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What do you think has been the panel's biggest achievement this term (2016-2019)?

Summary of responses:

- “Surviving”
- Support for the heritage team and providing advice on regional heritage matters to staff
- Supporting the Ihumatao situation
- Providing an outside voice when reviewing council processes in the heritage field
- Providing a forum for public groups to present heritage matters
Frustrations

- “the council took very little if any notice of the panel viewpoints or recommendations”
- “it has been difficult for the panel to meet its aims of protecting heritage given the structural context that we operate within.”
- “the heritage advisory panel has not had a direct conduit to council committees.”
- “the council…has very little interest, especially in the built heritage or development of historic precincts area”
In general, do you think the discussions in your meetings are at the right level?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question. The majority of respondents (approximately 70%) believe the discussions are at the right level.](chart.png)
Why do you say that

- “Our discussions are at the right level but advice is not listened to”
- “The panel began with a good mix of heritage activists and professionals. Some have left and were not...replaced and more recently there has been a decline in attendance..”
- “There have been too many agenda items simply informing the panel about interesting matters that require no action nor raise any wider issues. That has not been the best use of the panel’s time.”
How could the panel assist the council to reach other stakeholders who would have an interest in its work?

- Promoting and educating stakeholders about the role and work of council…through networks – could be formal or informal
- The panel requires communication support in order to reach other stakeholders including hand-out material or information that is distilled to be able to be circulated
- Need more young representation, greater engagement with local boards and stronger Maori and Pacific input
About meetings

Overall, how strongly do you agree or disagree that meetings:

- Help me better understand the operations of the council
- Are productive
- Are well organised and prepared for
- Are frequent enough

[Bar chart showing percentage responses for each statement]
Your voice during meetings

During panel meetings do you feel your voice...

ii - Is respected

i - Is heard

1 - Strongly disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Agree  4 - Strongly agree
Do you have any comments about your ratings above?

- “Re meeting frequency, they’re not frequent enough to deal with the matters they potentially could”
- “…there should be some time during the meeting for free ranging discussion and that time should be scheduled early in the meeting, not at the end.”
- “I agree that our voices are heard and respected “in the meetings” however I strongly disagree that this is the case within the wider council”
- “Heritage Panel advice does not directly reach councilors or council committees”
About support staff

How much you agree or disagree with the following:

1 - Strongly disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Agree  4 - Strongly agree

- i - Support staff offer timely and useful advice
- ii - Support staff keep me well informed
- iii - Support staff are approachable and easy to work with
How can support staff better support you?

- “Heritage unit staff are dedicated and easy to contact and deal with. The panel supports them in their work endeavours, but wishes they had a greater budget allocation, to achieve better heritage identification and protection.”
- “The panel is often not advised of the current state on heritage issues in the council, without asking for information.”
- “Support staff would be able to support the panel better if the previous structure was reinstated.”
- “We could be provided with access to information about current consents, through local boards and/or a liaison in the consents unit.”
Staff presenting at panel meetings

How much you agree or disagree that these council staff...

- v - Attribute these recommendations to your panel in reports and plans
- iv - Clearly explain follow-up processes
- iii - Provide you with information in a timely fashion
- ii - Provide quality material e.g., PowerPoint presentations
- i - Clearly explain in papers/reports what advice they want from the panel

Legend:
1 - Strongly disagree %
2 - Disagree %
3 - Agree %
4 - Strongly agree %
How can council staff seeking your advice and recommendations better work with you?

- “Have a serious engagement and exchange of information and include the outcomes in their work and policy development. Be pro-active in considering heritage aspects impacting on their work area.”
- “When there is consultation, it seems to be window dressing most of the time.”
- “Giving the council control over its agenda would be a start, along with a more comprehensive set of minutes”
- “It would be helpful if the Panel was given continuously updated feedback on how Council was receiving and acting upon its advice.”
Do you have any other comments about your sector panel including any concerns or areas for improvement?

