

Wellington Region

SER Historic Heritage

Technical Report



New Zealand Historic Places Trust
Pouhere Taonga

28 April 2005

Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
DEFINING HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	6
HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS	8
DISTRICT INDICATORS: WELLINGTON REGION	10
PROPOSED HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS, WELLINGTON REGION.....	13
THE STATE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE WELLINGTON REGION.....	15
ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE	15
Indicator: Number and distribution of Identified Heritage Places.....	15
Discussion:	17
Registered Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu, and Wahi Tapu Areas, NZHPT.....	17
Heritage Inventories	20
Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans.....	21
NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites	22
Department of Conservation, CMS and List of Actively Managed Sites	24
Iwi Heritage Schedules	25
Other Schedules.....	26
ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE	28
Indicator: Number and type of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards	28
NZHPT Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas	30
Heritage Inventories	30
Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans.....	30
NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites	31
Department of Conservation, CMS and List of Actively Managed Sites and Other heritage schedules.....	31
Iwi Heritage Schedules	31
HISTORIC HERITAGE THREATS/PRESSURE	32
ISSUE: CONDITION OF HERITAGE.....	32
Indicator: Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished.....	32
NZHPT Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas	34
Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans.....	34
NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites	35
Community.....	36
ISSUE: CONDITION OF HERITAGE.....	37
Indicator: The proportion of places being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity.....	37
Regional Wellington Survey	38
HISTORIC HERITAGE RESPONSES.....	41
ISSUE: PROTECTION BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.....	41
Indicator: Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect heritage places.....	41
New Zealand's Heritage Regulatory Environment.....	42
Reserves Act 1977.....	43
Local Government Act 2002: Regional Parks	43
Conservation Act 1987	44
Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977	44
Te Turi Whenua Maori Land Act 1993.....	45
Historic Places Act 1993	45
NZHPT Properties.....	45

<i>Heritage Covenants</i>	45
<i>Resource Management Act 1991</i>	46
<i>Heritage Orders</i>	46
<i>Wellington Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plans</i>	46
<i>District Plans Rules</i>	48
ISSUE: PROTECTION BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.....	49
<i>Indicator: Number of places assessed to be 'protected' by formal statutory instruments</i>	49
<i>Historic Heritage Places within Reserves and Trust properties</i>	50
<i>District Plan Rules</i>	51
<i>Assessment Criteria for Heritage Provisions, District Plans</i>	52
RESOURCES AND TRAINING	53
<i>Indicator: Funds provided and allocated for maintaining and enhancing heritage values and provision of heritage advice</i>	53
<i>New Zealand Lotteries Board</i>	54
<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>	54
<i>Local Authorities</i>	54
RESOURCES AND TRAINING	56
<i>Indicator: Amount of funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for specific projects involving heritage places</i>	56
REPORT CONCLUSIONS	56
<i>Recommendations</i>	59
APPENDIX 1	60
APPENDIX 2	73
APPENDIX 3: WELLINGTON REGION, NZHPT REGISTERED HISTORIC PLACES, SAMPLE SURVEY	76
APPENDIX 4: WELLINGTON REGION, NZHPT REGISTERED HISTORIC PLACES, SAMPLE SURVEY RESULTS	79

Front Cover: Te Rauparaha, Taupo No.2 Block Reserve, Motuhara Road, Plimmerton (Photo: R McClean, 2004)

Introduction

Places of historic heritage value are a finite resource that is threatened by a range of land use activities. It is important to develop indicators to measure historic heritage so that some idea of the 'state' of the heritage resource can be ascertained. This knowledge can be a catalyst for improved heritage identification and protection interventions.

In 1999, the Wellington Regional Council¹ published the first State of the Environment Report for the Wellington Region.² Entitled 'Measuring Up', the report provided information on the Wellington Environment including iwi perspectives, freshwater, soils, coast, air quality, biodiversity, landscape and heritage, natural hazards, energy, waste management and hazardous substances, built environment and transportation. Part of the 'vision' for the future outlined in the report was that 'places, things and objects of cultural and heritage value are conserved.' The report, however, contained only a brief examination of heritage-related issues and the report's data was not based on any systematic or comprehensive heritage monitoring or indicators. Any conclusions about the state of the heritage environment in 1999 were, therefore, very tentative.

The Greater Wellington Regional Council is in the process of working towards an updated State of the Environment report for the Wellington Region. This technical report has been prepared to assist in gaining a better understanding of the region's heritage and also to provide a framework for appropriate indicators and monitoring. As well, this report will assist in the future review of heritage objectives and policies within the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.

The proposed historic heritage indicators are largely based on the Australian national historic heritage state of the environment indicators and the indicators endorsed by the New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council (ANZECC). The Trust acknowledges the support of the Wellington local authorities and the Department of Conservation in this project and providing information. We have also appreciated the assistance by Greg Mason, PhD student at Waikato University and Ian Lawlor, Senior Archaeologist at Auckland Regional Council, in developing the proposed indicators.

This report has been prepared by Robert McClean, heritage adviser with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. The project has enjoyed the active support of the Greater Wellington Regional Council. In particular, the Trust acknowledges the support and encouragement of John Holmes, Senior Policy Analyst at Greater Wellington Regional Council. John also prepared and organised the local authority and community survey for this project

¹ Since 2002, Wellington Regional Council (WRC) is known as Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)

² WRC, *Measuring Up, The State of the Environment Report for the Wellington Region*, Wellington, 1999

The Trust also acknowledges the contribution of Penelope Laurenson, Planning Masters student at the University of Otago. During the summer of 2004-2005, Penelope assisted with the collection of information, planning of the regional survey, preparing the summary of survey responses, and writing parts of the report.

This report is a working document and will be subject to ongoing review and revision. The Trust welcomes any comments, feedback, and suggestions. We ask that the proposed indicators for the Wellington Region, in particular, are carefully considered. Please contact:

Robert McClean
Heritage Adviser
Central Region
New Zealand Historic Places Trust
PO Box 2629 Wellington
Email: rcclean@historic.org.nz

Defining Historic Heritage

The Greater Wellington Regional Council's existing policy framework adopts the concept of 'cultural heritage.' The Wellington Regional Policy Statement defines cultural heritage as 'buildings, structures, sites, areas, wahi tapu, and wahi tapu areas associated with human activity which are inherited from the past or are of value to future generations, and which are considered to be of special value.'³

Within this definition of cultural heritage, is the key concept of values. Every historic heritage landscape or place may have a complex layer of values and identification of those values is the cornerstone of cultural heritage protection strategies. For this reason, the definition of cultural heritage value in the ICOMOS Charter ties important places to a range of values:

Cultural heritage value means possessing historical, archaeological, architectural, technological, aesthetic, scientific, spiritual, social, traditional, or other special cultural significance, associated with human activity.⁴

Since the publication of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement in 1996, the Resource Management Act (RMA) has been amended to mean that the protection of 'historic heritage' is now a matter of national importance under section 6(f). There is a close alignment between the concepts of 'historic' heritage and 'cultural' heritage. Historic heritage under the RMA means 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, and technological. The definition of historic heritage also includes historic sites, structures, places, and areas, archaeological sites, and surroundings associated with natural and physical resources.

Cultural heritage is, therefore, one aspect of historic heritage as defined by the RMA. The Regional Council also has new responsibilities under section 12(1)(g) of the RMA which provides protection to historic heritage within the coastal marine area.

It is recommended that the Regional Council and the review of the Regional Policy Statement adopts the concept of 'historic heritage' instead of 'cultural heritage.'

The Wellington Regional Policy Statement focuses on cultural heritage places of regional significance. The objective (No.3, p 179) is that these places are recognised as being of importance to the Region, are managed in an integrated manner with other resources, and are conserved and sustained for present and future generations. The Regional Policy Statement states that places of regional significance are those places, buildings, structures, sites, and other resources listed as Category I items in

³ WRC, *Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region*, May 1996, p 5

⁴ ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Historical Value, 1992

the Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu, and Wahi Tapu Areas under the Historic Places Act 1993.

Section 22(3)(a) of the Historic Places Act 1993 defines Category I Historic Places as 'places of special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value.' The Trust may enter any historic place or historic area in the Register if the place or area possesses aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional significance or value. The Trust may assign Category I status or Category II status to any historic place, having regard to any of the following criteria:

- (a) The extent to which the place reflects important or representative aspects of New Zealand history:
- (b) The association of the place with events, persons, or ideas of importance in New Zealand history:
- (c) The potential of the place to provide knowledge of New Zealand history:
- (d) The importance of the place to the tangata whenua:
- (e) The community association with, or public esteem for, the place:
- (f) The potential of the place for public education:
- (g) The technical accomplishment or value, or design of the place:
- (h) The symbolic or commemorative value of the place:
- (i) The importance of identifying historic places known to date from early periods of New Zealand settlement:
- (j) The importance of identifying rare types of historic place:
- (k) The extent to which the place forms part of a wider historical and cultural complex or historical and cultural landscape:
- (l) Such additional criteria for registration of wahi tapu, wahi tapu areas, historic places, and historic areas of Maori interest as may be prescribed in regulations made under this Act:
- (m) Such additional criteria not inconsistent with those in paragraphs (a) to (k) of this subsection for the purpose of assigning Category I or Category II status to any historic place, and for the purpose of registration of any historic area, as may be prescribed in regulations made under this Act.

While the Trust's register will be discussed further in this report, it is worth noting, that the Regional Council's definition of cultural heritage places of regional significance as being Category I Historic Places excludes a number of places including:

- Category II Historic Places
- Historic Areas
- Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu areas
- Generally sites of significance to Maori and archaeologically significant sites (since there are no Category I Historic Places registered on account of Maori or archaeological values in the Wellington Region)
- Other significant historic heritage places not registered as Category I Historic Places.

The need to review the definition of cultural heritage places of regional significance will be revisited in the concluding chapter of this report.

Historic Heritage Indicators

The Greater Wellington Regional Council has adopted the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework as the basis of its state of environment reporting. This approach, developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), recognises that managing our environment requires a complicated form of feedback loop: human activities and natural causes exert pressures on the environment; these change the state or condition of the environment; society responds by developing or implementing policies that influence those human activities or modify natural processes, and this in turn changes the kinds of pressures.⁵

In the context of historic heritage, the P-S-R framework can be conceptualised as S-P-R where State is the condition of the entire historic heritage environment including the condition of our knowledge of that environment; Pressures are the threats on that environment caused by both human and natural interventions; and Response is the response of Government and communities to manage pressures and to improve the condition of the historic heritage environment.

An Indicator is a unit of measure that signals changes in the environment. The change may be an aspect of pressure, state, or response. The development of historic heritage indicators does not attempt to measure the 'total' heritage environment. Attempting to measure the total heritage environment, or the 'universe' of heritage places, is essentially a fruitless exercise since perceptions of what constitutes heritage values changes as society changes. In addition, the exercise of listing or registering a particular place inscribes new values.⁶ With regard to the link between heritage values and social change, the expansion of the Historic Places Trust Register during the 1980s can be tied to government restructuring led by the fourth Labour Government, which resulted in the sale of Government facilities and services including the New Zealand Post Office, Bank of New Zealand, and the restructuring of the public service sector. Many small rural communities perceived the institution of the Post Office and local bank to be essential places within the community and lobbied for their preservation, including the preservation of the building fabric.⁷

Generally, historic heritage indicators should have the ability to:

- Produce and simplify the most important information about the historic heritage environment;

⁵ WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

⁶ Prof Dirk Spennemann, 'Your solution, their problem. Their solution, your problem' Paper presented at Planning Institute of Australia Conference, Hobart, 2004

⁷ Steve Britton, Richard Le Heron, and Eric Pawson, *Changing Places in New Zealand, A Geography of Restructuring*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 1992

- Reduce the number of measurements required to give an 'accurate' representation of historic heritage outcomes;
- Illustrate trends and allow comparisons;
- Ensure responses are triggered when historic heritage thresholds are approached; and
- Make information gathered by specialists more easily understood by the public, the media, resource users, and decision-makers.⁸

The Ministry for the Environment is preparing a National Performance Indicators Programme. This programme, however, has largely excluded historic heritage indicators with the exception of work commissioned by the Auckland Regional Council (ARC).

