and structures.
\(^5\) When preparing this section, an arborist may need to be consulted to provide input. The approximate age of plantings can sometimes be determined from archival photographs or historic aerial imagery.
\(^6\) Either through historical records or prior investigation.
- **Summary of key modifications**: Describe any significant modifications to the place (including the date undertaken, where known). A timeline of modifications can be included in an appendix to support this summary. A colour-coded diagram can be useful if different parts of the place have had multiple changes or have been constructed at different times.

- **Summary of key features**: Key features are those that, if destroyed or removed, would adversely affect the overall significance of the place. This may include the interior, where it is of historic interest. Do not itemise every feature of the place. If the place is eligible, these key features will inform your recommendations for primary features.

## 5 Comparative analysis

The comparative analysis examines how a place compares with other similar or related places (both scheduled and unscheduled) in the local area, region or wider context to establish its relative significance against one or more points of comparison.

The comparative analysis will also help establish the geographic extent over which the heritage values associated with a place extend. Start with the local context and go broader if no comparable places are found.

For example, if the place is the work of a notable architect, the comparative analysis will establish if it is significant within the architect’s body of work by considering their other comparable works. Likewise, if the place is rare, unusual or an exemplar of its type, those qualities need to be established through the comparative analysis.

Revisit the comparative analysis when a preliminary evaluation against the criteria is undertaken, as there is a direct relationship between the comparative analysis and the inclusion and exclusion indicators.

### 5.1 Determining the basis for comparison

The historical research and physical description will identify the relevant points of comparison for a place. These may include (but are not limited to):

- design or architectural style
- geographic area
- thematic context
- period of significance/age
- historical associations (with individuals, groups, places, events, etc)
- type
• use
• architect, builder, engineer or designer
• fabric and/or technology

Select the points of comparison relevant to the place. It is important to understand the basis for comparison to avoid comparisons that do not help determine significance. For example, where a house appears to be significant because of who lived there, the appropriate basis for comparison is other buildings in which that person lived, and what phase of their life each is associated with. It would not be useful, in this example, to make a comparison of similarly styled houses as this would not assist in identifying the significance of the place.

The case for significance is built throughout the evaluation, and the comparative analysis is a key part of this. Ensure the comparative analysis is focused and robust enough to support the arguments made under each relevant evaluation criterion.

5.2 Selecting places to compare

Once the points of comparison are selected, look for comparable places to which these points are also directly relevant. Comparable places can be identified through a range of sources which include (but are not limited to):

• Schedule 14.1: Schedule of Historic Heritage
• Contributors to an HHA (Schedule 14.2: Historic Heritage Areas - Maps and statements of significance)
• Character supporting and defining places (Schedule 15: Special Character Schedule, Statements and Maps)
• City Centre Character Buildings (Chapter H8.11.1)
• ArchSite, the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) national database of archaeological sites
• New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (NZHL/RK)
• Engineering Heritage Register, maintained by Engineering New Zealand7
• Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement. (DOCOMOMO) Top 20
• The New Zealand Tree Register
• A thematic study or definitive work
• Cultural Heritage Inventory (CHI)
• Schedules maintained by other local or regional authorities
• International sources

---
7 Formerly Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand (IPENZ)
For each point of comparison, select places to establish the relative significance of the subject place. Do not list every place uncovered during research, focus on those only directly relevant to each point of comparison.

5.3 Format

A comparative analysis is generally approached as a narrative discussion supported by a table. The narrative discussion is an analysis of conclusions drawn from research on the comparable places. The table provides an overview of each comparable place. In many cases it will be appropriate to include the table as an appendix, with only the analysis/conclusions contained within the body of the text.

A separate analysis will be prepared for each point of comparison selected. There are, however, often multiple aspects of comparison for each place, and sometimes it is appropriate for these to be considered together (e.g. “churches” is too broad to be a relevant comparison, therefore, a more focused approach is required, such as “Post-war churches in South Auckland”).

A comparative analysis is to include the following information:

- The point of comparison being examined, and why this is relevant/important to the subject place. Why was this point selected for analysis?
- The name and/or address/location of each comparable place
- A photograph of each place including the date it was taken and the source in the caption
- A discussion of how each place is comparable to the subject site. Why is it considered comparable? How is it the same? / How is it different?
- Any current recognition or protection (i.e. is the place listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), or scheduled by a local authority?)
- Analysis/conclusions. What has the comparative analysis revealed? What has it established about the significance of the subject place? What is the outcome of this work?

6 Evaluation

6.1 Evaluation criteria

The AUP directs that places are eligible for inclusion in the schedule if they are found to have considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria, and if the place has considerable or outstanding overall significance to the locality.
or greater geographic area. It is not common for historic heritage places to only have significance in relation to a single criterion. The body of evaluations undertaken to date has shown that overall significance generally derives from the contribution of multiple criteria.

The evaluation criteria are not weighted or hierarchical. There is no correct number or combination of values required to determine overall significance.

### 6.2 Indicators

The process of evaluating historic heritage value against the criteria is guided by inclusion and exclusion indicators. The inclusion indicators assist with determining when a place has value against a criterion and the exclusion indicators assist with determining when a place is not considered to have value against a criterion. Not all criteria (or all indicators) will be relevant to the evaluation of every place.

The indicators:

- are not exhaustive
- assist with applying the criteria - they are not criteria, and
- assist with determining the overall value level under each criterion (NA/none; little; moderate; considerable; outstanding).

Examples illustrating the application of the indicators are included in Appendix 1.

### 6.3 Integrity and rarity

Integrity and rarity are factors that can apply to all the criteria, which is why this guidance is presented separately. These are important considerations in determining if a place has significance under each criterion.

#### 6.3.1 Guidance on integrity

- Intactness and authenticity are generally considered to be components of integrity
- Integrity does not necessarily relate to the way the place was when it was established but can derive from a wider period of significance. Later modifications to the place could be just as significant (sometimes more) than an original design or configuration

---

6 AUP B5.2.2(3)
• Places may be modified over time but not all change is detrimental. Modifications should be assessed as to the effect they have on the overall significance of the place.

• Integrity does not only relate to physical fabric; the way integrity is considered is dependent on the value being assessed (e.g. historical). There are different aspects of integrity to consider, including the materials used, the design and craftsmanship involved, the location, immediate setting and wider visual linkages, the continuing association with significant people or institutions or cultural practice. These aspects of integrity are addressed in the inclusion/exclusion indicators for each of the evaluation criteria.

• There are different standards for integrity depending on the reasons the place is significant. For a place that represents the work of a notable architect, design integrity is very important. For a place that is significant for its association with an event, the more important aspect of integrity is that the place is much the same as it was when the event occurred.

• Replacement of short lifespan fabric (marine timbers, roofing, etc.) does not necessarily preclude a place having value if it retains the relevant aspects of integrity.

• Potential for a place to be returned to an earlier state should not be a consideration during evaluation. The place must be considered as it is, not as it could be.

• The concept of “original” can be misleading as everything is “original” in some sense of the word. The issue is which chronological period a place or feature is original to, and whether that is significant.

6.3.2 Guidance on rarity

• Do not state that a place is rare without explaining why that matters. Why is that aspect of rarity important?

• Rather than rely on rarity per se to convey significance, consider why the place is rare and whether that reason tells a significant story. What can present and future generations learn from the fact that this place exists?

• Rarity does not automatically impart significance. A place can be rare without being important or significant.

• Apply the most relevant geographic context when discussing rarity (e.g. a two-storey villa is rare within the context of Blockhouse Bay, but not necessarily rare within the isthmus as a whole).
6.4 Criteria and Indicators

(a) Historical

_The place reflects important or representative aspects of national, regional or local history, or is associated with an important event, person, group of people or idea or early period of settlement within the nation, region or locality._

INCLUSION indicators

- Demonstrates or is associated with an important event(s), theme(s), process, pattern or phase in the history of the nation, region or locality
- Is associated with a person, group of people, organisation or institution that has made a significant contribution to the history of the nation, region or locality
- Is strongly associated with an important idea
- Is strongly associated with an early or significant period of settlement within the nation, region or locality
- The place or a component of it is an example of a nationally/internationally, regionally or locally unusual, rare or unique heritage place
- Retains a use, function or integrity of association that contributes to the historical importance of the place.

EXCLUSION indicators

- Demonstrates or is associated with an event or events, theme, process, pattern or phase that is of unproven or uncertain historical importance
- Associations are incidental, minor, distant or cannot be substantiated
- Provides evidence of themes, phases or other aspects of history that are not of substantiated historical importance
- The place appears to be rare only because research has not been undertaken to determine otherwise
- The claim of rarity or uniqueness has too many descriptive qualifiers linked to it
- The place or its attributes are rare or unique, but its importance is unproven or uncertain

- The place has been adversely changed or altered to such an extent that its historical values are no longer legible.
(b) Social

The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, a particular community or cultural group for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value.