- “The panel is there to be critical thinkers and provide advice, not just be rubber-stampers.”
- “Meetings should return to 8 per year (still only 1 every 6 weeks) to better respond and advice on current heritage matters.”
- “Heritage Panel to be able to directly present to councilors and committees – ie have a standing slot with the appropriate committee to briefly present Panel advice, and present community concerns.”
- “There needs to be greater focus on the concerns and priorities raised by Panel members as distinct from those of the staff.”
Questions and discussion
Water Heritage Thematic Study
Results and Recommendations
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The Project So Far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Investigation</td>
<td>Project Library</td>
<td>Sharepoint site</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Study</td>
<td>Procurement process</td>
<td>May-August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annotated Bibliography and Outline</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and Drafting</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2018 – June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery of Final Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study/Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additional Product: Inventory forms (stored with Watercare)
- Recommendations under separate cover
Summary of Results

Major events and patterns:
- Wai mātua o Tūapāpa – Wai ora, Wai Māori
- Domain Scheme (1866)
- Western Springs Waterworks (1877)
- Establishment of Drainage Boards (1876-1927)
- Other Local Waterworks (1880s-1931)
- Orakei Sewer Scheme (1908-1914)
- Waitakere Ranges Headworks (1902-1929)
- Lower Nihotupu Dam (1948)
- Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant (1960)
- Rosedale Wastewater Treatment Plant (1962)
- Hunua Ranges Water System (1951-1977)
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Waitakere Ranges Headworks – Heritage Landscape

Kellys Creek Dam 1907
Waitakere Dam Tunnel 1905
Georges Tunnel 1905
Waitakere Dam Tramway 1907
Waitakere Break Pressure Tank 1907
Waitakere Dam Caretaker’s House 1907
Big Muddy Creek Wharf 1915 & 1922
Nihotupu Tramway (lower) 1915
Nihotupu Auxiliary Dam 1929
Nihotupu Creek and Quinn’s Creek timber dams, pipeline and settler’s tank, Waitakere Ranges, 1902
Whare Puke residence, Huia Drive
Road
Associated Work Camp Sites (e.g. cookhouse paddock)
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Hunua Ranges Dams and associated systems

Cossey’s Dam 1955
Upper Mangatawhiri Dam 1961-1965
Ardmore Water Treatment Plant 1956-1961
Ardmore Booster Pumphouse 1965
Queen St c1860 showing early main sewer

Freeman’s Bay 1906, showing privies
Both a transformational move in sanitation and a shameful story of environmental injustice:

- First treatment of sewage
- Served 500,000 Aucklanders
- Deepwater Discharge
- Largest scheme in the dominion at the time

HOWEVER:

- Compulsory acquisition of land Ngati Whatu
- Blocked access to the harbor
- Turned the papakainga to swampy land
- Ruined kaimoana collection through dumping of sewage
- Put wai mate into wai ora right in their own backyard
- Waitangi Tribunal: “There could have been no greater insult to a Māori tribe even if our people were intended.”
Mangere wastewater scheme: Another story of progress and injustice
- Alternative to a Browns Island scheme
- Massive increase in capacity/technology
HOWEVER
- Right next to Makaurau Marae
- Destroyed main source of kaimoana
- Filled in adjacent creeks
- Compounded by quarrying for airport
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So Much More

- Sources of fresh water for Māori – puna, awa, roto
- Suburban pumping stations
- North shore wastewater schemes
- Later developments in the Hunua Ranges
- Rosedale Treatment Plant
- Biographies of notable engineers, designers, architects
- Annotated Bibliography for Water Supply, Wastewater, Stormwater
Recommendations Report

Maps:
- Overviews for water/wastewater
- Waitakere & Hunua Ranges
- Thematic series where useful
- Orakei Scheme

Understand Historical Impact on Māori, include in future asset management

Record before Removal (for infrastructure on Maunga)

Publish all/part of Murdoch manuscript

Share historical images online

Site interpretation:
- More
- Nuanced

Summaries, videos and Visuals

Schedule places/areas

Document Landscapes

Conservation Plans

Conservation advice:
- Restoration of finishes
- Reinstall plaques

Further Research
- Māori Sanitation/drainage
- Related Museum Collections
- University Papers
He huahua te kai? E, he wai te kai!

Are preserved birds the best food? Ah no, water is!