The Australian National State of the Environment programme published natural and historic heritage indicators in 1998. The Australian programme aimed to produce a set of key indicators that would 'provide rigorous data describing the major trends in, and impacts on all important elements of Australia's heritage environment.'⁹ The Australian programme selected indicators for natural and historic heritage that would satisfy a number of selection criteria including:

- Serve as a robust indicator of environmental change.
- Reflect a fundamental or highly valued aspect of the environment.
- Be either national in scope or applicable to regional environmental issues of national significance.
- Provide an early warning of potential problems.
- Be capable of being monitored to provide statistically verifiable and reproducible data that show trends over time and, preferably, apply to a broad range of environmental regions.
- Be scientifically credible
- Be easy to understand
- Be monitored regularly with relative ease.
- Be cost-effective.
- Where possible and appropriate, facilitate community involvement.
- Contribute to the fulfilment of reporting obligations under international agreements

The Australian heritage indicators were first published in 1998 and were refined with the publication of a review report in 2001.¹⁰ It is noted the indicators include natural heritage and specific indicators relating to indigenous/aboriginal knowledge, including specific indigenous language indicators.

⁸ Adapted from WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

⁹ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 9

¹⁰ Department of the Environment, *Implementing State of the Environment Indicators for Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2001

In 1999, the Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council (ANZECC) endorsed a core set of ten historic heritage indicators largely based on the Australian heritage indicators. The ten indicators (P: pressure; R: response; S state) were:

1. Number and distribution of identified heritage items (places and objects) S/R
2. Number of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards R
3. Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished P
4. Number of places reserved for conservation purposes where heritage values have been seriously impaired by visitor use S/P
5. Funds provided for maintaining heritage values R
6. Amount of funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for heritage places and objects R
7. Number of conservation practitioners and training courses R
8. Community awareness of and attitudes towards heritage places and objects and their conservation R
9. The number of heritage places assessed (by sampling) as being in (i) good (ii) average and (iii) poor condition S/P
10. The number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic places R.

Greg Mason at Waikato University is currently carrying out research for a PhD relating to the performance of District Plans in terms of heritage. Mr Mason has examined indicators from local authorities and international sources to develop an indicator set to measure the achievement of Anticipated Environmental Results (AER). These draft indicators include a number from the Australian National State of the Environment programme.

District Indicators: Wellington Region

Kapiti Coast District Council's monitoring strategy includes a significant section on heritage and tangata whenua. The relevant monitoring objective is 'to monitor the extent to which the District's heritage features are identified and protected.'¹¹ The key indicators are:

- No. of trees/buildings/archaeological sites protected on the Heritage Register
- No. of trees/buildings/archaeological sites placed on the Heritage Register in the past year through a Plan change.
- No. of resource consent applications involving the modification or destruction of a heritage feature
- No. of archaeological authorities approved for damage or modification of archaeological sites per annum.

¹¹ KCDC, *Capturing Our Environment – KCDC Monitoring Strategy*, August 2002

- No. and type of complaints received regarding existing or proposed Heritage features.
- Condition of Historic places and occurrence of modification outside resource consent process
- Condition of 'high risk' heritage features
- No. and survey of all historic sites threatened by urban development.¹²

With regard to the 'Condition of Historic Places' indicator, the monitoring strategy states that the condition of historic places will be assessed every five years, while the condition of 'high risk' heritage features will be assessed annually.

Relevant indicators regarding tangata whenua include the 'No, type and location of Wahi Tapu sites protected in the District Plan' and 'No. of resource consents applied for that involve or affect culturally significant sites or heritage features.'

The Wellington City Built Heritage Policy of July 1998 contained a monitoring plan for 1998-2001. This monitoring plan involved the following indicators:

- Buildings in economic use
- Resident and owner satisfaction with policy goal
- Level of major disadvantage to owners from owning a listed building
- Understanding of how Council protects listed heritage buildings.

In February 2000, Yvonne Legarth proposed a new set of indicators for the Built Heritage Policy. These draft indicators included:

- Number of building permits issued to demolish buildings in heritage inventory
- Number of building permits issued to alter buildings in heritage inventory
- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to relocate or demolish buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to alter buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of buildings in the heritage schedule of the District Plan that remain authentic'
- Number of heritage buildings in a neglected state
- Number of heritage fund applications for restoration of buildings on the heritage schedule of the District Plan.¹³

During 2004, Wellington City Council undertook a monitoring project to review the effectiveness of the District Plan relating to heritage. The following indicators were selected for the project:

- Number of listed buildings, objects, trees and sites of significance.

¹² *ibid*, p 69

¹³ Yvonne Legarth, WCC Internal Report to City Development and Business, 14 February 2000

- Number of buildings and objects identified as meeting the District Plan criteria for protection but not currently listed.
- Number of buildings (incl. Heritage buildings) that are earthquake strengthened during the year.
- Resource consents granted under Rules 21.2.1, 21.2.2 and 21.1.3 in respect of additions and alterations.
- Professional assessment of the effect of approved resource consents for additions and alterations.
- Resource consent applications under Rules 21.3.1 for total or partial destruction of heritage.
- Resource consent applications for Rule 21.3.2 for tree destruction, removal or partial removal.
- Compatibility of design guides with heritage.¹⁴

The results of this monitoring project will be discussed in this report below.

¹⁴ WCC, Draft District Plan Monitoring Programme, Effectiveness of the Plan relating to Heritage, June 2000 – December 2004

Proposed Historic Heritage Indicators, Wellington Region

The proposed historic heritage indicators below are largely based on the Australian National State of the Environment programme and the core set endorsed by the Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council in 1999 with some minor modifications in light of the 2001 review of the Australian programme.

This set of indicators was proposed in the first draft of this report in June 2004 and was presented to an informal forum of local authority planners from the Wellington Region. It was further presented as a paper to the Central Region's NZHPT Summer School in January 2005.

Proposed Historic Heritage Indicators: Wellington Region				
Issue		Indicator	Source	State (S), Pressure (P), Response (R)
Knowledge of the historic heritage resource	I.1	Number and distribution of identified heritage places	NZHPT Register NZAA , DOC District/Regional Plans District Inventories Iwi Inventories Other	S R
	I.2	Number and type of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards	As above	S R
Condition of heritage	I.3	Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished	NZHPT Register NZAA Local Authority Resource Consent database	S P
	I.4	The proportion of places being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity	Survey	S P
Protection by Central Government and Local Government		Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect heritage places	Legislation NZHPT DOC Local authorities District and Regional Plans	R
		Number of places protected by formal statutory instruments	As above	R
Resources and Training	I.5	Funds provided and allocated for	NZHPT, Lottery Grants Board, local authorities,	R

		maintaining and enhancing heritage values and provision of heritage advice	other	
	I.6	Amount of funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for heritage places	Government budget Local authorities	R

The State of Historic Heritage Resources in the Wellington Region

Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: Number and distribution of Identified Heritage Places

Description: Measures number and distribution of identified historic heritage items in the Wellington Region.

Knowledge of the historic heritage resource	I.1	Number, and distribution of identified heritage places		S R
		NZHPT	No. of Registered Category I Historic Places	126
			No. of Registered Category II Historic Places ¹⁵	496
			No. of Registered Historic Areas	25
			No. of Registered Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas	2
		Local Authorities	No. of Local Authority Heritage Inventories	2
			No. of Sites listed in Heritage Inventories	511
		Local Authorities	No. of listed Heritage Sites, District Plan	1605
		Regional Council	No. of listed Heritage Plans, Regional Plans	22
		NZAA	No. of Recorded Archaeological Sites	1030
		DOC	No. of Actively Managed Sites	44
		Iwi	No. of Iwi Authority Heritage Inventories	4
			No. of Sites listed in Iwi Inventories	1035
		Rail Heritage of NZ	No. of Sites listed in Rail Heritage of NZ Register	6
		IPENZ	No. of Sites listed in IPENZ Inventory	19
		NZ Defence Force	No. of Sites listed in NZ Defence Force Inventory	10

¹⁵ This figure includes both registered places and proposed registrations as included in the NZHPT Register. Proposed registrations have been included in the NZHPT Register, but do not have the necessary historical documentation that confirms the registration. These places will be subject to review and formal registration processes.

Rationale:

At the core of New Zealand's cultural management regime is a system of listing of historic heritage places. The lists define a place that is signalled out on account of its heritage value. There are generally three main types of lists: statutory; regulatory; and community. New Zealand's only statutory list is the Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu, and Wahi Tapu Areas. The register is a requirement of the Historic Places Act 1993. Local and regional authorities prepare and manage regulatory lists or schedules that have legal ramifications in terms of rules within District or Regional Plans prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991. In addition, there are a range of community lists which have no statutory basis or regulatory effect. These include the Department of Conservation's List of Actively Managed Sites and the Rail Heritage Register.

Lists of historic heritage places reflect the values or objectives of the group or organisation which created and maintain them. Counting the numbers of listed places actually provides little information about changes to the historic heritage environment. This is because the large proportion of the historic heritage environment is not listed and the listings themselves are biased towards particular time, geographic and thematic categories. For example, the Trust's register in the Wellington Region is dominated by Wellington City listings and most of these are houses, churches, halls, or commercial premises.

Numbers of listed places also do not indicate numbers of actual sites or places protected. Protection largely depends on either property status (i.e. reserves) or the quality of rules within District Plans. For example, until recently it was a permitted activity within Hutt City to demolish or relocate any listed building. The quality of protection offered by district plan rules will be further discussed below.

Changes in the number of listed places does, however, reflect changes in Government and/or community commitment to identify and protect historic heritage. The Trust's registration process and the RMA Plan Change process to add new listed items into District or Regional Plans requires formidable legal, informational, and consultative requirements. The processes also require substantial resources at both a central and local government level. The preparation of community lists, such as the Rail Heritage Trust Register also takes considerable resources and general commitment from largely voluntary labour.

Other changes to listed places can reflect improved regulatory processes. For example, many surveyors and developers are more aware of the Historic Places Act with regard to archaeological authority requirements and often engage an archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment if requested by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Thus, most new additions to the NZAA Site Record Scheme are the result of surveys associated with proposed coastal subdivisions or other developments.

Discussion:

Registered Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu, and Wahi Tapu Areas, NZHPT

Data for Greater Wellington Region	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of Registered Category I Historic Places	NZHPT	NZHPT Register Database	114	126
No. of Registered Category II Historic Places	NZHPT	NZHPT Register Database	422	496
No. of Registered Historic Areas	NZHPT	NZHPT Register Database	18	24
No. of Registered Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas	NZHPT	NZHPT Register Database	1	2

Local Authority	1995						2004					
	Historic Places			Historic Areas	Wahi Tapu	Wahi Tapu Areas	Historic Places			Historic Areas	Wahi Tapu	Wahi Tapu Areas
	Cat I	Cat II	Total				Cat I	Cat II	Total			
Carterton	0	18	18	0	0	0	1	18	19	0	0	0
Hutt	7	35	42	1	0	0	9	37	46	3	0	0
KCDC	5	18	23	2	0	1	5	22	27	2	0	1
Masterton	11	41	52	0	0	0	11	44	55	1	0	1
Porirua	4	7	11	1	0	0	5	50	55	1	0	0
South Wairarapa	4	66	70	1	0	0	4	71	75	2	0	0
Upper Hutt	5	7	12	1	0	0	5	7	12	2	0	0
Wellington	78	230	308	12	0	0	86	247	333	13	0	0
Total	114	422	556	18	0	1	126	496	622	24	0	2

The Register dates back to 1963 when the Trust began to establish a national list of historic sites and buildings. The structure of the list was formulated in 1969 with the classification of buildings into five categories A, B, C, D, and O (objects). By 1980, the Buildings Classification Committee of the Trust had identified 3,000 buildings for classification.

The Historic Places Act 1980 enshrined the A, B, C, D classification system into legislation as a List of Classified Historic Places and Historic Areas.

The Historic Places Act 1993 established a Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu, and Wahi Tapu areas. Historic places in the Register are divided into two categories. Category I historic places have 'special or outstanding historic or

historic heritage significance or value. Category II places have 'historical or historic heritage significance or value.' The purpose of the Register is to inform the owners and the public about significant heritage places, and to assist in protection under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Under the transitional provisions of the Historic Places Act 1993, the buildings formally classified as 'A' and 'B' under the Historic Places Act 1980 were transferred to the Register as Category I Historic Places and the 'C' and 'D' buildings were transferred to the Register as Category II Historic Places.