INCLUSION indicators

- Is held in high public esteem
- Represents important aspects of collective memory, identity or remembrance, the meanings of which should not be forgotten
- Is an icon or marker that a community or culture (past or present) identifies with
- Has an enduring or long-standing association with a community or culture (past or present)
- Plays an important role in defining the communal or cultural identity and/or distinctiveness of a culture or community (past or present)
- Demonstrates a custom, way of life or process.

EXCLUSION indicators

- Social, cultural, spiritual, symbolic or community values are incidental, or cannot be demonstrated satisfactorily or otherwise substantiated
- Provides evidence of social, cultural, spiritual, symbolic or commemorative value or community association or esteem that are of dubious historical importance
- The place is valued by a community solely for amenity reasons
- The place is important to a community, but only in preference to a proposed alternative (e.g. a new development)
- The place is not valued or recognised by an identifiable group or interest group within, or that represents, a past or present community
- Associations are not held very strongly or cannot be demonstrated satisfactorily
- The place or its context has been altered or significant elements of the fabric have been changed or neglected to such an extent that its value is severely degraded, illegible or lost
The custom, way of life or process is rare or in danger of being lost or has been lost but its importance is questionable.

Guidance

Caution needs to be taken when ascribing social value. Efforts to engage potential communities of interest or the public may be necessary to make a case, particularly if the evaluation may be contentious.

Supporting factors to consider (these are not values, but may support values):

- Recognition in a schedule or list maintained by a heritage organisation, such as HNZPT, Engineering New Zealand, DOCOMOMO, etc
- Organisations dedicated to retention of the place (e.g. Friends of...)
- Subject or location of public events, celebrations or festivals (e.g. Anzac ceremony at a war memorial)
- Protests or appeals during attempts to alter or remove the place
- Extraordinary efforts to save a place
- Public nominations or submissions for scheduling
- Inclusion of the place in literature, history books or heritage trails.

Further matters to consider:

- Is the esteem actually for the physical place, or is it for the role the place has in the community? For example, if a historic church was replaced with a new church building, would the parish value it less?
- Does the public esteem relate to views held by a contemporary community, or a community in the past, or a community that no longer exists, or a community whose views have shifted over time?
- Social value can have multiple layers and can relate to different communities of interest. These values may overlap or compete
- Care needs to be taken if justifying a case for overall considerable or outstanding significance for a place based on this criterion alone
- Consider both place-based communities and communities of interest. Communities of interest may include groups of individuals who are not necessarily resident in the vicinity of a place, or even within the Auckland region but have a shared ethnic, cultural or other background. For example, the community associated with a particular religious place or cemetery may be widely scattered
- A place may have significance to Māori who are not Mana Whenua and may not even be resident within the region. In this case significance should be considered under the Social criterion.
(c) Mana Whenua

The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, Mana Whenua for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value.

* Development of indicators has yet to be undertaken with Mana Whenua.

INCLUSION indicators

EXCLUSION indicators
(d) Knowledge

The place has potential to provide knowledge through archaeological or other scientific or scholarly study or to contribute to an understanding of the cultural or natural history of the nation, region or locality.

INCLUSION indicators

- Has provided or has the potential to provide substantial new information on past human activity or natural environments through archaeological or other scientific investigation or scholarly study
- Is an important benchmark or reference place that typifies its type and provides a point of reference to which other places can be compared
- Is an important research or teaching site
- Has the potential to play an important role in enhancing public understanding or appreciation of the history, ways of life, cultures or natural history of the nation, region or locality
- Has the potential to be used to educate the public through the use of on- or off-site interpretation
- The place or a component of it, is an example of an internationally/nationally, regionally or locally unusual, rare or unique heritage place
- Demonstrates a custom or way of life or process.

EXCLUSION indicators

- The information that can be derived from or about the place is readily available from other places or sources
- There is insufficient physical, documentary or other evidence to assess the research potential of the place
- The place or its context have been disturbed or altered in such a way that its potential to yield meaningful or useful information has been compromised
- The research potential of the place has been fully exhausted (for example where a site has been excavated and negligible intact physical remains are left in situ, or a building where the significant fabric has been substantially removed or replaced with new work)
The knowledge that has or could potentially be gained from or about the place is/would be of little or limited value.

The place appears to be rare only because research has not been undertaken to determine otherwise.

The claim of rarity or uncommonness has too many descriptive qualifiers linked to it.

The place or its attributes are rare or unique, but its importance is questionable.

The custom, way of life or process is rare or in danger of being lost or has been lost but its importance is questionable.

Guidance

This criterion and set of indicators apply primarily to archaeological sites or other places (including buildings and their settings) that have the potential to provide substantial physical information about the past. In some cases, places will have multiple periods of use or occupation, for example archaeological evidence of Māori or previous European occupation underlying existing buildings and structures.

Caution is required in relation to the application of this criterion. Physical evidence provides evidence from a place while documentary sources provide evidence about a place. Physical evidence is subject to less bias in its creation and can be regarded as the most reliable and therefore the primary evidence relating to the place. It provides evidence that is different from and may not be obtainable from other sources. It may confirm documentary evidence, but it might also tell a different story (for example, that a building was not built as planned). In relation to buildings and settings, physical evidence can provide information on construction details, subsequent modifications and the history of use of a place.

Further matters to consider:

- Standing buildings or structures may have potential to reveal information through archaeological or other investigation. A considerable amount of previously unknown information may be obtainable from early buildings or buildings with little recorded history. For example, Mansion House incorporated recycled building materials from the former Kawau smelting works in its construction. Even for document-rich places, physical investigation of buildings and structures can generally produce a variety of information not included in written or photographic sources. It is additionally worth bearing in mind that a combination of well-preserved physical evidence and variety of documentary information has the potential to allow more complex questions about the past to be explored and addressed.

- With archaeological sites, caution is needed in reaching the conclusion that the information available from a particular site can be obtained from other places as not all similar site types have the same information potential or historical trajectory.
- Claims as to rarity or uncommonness should not be made without evidence from a contextual study or expert knowledge of the subject/area

- With subsurface archaeological remains expert knowledge or studies of the results of previous investigations of similar sites or places can provide a context for assessing research potential. For example, waterlogged archaeological sites have typically provided an opportunity to apply techniques such as dendrochronology and palynology to reveal detailed information on chronology and the vegetation history of the local environment.

- Public access is not a prerequisite. Off-site interpretation may be an appropriate way of interpreting places that are not accessible, and accessibility can change over time.

- A place may be judged capable of yielding information or knowledge even if it will not or cannot be investigated in the foreseeable future.

- Care is required when considering existing statutory or other formal recognition to avoid multiple counting of values, and to ensure that it is directly relevant to the criterion under consideration.
(e) Technology

The place demonstrates technical accomplishment, innovation or achievement in its structure, construction, components or use of materials.

INCLUSION indicators

- Demonstrates or is associated with a technical accomplishment, innovation or achievement in its structure, construction, engineering, choice or use of materials, equipment or machinery or its other components
- Adapts technology in a creative or unorthodox manner or extends the limits of available technology
- Is a notable or good representative, example of a particular technical design or technology
- Is a notable example of a vernacular response to the constraints of the available material, technology or know-how
- The place or a component of it, is an example of an internationally/nationally, regionally or locally unusual, rare or unique type of technical design or technology.

EXCLUSION indicators

- Has a minimal, indirect or distant association with a technical accomplishment, achievement or innovation
- The place appears to be rare only because research has not been undertaken to determine otherwise
- Is not a notable or good representative example of technical design or technology or technical accomplishment, innovation or achievement
- The claim of rarity or uniqueness has too many descriptive qualifiers linked to it
- The place or its attributes are rare or unique, but its importance is questionable
- The place is under threat of destruction, but its importance is questionable
- The integrity of the technical design has been severely degraded, illegible or lost
- The accomplishment, innovation or achievement is no longer apparent in the place.
(f) Physical attributes

The place is a notable or representative example of:

(i) a type, design or style;

(ii) a method of construction, craftsmanship or use of materials; or

(iii) the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder.

INCLUSION indicators

- Is the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder and is important in the context of their body of work (for example, elaborate design, significant shift in their career, an experimental phase, a personal project, or a particularly well-preserved or otherwise illustrative example of a design type for which they were noted)

- Is a notable, or good representative, example of vernacular heritage

- Is a notable, or good representative, example of a type, style, method of construction, craftsmanship or use of materials

- Is a notable, or good representative, example of architecture or design associated with a particular time period

- Demonstrates the introduction of, transition to, evolution of, or culmination of a particular architectural style

- The type, style or method of construction is indicative of or strongly associated with a specific locale or pattern of settlement within the region

- The place, or a component of it, has physical attributes that are internationally/nationally, regionally or locally unusual, rare or unique

- The collective grouping is a notable or good representative example of historic built form, such as a pattern of development, street layout or building height, massing and scale.