“Men have gone to the moon and marvelled, but no greater event occurred on the earth than the abundance of soap and the unheralded arrival of hot and cold water by the turning of a tap. It is a gift of my lifetime, as is the leisure to use it. A rocket to the moon put millions on to exploration potential; but hygiene – made possible by instant hot and cold water – probably doubled our lifespan”

- John A. Lee
Review of methodology guidance and evaluation template

Reporting back
Report back on completion of updates to the methodology and guidance document for evaluating historic heritage and historic heritage evaluation template.
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Background

- Original methodology and evaluation template documents developed 2012-2013 for PAUP

- Initially this project proposed minor tweaks. Final product in some areas has delved further
Inputs

- Policy team
  - team members assigned sub areas to lead
  - workshops with team & then reference group

- Reference group
  - heritage consultant, HNZPT rep, x2 HAP, Heritage Unit staff outside Policy team
  - 5 workshops held with activities and group discussions

- Opportunities for more general Heritage Unit feedback

- Findings & feedback brought together to develop amendments
Outputs

**Methodology** - what's new?

- the evaluation process – *updated*
- historical summary – *new (moved from template)*
- physical description – *new (moved from template)*
- comparative analysis – *new*
- integrity and rarity – *new*
- guidance sections for criterion indicators – *new*
- preparing a statement of significance – *updated*
- identifying geographic thresholds – *updated*
- defining extent of place – *updated*
- historic heritage areas – *updated*
- trees, gardens plantings and other features of the setting – *new*
- additional rules for archaeological sites – *new*
- place of Māori interest or significance – *new*
- definitions – *updated*
Example of where the evaluation process has been clarified and further explained.
Outputs

Evaluation template – what's new?

- Executive summary
- Guidance moved to methodology
- Comparative analysis section formalised
- Further sections for HHAs
Where to from here?

Criterion C – Mana Whenua

• Inclusion and exclusion indicators removed. Direct engagement with iwi to develop this area further. Separate project underway.
• Also part of wider consideration to how mana whenua criteria is assessed moving forward
• Outcomes of this other project will inform future updates to the methodology and evaluation template.
Where to from here?

Completion of appendices

- Appendix 1: Criteria inclusion indicators
- Appendix 2: Statements of significance
- Appendix 3: Extent of place, primary features and exclusions
- Appendix 4: Schedule 14 style guide
- Appendix 5: Vocabulary to assist with establishing significance

Example from Appendix 1 under development
### Examples from appendices currently under development

#### Appendix 4: Schedule 14 style guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Should be written in full. Exceptions: “St”, “Co”, “LIM” (original or significant historic name of the place).</td>
<td>Bank of New Zealand, Mount Eden, Victoria Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use “of” instead of “a”. Exceptions: “is” part of the original or significant historic name.</td>
<td>Heathcote &amp; Gage, Pioneer Women’s and Ellen fruhling Memorial Hall, F. Perkins &amp; Co Building, Parnell’s and Marshall’s Building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalise proper nouns and the start of a sentence.</td>
<td>Mount Victoria, Museum, Newmarket Police Station (former), including marine villa and lock-up, Automatic telephone exchange and garage (former).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only capitalise words like “house”, “homestead”, “building” or “pā” where these words are part of the original or significant historic name.</td>
<td>Ngāruawākau House, Imperial Building, McDougall farmhouse (former), Kaiapoi Pā. Settlers, Pā.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalise “State” when referring to State housing.</td>
<td>State housing complex, First State house on the North Shore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrons / accents should be used where appropriate.</td>
<td>With this, Por.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix 5: Vocabulary to assist with establishing significance

- **Useful word/phrase**
  - “associated with”
  - “evident in”
  - “is valued as by”
  - “notably” or “it is interesting to note…” or “it is notable that…”
  - “tangible evidence” of
  - “value lies in”

- **Explanation/Example**
  - Use to demonstrate how a historic heritage place relates to a significant historical pattern/event/community/person. For example: “The historic heritage place has a strong and special association with this particular community group.”
  - Use when the heritage value of a place is manifest in its tangible elements. For example: “The historical value of this place is evident in its continuous use as a place of worship for over a century.”
  - Use to convey how a historic heritage place is considered to be important or significant as a place or to a community. For example: “This historic heritage place is valued as by…”
  - Use when introducing a historic fact or association which is supplemental to the heritage value of the place. For example: “It is notable that this place has an interesting historic association with J. Dow, who worked and lived here for many years.”
  - Use to demonstrate how tangible elements of a historic heritage place can be significant to particular heritage values. For example, “This historic heritage place provides tangible evidence of this type of technology from the 1880s.”
  - Use to articulate the primary aspects of the place which conveys heritage value. For example: “The historic heritage value of this place lies in its architectural design.”
Questions or discussion?
Heritage Advisory Panel Education Subcommittee