Most of the historic places on the Trust's Register were identified and listed in the 1980s by the Buildings Classification Committee. Not surprisingly, buildings dominate the Register and most of these buildings are houses, churches, halls, or commercial premises.

A review of the Register in 2000 found that any analysis of the Register for its ability to represent various key historical themes was problematic. The review, quoting research by historian Gavin McLean, stated that thematic analysis was hindered because:

The Register index can search names, addresses, local authority areas, building dates, building types and architects' names, but can not search uses of places, historic events or ideas associated with them. 'It is therefore difficult to match places to people, events, ideas or historic themes without undertaking a prohibitively time-consuming manual search of the field record forms.'¹⁶

With regard to building types, the 2000 Register review found there was a lack of clear definitions of categories or 'building-type' used in the Register database. Despite this definition problem, the review identified that houses made up over a fifth of the entire list of buildings and generally the Register was dominated by houses, churches, cottages, homesteads, hotels/motels, and farm buildings. The review noted that very few buildings of significance to Maori have been registered as historic places.

In 2004, an audit of the Register was carried out by the Trust. This audit discovered a large number of registered historic places and areas lacked the necessary historical documentation to confirm the registration. In other words, the places appeared on the Trust's register, but were not actually and legally registered. In the latest 2005 Register, the Trust has divided it into two parts as a result of the audit: Proposed registrations which require confirmation by the Trust Board and the Register containing legally registered places and areas. In this paper, both types of registrations are included in the numbers of registered places.

¹⁶ Peter Richardson and Elizabeth Cox, 'Review of the Historic Places and Historic Areas sections of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust's National Register', 2000, p 44

A number of archaeological sites are registered as historic places. These registrations were entered under a 1975 amendment Historic Places Act 1954. This section provided for a Register of Archaeological Sites. The purpose of the Register was for scientific use and for planning purposes at the local government level. Generally, registration of archaeological sites meant the landowner was made aware of the presence of a recorded archaeological site. Some 63 archaeological sites were registered in the Wellington region. Most of these are located in the Porirua District (41 sites) and Wellington (11 sites). These pre-1993 registered archaeological sites are now registered as Category II Historic Places under the Historic Places Act 1993.¹⁷

Despite the Register providing for historic areas, wahi tapu, and wahi tapu areas since 1993, few of these types of places are registered. This trend is slowly changing with a recent focus of historic areas (such as the Rimutaka Rail Incline and Trail) and other proposals such as the Waikēkeno historic area. Iwi have also concentrated scarce resources on researching wahi tapu and sites of significance for the Waitangi Tribunal's process or for the purpose of creating their own schedules as part of iwi management plans.

In 2005, there was a total of 648 registered historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas in the Wellington Region. Of these 346 registered historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas are located within Wellington City.

Nearly all of the registered places in the Wellington Region are historic places and most of the historic places are buildings as opposed to registered archaeological sites. The only district that does not follow this pattern is Porirua. Porirua City has 12 buildings/structures that are registered historic places and 43 registered archaeological sites. Most of these archaeological sites are located at Whitireia Park.

The NZHPT Register in the Wellington Region is dominated by historic places that are buildings and structures and has a small number of historic areas. There are only 2 wahi tapu/wahi tapu areas.

In addition to the Register audit, the Trust has carried out a Registration upgrade project which focused on Category I Historic Places. As a result, the Trust has relatively good information of most of the Category I Historic Places in the Wellington Region.

Summary:

- The numbers of registered places in the Wellington Region since 1995 has increased. However, this increase has largely been limited to Porirua and

¹⁷ For background on pre-1993 registrations of archaeological sites, see Jeffrey Mosen, *Section 43 Register of Archaeological Sites – A Review of the Register and Implications for the 1993 Section 22 Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas*, NZHPT, March 1994

Wellington districts. In comparison with pre-1995 registrations, while the rate of new registrations has slowed, the quality of new registrations has improved.

- The status of information about Category I Historic Places is generally good in the Wellington Region.
- The status of information about Category II Historic Places is generally poor/fair in the Wellington Region.
- Category I Historic Places generally exclude historic areas, registered archaeological sites and sites of significance to Maori.

Heritage Inventories

Data	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of Local Authority Heritage Inventories	Local Authorities	Inventory	1	2
No. of Sites listed in Heritage Inventories	Local Authorities	Inventory	537	511

Local Authorities	1995		2005	
	No. of Heritage Inventories	No. of sites listed in Heritage Inventories	No. of Heritage Inventories	No. of sites listed in Heritage Inventories
Carterton	0	0	0	0
Hutt	0	0	0	0
KCDC	0	0	0	0
Masterton	0	0	1	198
Porirua	0	0	0	0
South Wairarapa	0	0	0	0
Upper Hutt	0	0	0	0
Wellington CC	1	537	1	313 (Non-Residential buildings only)
Wellington RC	0	0	0	0
Total	1	537	2	511

The role of a heritage inventory is to provide information about heritage resources within a district in a form that can be updated on an annual or regular basis. The inventory also 'stands behind' those places scheduled in the District Plan as a section 32 report. The preparation of a district heritage inventory requires a comprehensive heritage identification process and standards for identification of heritage significance. The Wellington City Council and Masterton District are the only local authorities within Wellington Region that maintain an updated heritage inventory. The Wellington City Heritage Building Inventory for Non-Residential Buildings was completed in 2001. This Inventory contains information on 313 buildings and five precincts.¹⁸ The Council are currently progressing with an inventory of residential buildings. A number of local authorities are now in the process of preparing a heritage inventory, including Kapiti, Porirua, and Carterton.

¹⁸ WCC, *Heritage Building Inventory*, Boffa Miskell Limited with Chris Cochran for WCC, 2001

Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans

Data	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of listed Heritage Places, District Plan	LA District Plans	District Plan	?	1583
No. of listed Heritage Places, Regional Plans	Regional Council	Regional Plans	?	22

Local Authority	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
Carterton	LA District Plans	District Plan		26
Hutt	LA District Plans	District Plan	105	282
KCDC	LA District Plans	District Plan		138
Masterton	LA District Plans	District Plan	27	206
Porirua	LA District Plans	District Plan	136	87
South Wairarapa	LA District Plans	District Plan	128	131
Upper Hutt	LA District Plans	District Plan		28
Wellington CC	LA District Plans	District Plan	537	686
Wellington RC	Regional Council Plans	Regional Coastal Plan	?	22
Total			?	1605

Section 74(2)(b)(iia) of the Resource Management Act requires all local authorities to have regard to any relevant entry in the Historic Places Trust's Register when preparing and changing a District Plan. All local authorities in the Wellington Region have, therefore, included registered historic places/areas in the district plans as part of a list or schedule. There are a few exceptions to this rule. For example, recent registrations, such as the Basin Reserve Historic Area are not listed as a historic precinct in the Wellington City District Plan.

It is difficult to measure the increase in scheduled heritage places because in 1995 many local authorities were in the process of preparing proposed district plans. Clearly, during the plan preparation process, some heritage places were added and some removed and a number of district plans did not become operative until recently.

Now in 2005 all district plans in the Wellington Region are operative. Within these plans, there are a total of 1605 places, areas, and sites/areas of significance to tangata whenua listed in District Plan schedules in the Wellington Region. Some 686 of these are heritage items listed in the Wellington City District Plan. As with the Trust's register, heritage buildings are dominant in District Plan Schedules.

Only Kapiti Coast District Council has more archaeological sites listed than heritage items/structures. However, the archaeological sites listed in the Kapiti District Plan are for information purposes only. Kapiti Coast District Council adopted a Plan Change in 2004 to add an additional 6 items to its District Plan.

Porirua City also has a large number of archaeological sites covered by the nine areas listed in the Plan. The nine areas are archaeologically rich landscapes and include Ngati Toa Domain, St Albans Church Area, Whitireia Peninsula Area, Mana Island, Round Point Area, Green Point Area, Plimmerton Pavilion Hall Area, Motukaraka Point Area, and Ration Point Area. The Council's Consents Team undertook a heritage project in 2004 involving the electronic storage and mapping of heritage items. In addition to the heritage items listed in the District Plan Heritage Register, hundreds of further items have been identified and recorded in Porirua for this project. The information gathered for this project has been added to the Council's GIS system so that it is possible identify both listed and non-listed heritage features on any property of interest.

Masterton District Council completed a Plan Change in May 2003 to add some 206 heritage items and 4 historic precincts to the Heritage Schedule of the District Plan. The new Schedule F.4A and F.4B includes a photograph of each item, a statement of significance, and an indication of the actual fabric or area protected by the District Plan rules.

It is expected that the Wairarapa Combined District Plan will contain a new heritage schedule that includes all currently listed heritage places.

The Wellington Regional Coastal Plan includes a list of Areas of Significant Conservation Value (ASCV), Areas of Important Conservation Value (AICV), and Features and Buildings of Historic Merit (FBHM). Many of the AICV places were listed due to their importance to tangata whenua. These include Kapukapuariki Reef, Wairaka Rock, Toka-a-papa Reef, Onehunga Bay, Oterongo, Toka-haere, Taputeranga Island, Te Aroaroa Kupe, and Tarakena Bay. The Features and Buildings of Historic Merit schedule contains 22 places. These are mostly wharves, lighthouses sea walls, and sheds. They include Shed 3 and Shed 5 Queens Wharf, Halswell Lighthouse, Seatoun Wharf, Oriental Bay Sea Wall, Days Bay Wharf, Steeple Rock Lighthouse, Former Eastbourne Ferry Terminal, and the Street Façade of the former Westport Chambers Building (Circa Theatre).

NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites

No. of Recorded Archaeological Sites	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
Wellington Region (Total)	NZAA	Central Database (DOC)	881	1030
Carterton	NZAA	Central Database	20	24
Hutt	NZAA	Central Database	75	103
KCDC	NZAA	Central Database	144	205
Masterton	NZAA	Central Database	36	37
Porirua	NZAA	Central Database	204	217
South Wairarapa	NZAA	Central Database	268	290
Upper Hutt	NZAA	Central Database	5	8
Wellington	NZAA	Central Database	129	146

Archaeological sites, defined by the Historic Places Act 1993, are places in New Zealand that were associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 (including wrecks) and are or may be able, through investigation by archaeological methods, to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.

The New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Site Recording Scheme is a national inventory of archaeological sites and currently contains records of over 54,000 sites nation-wide. This list is only those 'recorded' sites. In any given area, there may be undiscovered or unrecorded sites.

An important source of archaeological information is the work carried out by historians in the early 20th Century. Eldson Best obtained most of his information from Maori informants or from minutes of the Native Land Court. Unfortunately, Best did not identify the sources of his information in his published works. Best's work was added to by Adkin and Carkeek in the mid-20th Century. These authors also relied upon minutes from the Native Land Court.

Archaeological sites have been recorded by the NZAA since the 1950s. The sites include Maori archaeological sites (pa, midden, pits, etc), and historic or European archaeological sites (goldmines, buildings, structures, tracks, etc). Archaeological sites are recorded by archaeological survey or as a result of discovery. There are few areas in the Wellington region that have been covered by systematic archaeological survey. Bruce McFadgen notes that in the Kapiti-Horowhenua area, sites have only been recorded near Waikanae and in parts of the Horowhenua,¹⁹ and extensive survey work was carried out along the southern Wairarapa coast between 1958 and 1972. Warren Gumbley has prepared an overview of the archaeological resources in the South Wairarapa District.²⁰ There appears to be a need for an assessment of archaeological survey coverage in the Wellington Region.

There is modest information that indicates the condition of archaeological sites in the Wellington Region. As noted, many of the sites were recorded in the 1960s or 1970s and many of these sites may have been destroyed by natural and human activities. In addition, the grid reference location of these sites requires updating using GPS. Warren Gumbley's assessment surveyed a sample of 7% of the 274 sites recorded in the South Wairarapa District. Of these sites, Gumbley found 40-60% remain in good condition but that 50% of the intact sites which could be relocated were ascribed incorrect grid references on the site record forms.²¹

NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites are clustered within South Wairarapa, Porirua City, Kapiti Coast and Wellington. These sites are mostly located in the coastal

¹⁹ Bruce McFadgen, *Archaeology of the Wellington Conservancy – Kapiti-Horowhenua, A prehistoric and palaeoenvironmental study*, Department of Conservation, Wellington, 1997, p 6

²⁰ Warren Gumbley, 'South Wairarapa District, Assessment of Archaeological Site Data for Resource Management Purposes', June 1998

²¹ *ibid*, p 2

environment, especially around Pauatahanui Harbour and the South Wairarapa coast.