EXCLUSION indicators

- Associations with a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder are incidental or unsubstantiated
• Is the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder but is not important within the context of their body of work, including as a not especially well-preserved or otherwise illustrative example of a design type for which they were noted

• Representative qualities have been degraded or lost to the extent that the characteristics of the place no longer typify the type or style

• The place appears to be rare only because research has not been undertaken to determine otherwise

• The claim of rarity or uniqueness has too many descriptive qualifiers linked to it

• The place or its attributes are rare or unique, but its importance is questionable

• The place is under threat of destruction, but its importance is questionable

• The place or its context has been altered or significant elements of the fabric have been changed to such an extent that the value is severely degraded, illegible or lost

• Is, or is substantially, a modern reconstruction, replica or rendering of historic architecture or architectural elements.

Guidance
This criterion is also applicable to constructed archaeological sites that demonstrate notable attributes or are notable or representative examples. For example, a pā site that incorporated the use of stonework in the design or exemplified a particular type of pā, could potentially meet this criterion.

* For example: the only pillbox on Motutapu Island with five embrasures and a left-hand entrance
(g) Aesthetic

*The place is notable or distinctive for its aesthetic, visual, or landmark qualities.*

**INCLUSION indicators**

- Includes, contributes to, or is a visual landmark
- Contributes positively to an important view, vista or panorama (from, within or towards a place)
- Is the subject of artworks and photographs
- Has notable aesthetic quality that has derived from the passage of time and the action of natural processes on the place (the patina of age)
- Exemplifies a particular past or present aesthetic taste
- Has strong or special visual appeal for its sensual qualities, such as beauty, picturesqueness, evocativeness, expressiveness and landmark presence.

**EXCLUSION indicators**

- The positive visual qualities have been more than temporarily degraded, for example by surrounding or infill development
- The place is not aesthetically or visually distinctive
- Historically significant views to or from the place have been lost or modified to the extent that the original aesthetic, visual or landmark values are severely degraded, illegible or lost
- The place or its context has been altered or significant elements of the fabric have been changed to such an extent that the value is severely degraded, illegible or lost
- There is insufficient evidence that a community or cultural group values or valued the aesthetic appeal of the place.

**Guidance**

A place does not need to be available for public viewing in order to have aesthetic values.
(h) Context

The place contributes to or is associated with a wider historical or cultural context, streetscape, townscape, landscape or setting.

INCLUSION indicators

- Has collective value as a part or member of a group of inter-related, but not necessarily contiguous, heritage features or places or wider heritage landscape

- Is part of a group of heritage features or places (contiguous or discontinuous) that, taken together, have a coherence because of their age, history, style, scale, fabric or use

- Is notable because the original site, setting or context is predominantly intact

- The relationship between the components of the place (buildings, structures, fabric, or other elements) and the setting reinforce the quality of both

- The site, setting or context adds meaning and value to the particular place or item

- Has townscape value for the part it plays in defining a space or street

- Contributes to the character and sense of place of the region or locality

- The individual components of an area collectively form a streetscape, townscape or cultural environment that has value for its architectural style, town planning or urban design excellence, landscape qualities, strong historic associations, or legibility as an archaeological landscape

- Is, or is part of, a group of heritage features or places (whether contiguous or not) that spans an extended period of time or possesses characteristics that are composite or varied but which are linked by a unifying or otherwise important theme.

EXCLUSION indicators

- The theme or relationship linking the grouping of places or the context to the place is of questionable importance

- The context of the place has been changed to such an extent that its value is severely degraded, illegible or lost

- The relationship of the place to its original site, setting or context or to a subsequent site of significance has been lost (for example by relocation of a building)
• The site, setting or context is predominantly intact, but its importance is questionable.

Guidance

The subject place must have significance in its own right. Places beyond the subject place can support context values but they cannot form the basis of the significance under this value. If important aspects of context, upon which the significance of the subject place relies, are identified beyond the place, these need to form part of the overall evaluation. It is important to note places and features not included in the extent of place are not managed as part of that place and may change over time.

Groupings of inter-related places can be considered for potential scheduling as HHAs.

Where historical context is attributed, consider whether this is best assessed under criterion (a) historical or (h) context. Different aspects of historical context may be addressed under both, but generally, it is not appropriate to attribute the same value under both criteria.

The context of a place may change over time but not all change is detrimental. Changes should be assessed as to the effect they have on the significance of the place.
7 Statement of significance

The statement of significance is a succinct and convincing statement of how and why a place is important. The statement is a summary of the evaluation, communicating the values and significance of the historic heritage place. The summary is based on the information available or able to be sourced at a particular time.

A clear and informative statement of significance is equally as necessary for places that do not meet the thresholds and will not be recommended for scheduling. These statements should focus on the values the place has, rather than the values or level of values that are lacking or unproven (e.g. state “The Smith residence has moderate social value because...” rather than “The Smith residence does not meet the threshold for scheduling...”).

Consider this statement as an information record. Will it make sense in the future outside the wider context of the evaluation? Will someone in ten years be able to read it and understand what values the place had/has and why it was or was not recommended for scheduling?

7.1 Format

A statement of significance should be written as a narrative in one or more paragraphs, depending on the complexity of the place.

The statement forms part of the evaluation but should be treated as if it were a stand-alone section, as in some cases, this may be the only section of an evaluation that the user reads.

To make a statement strong, the most significant values should be mentioned first. Moderate heritage values should only be included if they contribute strongly to the overall significance of the place.

There is no need to repeat the evaluation criteria or geographic significance; this can be woven into the narrative.

Include

- Brief descriptive information of the place at the beginning (place name, location, dates of construction/period of significance, use, overall significance)

- Why values are important/significant, not just that the place has these values (Use “because” phrasing - “this place is significant in history because...” it has exceptional aesthetic value because...” simple sentences convey important ideas in a way that most readers will quickly grasp.)
• Key words/terminology from the evaluation criteria (Refer to appendix 5)
• Information from the comparative analysis, where it helps explain significance
• How the place fits into the context of other places/historical themes
• Reference to key features or attributes that make a positive contribution to the significance of the place

Avoid

• Summarising or copying-and-pasting assessments prepared under each evaluation criterion
• Using argument – this is not the place for justification, these are conclusions; an explanation of significance
• Unnecessary superlative or hyperbolic language, especially where it is unsupported by the assessment. (i.e. This place is really important and special; this is a fantastic example, etc.)
• Overly technical language; jargon; long, complicated sentences
• Itemising features or aspects of the place
• Including irrelevant information
• Using passive voice
• Wording that dates the statement (e.g. Instead of saying "for 63 years..." say "since 1950...")

7.2 Historic heritage areas

Statements of significance for HHAs are included in Appendix 14.2 of the AUP, which means they play a statutory role in the implementation of the HHA rules in D17. Because of this role, HHA statements contain additional information and are generally longer and more detailed than statements prepared for individual places.

In addition to describing the historic heritage values of the area, HHA statements also include information on the geographic and physical context of the area, including describing the features and qualities that support the coherency and cohesiveness of the area, such as:

• Lot size
• Set back
• Subdivision pattern
• Infill development
• Garaging/carports
• Accessways
• Boundary treatments
• Vegetation, trees, gardens and other plantings
• Proximity to or relationships with geographic or topographic features
• Common fabric or materials
• Common design or structural features

Example statements of significance are included in Appendix 2.

8 Significance thresholds

Determining the level of significance of a historic heritage place requires an evaluation of the overall significance of the place. This involves applying professional judgement to the two thresholds that must be met for a place to be eligible for scheduling:

1. A value threshold: Considerable or outstanding significance in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria, and

2. A geographic threshold: Considerable or outstanding significance to a locality or greater geographic area.

8.1 Determining the thresholds

8.1.1 The value threshold

The value threshold is the level of significance that a place must have in order to be eligible for scheduling. The levels are:

• **Considerable** to a locality or beyond for Category B, and;
• **Outstanding** well beyond their immediate environs for Category A.

For consistency the following definitions are to be used:

10 RPS B5.2.2(3)(a)
11 RPS B5.2.2(3)(b)
12 RPS B5.2.2(3)(c)
13 RPS B5.2.2(4)(a)
14 Category A* is an interim category for places scheduled in the top tier of legacy plans. They have not yet been reviewed to determine their significance. New places cannot be scheduled in Category A*
Considerable [value/significance]: of great importance and interest; retention of the identified value(s)/significance is very important

Outstanding [value/significance]: of exceptional importance and interest; retention of the identified value(s)/significance is essential

Most historic heritages places are expected to be Category B. A historic heritage place that is of local significance can be Category A where overall values of the place are truly outstanding.

Historic Heritage Areas are not assigned a specific category but are expected to be of at least considerable overall value. The emphasis is on the collective values of the area, rather than the significance of individual places.

8.1.2 The geographic threshold

The geographic threshold is the area over which considerable or outstanding significance must extend. The areas are:

- ‘to a locality or beyond’ for Category B, and;
- ‘well beyond their immediate environs’ for Category A.