Notes from Meeting 16 July 2013

Present: E. Altken Rose, G. Burgess, A. McEwan, S. Reynolds

The Subcommittee identified the following interventions to improve the identification, management and appreciation of heritage in Auckland:

Community Education
- Integration of heritage into primary and secondary school curricula
  - Preparation of teaching resources for primary schools e.g. neighbourhood change
- Programmes for owners and ratepayers
- Media publicity
- Public dissemination of ‘Heritage Asset of the Week’
- Workshops and training for community heritage groups and individuals to up-skill for participation in heritage related RMA processes and heritage management and protection generally

Professional Education
- Short-term heritage training courses (2-5 days)
  - Council staff in portfolios interfacing with heritage e.g. consents, parks, libraries, leadership/communication, finance
  - Council staff in gatekeeping roles e.g. consents, compliance, parks, finance
  - Council Controlled Organisations
  - Private practitioners (upskilling)
    - NZPI and NZIA CPD programmes
- CPD for heritage and affiliated heritage staff
  - Best practice modelling and innovation
- Summer School programmes (2 months) COP
  - Partnership with tertiary providers
- National or regional conference on heritage conservation and preservation

Tertiary Education
- Integration of heritage into architecture and urban planning curricula at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels in taught degrees
- Post-graduate degrees on built heritage conservation and management, heritage policy and planning
- Scholarships and funding for heritage research
- Sponsorship of a chair in heritage conservation and management.

Mana Whenua
- Acknowledgement, collaboration and capacity building
  - Dialogue with the Independent Maori Statutory Board and other Maori agencies

The Subcommittee also noted the need for a full audit of Auckland Council heritage resources.
Heritage Advisory Panel

Update on Tertiary Education 27 August 2019

Achievements

- Integration of heritage into architecture and urban planning curricula at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels in taught degrees
  - Bachelor of Urban Planning (Hons)
    - URBPLAN 302 Heritage/Cultural Issues for Urban Planning
    - 15pt compulsory undergraduate 3rd year course introduced in 2016
  - Master of Architecture (Professional)
    - ARCHDES 701 Adaptive Reuse
    - Elective studio
    - ARCHGEN 750 - Heritage Processes
    - Elective seminar
    - ARCHGEN 751 - Heritage Assessment and Conservation Planning
    - Elective seminar
    - ARCHGEN 752 - Conservation of Materials
    - Elective seminar
    - ARCHGEN 753 - Diagnosis and Adaptation
    - Elective seminar

- Post-graduate degrees on built heritage conservation and management, heritage policy and planning
  - Master of Heritage Conservation (Built Heritage)
    - Introduced in 2016
  - Master of Architecture (Professional) and Master of Heritage Conservation
    - Introduced in 2016
  - Master of Urban Planning (Professional) and Master of Heritage Conservation
    - Introduced in 2016
  - Doctor of Philosophy (in Architecture or Planning)
    - Seven students currently enrolled and engaged in heritage research

- Heritage Graduates (2016-19)
  - Master of Heritage Conservation
    - Five
  - Master of Architecture (Professional) and Master of Heritage Conservation
    - Twelve
  - Master of Urban Planning (Professional) and Master of Heritage Conservation
    - Two
  - Postgraduate Certificate in Heritage
    - One
  - 2019-20
    - Fourteen engaged in the heritage programmes

- Master of Heritage Conservation (Museums and Cultural Heritage)
  - Introduced in 2016
  - Heritage Graduates (2016-19)
    - Three
  - 2019-20
    - Ten engaged in this programme

- School of Architecture and Planning History Theory Research Hub
- Strengths of the MHerCons initiative
  - Unique in NZ
  - Combined degree options
  - Heritage contribution to core programmes
  - Partnerships with Auckland Council, Heritage New Zealand, Department of Conservation, heritage consultants, advocates

- Threats to the MHerCons initiative
  - Niche programmes in the wider university context
  - Programme promotion