The numbers of archaeological sites have increased in the Wellington Region, especially on the Kapiti Coast, Porirua, South Wairarapa, and Wellington. While the increased number of sites does represent an improvement in the knowledge of the archaeological resource, it is, however, unclear if the increase represents an increase in the number of archaeological sites that exists and have integrity, or relates to sites that have been destroyed or modified. This issue is discussed further below.

Department of Conservation, CMS and List of Actively Managed Sites

Data	Source				Format				No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of Actively Managed Sites	DOC				Inventory				40	38
No. of Historic Sites	DOC				CMS					
Local Authorities	W	H	U	P	K	M	SW	C		
No. of Actively Managed sites	5	9	1	5	7	0	7	4		

The Wellington Conservancy Conservation Management Strategy identifies a number of historic resources of high significance which are actively managed by the Department of Conservation. These sites are the subject of on-going DOC management and attention and are termed List of Actively Managed Sites or LAMS. There are currently 38 places listed on the DOC LAMS in the Wellington Conservancy. These sites are located as follows: Chatham Islands (4 sites), Kapiti-Porirua (12 sites), Wellington (15 sites), and Wairarapa (11 sites).

Most of the sites listed are within the conservation estate. Examples include Te Kahu-o-terangi Whaling Station and The Whare on Kapiti Island, Mana Island Woolshed and Lighthouse, Field Hut, Government Buildings Historic Reserve, Dominion Observatory, Hospital Building (Matiu/Somes Island) Rimutaka Incline Summit Tunnel, and Cone Hut.

The number of listed sites has shown a reduction since 1995 since a number of formerly listed sites that were not within the conservation estate have been removed. These included the Makara Gun Emplacements (owned by Meridan Energy), Somes Lighthouse (Matiu/Somes Island), Bolton Street Memorial Park, Old Saint Pauls, Pencarrow Head Lighthouse, and the Upper Hutt Blockhouse. The reduction has been partially offset by an increase in numbers of listed sites within the conservation estate.

Iwi Heritage Schedules

Data	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of Iwi Authority Heritage Inventories	Iwi Authorities	Inventory	1	4
No. of Sites listed in Iwi Inventories	Iwi Authorities	Inventory	85	1035

Local Authority	No. of Iwi Authority Heritage Inventories		No. of sites listed in Iwi Heritage Inventories	
	1995	2005	1995	2005
Carterton				
KCDC		1		300
Masterton		1		240
Porirua	1	1	85	85
South Wairarapa				
Hutt City Upper Hutt Wellington		1 (Wellington Tenth Trust, covers Wellington and Hutt areas)		410 (200 of which are recorded NZAA sites)

Most iwi in the Wellington region have become involved in the Waitangi Tribunal's hearing process. As part of this process, a range of research has been commissioned involving sites of significance to iwi. Often such research is contested between the different parties involved in single or multiple hearings. For example, the Wellington 10th Inquiry involved a range of claimant groups from the southern North Island and research included a large number of sites of significance in the Wellington area. In the Wairarapa, research is currently being prepared by the Waitangi Tribunal, Crown Forestry Rental Trust, and iwi themselves involving sites of significance. Such research may be prepared at an iwi, hapu or whanau level.

Claim-based research normally is for the purpose of the Tribunal's hearings and is presented verbally at hearings and lodged in the Tribunal's Record of Inquiry. The Record of Inquiry is a public store of information (unless an item is identified as confidential).

Some iwi and hapu have (or are) prepared iwi management plans or schedules that involve the identification and research of sites of significance. Most of the City Councils have engaged iwi to prepare these reports and normally the schedules include both archaeological and non-archaeological sites. For example, the heritage inventory prepared by Ngati Toa Rangatira includes urupa, pa, middens, tauranga waka, reefs, marae, and swamp. NZAA site record forms were used to help identify and locate some of the archaeological sites identified in the heritage inventory. Both Wellington and Porirua iwi inventories identified particular areas of high significance and these have been listed in the district plans.

As indicated in the results above, a number of iwi in the Wellington Region have prepared iwi heritage schedules. This is a positive heritage indicator and indicates

improved knowledge about the Maori heritage environment. The largest iwi heritage projects that are being prepared and/or completed include:

- Wellington Tenth's Trust: A GIS database of significant sites in the Wellington area prepared with the support of GWRC and Beca Carter Hollings.
- Ngati Raukawa: A GIS database which involves the mapping of sites of significance along the Otaki River.
- Rangitaane/Ngati Hamua hapu: A GIS wahi tapu database in the Masterton District

Other iwi, such as Ngati Kahungunu ki Wairarapa, maintain a 'paper-based' system. This system includes nearly 1000 sites in the Wairarapa region.

Other Schedules

Data	Source	Format	No. 1995	No. 2005
No. of Sites listed in Heritage Inventories	Rail Heritage of NZ	Register	6	8
	IPENZ	Heritage Inventory	0	19
	NZ Defence Force	Heritage Inventory	10	10

Local Authorities	No. of sites listed in the Rail Heritage Register		No. of heritage sites listed in IPENZ Heritage Inventory		No. of heritage sites listed in NZ Defence Force Heritage Inventory.	
	1995	2005	1995	2005	1995	2005
Carterton	1	1	0	0	0	0
Hutt	1	1	0	0	0	0
KCDC	2	2	0	0	0	0
Masterton	1	1	0	0	0	0
Porirua	0	1	0	0	0	0
South Wairarapa	0	0	0	3	0	0
Upper Hutt	0	0	0	0	9	9
Wellington	1	1	0	16	1	1

There are a number of very valuable specialist heritage inventories of relevance to the Wellington Region. The Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand was established in 1991 in order to protect heritage rail buildings and other structures. The Rail Trust has established a national Register of significant rail heritage. Rail buildings at Otaki, Carterton, Lower Hutt, and Wellington are currently listed in the Register.²²

The Institute of Professional Engineers of New Zealand (IPENZ) have recently established a national heritage committee. This committee is responsible for developing a heritage assessment programme. The programme aims to identify those structures of historical engineering significance. The Petone Waterworks Dams is an example of the type of structures listed in the assessment programme.²³

A few corporations and government departments have formalised heritage policies. An example is the Heritage Policy of the New Zealand Defence Force. This policy documents internal defence force policy and practice regarding heritage and includes a list of Defence Buildings Assessed for Heritage Value. The list includes buildings at the Trentham Military Camp and HMNZS Olphert in Wellington. This draft policy is not yet formally approved by the Chief of Defence Force.²⁴

²² For further information, contact: The Secretary, Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand, 92 Nicholson Road, Khandallah Wellington, phone 04 479 6780 and fax 04 479 6780

²³ For further information, contact IPENZ (www.ipenz.org.nz)

²⁴ New Zealand Defence Force, 'Draft Heritage Policy ' August 2002. Contact G Pennefather, NZDF Headquarters, Wellington

Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: Number and type of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards

Description: Measures change and extent of knowledge of the values of heritage places in the Wellington Region by measuring the proportion of identified places assessed using best practice assessment standards in various heritage registers and inventories

Knowledge of the historic heritage resource	I.2	Number and type of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards	Data	S R
		NZHPT	No. of post-1993 registered historic places, areas, wahi tapu	127
		NZHPT	No. of reviewed and upgraded registered places, areas, wahi tapu	73
		Local authorities	No. of sites identified in heritage inventories assessing using best practice assessment standards	884
		Local authorities	No. of sites listed in Heritage Schedules assessed using best practice assessment standards	1029
		NZAA	No. of upgraded recorded archaeological sites	0
		DOC, Rail Heritage Trust, Other	No. of sites listed in heritage inventories assessed using best practice assessment standards	75
		Iwi	No. of sites listed in iwi heritage inventories using best practice assessment standards	1035

Local Authority	No. of post-1993 registered items.	No. of upgraded registered sites.	No. of Upgraded NZAA archaeological sites	No. of sites identified in heritage inventories using best practice	No. of sites listed in Heritage schedules using best practice	No. of sites listed in other heritage inventories using best practice	No. of sites in iwi inventories assessed using best practice
Carterton	1	1	0	0	0	5	0
Hutt	12	36	0	0	0	10	See * below
KCDC	9	4	0	Pending	138	10	300
Masterton	7	4	0	198	205	1	240
Porirua	46 ²⁵	9	0	0	0	4	85
South Wairarapa	7	2	0	0	0	10	0
Upper Hutt	2	0	0	0	0	10	410*
Wellington	43	17	0	686	686	25	(includes Hutt City)
Total	127	73	0	884	1029	75	1035

Rationale:

This indicator analyses the changing proportion of places identified on registers or schedules which have involved the adoption of best practice heritage criteria and/or which were based on best practice assessment processes.

The NZHPT Register and many other heritage lists contain places and sites that were listed without the use of systematic identification or significance assessment standards and methods. A key aspect of improved standards is the establishment of stated criteria or other bases for the assessment of heritage value. Examples of improved standards include section 23 criteria for registration of historic places and historic areas; guidelines for assessing significance (Vossler, 2001), criteria for inclusion in heritage inventories and district plan schedules. These standards require new listings or updated listings to contain information that indicates that the place or item does have heritage value. The information often includes photographs/plans, heritage fabric assessment, historical documentation, and an assessment of heritage value. The standards also outline the process by which heritage value is established, including consultation with building owners and other interested parties.

As stated in the Australian Environmental Indicators report, 'an increasing proportion of identified places with or using best practice heritage assessment criteria or processes reflects an improvement in our understanding of heritage places.'²⁶ The indicator also signals an improvement in the quality of the heritage register or list and its usefulness to assist with protective processes and mechanisms.

²⁵ The majority of post-1993 registrations in the Porirua district relate to archaeological sites at Whiteria.

²⁶ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 41

Discussion:

NZHPT Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas

As indicated above, a large number of places currently on the NZHPT Register were listed before 1993 when processes to identify heritage significance were in their infancy. Generally, registrations after 1993 have been required to meet best practice heritage assessment standards and the Trust has been upgrading and reviewing a large number of pre-1993 registrations to ensure these places are reassessed using best practice assessment standards.

Heritage Inventories

Most heritage inventories adopt best practice heritage assessment standards to assist in selecting inventory candidates. The Wellington City Council Heritage Building Inventory was prepared with the assistance of a Heritage Planner, Conservation Architect, and two historians. Their professional expertise was used to develop assessment criteria to measure and review the heritage values of the non-residential buildings in the earlier 1995 inventory. In addition, the inventory developed a thematic framework as a way of structuring the identification of further heritage buildings in the City. As noted in the Inventory, the thematic framework 'established key themes and sub-themes in the development of Wellington, and it exposed some areas of Wellington history that were not represented (or were under-represented) in the 1995 Inventory.'²⁷

Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans

Heritage schedules in District or Regional Plans have been established by a range of methods. The minimal approach has been the adoption of the Trust's registered historic places and historic areas and the inclusion of these places in the District Plan without further assessment or analysis. Another common approach is the inclusion of registered historic places and historic areas with additional heritage places identified from local sources. Some local authorities have ensured best practice heritage assessment standards are adopted as criteria for the listing of items in the Heritage schedule. These standards include the preparation of a heritage inventory, photographic recording, consultation with owners, and an assessment of the heritage values of each particular item. These requirements provide key information about what each heritage item is; why it is listed in the District Plan; and why it merits protection via rules.

Examples of best practice heritage assessments in the Wellington Region include Kapiti Coast District Plan Heritage Schedule, Wellington City District Plan Heritage Schedule, and Masterton District Plan Heritage Schedule.

²⁷ WCC, *Heritage Building Inventory*, Boffa Miskell Limited with Chris Cochran for WCC, 2001

NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites

The NZAA recognises that some of the information about recorded archaeological sites may be problematic. The problems include locational data, site information, and condition. This situation means that the location of many archaeological sites identified by the NZAA and in the district plans schedules may not be accurate and the condition of such sites is largely unknown.