For consistency the following guidance is provided:

- A ‘locality’ is a district (including rural districts), township, suburb or grouping of suburbs. An unnamed area surrounding a place should not be considered a locality.15
- ‘Well beyond the immediate environs’ of a place means an area that extends beyond the immediate neighbourhood that the place is located in.
- The words ‘regional’ and ‘district’ should not necessarily be understood as current or legacy statutory boundaries.

A place can be significant to the locality, region, nation or internationally significant without being significant to living individuals or communities. For example, Browne’s spar station is historically significant as the first European settlement in the Auckland region, even though few people would know of its history or location.

It is better to establish firmly the significance a place has at a local level than attempt a weaker argument for significance at the regional or national levels.

A place may sit within a geographic context without having significance at that level. For example, Plunket Rooms are considered within a national context of the social and historical development of early childhood wellbeing in New Zealand, however an individual

15 Adapted from the Oxford English Dictionary definition of "locality".
Plunket Rooms building should not automatically be considered to have national significance.

Depending on the criteria being evaluated, a useful ‘reality check’ as to whether a place potentially has regional or wider significance can be to consider pertinent questions\(^\text{16}\):

- Is this place identified as being significant in an authoritative regional, New Zealand-wide or international publication on a relevant theme (e.g. dam building in New Zealand)?
- Would people in a relevant community of interest be familiar with the place across the region, nationally or even internationally?

9 Extent of place

The AUP directs that the location and physical extent of each historic heritage place is defined.\(^\text{17}\) The area, known as the ‘extent of place’ (EOP) is in line with the place-based approach described above.

An EOP is the area that contains the historic heritage values of the place\(^\text{16}\) and, where appropriate, any area that is relevant to an understanding of the function, meaning and relationships of these values.\(^\text{18}\) The AUP provisions relating to a historic heritage place apply within the area mapped as the EOP on the AUP maps, including land, water and airspace.

9.1 Defining the extent of place

To determine an appropriate extent of place, consider the following:

- The geographic area that demonstrates/illustrates the values that have been identified for the place
- All the features that contribute to the value of the place (e.g. a church, hall, cemetery, presbytery, stone wall and trees)
- Historic evidence of the original extent of the place (e.g. original lot or property boundary; location and size of original buildings, structures, and features; relationships with surrounding area (e.g. roads, driveways, landscaping and gardens), relationship with setting, particularly if place has been identified for its aesthetic or context value

\(^{16}\) Note that these indicators may not be relevant if the place has been recently identified or for other reasons not widely known

\(^{17}\) AUP B5.2.2(2)

\(^{18}\) AUP B5.2.2(2)(a)
• The area that adequately encompasses the features or important elements of the place, including any features that are likely to exist and/or continue sub-surface where archaeological values have been identified

• How the historic heritage place is currently viewed from within and immediately around the site, particularly if the place has been evaluated as having considerable aesthetic and/or context values. Consider whether views to and from the place have historic significance and have been articulated in the evaluation against the criteria

• Any parts of the place that have been lost or substantially modified through later development such that they no longer contribute to identified values may be appropriate to exclude from the extent of place, through either not including that portion of the site or identifying as an exclusion

• Whether there are views to, from or within the site that contribute to the values of the place. For example, it might be appropriate to protect the view that represents the field of fire from the embrasures of a gun emplacement

There are several ways to define an extent of place. Useful starting places include: the boundary of the current Record of Title20 (RT), Deeds Register document or New Zealand Gazette notice; natural, topographical or historical boundaries.

Consideration should be given to using a non-RT boundary definition where:

• A lesser area would be sufficient to achieve appropriate protection of the historic heritage values of the place

• A greater area is required to accurately encompass all of the features that contribute to the significance of the place

• Identified heritage values do not apply to the whole RT site (for example a heritage school building in a more modern school complex that contains no identified heritage values)

• It is an HHA (refer to section 9.1.1)

• Identified historic heritage values extend across more than one RT (for example basalt walls from early subdivision, a historic complex that has later been subdivided into separate ownership, or a large archaeological site)

• The RT site is excessively large compared to the extent of features identified (for example a woolshed or a burial site on a small part of a large farm)

• The historic heritage place is on public land which is not easily defined by the RT approach

20 Formerly Certificate of Title (CT)
• The historic heritage place is within, or partially within, the coastal marine area (CMA)

• The air space component of a historic heritage place is compromised (for example, if a large modern tower has been built directly over and above a historic building)

• The identified values extend to a portion of footpath and/or street area beyond the RT (refer below for further explanation)

• Accurately defining the EOP for shipwrecks is problematic as there will rarely be sufficient data based on surveys or observations to inform the process. One option is to use a circular EOP centred on the known wreck location. The size of the circle will depend on a number of factors including the circumstances of the wreck and the local environment

9.1.1 Historic Heritage Areas

When defining the boundary of an HHA, consider:

• Patterns of historical development, visual changes in historic character, natural features/landforms, historic features, land-use or modern barriers (such as a motorway)

• The heritage values of the area and how they manifest spatially

• Key heritage features/contributing places of the area

• What is included and what is excluded – is it clear?

• The immediate setting and whether the boundary contextualises the historic heritage values adequately

• The area as a whole. An HHA should not have gaps or holes, instead, non-contributing places within the area should be identified as such.

• Likewise, a boundary should run around, rather than through a space, street or land parcel. Avoid boundaries that run down the middle of a street

9.1.2 Interiors

Under the place-based approach, interiors of buildings and structures are considered to be an intrinsic part of the overall value of the place, recognising each place as an integral whole rather than a sum of separate parts. While this is the foundation principle, inclusion of an interior in the schedule may not always be possible because the interior has not been viewed, no recent photographic information has been able to be sourced, or the interior is modified to such an extent that its contribution to the identified values of the place has been lost.
The interiors of buildings are not considered for HHAs.

To determine whether the interior should be included, consider:

- Any spaces, components, and fabric, services and equipment, finishes and fixtures (but excluding moveable objects such as furniture) which are original to the place and/or identifiable as contributing to the heritage value of the place

- The original or other significant use of the place and how this has influenced the interior (for example washable tiled surfaces in a butcher shop, machinery or structure to hold equipment in a former factory)

- Whether the original or other significant volume(s) of the building is still perceivable (for example in a church or warehouse)

- Whether the original or other significant internal layout of the building is still largely intact (for example the traditional layout of a Victorian villa, or changes in church layout that reflect important shifts in religious philosophy)

- Whether the interior is particularly integral to the underlying design philosophy of the place (for example the Group houses, or wharenui)

- In some circumstances, it may be appropriate to include portions of an interior. Piecemeal inclusion of individual features is generally discouraged (for example, ‘the pressed metal ceilings’ or ‘the main staircase’) but may be appropriate in some instances

9.1.3 Road and rail reserve, footpaths, driveways and the CMA

Consider whether to include areas of the public realm, rail reserve or CMA within the EOP where:

- The public realm, rail reserve or CMA\(^\text{21}\) forms part of the setting of the place and/or is of relevance to, or contributes to, the identified values of the place

- A feature (or part of a feature) of a place is on, above or below the footpath, street, rail line or coastal edge itself (e.g. a bridge, pillbox, tree, lamp post, balcony, verandah or roof canopy)

- A feature is directly on, or close to the property boundary or coastal edge (for example a corner pub, or a villa with minimal setback)

\(^{21}\) To determine if the proposed EOP extends into the CMA, use Geomaps to view the indicative coastline: Management layers -> Information -> Indicative coastline
A feature has a historical association with the footpath/street, rail line or coastal edge (for example a commercial building with display windows or a mechanics centre)

The driveway is an original or early entrance way of the place which may include features such as historic fences, gates, plantings and/or pavement

9.1.4 Trees, gardens, plantings and other features of the setting

A scheduled historic heritage place may include features that are trees, gardens and/or plantings, as well as constructed and archaeological features. Constructed features may include fences, gates, walls, posts, paths, steps, etc. It is important to identify any trees or other vegetation that are a historic feature of a place in the schedule to ensure their protection, and to meet the requirements of the RMA.

For trees to be protected in urban environments, the RMA requires district plans to describe the tree in a schedule to the district plan, and identify the allotment where a tree or trees are located by street address and/or legal description.

The provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay apply to all features within the extent of place of a historic heritage place. A new rule is being added to the overlay to make it clear that tree and vegetation removal and trimming of trees and plantings not specifically identified in Schedule 14.1 is a permitted activity (unless the historic heritage place is subject to additional archaeological controls).

Any tree or vegetation that is a historic feature of a scheduled historic heritage place must be clearly identified in the Place Name and/or Description column or Primary Feature column of the schedule.

Include

- The name of the tree species/vegetation
  - e.g. Pā site Q10_411, including karaka trees (Place Name and/or Description column)
  - e.g. Mansion House; all pre-1889 plantings and garden features (Primary Feature column)

- Consider identifying the number of trees, if they are a group

- The period the trees and plantings are associated with, if known (e.g. All pre-1923 garden features and plantings)

Avoid

- Vague or general descriptions (e.g. trees, bush, hedge)
• Using descriptors that will easily date (e.g. tree of 3m in height)
• Identifying a tree or vegetation as a primary feature, unless it is a primary feature
  (for guidance refer to section 11)

9.1.5 Views

In some instances, it may be appropriate to use the EOP to define an important view to or
from a historic heritage place, where that view is of primary importance to the values of the
place as a whole. For example, an area representing the primary outlook of a pillbox might
be included in the EOP because the view from a pillbox is essential to understanding its
functionality.

The EOP, however, should not be used to define wider or more distant views, views that
are purely aesthetic, or views that are ancillary to the values of the heritage place. This is
because views included as part of the EOP will trigger the wider suite of heritage
provisions included in D17 of the AUP.

Where other views have been identified, they should be evaluated separately under the
criteria and thresholds for Schedule 11: Local Public View Schedule.

9.2 Format

The recommended EOP should be presented as both an aerial photograph with the EOP
boundary indicated, and as a written description.

The aerial photograph should:
• Fill at least half of an A4 sheet of paper
• Clearly show the recommended EOP boundary/ies
• Include parcel and lot boundaries and any neighbouring or overlapping extents of
  place
• Bear in mind geo-referencing inaccuracies (e.g. aerial photographs can show
  images at an oblique angle)
• Match the written description justifying the extent place

The written description should:
• Clearly describe the proposed extent of place
• Provide a clear justification for the extent of place. Why was this EOP
  recommended? How does it illustrate the historic heritage values? Why is this area
  integral to the function, meaning and relationships of the place?
• Match what is depicted in the aerial photograph

9.2.1 Diagrams and digital files

Where an EOP is not well-represented through a boundary line on a map, a diagram can be used to clarify the recommended extent of scheduling.

The proposed EOP may also be provided digitally as an *.mpk file.

10 Exclusions

Exclusions are features that do not contribute to, or may detract from, the values for which the historic heritage place has been scheduled. Exclusions are subject to the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay, but activities that affect exclusions are usually subject to a lesser level of control than the controls that apply to the balance of the scheduled place. Any part or feature of a place recommended for exclusion must be clearly identified in the Exclusions column of the schedule.

HHAs may have identified exclusions (refer also to section 12).

Include

• Enough detail to be clear

• Exact names and dates, where known (e.g. instead of “hall”, state “St Andrew’s Hall”; instead of “modern fabric”, state “post-1940 fabric”)  

• Clear exceptions, where relevant (e.g. interior of building(s) except for common spaces including stairwells, lift lobbies and corridors)

Avoid

• Itemising every individual element that is excluded (e.g. instead of “awning, hand rail, balustrade, flower boxes…” say “porch”)  

• Using descriptors that will easily date (e.g. paint colour)  

• Vague descriptions (e.g. non-historic fabric; later buildings, etc)

11 Primary feature(s)

Primary features are the key components or principal elements of the identified values of a place; they are the fundamental basis of why a place has been scheduled.
If a feature forms a notable part of the historic heritage place and contributes to the historical context and understanding of the place but is not the fundamental basis for scheduling the place, it should not be identified as ‘primary’.

It is anticipated that in most cases the primary feature will be the principal element, for example, the main dwelling on a residential site. In some instances, there will be more than one primary feature. In some cases (for example many archaeological sites) it may not be appropriate to identify a specific element of a site as a primary feature. In this case the ‘entire site’ should be identified as the primary feature.

Primary features are included in the “Primary features” column of the schedule. All Category A and A* places have primary features identified, but this work has not yet been completed for Category B. All new evaluations should identify the primary feature or features for every place recommended for scheduling.

HHAs do not have primary features.

11.1 Non-primary features

All features within an extent of place that are not primary features or exclusions are considered “non-primary features”. In some instances, they can have value in their own right without being primary to the significance of the place. In other cases, they support the values of the primary feature, or are neutral, but do not need to be excluded.

Features that have value in their own right or support the values of the primary feature should be specifically addressed in the assessment against the evaluation criteria and discussed in the historical summary and physical description.

12 Contributing and non-contributing sites/features

Places within an HHA are identified as either contributing or non-contributing. No site within the boundary of an HHA is to be unclassified; they must be either contributing or non-contributing.

Places considered to contribute to the area are those that demonstrate the identified values of the area, and places considered to be non-contributing are those that do not demonstrate the identified values of the area.

Non-contributing places are included within the boundary of the HHA so that development on these sites can be considered through a resource consent process to ensure any new building or structure is sympathetic to the wider HHA.

HHAs may also have identified exclusions. Exclusions differ from non-contributing sites/features in their relative scale and management. Generally, exclusions are components of a place, such as the interior of a building or a modern garage with no
identified heritage values. Non-contributing places, however, are generally whole sites within an HHA that contain buildings or structures that do not demonstrate the identified values of the area.

Activity statuses that relate to exclusions are generally more permissive than activity statuses that relate to non-contributing places.

Examples of identifying an appropriate extent of place, exclusions, primary features and contributing/non-contributing sites/features are included in Appendix 3.

13 Additional rules for archaeological sites or features

Schedule 14.1 identifies those scheduled historic heritage places with archaeological values where additional archaeological rules in D17 apply.

Scheduled historic heritage places that are archaeological sites or contain archaeological sites or features that contribute to the significance of the place, are identified in the schedule in the column by the word ‘Yes’ in the ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column. This column is “ticked” where the evaluation has assessed and determined that a place has archaeological significance. If a place has been identified in this column, the place is subject to additional rules listed in Table D17.4.2. and E12.4.2.

It is generally not appropriate to tick this box in relation to the archaeology of standing buildings because these rules primarily relate to land uses involving land disturbance. On the other hand, many early buildings will have associated or underlying archaeological features or sites. If in doubt, consult an archaeologist.

14 Place of Māori interest or significance

Schedule 14.1 identifies existing scheduled historic heritage places that are or may be places of interest or significance to Māori because of the physical attributes or known history of the place. Many of these places have not been evaluated against Criterion C (Mana Whenua significance). It is currently for information purposes only.

Development of policy on how this column is populated into the future has yet to be undertaken with Mana Whenua.
15 Definitions

Common use words are not defined and default to the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition.

**Archaeological site:** Any place including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.

Archaeological sites associated with pre-1900 human activity, including the sites of shipwrecks that occurred before 1900, and any site for which a declaration has been made under Section 43(1), are protected under the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.22

**Considerable** [value/significance]: of great importance and interest; retention of the identified value(s)/significance is very important.

**Contributing buildings, structures or features:** Buildings, structures or features within the extent of a scheduled HHA that have heritage value or make a contribution to the significance of the area.

**Fabric:** all physical material of a place, including subsurface material, structures, and interior and exterior surfaces including the patina of age; and including fixtures and fittings, and gardens and plantings.23

**Feature:** a physical entity within a scheduled historic heritage place that is discernible as an individual element within the place. A feature can be an archaeological feature, such as pits, terraces or a midden; a building, object (not including a moveable chattel) or structure.

**Historic heritage:** those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities: archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, technological; and includes: historic sites, structures, places, and areas; archaeological sites; sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.24

**Historic Heritage Area:** groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous, places or features that collectively meet the Category A or B criteria. Historic Heritage Areas may include both contributing and non-contributing sites or features, places individually scheduled as Category A or B places, and notable trees. Before the map for each Historic

---

22 Adapted from HNZPTA 2014 Section 6(a) (i) and (ii) and Section 6(b). Only one post-1900 site has been declared to be an archaeological site in the Auckland region.

23 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, Revised 2010

24 Resource Management Act 1991
Heritage Area in Schedule 14.2. Historic Heritage Areas - Maps and statements of significance there is a statement of significance which summarises the heritage values of each Historic Heritage Area and the relative importance of the values.\textsuperscript{26}

**Historic heritage place:** any land having cultural heritage value in New Zealand, including areas; cultural landscapes; buildings, structures, and monuments; groups of buildings; gardens and plantings; archaeological sites and features; traditional sites; sacred places; townsplaes and streetscapes; and settlements. Place may also include land covered by water, and any body of water. Place includes the setting of any such place.\textsuperscript{26}

**Integrity:** wholeness or intactness of a place, including its meaning and sense of place, and all the tangible and intangible attributes and elements necessary to express its cultural heritage value.\textsuperscript{27}

**Little** [value/significance]: of limited importance and interest.

**Mana whenua:** Māori with ancestral rights to resources in Auckland and responsibilities as kaitiaki over their tribal lands, waterways and other taonga. Mana Whenua are represented by iwi authorities.\textsuperscript{28}

**Moderate** [value/significance]: of some importance and interest; retention of the identified value(s)/significance is desirable.