To improve this situation, the NZAA has embarked upon a national Site Record Upgrade Scheme. This scheme, partially funded by the Crown, Lotteries Commission and local authorities, involves re-recording all recorded archaeological sites in each district. This project is a collaborative venture between the NZAA, Councils, iwi, and the landowners. In early 2005, the NZAA Site Record Upgrade commenced in the Wellington Region and this project will be completed by late 2005/early 2006.

Within the Wellington Region, some individual sites or areas have been the subject of resurveys. For example, the Greater Wellington Regional Council has recently commissioned the resurvey of archaeological sites within the East Harbour and Belmont Regional Parks.

Department of Conservation, CMS and List of Actively Managed Sites and Other heritage schedules

DOC has adopted a national standard for the identification and assessment of historic resources (SOP 1020 Heritage Protection on the Conservation Estate). All Actively Managed Sites have been identified and selected according to best practice heritage assessments and procedures. Other heritage schedules such as the Rail Heritage Trust Register and the IPENZ heritage list has also adopted best practice heritage assessments and procedures.

Iwi Heritage Schedules

While, there is no established best practice standard for the identification and selection of sites of significance to iwi, iwi heritage schedules must be at a standard to ensure the recognition of sites of significance to iwi. Some tentative standards for the preparation of an iwi heritage schedule or inventory would be that the project:

- Has the support of the Iwi katoa and the mandated Runanga.
- Is properly funded
- Involves kaumatua and kuia who may have knowledge about sites of significance within a district.
- Adopts both Maatauranga Maori (Maori knowledge systems) and 'scientific' knowledge.
- Uses both oral and written primary historical sources, including the minutes of the Maori Land Court

- Ensures the sites of significance are located on the ground
- Ensures the sites of significance are mapped using GIS systems.
- Includes a clear statement of significance based on tikanga Maori.
- Includes a clear statement of sites relating to wahi tapu and wahi tuupuna
- Adopts archaeological expertise if required.
- Includes consultation with landowners if possible

It appears that the iwi heritage inventories completed or currently being prepared (as outlined above) have adopted most of these tentative standards.

Historic Heritage Threats/Pressure

Issue: Condition of Heritage

Indicator: Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished

Description: Shows the extent to which heritage places have been reported as destroyed or severely modified during a set period.

Condition of heritage	I.3	Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished	NZHPT Register NZAA Local Authority Resource Consent database	S P
		NZHPT	No. of entries removed from the Register, 95-05	65
		Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate listed heritage building or item, 95-05	13
		Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed heritage building or item	?
		NZHPT	No. of archaeological authorities issued to destroy, damage, or modify archaeological sites, 03-04	21
		Community	Results from survey about perception of state of heritage places	
		Other	DOC monitoring	

Local Authority	No. of entries removed from the NZHPT register by 1995, and by 2005 ²⁸		No. of resource consents issued to demolish or relocate listed heritage buildings or items ²⁹		No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed heritage building or item		No. of archaeological authorities issued to destroy, damage, or modify archaeological sites	
	1995	2005	1995	2005	1995	2005	1995	2003-04
Carterton	0	0						0
Hutt	3	1		12		46		1
KCDC	3	0				24	1	4
Masterton	2	0						0
Porirua	0	0						3
South Wairarapa	2	0		0		12		0
Upper Hutt	2	0						1
Wellington	51	1		1			1	12
Total	63	2 (65)					2	21

Rationale:

Historic heritage threats can be generally divided between (re)development threats, rural development, and non-development or heritage decay. Urban-based redevelopment threatens heritage by activities such as demolition, relocations, additions, and alterations. This threat is concentrated in Wellington City, especially the CBD. Within Wellington City, additions and alterations to heritage items has become a key heritage issue in the Capital. Other areas that face redevelopment threats include Hutt City, Porirua, and the Wairarapa. In the Wairarapa there is a demand to relocate heritage buildings from urban areas such as Masterton to the countryside or to other towns such as Martinborough.

Rural development threats involve the destruction of heritage by both urban expansion and rural redevelopment (rural subdivision). Often recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites are destroyed by such development. The focus of this threat is the Kapiti Coast. The Kapiti Coast District has high population growth and a large number of unrecorded archaeological sites. The combination of these factors means a huge loss of heritage over time on an ad hoc basis. Another focus is the Wairarapa coast which is experiencing increased coastal development pressure. Archaeological sites around the Pauatahanui Harbour area are also at risk from rural development.

Heritage decay is difficult to assess or determine. The threat in this case is non-development or little incentive to restore and maintain heritage items. There is a need for monitoring strategies to determine the extent of this threat.

Ideally, indicators should indicate if the damage or loss has been caused by natural causes, decay or neglect, or by human interventions permitted by resource consent process.

²⁸ It appears all entries removed from the Register were Category II Historic Places

²⁹ Registered items that were demolish or relocated were limited to Category II Historic Places or listed places within Historic Areas.

NZHPT Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas

The link between the actual loss of historic places and the Register can be weak. This is because the process of modification or destruction is generally regulated by the Resource Management Act 1991 and places may remain on the Register long after they have actually been highly modified by removal or alterations or destroyed. As part of the upgrade and review process, the Trust is seeking to improve this situation by ensuring places are removed from the Register if they have been destroyed or have been severely modified to the extent that the continued presence of the item on the Register cannot be justified.

Scheduled Heritage Places, District and Regional Plans

All local authority District Plans in the Wellington Region require resource consent to demolish, relocate, or carry out substantial alterations and additions to listed buildings and items. Few resource consents have been actually issued to demolish or relocate listed buildings and items and generally this information should be readily available from local authorities. An exception to this rule was Hutt City, which did not require consent to demolish or relocated listed heritage places before 2004.

The Trust is also consulted on all proposals to demolish or relocate (both on registered listed buildings and non-registered listed buildings) and the Trust's resource consent database can also be used to determine actual numbers of demolished or relocated listed buildings and items. It appears from the Trust's database only one listed/registered building in the Wellington Region has been demolished (with the exception of Hutt City Council).

Alterations and additions to listed buildings and items are more difficult to measure. Most building-related resource consents involve alterations and additions and there has been a general increase in resource consents reviewed by the Trust. In 1997-1998, the Trust's Central Region office reviewed some 104 consents from the entire Central Region (Taranaki, Hawke's Bay, Wanganui-Manawatu, Wellington, and Northern South Island regions). This figure contrasts with some 240 consents reviewed in 2002-2003 and 360 consents reviewed in 2003-2004.

Clearly, the numbers of consents involving listed buildings and items can be determined. However, as found in the Australian SOE experience, counting numbers of consents provided little valuable information:

In the case of historic places, it appears at present that information relating to building approvals may not identify whether the particular proposal is beneficial or detrimental to heritage values. All the counting of building approvals would indicate would be a change in the rate of activity – more information would be

needed to determine if that activity was detrimental to the condition of the historic environment.³⁰

Outside Wellington City, the number of resource consents issued per year involving listed buildings is not large and it may be possible to determine if the consent resulted in substantial and severe loss of heritage values. Some of this information was acquired during the sampling survey as part of indicator I.4 below.

Within Wellington City, using resource consent numbers alone is problematic since most damage is caused by substantial alterations and additions as a controlled activity. To monitor the effectiveness of the District Plan in this regard, the Wellington City Council undertook a heritage monitoring project for the period June 2000 – December 2004. Generally the monitoring outcomes were not positive for heritage. With regard to a sample of 55 listed buildings that had resource consents granted, the following occurred:

- Heritage values were enhanced in 9% of cases
- Heritage values were not affected in 36% of cases
- Negative impacts to heritage values occurred in 55% of cases.³¹

Based on the sample data, the report states that ‘we can infer that of the 143 listed heritage buildings granted resource consent since June 2000, 48 have had a more than minor loss of heritage values. This represents 10% of the entire list of heritage buildings and a rapid rate of loss for such a short period.’³² The study also found the loss of heritage has been concentrated in the Wellington CBD with some 85% of resource consents issued since June 2000 located within the central area. This finding confirms the Trust’s view that residential heritage buildings have retained higher heritage integrity than commercial and industrial heritage buildings.

It would be of assistance if the local authorities kept an accessible record of annual numbers of resource consents relating to listed heritage places and activities such as subdivision, demolition, relocation, additions, alterations, and signage. Further, the local authorities could monitor the results of these consent decisions in terms of heritage outcomes and this information could become part of a regional monitoring framework.

NZAA Recorded Archaeological Sites

The Trust’s archaeological authority database records authorities issued to damage, destroy, or modify archaeological sites. Not all authorities issued, however, actually involve damage or modifications to archaeological sites. For example, in the case of many section 12 archaeological authorities, the authority is issued because there is

³⁰ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting*, natural and historic heritage, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 43

³¹ WCC, Draft District Plan Monitoring Programme, Effectiveness of the Plan relating to Heritage, June 2000 – December 2004, p 6

³² *ibid*, p 7

'reasonable cause to suspect' that unrecorded archaeological sites may be uncovered by earthworks in an area – the actual work may avoid the archaeological sites. Archaeological authorities may also be issued to enable restorative or mitigation work to take place on archaeological sites and this work would have positive effects on the heritage environment. In addition, there is currently no capacity to monitor many archaeological authority conditions thus the actual result of authorities 'on the ground' is generally unknown. However, reports produced as a result of the conditions of the authorities may provide a starting point.

Clearly numbers of archaeological authorities are increasing at a national and regional level. In Wellington City the increase relates to pre-1900 historic buildings and this accounts for most of authorities issued by the Trust between 2003-2004. On the Kapiti Coast, most archaeological authorities have covered earthworks that have disturbed unrecorded sub-surface sites within the coastal dune system. This remains an important heritage issue on the coast and sites and koiwi continue to be exposed in relation to subdivision-related works. In Porirua, authorities were issued in the context of minor works within archaeological landscapes, such as the new security fence at Paremata Barracks and new fencing at Whitieria.

As with numbers of resource consents, further information would be required by a sampling strategy and monitoring of archaeological sites subject to archaeological authorities. This information should become available as part of the Wellington NZAA Site Record Upgrade project.

Community

Understanding community perception of the state of heritage is important. Many heritage groups and individuals carry out 'unofficial' monitoring of heritage places on a daily basis. Often these groups and individuals identify incremental changes that are not measured by any consents or monitoring programmes.

Understandings of the community heritage environment were the subject of a survey in 2004. This was a targeted survey of heritage organisations conducted by the Trust and GWRC. A summary of the results of this survey is included in appendix 5. The survey results generally show a positive change in the perception of the state of the region's heritage. For example, the Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand considered that the condition of railway heritage is much better than it was 10 years ago, and would now rate an 8/10 compared with 5/10 a decade ago. This view reflects substantial efforts by community groups to retain and restore key heritage places. The Fell Museum complex and the ANZAC Memorial Hall in Featherston are good examples of heritage places preserved by community efforts. Another example is St Joseph's Church and St Alban's Church in Pauatahanui.

Issue: Condition of Heritage

Indicator: The proportion of places being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity

Description: Indicates the physical condition of the heritage places using a regional sampling audit strategy.

Condition of heritage	I.4	The proportion of places being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity	Survey of listed heritage items and archaeological sites	S P
-----------------------	-----	---	--	--------

Rationale:

The monitoring of the condition of heritage places has not been previously attempted on a regional scale. The KCDC Monitoring Strategy does aim to carry out some sampling or monitoring survey, including visits to a sample of listed places, and Wellington City has carried out a similar monitoring programme. The Trust has no systematic programme to monitor the condition of registered places.