**Non-contributing** properties, places or features are either not relevant to, or may detract from, the values for which an area has been scheduled, or have the potential to adversely affect the heritage values of the place through future use and development.

**None/NA** [value/significance]: of no importance and interest.

**Outstanding** [value/significance]: of exceptional importance and interest; retention of the identified value(s)/significance is essential.

**Primary feature** (of a scheduled historic heritage place): The feature(s) within a scheduled historic heritage place that form(s) the fundamental basis of why it has been scheduled.

**Representative:** importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a set of historic heritage places.

**Setting:** elements of the surrounding or spatial context within which a historic heritage place is experienced, including sea, sky, land, structures, features, backdrop, skyline and

\textsuperscript{25} D17 1

\textsuperscript{26} Adapted from: ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, Revised 2010

\textsuperscript{27} ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, Revised 2010

\textsuperscript{28} AUP J1
views to and from the place. Setting can include landscapes, townscapes, and streetscapes and relationships with other historic heritage places which contribute to the value of the place.
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1. Executive summary

[The executive summary is not expected to exceed one page, unless the evaluation relates to a particularly complex place.

The summary must be able to be read and understood separately from the wider evaluation. This summary may be used and distributed by itself.

The executive summary should include the following information:

- Why was this place evaluated? Where did the evaluation originate from? (ie: landowner request, public nomination, submission, recommendation from a spatial planning programme, pre-1944 study list, local board project, etc)

- Brief description of the place, including relevant information such as: place name/description, location, dates of construction, period of significance and use. Include information from the historical summary and physical description, where required.

- Outcome of the evaluation: is the place recommended for scheduling? If so, in what category? Briefly explain the recommended extent of place, primary features and exclusions.

- Statement of significance (or summarised version of the statement)]
### 2. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to consider the place located at [insert address(es)] against the criteria for evaluation of historic heritage Regional Policy Statement (RPS) section (B5.2.2 Policies) in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).

The document has been prepared by [insert consultancy name and author] on the specific instructions of our client, Auckland Council or by [insert name and job title] Heritage Unit, Auckland Council.] It is solely for the use of Auckland Council for the purpose it is intended in accordance with the agreed scope of work.

### 3. Identification

[Do not use full stops at the end of each information field]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site address(es) and/or location</th>
<th>[Ensure the address details match the address(es) in the Auckland Council Geomaps]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For places with multiple addresses, include the address that is the primary point of access first, followed by all other relevant addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For places that do not have an address, include information that will help identify the location of the place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal description(s) and Record of Title identifier(s), Deeds register and/or Gazette notice information</th>
<th>[Use the legal description in the Auckland Council Geomaps, under the ‘Parcels/Land parcels’ tab. Note that it may be different than the legal description under the “Property Summary” tab]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the place extends over a road or rail reserve or into the Coastal Marine Area (CMA), this must be identified here as well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NZTM grid reference | [Identify the grid reference for the centre of the place setting out the northing and easting coordinates. This can be retrieved through the Auckland Council Geomaps] |

| New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangi Kōrero details | [Listing type (i.e.: historic place, historic area, wāhi tapu), listing number and category. This can be retrieved through Heritage New Zealand] |

| Archaeological site | [Select one of three options Yes/No/Unknown] |
| (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act [HNZPTA] 2014, Section 6) | Provide clarification e.g.:  
The fabric of the place does not identifiably predate 1900 and has no identified archaeological values relating to this period  
The place is the site of human activity before 1900 but is not recorded as an archaeological site and has not been assessed to determine if it has archaeological values |
| --- | --- |
| Cultural Heritage Inventory (CHI) reference(s) | [Insert CHI place number(s), or leave blank if the place is not recorded in the CHI.  
This information can be accessed through the Auckland Council Geomaps Cultural Heritage layer] |
| New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) site record number(s) | [Insert NZAA record number(s), or leave blank if the place is not recorded by NZAA] |

### 4. Scope

[Identify the scope, including any limitations associated with the undertaking of the heritage evaluation, such as:]

- the level of accessibility onto and within the property
- whether the report addresses built, archaeological, Mana Whenua or natural values
- whether the evaluation addresses other matters such as engineering, soundness or safety, earthquake risk, safety in the event of fire or insanitary conditions
- whether the evaluation addresses structural integrity or the condition of buildings or structures
- the availability of information provided or able to be sourced while undertaking the evaluation, including the likelihood that additional research may yield new information.]

### 5. Historical summary

[The length of this summary will depend on the complexity of the place being evaluated. Sources of evidence do not need to be footnoted in this summary provided they are footnoted in the more detailed narrative contained in the appendix.]
Refer to section 3 of the *Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance*.

6. Physical description

[Refer to section 4 of the *Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance*

Content should be set out under the headings below.]

Site visit

Place location

Geographical/physical context

Site description

Description (exterior or surface features)

Description (interior or known sub-surface features)

Summary of key modifications

Summary of key features

7. Comparative analysis

[Refer to section 5 of the *Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance*. Include the summary table as appendix 5.]
8. Significance criteria

Section B5.2.2 of the AUP RPS sets out the criteria for the identification and evaluation of historic heritage places.

- [Refer to section 6 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance.

- The evaluation under each criterion must use the standard terms for describing levels of significance which are: NA/none; little; moderate; considerable; outstanding

- Where relevant, identify the community of interest or geographic area within which the place has value. Use the standard terms: local, regional, national, or international

- Conclude with a sentence clearly identifying the value attributed: e.g. “The (place) is considered to be of moderate social significance to the community in the local (Onehunga) area.” Use bold font for the value level and the geographic level of significance]

(a) Historical

The place reflects important or representative aspects of national, regional or local history, or is associated with an important event, person, group of people or idea or early period of settlement within New Zealand, the region or locality.

[Evaluation follows]

(b) Social

The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, a particular community or cultural group for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value.

[Evaluation follows]

(c) Mana Whenua

The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, Mana Whenua for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value.

[Evaluation follows]
(d) Knowledge

The place has potential to provide knowledge through archaeological or other scientific or scholarly study, or to contribute to an understanding of the cultural or natural history of New Zealand, the region, or locality.

[Evaluation follows]

(e) Technology

The place demonstrates technical accomplishment, innovation or achievement in its structure, construction, components or use of materials.

[Evaluation follows]

(f) Physical attributes

The place is a notable or representative example of:

(i) a type, design or style;

(ii) a method of construction, craftsmanship or use of materials; or

(iii) the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder.

[Evaluation follows]

(g) Aesthetic

The place is notable or distinctive for its aesthetic, visual, or landmark qualities.

[Evaluation follows]

(h) Context

The place contributes to or is associated with a wider historical or cultural context, streetscape, townscape, landscape or setting.

[Evaluation follows]

9. Statement of significance

[Refer to section 7 and Appendix 2 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]

[Insert property address(es), place name (if any)]
10. Extent of the place

[Where the place meets the criteria thresholds to merit scheduling refer to section 9 and Appendix 3 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]

Where the place is not found to meet the criteria thresholds, state that the extent of place is not defined for this reason.]

Exclusions
[Refer to section 10 and Appendix 3 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]

Primary features
[Refer to section 11 and Appendix 3 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]

Contributing and non-contributing places or features
[Delete this section if not required; Refer to section 12 and Appendix 3 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]

11. Recommendations

[Refer to section 8 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance.]

Based on the preceding evaluation, make a recommendation on whether the place meets the threshold for eligibility as; Historic Heritage Place Category B, Historic Heritage Place Category A or Historic Heritage Area. Include in the recommendation:

- The heritage value(s) which meet the threshold of considerable or outstanding and their geographic context; and
- The overall significance

Delete reference to category A or B for Historic Heritage Areas as they are not assigned a category.]

12. Table of historic heritage values

[Summarise the values identified under evaluation of the significance criteria.]

[Insert property address(es), place name (if any)]
## 13. Overall significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name and/or Description</th>
<th><a href="#">Refer to Appendix 4 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance for direction on naming conventions</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For an archaeological site that is recorded with the NZAA site recording scheme, include the identification number at the end of the place name. For example: R10_709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Verified Location             | [Ensure the address details match the address in the](#)  
|                               | [Auckland Council GIS](#)                                                                                                         |
| Verified Legal Description    | Use the legal description set out in the [Auckland Council GIS](#), under the 'Parcels/Land parcels' tab. Keep formatting used in the GIS viewer, including capitalisation and abbreviations; include "road reserve", "rail reserve", and/or "CMA" where relevant |
| Category                      | [A/B – leave blank if for an HHA]                                                                                                 |
| Primary Feature(s)            | [Refer to section 11 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance](#)                             |
| Heritage Values               | [Select from values A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H](#)                                                                                  |

[Insert property address(es), place name (if any)]

[template version 2 – finalised 12 August 2019]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>[Refer to section 10 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Controls for Archaeological Sites or Features</td>
<td>[Insert “yes” or leave blank if the control does not apply. Refer to section 13 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance for deciding whether it is appropriate to insert yes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Māori Interest or Significance</td>
<td>[Insert “yes” or leave blank if the control does not apply. This should only be confirmed as ‘yes’ where the place has had an assessment of values from Mana Whenua as part of the evaluation. Refer to section 14 of the Methodology and guidance for evaluating historic heritage significance]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **Other recommendations**

[Set out any additional recommendations not covered under the above headings. Delete this section if it is not required.]