The Australian SOE indicators programme originally attempted to sample the 'number of heritage places as being in good, average, and poor condition at a national level.' However, after a review of this sampling programme in 2001, the indicators were amended to include factors such as integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity. These factors were included because it was found that while many buildings or structures were assessed to be in good physical condition, substantial alterations had undermined the integrity of the fabric:

An observation, particularly of commercial premises in urban centres and regional towns, is that they had retained good condition externally (except on their ground floor shop fronts in most cases), but their interiors were substantially modified, and while in good condition, had low internal integrity. Their historical associations and functional significance had been severely diminished as a result. There are, for example, few country town emporiums retaining their internal fittings and internal space characteristics.³³

³³ Michael Pearson et al, *Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra, 2001, p 34

Other issues raised in the Australian survey included:

- Obtaining permission from owners to visit properties was time and resource consuming.
- Many interiors of buildings were not accessible for survey (only 50% of all places with interiors were accessible).
- To ensure a representative sample was obtained, the survey selections requires planning (rather than random selection) to achieve a balance between rural, suburban and urban places and a balance between residential, commercial, public, industrial place types, and sites of significance to the indigenous people.
- Many remote heritage places were not sampled.
- It was originally planned that community groups would carry out the survey. This ideal, however, was not realised and professional heritage consultants completed the project.
- The survey of historic or conservation areas was difficult in terms of the adopted methodology which was generally designed to assess individual items (rather than groups of items and the relationships between these items in an area or landscape)

Despite these limitations, the Australian survey produced valuable documentation about the state of the heritage resource and raised issues relating to the loss of values through changes for new uses, loss of values as result of modernising alterations, threats from urban growth, the state of large former government buildings, the high integrity and good condition of residential buildings, and high maintenance issues with regard to churches.³⁴

Regional Wellington Survey

A survey was undertaken of a sample of registered historic places from each local authority area in the greater Wellington region during the summer of 2005. The survey was based on the Australian survey discussed above, though modifications were made to ensure its relevancy to the Wellington regions heritage environment. The survey guide is attached in Appendix 6.

The sample of heritage buildings, attached in Appendix 7, was developed to include a representative selection of places from each local authority area in the greater Wellington region. The sample included a variety of historic places, including commercial, residential and public buildings in a mix of rural and urban locations for each District. It was initially decided to survey 10% of the historic places registered with the NZHPT in each District; however, this would have resulted in only 1 or 2 buildings in some District and over 30 in Wellington. It was instead decided to survey either 10% of registered buildings in each District as at 2004 numbers, or 5 historic places, whichever was greater.

³⁴ *ibid*, pp 37-38

Early in the planning stages, it was decided that a survey of Wellington City's historic places was not necessary as the Wellington City Council was carrying out its own survey process as outlined above. This survey, however, adopted different criteria and was tied to monitoring resource consent outcomes, rather than a strict focus on condition and integrity. A future re-survey of the Wellington Region would need to include Wellington City.

The survey was organised and coordinated by Robert McClean, Heritage Adviser at the Central Region NZHPT branch, and Penelope Laurenson, a Planning Masters student from the University of Otago. Xanthe Howes (NZHPT architect) also assisted in the survey of a number of Wairarapa buildings. The results of the survey are indicated in the appendix 7. It is noted that not all the selected buildings were surveyed and for a number the survey was limited to the exterior.

While the survey was limited by the small number of places visited for each district, some tentative conclusions are:

1. The condition and integrity of most of the surveyed heritage buildings was generally positive. Many buildings show evidence of recent repair and maintenance and had uses compatible with their heritage value. There did not appear to be any major differences between Category I and Category II with regard to condition and integrity.
2. The integrity of private residential buildings tended to be healthier than commercial and public buildings. However, in some cases public and commercial buildings were in better condition. A number of residential dwellings are cause for alarm, especially those houses that have lost their original usage. In this regard, Taylor-Stace Cottage (Porirua) is a key concern. This building is a Category I Historic Place and the oldest cottage in the Wellington region. The cottage is used as an office and pipe store and is threatened by flooding and general decay.
3. The condition of outbuildings associated with rural buildings is a key concern. With changes in farm practices and management, these buildings often become 'redundant' with a loss of utility value. An example is Sayers Slab Whare (Category I) which was a historic family home and then used farm storage shed. The Whare is at serious risk of collapse and is threatened by a neighbouring tree. The building has been the subject of an NZHPT Heritage Incentive Fund grant and work to remove the tree commenced in April 2005.
4. The integrity of commercial buildings is a key concern, especially in the main towns. While, the condition of many of these buildings is good, most have been modified (especially at the ground-level) for new shop fit outs and renovations. For many commercial premises, the remaining heritage fabric is often limited to the main street façade above the veranda. This finding is

supported by the WCC heritage monitoring project. If these trends continue, Wellington Region will have few remaining heritage commercial buildings in the main urban areas that could be described as in an original state. In rural areas, there are a number of original commercial premises that remain and continue to operate. However, many of these buildings require ongoing repair and maintenance.

5. Most heritage buildings in the public domain have high integrity and are in good condition. These buildings are also often open to the public for functions and meetings. Examples include Gear Homestead (Porirua) and Norbury House (Hutt). Both of these dwellings were private residential dwellings that have been acquired by the respective local authorities for public use. Other public buildings of high integrity and good condition include Petone Settlers Museum (Hutt), Carterton Public Library (Carterton), St Mary's Catholic Church (Carterton); St Joseph's Church (Porirua), St Alban's Church (Porirua).
6. In some cases, former buildings associated with the Government, hospital etc remain at risk as a result of restructuring and Government land reorganisation. Both the Mental Health Museum (Porirua) and the Wallaceville Animal Research Centre (Upper Hutt) are in this situation. Both buildings are Category I, are at risk, and are in poor condition. There has been recent progress to manage and repair the Mental Health Museum thanks to the hard work of museum volunteers. The situation of the Wallaceville Animal Research Centre is not so positive and the building has effectively been abandoned.
7. As a general observation, a limited number of heritage buildings have been converted into museums (either general museums or house museums). Examples of museums within heritage buildings in the Wellington Region include Cobblestones (Greytown), Fell Museum (Featherston), Nairn Cottage (Wellington), Katherine Mansfield House (Wellington); Waikanae Museum (Kapiti) and Golder's Cottage (Upper Hutt).

Historic Heritage Responses

Issue: Protection by Central and Local Government

Indicator: Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect heritage places

Description: Measures any change in the application of statutory protection for heritage places offered by the active use of heritage legislation and resource management legislation.

Protection by Central Government and Local Government		Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect heritage places		R
		DOC, Local authorities	Reserves Act 1977	Historic reserves Other reserves
		DOC	Conservation Act 1987	Conservation Areas with Historic Resources
		QEII Trust	QEII Trust Act 1977	QEII Covenants
		Maori Land Court	Te Turi Whenua Maori Land Act 1993	Maori reservations
		NZHPT	Historic Places Act 1993	Trust properties
			Heritage Covenants	Covenants
		Local authorities Heritage Protection Authorities	RMA 1991	Heritage Orders
		Regional Councils	RMA 1991	Regional Plan rules
		District Councils	RMA 1991	District Plan rules

Rationale:

The legislative framework for historic heritage is managed by four different but intersecting regulatory streams coming from different planning traditions. These are:

- Heritage classification and archaeological sites: Historic Places Act 1993, NZHPT

- Land-use planning and building regulation: Resource Management Act 1991, Building Act 1991, local authorities
- Reserve management: Reserves Act 1977, Conservation Act 1989, QEII Trust Act 1977, DOC, NZHPT, local authorities
- Maori land and Maori-based planning: Te Turi Whenua Act 1993, Maori authorities (iwi and hapu)

An additional historic heritage regulatory stream is the Antiquities Act 1975 which is managed by the Ministry of Culture and Heritage. This report, however, does not include the monitoring or measurement of indicators associated with antiquities or artefacts.

New Zealand's Heritage Regulatory Environment				
	Classification and Archaeological Sites	Land use and Building regulation	Reserve management	Maori-land/Maori-based planning
General Focus	Identify places of significant historic heritage value Management of all archaeological sites	Sustainable management of all land, air, water resources (excluding reserves) Building regulation	Management and conservation of reserves	Maori land management Control of sites of significance to Maori
Key legislation	Historic Places Act 1993	Resource Management Act 1991 Crown Minerals Act 1991	Reserves Act 1977 National Parks Act 1980 Conservation Act 1987 QEII Trust Act 1977	Te Turi Whenua Act 1993 Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975
Key agencies	NZ Historic Places Trust Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Ministry for the Environment Local authorities Building Standards Authority	Department of Conservation NZCA Local authorities	Maori land Trusts Maori Land Court Te Puni Kokiri Iwi and hapu
Key policy and planning documents	Statements of General Policy The Register Conservation Plans	National Policy Statements Regional Policy Statements Regional and District Plans	Statements of General Policy Conservation Management Strategies Management Plans	Iwi Management Plans

The long-term conservation of heritage places relies, to some extent, on the availability and effectiveness of each specific legislation regime and the heritage component within that legislation regime. While legislation, however, may exist that

enables heritage sites to be protected, the provisions provided by the law are not always implemented. The indicator, therefore, measures two components:

1. The level of statutory protection irrespective of implementation
2. The level of implementation of statutory protection measures

Discussion:

Reserves Act 1977

The purpose of the Reserves Act 1977 is to provide for the preservation and management areas of New Zealand that possess, among other values, natural, scenic, historic, cultural, archaeological, biological, geological, scientific, educational, community, or other special features or value. The Act provides for the establishment of a range of reserves including recreation, historic, scenic, scientific, Government purpose, and local purpose reserves. It is an offence to damage any historic sites within any type of reserve classified under the Reserves Act.

The Wellington Region has only two historic reserves. These are the Government Buildings Historic Reserve and the Turnbull House Historic Reserve.

A large number of other reserves have heritage or historic significance. Examples include Wrights Hill Stewardship, Somes Island Reserve, Battery Hill Stewardship, Kelburn Observatory Reserve, and Kapiti Island Nature Reserve. The Forest Parks also have a large number of historic resources and DOC via the Wellington Conservation Management Strategy manages these resources.

During 2004, the Trust has taken a greater interest in Paremata Barracks, Ngati Toa Domain, Porirua. With the support of the Porirua City Council, the barracks were fenced and later a hole created by vandals was repaired. A successful NZ Lotteries Board application enabled the preparation of a draft conservation plan. The draft plan recommends the establishment of a historic reserve (currently classified a recreational reserve) and the upgrading of the site to Category I NZHPT status.

Local Government Act 2002: Regional Parks

Wellington Regional Council manages the regional parks system under the Local Government Act. Heritage resources within these parks include water dams and structures, the Rimutaka Rail Trail, lighthouse, and military-related installations. The Regional Council has developed an overall regional park strategy, which includes management policies for heritage within the regional parks.

The local authorities own and manage a large number of reserves that have heritage significance. Examples include the Basin Reserve, Town Belt, and Wellington Botanic Garden. The Hutt City Council has recently completed an overall reserve management strategy which includes heritage-related policies. Kapiti Coast District

Council is developing a reserves acquisition policy and this also has a heritage component.

Conservation Act 1987

The purpose of the Conservation Act 1987 is to promote the conservation of New Zealand's natural and historic resources, and for that purpose to establish a Department of Conservation (DOC). The functions include the management of land for the conservation of historic resources, to advocate for the conservation of historic resources generally, and to promote the benefits of the conservation of historic resources. It is an offence under the Conservation Act to interfere with or damage any historic or natural feature of, or on, any conservation area.

Conservation planning includes national general policies, conservation management strategies, and conservation management plans. The Wellington Conservation Management Strategy includes a number of objectives relating to historic resources. The focus of these objectives is the conservation of historic places on land managed by DOC which are of high historic significance.³⁵ The implementation policies include:

- Inventory of historic resources on the DOC estate
- Review and update of historic resources strategy
- Archaeological resource statement
- Historic resource surveys
- Conservation plans
- Remedial work
- Consultation with tangata whenua

The Strategy lists 14 historic sites to be actively managed. As noted above, this list has been updated and expanded. The Strategy identifies 9 areas for thematic study. These studies cover the themes of Maori occupation, Maori horticulture, Maori warfare/defence, wahi tapu, whaling, shipping, farming, recreation, and nature conservation. The planned areas for survey for historic resources include Tararua foothills timber industry sites, Aorangi Forest Park, Horowhenua Crown land, Wairarapa Crown land, and southern Kapiti Island.³⁶

Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977

The Queen Elizabeth II Trust Act 1977 established the QEII Trust to 'encourage and promote the provision, protection, and enhancement of open space for the benefit and enjoyment of people of New Zealand.'³⁷ Open space means any 'area of land or body of water that serves to preserve or to facilitate the preservation of any landscape of aesthetic, cultural, recreational, scenic, scientific, or social interest or

³⁵ DOC, *Conservation Management Strategy, Vol 1 for Wellington, 1996-2005*, DOC, 1996, p 157

³⁶ *ibid*, p 159

³⁷ Long Title, QEII National Trust Act 1977

value.³⁸ The Act facilitated a system of open space covenants on private land. The general focus of the covenants has been to protect land with high natural values. It is unknown if any of the QEII covenants in the Wellington Region protect historic heritage places.