For example, if the evaluation has identified comparative places within the region that are of high value and not scheduled, it may be appropriate to recommend that place is a high priority for evaluation in the future. Additionally, if a regional thematic study is recommended to provide greater context, mention this here].

[Author, Job title]

[Date]

[Peer reviewer, Job title]

[Date]
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update Heritage Advisory Panel members on heritage items of interest.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At the Planning Committee of 6 August 2019, the following items related to heritage were approved:
   - Publicly notify a proposed plan change to add six historic heritage places including one historic heritage area (Remuera shops)
   - Make operative Plan Change 7 that added 41 historic heritage places to the Unitary Plan (apart from two appeals)
   - Publicly notify a change to include a special character statement for the Howick Business Area.

Heritage Grants
3. At the Environment and Community Committee it was resolved to:
   a) approve, in principle, an increase in the Regional Historic Heritage Fund from $84,000 to an amount up to $500,000, subject to reallocation of funding and revenue linked to historic heritage incentives.
   b) request staff report back on how this reallocation will be achieved through the Annual Plan.
   c) request staff to work with the Independent Māori Statutory Board to develop a tikanga/protocol that supports greater Māori uptake of the Fund.
4. This action by the committee is consistent with the Heritage Advisory Panel’s recommendation to the Annual Plan and LTP.
5. Officers are currently working through a resolution to determine how much and when the additional funds become available. Once this is completed it may be necessary to determine a new process including the frequency of the grants process.
6. Officers are also engaging with IMSB to progress condition c).
7. Panel members have raised the following items they wish to discuss:
   Allan Matson
   - the Civic Admin Building
   - the current situation at Ihumātao
   - 75-77 Wakefield Street, site of the former Fitzroy Hotel, Scheduled Cat A and Listed Cat 1.
   - Heritage grants - which is addressed above
   - The Heritage Advisory Panel - which is covered in a separate agenda item.
   Allan Matson/ Graeme Burgess
   - Dangerous Buildings/ St James Church Hall.
Elizabeth Aitken Rose

- Education and the achievements of the HAP in this respect.

Claudia Page

- Requesting an update on old Takapuna Library.

City Centre Master Plan

8. Following staff engagement with the Heritage Advisory Panel at the end of April 2019, the content of the City Centre Master Plan has been revised and updated.

9. As noted at the April meeting, the majority of content has been retained but there has been revision of wording and some adjustments to the Outcomes and Transformational Moves.

10. Staff presented proposed content and consultation approach to the Planning Committee on 2 July 2019. Following this approval, a public consultation process will run for six weeks between 19 August and 30 September 2019.

11. Panel members can provide feedback directly via CityCentreMasterplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Heritage 2019/2020 Budget

12. The heritage budget for the 2019/2020 year is available. There is very little change in the budget. The total budget is $4,384,000 compared to an actual spend from last year of $3,725,000. The difference is largely made up from increased revenue from resource consents.

Heritage Advisory Panel 2019 resolutions

13. Attached for the panel's information are the resolutions that have been passed in this year's meetings. I have made a comment on the action(s) that followed.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation

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>A</td>
<td>Panels 2019 Resolutions</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
Resolutions from Heritage Advisory Panel meetings of February, April and June 2019

Heritage Evaluations
Sue Cooper from Remuera Heritage spoke to this item. Staff to report back on how to make this process, pioneered by Remuera Heritage, Ōrākau local board and the council heritage team, available regionwide.

Action: Staff have not as yet developed this process. The Heritage Unit have recently created a position which is responsible for engagement with local boards and one of the tasks will be to roll this process out once developed.

Heritage Counts
Dr David Bade
First edition of Auckland’s Heritage Counts 2018 Annual Summary.

Action: None Required

St James Hall Esplanade Road Mt Eden
Panel express its serious concern about the precedent set by this case and ask the Manager Heritage to raise this issue with the appropriate department (Consents and Compliance) within council and report back to the panel at its 30 April 2019 meeting.

Action: The matter has been raised with compliance and was reported back to the 30th April Panel meeting.

Heritage Managers Report
Chair of the Heritage Advisory Panel to write to the Chair of Auckland Transport expressing formal support by the panel for the retention of the long-standing right to occupy, by the former Remuera Railway Station Preservation Trust.

Action: Completed

Advise the impact of Plan Change 26 on built heritage is unclear and request the council provide more clarification to the public.

Action: This advice was passed onto the General Manager Plans and Places and further information has been provided to the public.

Advise there is growing concern among the membership of local heritage and residents’ organisations that Plan Change 26 could have a deleterious outcome for Auckland’s built heritage.

Action: This has been passed onto the General Manager Plans and Places.

Public Input
Provide a letter to the mayor in support of SOUL’s objectives including the matters SOUL raised at the meeting.

Action: Completed
Jef Grobben – Chair provides letter of support for Auckland Electric Tramways Trust and forward to Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Tourism, Events & Economic Development (ATEED) for their information.

Action: Completed

**Symonds Street Cemetery Update**

Congratulate the Waitemata Local Board and Friends of Symonds Street on the success of their ongoing conservation programme.

Action: None Required

**City Centre Masterplan refresh**

Provide feedback on Factor 8 of the CCMP (the importance of heritage) and how this can be reflected in the refreshed Masterplan.

Action: None Required

**Carlile House Update**

Notes the council’s Category A and Heritage New Zealand’s Category 1 heritage status of the Carlile House property.

Confirms its support for the long-standing policy of council acquiring the Carlile House property to secure its outstanding heritage values.

Action: None Required

**AMETI Archaeological Survey Panmure**

Presentation on the archaeology of Mokoia and Mauinaina sites at Panmure. Action: None Required

**Auckland cultural heritage institutions review**

Request Heritage Manager advise council that the panel wishes to be consulted on the review as it progresses.

Advise council that a wider public consultation process should be undertaken.

Action: Completed
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a public record of correspondence for the panel's information.
2. To receive a summary and provide a public record of information distributed to Heritage Advisory Panel members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information or correspondence circulated to or on behalf of, the Heritage Advisory Panel.
4. The following correspondence is attached:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/02/2019</td>
<td>Oruarangi Special Housing area – PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/02/2019</td>
<td>Letter to Hon Eugenie Sage from Mayor Goff re background to Oruarangi Special Housing Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2019</td>
<td>Letter to Cr Lee from Mayor Goff regarding Ihumatao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/6/2019</td>
<td>Email to General Manager Plans &amp; Place re: Plan Change 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/7/2019</td>
<td>Letter of support to the Auckland Electric Tramways Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Note staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Panel members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:

a) receive the Summary of Heritage Advisory Panel correspondence and information – 27 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Oruarangi SHA</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Letter to Eugenie Sage from Mayor Goff</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Letter to Cr Lee regarding Ihumatao</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Email to GM Plans &amp; Places - Plan Change 26</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Letter of support to the Auckland Electric Tramways Trust</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ngā kaihaina
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Oruarangi Special Housing Area

Presented by:

John Dunshea
General Manager (DPO)
Oruarangi-Background

- Manukau City Council tried to zone it Open Space through a Notice of Requirement which was successfully challenged in the Environment Court by private landowners in 2012

- Environment Court directed Council to remove the designation for park and to re-zone the land Future Development zone (similar to Future Urban) meaning it could be developed for either residential or business purposes in the future

- 33ha of privately owned greenfields land next to Otuataua Stonefields

- Fletchers applied for Special Housing Area (SHA) as a proven developer with a good track record

- The Local Board opposed it, but the governing body supported it

- SHA created under HASHAA, tranche 3, by Order in Council on 28 July 2014, on the recommendation of Council
Iwi Consultation

- Housing Project Office e-mailed iwi in Sept 2014 wanting to engage with iwi.

- Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua, Ngati Whatua o Orakei, Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki, Te Kawerau a Maki, Ngati Tamaoho, Te Akitai Waiohua, Ngati Paoa, Ngati Maru, Ngati Whanuaunga, Ngati Tamatera, Waikato-Tainui

- Iwi ‘self-selected’ Te Kawerau Maki and Te Akitai Waiohua as primary contacts.