Te Turi Whenua Maori Land Act 1993

Historically, the Native Land Court and the Maori Land Court has established Maori reserves for historic purposes or to protect areas of significance to Maori. These sites are now managed under the Te Turi Whenua Maori Land Act 1993. Some of the places, mostly urupa, are vested in the Maori Trustee.

Further research is required to determine the numbers and extent of Maori reserves that were established to protect historic or cultural sites. Some examples in the Porirua District include:

- Te Rauparaha Reserve, Motuhara Road, Plimmerton (includes NZHPT plaque) Taupo Pa urupa (Plimmerton Domain)
- Pa Road urupa, Pukerua Bay
- Onepu Road urupa, Pukerua Bay
- Hongoeka 7 Block V, urupa, Hongoeka Bay urupa
- Takapuwhia urupa, Puaha Road, Takapuwhia

Historic Places Act 1993

NZHPT Properties

The Historic Places Act 1993 empowers the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (the Trust) to 'manage, administer, and control all historic places, buildings, and other property owned or controlled by the Trust, or vested in it, to ensure the protection, preservation, and conservation of such historic places, buildings, and other property.'³⁹

Within the Wellington Region, four properties are managed by the Trust: Pencarrow Lighthouse, Antrim House Boulcott Street, Wallaceville Blockhouse, and Old Saint Pauls. The Trust has also had a role in managing Paremata Barracks since 1959.

Heritage Covenants

The Trust can negotiate and agree with the owner of any owner (or lessee/licensee) of any historic place, historic area, wahi tapu, or wahi tapu area for the execution of a heritage covenant to provide for the protection, conservation, and maintenance of that place, area, or wahi tapu.⁴⁰

³⁸ sec 2, *ibid*

³⁹ sec 39(e) Historic Places Act 1993

⁴⁰ sec 6(1), Historic Places Act 1993

Heritage covenants currently protect the following properties:

- Schow's Barn and Whare, Mount Munro Road, Mauriceville West, Masterton
- Mangatoetoe Grove and Ben Avon Grove, Maori garden stone walls/borrow pit, Cape Palliser Road
- Archaeological site R26/291 (Midden) 14 Kohutuhutu Road, Raumati
- Cottage, Paekakariki Hill Road

Resource Management Act 1991

Heritage Orders

The Resource Management Act 1991 provides for a system of heritage orders for the purpose of protecting 'any place of special interest, character, intrinsic or amenity value or visual appeal, or of special significance to the tangata whenua for spiritual, cultural, or historical reasons; and such area of land (if any) surrounding that place as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of ensuring the protection and reasonable enjoyment of that place.'⁴¹

A heritage order is a provision made in a District Plan to give effect to a requirement made by a heritage protection authority. A heritage protection authority includes any Minister of the Crown, local authorities, NZHPT, and a body corporate that is approved as a heritage protect authority. The Minister for the Environment has approved two heritage protection authorities in relation to the Wellington Region, these being the 'Save Erskine College Trust' and the 'Friends of Mount Street Cemetery Inc'.

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust has issued notice of six heritage orders in the Wellington Region. All of these orders relate to significant buildings in Wellington City:

- Public Trust Building, Lambton Quay
- Plimmer House, Boulcott Street
- St James Theatre, Courtenay Place
- Former BNZ Building, Lambton/Customhouse Quay
- State Insurance Building, Lambton Quay
- Prime Minister's Residence, Tinakori Road,

Wellington Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plans

Chapter 10 of the RPS for the Wellington Region outlines a range of issues, objectives, and policies relating to landscape and heritage. Cultural heritage is defined as 'buildings, structures, sites, areas, wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas associated with human activity which are inherited from the past or are of value to

⁴¹ sec 189(1) Resource Management Act 1991

future generations, and which are considered to be of special value.’⁴² The Statement outlines the range of agencies involved in historic heritage and says that ‘agencies need to co-operate to avoid any duplication of function and effort in this area.’⁴³ Objective 3 states that:

The historic heritage of the Region which is of regional significance is:

- (1) recognised as being of importance to the Region
- (2) Managed in an integrated manner with other resources; and
- (3) Conserved and sustained for present and future generations.⁴⁴

In the explanation of this objective, the Policy Statement states that historic heritage is primarily the responsibility of territorial authorities and that the objectives and policies of the Policy Statement only applies to structures and places of regional significance. The explanation of Policy 6 says that regionally significant structures and places are those places listed as Category I items in the NZHPT Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas... ‘Category I entries in this Register are of outstanding or special value and are therefore worthy of recognition at a regional level.’⁴⁵ Method 8 states that the Regional Council will ‘investigate the need for, and prepare if necessary, a regional plan for regionally significant historic heritage matters.’⁴⁶

Other chapters in the Regional Policy Statement refer to historic heritage protection. Chapter 7 – Coastal Environment – includes a policy aimed at protection of regional outstanding sites of historical or cultural significance.⁴⁷ These include sites of historical features listed in Table 10 being:

- Wellington Harbour Sheds 7,11-13 and 21
- Massey Memorial, Point Halswell
- Paiaka Shipwreck
- Fitzroy Bay – concentration of archaeological sites
- Pencarrow lighthouse
- White Rock to Orori – concentration of archaeological sites.⁴⁸

As noted above, the Regional Coastal Plan for the Wellington Region includes a list of heritage-related features within the Areas of Important Conservation Value and Features and Buildings of Historic Merit. Policy 4.2.12 states ‘To protect significant cultural and historic features in the coastal marine area from the adverse effects of use and development. In particular, the values of the features and buildings identified in Appendix 4 [Features and Buildings of Historic Merit] will be

⁴² WRC, *Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region*, Operative, May 1996, p 5

⁴³ *ibid*, p 177

⁴⁴ Objective 3, *ibid*, p 179

⁴⁵ *ibid*, p 184

⁴⁶ *ibid*, p 186

⁴⁷ Policy 1, *ibid*, p 120

⁴⁸ *ibid*, pp 123-124

protected.⁴⁹ The Regional Coastal Plan also contains a range of objectives and policies relating to recognition and protection of sites of significance to tangata whenua in the coastal environment. The rules in the Plan, however, tend to exclude reference to the Areas of Important Conservation Value and the Features of Buildings of Historic Merit and thus these places are included in the Plan for information and advocacy purposes.

The other regional plans tend to exclude heritage-related issues and do not provide any specific heritage policies or rules. Exceptions to this rule are the objectives, policies and rules relating to sites of significance to tangata whenua.

District Plans Rules

Rules relating to listed heritage buildings and areas are a form of regulatory heritage protection. District plan rules generally require most major work involving a listed heritage item to require resource consent from the relevant local authority. Minor maintenance and repair is generally a permitted activity. Additions and alterations are either controlled or discretionary, and demolition or relocation is generally a discretionary or non-complying activity.

There are two main heritage rule approaches in the district plans. The first approach is a heritage schedule that is divided into categories of significance. An example is the Porirua City District Plan's approach in the table below:

District	Heritage Category	Rationale	Rule Example: Alteration, demolition, removal
Porirua City	JA	NZHPT Category I	Restricted discretionary
	JB	NZHPT Category II/Sites of district or regional significance	Restricted discretionary (no need to obtain written approval of affected parties)
	JC	Sites of local significance	Permitted

A variation on this approach is to have one heritage list, but with different rules depending on heritage significance. For example in the Kapiti Coast District Plan demolition or removal of a listed heritage item is a discretionary activity. However, for a NZHPT Category II item it is a non-complying activity and for a NZHPT Category I item it is a prohibited activity. This approach has been promoted by the Trust in its submissions to district plans since the early 1990s.

⁴⁹ WRC, *Regional Coastal Plan for the Wellington Region*, May 2000, p 28

The other main approach to heritage rules is one heritage list without categories and without varying rule application. This is the approach of Wellington City. For all heritage items listed in this plan, the rules are the same. The total or partial demolition, destruction or removal of any listed heritage areas, building or listed façade or other listed elements is a discretionary activity.

Kapiti Coast District is noted for its proactive approach to its District Plan Heritage Register. Each year the Council calls for new nominations or amendments/deletions to the Heritage Register. In 2001, 32 new heritage features were added to the Register. The Council has prepared and published a brochure that seeks public nominations and provides information about the heritage grants scheme.

Wellington City has the most extensive provision for heritage overlays or precincts with 21 heritage areas listed in the District Plan. In addition, Wellington has a number of inner city precinct zones and character areas. These include Thorndon, Te Aro, Mt Victoria, North Kelburn/Bolton, Roseneath, and particular institutional precincts. Design guides apply to Te Ara Haukawa, Stadium, Multi-Unit Housing, Subdivision, Courtenay Place, Cuba, Civic Centre, Thorndon, Mt Victoria, Newtown, Shelly Bay, Mount Cook, and Wellington Hospital.

Hutt City District Plan has a Historic Residential Activity Area (mainly limited to Patrick Street and Riddlers Crescent), Petone Commercial Activity Area (Jackson Street), and a Special Commercial Activity Area (Station Village).

South Wairarapa has a type of urban heritage zone with a rule that means any demolition or removal of any existing building in the Town Centre areas of Featherston, Greytown and Martinborough is a discretionary activity.

Issue: Protection by Central and Local Government

Indicator: Number of places assessed to be 'protected' by formal statutory instruments

Description: Measures any change in the effective implementation of statutory protection for heritage places offered by the active use of heritage legislation and resource management legislation.

Protection by Central and Local Government	Number of places assessed to be 'protected' by formal statutory instruments		R
	NZHPT DOC, Local Authorities	No. of conservation plans/condition reports for heritage places within reserves, conservation areas (including Trust properties)	21

	Local authorities	No. of district plans assessed to have (1) Comprehensive (2) Basic (3) Lacking, heritage rules	(1) Comprehensive: 8 Carterton , Hutt City, Kapiti Coast, Masterton, South Wairarapa, Wellington City, (2) Basic: 2 Porirua , Upper Hutt (3) Lacking: 0
--	-------------------	--	--

Rationale:

While the legislation may provide methods to protect heritage places and a number of places may be listed or reserved for protection, the numbers and the legislative provisions provide little information on actual 'protection' that is achieved. Further specific indicators are required to provide improved information on actual levels of protection. This information can also be provided by specialist survey and community survey

Historic Heritage Places within Reserves and Trust properties

In terms of reserves, it cannot be assumed that all historic places or sites within reserve or conservation areas are actually 'protected.' Many sites may be left to decay or may be removed and/or damaged as a result of reserve management actions. To provide further information on this matter, it is proposed to measure the number of heritage places within reserve or conservation areas (or properties managed by the Trust) that are subject to a conservation plan. A conservation plan is a specific plan for an individual building, site, or structure or a number of places within an area. The plan normally contains a historic heritage assessment, conservation or structural report, and a cyclical maintenance plan. Generally, the existence of a conservation plan indicates that the authority responsible is taking an active interest in a site or group of sites to ensure improved management and conservation.