- Each produced a cultural impact assessment.
Challenge to SHA status

- SOUL opposed SHA status and approached the governing body to overturn decision to create SHA in 2015

- Katherine Anderson, Legal Counsel advised the governing body that the SHA could not be overturned unless there was no longer a housing crisis or the Minister of Housing (Nick Smith) agreed

- Governing body debated the issue but voted in favour or keeping it a SHA
Plan Change and Qualifying Development

- Fletchers lodged combined Plan Change and Qualifying development on 30 June 2015 and applications were accepted 25/9/15
- Limited notified on 9 Nov 2015 and received 13 submissions
- 2 in support (Daniel Nahkle and Te Kawerau a Maki), 1 neutral, 10 opposing
- Thorough range of reports
- Hearing on 3-4th Feb 2016 before 5 commissioners
- ATA Panel issued their decision in May 2016 approving Plan Change and QD
Plan Change Outcomes

- Single storey housing over part of the site to balance visual connection for residents of the village to Pukeiti maunga
- Created a conservation reserve next to Otuataua, plus neighbourhood reserves and space for larger trees as mitigation
- Interface treatments
- Maunga buffer zone
- Affordable Housing provisions
- Iwi (Te Kawerau a Maki) entered into confidential negotiations with Fletchers on affordable housing
- Te Kawerau a Maki negotiated a reduction from
- 520 houses to 480 and moving a fence back by 80m
Heritage Advisory Panel
27 August 2019
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Attachment A
21 February 2019

Hon Eugenie Sage
Minister for Conservation
Minister for Land Information

By email: e.sage@ministers.govt.nz

Dear Eugenie

We spoke recently about the issues concerning Fletcher’s proposed housing development in Oruarangi Special Housing Area.

I enclose a copy of a factual briefing given to Councillors this week on the background to the development which you and your colleagues may find useful.

Views in the community are divided. A protest group (SOUL) strenuously opposes the development. Iwi that have a mana whenua connection to the land, including Te Kawerau a Maki, are supportive of the development, based on concessions they have secured from Fletchers and undertakings that the development will secure affordable housing for Maori.

The development site adjoins the 92 hectare Ōtuataua Stonefields Reserve which contains Ihumātao’s most important historic and geological sites.

On another side of the development is an 8.9 hectare site known as the Rennie Homestead Block. It is also Council owned and currently zoned for future development. Council is however prepared to rezone it as public open space as its contribution to finding a solution to the disagreement.

Councillors have asked us to clarify what the Government's position is in relation to the Oruarangi development. We note that it is a special housing development area and this designation can only be changed by the Minister of Housing.

Council is also not in a position itself to purchase the development site. The Environment Court ruled against Council in 2012 and zoned it for future housing development. Purchase of the site is outside Council’s criteria as the area is already well endowed with public open space and there would not be justification for expenditure of up to $40 million on purchasing an additional site.

The protest group has also asked whether government would act as mediators to seek resolution of the dispute. Parties to any mediation would need to include mana whenua groups as well as the protest group. It is not immediately obvious that the views of these groups can be reconciled. However, you may consider that to avoid a confrontation which could leave ongoing scars, an effort should be made to see if common ground could be found.
Thank you for your interest in and attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely

Phil Goff
MAYOR OF AUCKLAND

Penny Hulse
Chair | Environment and Community Committee
Auckland Councillor | Waitākere Ward
15 May 2019

Councillor Mike Lee  
Chair, Heritage Advisory Panel

By email: Mike.Lee@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Copy to: Heritage Advisory Panel

Dear Councillor Lee

LETTER FROM HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL RELATING TO IHUMATAO

Thank you for your letter of 14 May 2019, outlining the presentation that members of SOUL (Save Our Unique Landscape) gave to the Heritage Advisory Panel, and the panel’s support to SOUL’s cause. I appreciate you taking the time to communicate the panel’s feedback and recommendations to me.

SOUL have requested that Auckland Council Governing Body take action to protect the 33 hectares located next to Otuatau, “either by contributing to the purchase of the land, or mandating a process that produces an outcome that affected parties can live with”.

I acknowledge this request and genuine intent of the Heritage Advisory Panel to help achieve an amicable resolution. You will be aware that the council has previously tried to zone the site as Open Space through a Notice of Requirement, which was successfully challenged in the Environment Court in 2012. The council was directed to remove the designation for park and to rezone the land future development, meaning it could be developed for either residential or business purposes in future.

As staff advised at the March 2019 workshop, purchase of the site is outside the council’s criteria as the area is already well endowed with public open space and there would not be justification for expenditure of up to $40 million on purchasing an additional site. This would come at the sacrifice of open space in other parts of the city where deficits have been identified.

At this same workshop, the council stated that the 8.9 hectare Rennie Homestead Block, located on another side of the site, can be rezoned as public open space. This site is council owned and currently zoned for future development. The offer to rezone this land is a contribution by the council towards a satisfactory resolution for all parties.

As an outcome of this workshop, Councillor Penny Hulse and I wrote to Minister for Conservation Eugenie Sage on behalf of the Governing Body (attached). We asked for clarification of Government’s position in relation to the Oruarangi development, noting that the area’s designation as a special housing development is one that can only be changed by the Minister of Housing.

Our letter also conveyed SOUL’s request for the government to act as mediators to seek resolution to the dispute. To date, we have not received a formal response from the Minister’s office.
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With regard to SOUL's objectives regarding cultural heritage, a review of the management of the Oturataua Stonefields Historic Reserve is now underway. The council-owned Rennie Homestead Block is being assessed for inclusion within the Reserve and protection in perpetuity.

I trust that this information is of use to you and thank you again for bringing the views of the Heritage Advisory Panel to my attention.

Yours sincerely

Phil Goff
MAYOR OF AUCKLAND
From: Councillor Mike Lee
Sent: Friday, 28 June 2019 12:55 PM
To: John Duguid <John.Duguid@AucklandCouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Sally Hughes <sallyhughes1@me.com>; Elizabeth Aitken-Rose (External) <e.aitken-
rose@Auckland.ac.nz> <e.aitken-rose@Auckland.ac.nz>; allan.matson (allan.matson1@gmail.com)
<allan.matson1@gmail.com>; Helen Geary (heleng@maxnet.co.nz) <heleng@maxnet.co.nz>
<claudiampage@gmail.com>; graeme.nz.burgess@gmail.com; John Burns <jaburns@xtra.co.nz>
<Leyton Chan <leyton.chan@gmail.com>; Rau Hoskins <rau@designtribecj.nz>; Sherry Reynolds
<sreymonds@heritage.org.nz>; David Veart <veart@xtra.co.nz>; Lorraine Wilson
<oulou@xtra.co.nz>; Bill Rayner (brayner@xtra.co.nz) <brayner@xtra.co.nz>; Noel Reardon
<Noel.Reardon@AucklandCouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Heritage Advisory Panel Minutes - 25 June 2019

Dear John,
I hope all going well with you. Congratulations on the excellent way you conducted George Farrant’s
farewell function. Please find attached minutes of the Heritage Advisory Panel meeting of 25 June
2019.

In regard to the matter of Plan Change 26, I must convey to you a growing unease out there in the
community that the consequences of Auckland Council’s approach to the ‘Character Overlay’
provisions will rather than strengthening, will actually result in the weakening and undermining of
the long-standing protections of the single house zones in the various legacy District Plans.
The Heritage Advisory Panel, as you know made up of heritage professionals and expert community
heritage activists, is also picking up this growing sentiment in the community.

Here are the resolutions of the Heritage Advisory Panel in relation to this issue.

7 Heritage Manager’s Update
Resolution number HER/2019/21
MOVED by Member S Hughes, seconded by Member E Aitken-Rose:
That the Heritage Advisory Panel:
a) advise the impact of Plan Change 26 on built heritage is unclear and request the
council provide more clarification to the public.
b) advise there is growing concern among the membership of local heritage and
residents’ organisations that Plan Change 26 could have a deleterious outcome
for Auckland’s built heritage.

CARRIED

On behalf of the Panel, I would ask that you and your staff to give these resolutions your most
serious consideration.

Best wishes,

Mike
Councillors’ Office

22 July 2019

Jef Groben
Electric Tramways Trust
info@aeet.org.nz

Dear Jef

Thank you for your presentation to the 25th June 2019 Auckland Heritage Advisory Panel. The Panel recognised that the Auckland Electric Tramway Trust is the custodian of an important and often overlooked aspect of Auckland’s Heritage. The Panel resolved as follows:

That the Heritage Advisory Panel:
 a) receive the presentation from Jef Groben.
b) provide a letter of support for Auckland Electric Tramways Trust and forward to Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Tourism, Events & Economic Development (ATEED) for their information

The Trust’s efforts to preserve and promote the usage of Auckland’s trams is recognised and supported by the Panel.

Please take this letter as the Heritage Advisory Panel’s support for your efforts not only regarding your work in serving heritage trams but also the associated plans, drawings and microfilm relating to Auckland’s original tramway.

Yours sincerely

Michael Lee
Chair of Heritage Advisory Panel
Auckland Councillor for Waitemata and Gulf