There is no 'official' record of conservation plans in the Wellington Region so determining this measurement is a difficult exercise. Most conservation plans, however, are located within the Trust's library at Antrim House. A count of these plans finds some 21 conservation plans/condition reports relating to heritage places within reserve or conservation areas:

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Antrim House | NZHPT |
| 2. Bolton Street Cemetery, Wellington | WCC |
| 3. Dominion Observatory, Wellington | DOC |
| 4. Former Cable Car Winding House | WCC |
| 5. Government Buildings, Wellington | DOC |
| 6. Karori Cemetery, Wellington | WCC |
| 7. Katherine Mansfield House | Private Trust |
| 8. Lower Hutt War Memorial Library, Hutt | HCC |
| 9. National War Memorial, Wellington | MCH |

10. Matiu/Somes Island, Hutt	DOC
11. Old Saint Paul's	NZHPT
12. Paremata Barracks, Draft Porirua	NZHPT/PCC
13. Parliament Buildings	Government
14. Pencarrow Lighthouse, Hutt	NZHPT
15. Rimutaka Rail Trail, Upper Hutt	GWRC
16. Te Kahu-o-te-Rangi, Kapiti Coast	DOC
17. The Stables, Kapiti Coast	GWRC
18. Truby King Historic Area, Wellington	WCC
19. Turnbull House, Wellington	DOC
20. Wallaceville Blockhouse, Upper Hutt	NZHPT
21. Wright Hill Fortress, Wellington	WCC

District Plan Rules

As indicated above, heritage rules within District plans are a key method of implementing statutory protection for heritage places. To determine if District plans are effective in the implementation of statutory mechanisms, an assessment is required of the quality of the heritage rules. Poorly designed rules will not result in the effective protection of heritage places and the converse is true that robust and comprehensive rules will result in effective protection of heritage places. To assess the quality of heritage rules within District and Regional Plans, some key questions that form the assessment criteria are:

Resource Consent Information Requirements

- Does the Plan have comprehensive information requirements relating to heritage? (registered places, areas and precincts, recorded archaeological sites, sites of importance to tangata whenua, other heritage items)
- Does the Plan have some information requirements relating to heritage? (registered places and recorded archaeological sites)
- Does the Plan have any information requirements relating to heritage?

Heritage Schedule

- Does the Plan have a Heritage Schedule?
- Does the Schedule provide a comprehensive list of heritage sites, places, and areas (registered places, areas and precincts, recorded archaeological sites, sites of importance to tangata whenua, other heritage items)
- Does the Plan include a list of criteria for inclusion of items into the Schedule?
- Are the criteria for inclusion of items into the Schedule comprehensive?

Heritage Rules

- Does the Plan have any rules relating to Heritage?
- Does the Plan have any definitions relating to key heritage concepts?
- Is demolition and relocation of all listed built heritage items regulated as a discretionary or non-complying activity?
- Is demolition and relocation of all structures in Historic Area or Precinct regulated as a discretionary or non-complying activity?
- Is demolition of all registered historic places regulated as a discretionary or non-complying activity?
- Are major additions and alterations of all registered historic places regulated as a discretionary activity?

- Is subdivision regulated in Historic Areas and Precinct?
- Are there separate rules for archaeological sites and sites of significance to tangata whenua?

Assessment Criteria for Heritage Provisions, District Plans (Consent Information, Schedule, Rules only)				
	Points	Resource Consent Information Requirements	Heritage Schedule	Heritage Rules
Comprehensive	10	The plan has explicit and detailed information requirements for resource consents applications. All heritage items, registered historic places, areas, wahi tapu, recorded archaeological sites are identified, plus possible provision for requirements for further information, i.e. archaeological and heritage survey and conservation plan where relevant	The Heritage Schedule is an extensive list of heritage sites, places, and areas that includes registered places, areas, wahi tapu, recorded archaeological sites, archaeological overlays, sites of significance to tangata whenua, precincts. The Plan also contains a robust list of criteria for inclusion of items into the Schedule	The Rules regulate: demolition and relocation of all listed heritage items (discretionary or non-complying activity); demolition and relocation, subdivision within historic areas or precincts; demolition/relocation of all registered historic places; major alterations and additions to all registered places; destruction/modification to archaeological sites and sites of significance to tangata whenua with notice of requirement for HPA archaeological authority
The Basics	5	The Plan has some heritage-related information requirements relating to listed heritage items and registered historic places	The Heritage Schedule contains all registered places and areas, some other places, some archaeological sites/sites of significance to tangata whenua	The Rules regulate demolition/relocation to registered historic places. There is some other rules that protect archaeological sites and sites of significance to tangata whenua
Lacking	0	The Plan has no or very little heritage-related information requirements	The Heritage Schedule is restricted to a few registered places	The Rules don't regulate heritage-related activities

On the basis of these criteria, the following assessment is made of the heritage provisions in the district plans:

Local Authority	Resource Consent Information Requirements	Heritage Schedule	Heritage Rules
Carterton	Basic	Basic	Comprehensive
Hutt	Basic/Lacking	Basic	Comprehensive
Kapiti Coast	Comprehensive	Comprehensive	Comprehensive
Masterton	Comprehensive	Comprehensive	Comprehensive
Porirua	Comprehensive	Basic	Basic
South Wairarapa	Basic	Basic	Comprehensive

Upper Hutt	Comprehensive	Basic	Basic
Wellington City	Basic	Comprehensive	Comprehensive

It is positive that none of the district plans in the Wellington Region are considered to be 'lacking' in terms of their heritage rules. The only district plan that was lacking in this respect was City of Lower Hutt District Plan. This Plan now regulates demolition and relocation of listed heritage buildings and the rules are considered to be now as comprehensive. In the Wairarapa (excluding Masterton) and Upper Hutt, the more basic approach to heritage protection probably reflects less development pressure. In terms of the Wairarapa, the new draft Combined District Plan process should enable the preparation of a 'second generation' plan with robust heritage rules.

While this assessment exercise may be a useful guide, it can mask difficult heritage issues and problems. For example, the issue of alterations and additions as a controlled activity in Wellington has been the subject of review and is blamed for many inappropriate additions to listed heritage buildings. However, in other areas such as Upper Hutt (where additions are also a controlled activity), there is less pressure to make additions to listed heritage buildings and from the Trust's knowledge, no inappropriate additions have been consented in this district.

Resources and Training

Indicator: Funds provided and allocated for maintaining and enhancing heritage values and provision of heritage advice

Description: Measures funds provided and allocated to owners of heritage places (or community organisations and groups) for heritage protection from central and local government sources via strategies and other policy documents.

Resources and Training	I.5	Funds provided and allocated for maintaining and enhancing heritage values, heritage strategies, and provision of heritage advice	NZHPT, Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Lottery Grants Board, Sustainable Management Fund, local authorities, other	R
------------------------	-----	---	--	---

Rationale:

The long term identification and protection of heritage places is largely dependent on sufficient funding available to support research, heritage advice, and repair and restoration projects. While regulation may 'protect' a building from demolition or removal, if funding assistance is not available, the building may be subject to decay and neglect (demolition by neglect).

New Zealand Lotteries Board

The New Zealand Lotteries Board is New Zealand's most important source of funding for heritage projects. The criteria for funding assistance are limited to either local authorities, churches, trusts, incorporated societies, or other community organisations.

New Zealand Historic Places Trust

In Budget 2003, the Government announced a national heritage preservation incentive fund to be administered by the Trust with an annual appropriation approved by Parliament of \$563,000 (GST inclusive). The purpose of the incentive fund is to assist private owners of heritage properties who are unable to access other funding sources such as the New Zealand Lotteries Board. The fund is restricted to owners of Category I Historic Places or places of national significance.

At the time of writing this report, two restoration projects – Sayers Slab Whare and The Moorings – in the Wellington Region have received funding support under the Trust's incentive fund scheme.

Local Authorities

Wellington, Hutt City, and Kapiti Coast have formalised a heritage policy or strategy. The Wellington City Council Draft Built Heritage Strategy was prepared in 1995. The objective of this Strategy is 'A City with heritage resources that are respected and conserved.' The Strategy formed the 'launching pad' for the Council's heritage inventory project. The aim was: 'That all known built heritage items of value are accurately recorded in the Heritage Buildings Inventory by 1998 and that Council encourages their conservation through a programme of methods which match both the values of the item and the needs of its owner.'⁵⁰

The Council also produced Wellington's Built Heritage Policy, dated July 1998. The objective of this policy document is 'that Council encourages the conservation of built heritage items through a programme of methods which match both the values of the items and the needs of the owner.'⁵¹ Methods listed in the Heritage Policy include:

- Monitoring of heritage policy implementation
- Development of a Heritage Strategy
- Implementation of a Building Safety Project for all earthquake prone buildings
- Prepare a heritage areas and objects inventory
- Investigate and expand incentives programme

⁵⁰ WCC, *Built Heritage Strategy*, 1995 (available www.wcc.govt.nz)

⁵¹ WCC, *Wellington City Built Heritage Policy*, July 1998, p 3

The Built Heritage Policy was developed in conjunction with the WCC Building Safety Policy for Earthquake Prone Buildings. This policy aims to identify earthquake prone buildings and avoids or minimises the loss of built heritage/minimising conflict with the Council's heritage policy.⁵² With regard to heritage, the Policy is designed to target Council's assistance to the owners of heritage buildings that are suspected or confirmed as being earthquake prone.⁵³ The funding package includes:

- Funding to confirm if the building is earthquake prone (max of \$400)
- Funding for the preparation of a feasibility study for strengthening (max \$4,500)
- Funding for further working drawings and technical advice (max of \$10,000)
- General grant of \$15,000 towards strengthening work.⁵⁴

The Draft Wellington Heritage Strategy 2004, when adopted will replace the Built Heritage Policy and proposes a new heritage grants scheme. This scheme will include grants for conservation work, assistance with fire protection and repair work, funding for professional services, free conservation advice, and introducing a fee waiver for non-notified resource consent applications.

The Hutt City Council has supported a Heritage Advisory Group since the early 1990s. The role of the Group is to advise Council on heritage policy generally and to administer a heritage fund. The Hutt City Council's Heritage Policy was developed in August 2000. The goals of the Policy include the retention and promotion of heritage values, recognition and conservation of heritage sites, buildings, and areas, and the conservation of archives and collections of general, local and regional significance.⁵⁵

Kapiti Coast District Council's Heritage Strategy was adopted in October 2001. The Strategy aims to promote a range of heritage initiatives that include the co-ordination of heritage information, the development of a rates relief package, and the establishment of a Community Charitable Trust to develop and implement the Heritage Strategy. The Strategy includes a \$25,000 fund for grants. A recent project by Kapiti Coast District (with support of Horowhenua District Council) has been to prepare and publish a public brochure that is aimed at raising awareness about disturbance to archaeological sites along the coast. One thousand copies of the brochures have been printed and circulated to the public.

⁵² WCC, *Building Safety Policy for Earthquake Prone Buildings in Wellington*, 1998

⁵³ *ibid*, p 18

⁵⁴ *ibid*, p 22

⁵⁵ Hutt City Council, 'Heritage Policy', Development Policy Division, August 2000

Resources and Training

Indicator: Amount of funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for specific projects involving heritage places

Description: Measures funds provided by Central Government to heritage agencies at either the central or local government level.

Resources and Training	I.6	Specific project funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for heritage places	Government budget Local authorities	R
------------------------	-----	--	--	---

Rationale:

The inadequate funding of heritage agencies is a key international issue as the lack of funding results in poor heritage outcomes at both a national and regional level. Central Government allocates historic heritage funding via Vote Art, Culture and Heritage. This fund supports the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, and a range of heritage related initiatives including the Film Archive and War Graves. Other heritage-related funding is sourced from Vote Environment (Ministry for the Environment) and funding associated with Maori initiatives (Ministry for the Maori Development, Te Puni Kokiri).

Government funding is generally allocated on a national basis and it would be difficult to measure funding investment and budget by organisations such as the Trust at a regional level. However, specific heritage projects funded by Central Government relating to the Wellington Region can be identified. For example, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage manages the Regional Museums Policy and projects such as the proposed additions to the Cable Car Museum would be covered by this policy. Also, the National War Memorial restoration and 'Tomb of the Unknown Warrior' attracted substantial funding in the 2004-2005 budget.

Report Conclusions

The 'total' state of the historic heritage environment cannot be measured in a physical or mathematical sense. By nature, historic heritage is defined and redefined by people whose values about the heritage environment change with time and place. Currently, the historic heritage resource is expanding with new places, areas, and landscapes identified and selected for a range of reasons. Within Porirua City District, the huge number of submissions to the proposed lifestyle development above the Pukerua Bay-Paekakariki escarpment is a current indicator of the strong feelings Wellingtonian's have for the landscape environment. Similar indicators are the long term projects to protect heritage on the waterfront and at Te Aro from the

inner-city bypass threat. Other examples of an 'expanding' historic heritage resource are the number of modern movement examples of architecture being proposed for registration and protection.

The issue of historic heritage places of regional significance needs further investigation. Both Auckland and Bay of Plenty Regions have developed systematic criteria for the identification of the regionally significant heritage and these criteria can be adapted for Wellington. Clearly, Category I places alone do not represent all places that are of regional significance.

The number of registered and listed heritage places are increasing, as are numbers of places within heritage inventories. During the 1980s the increase was largely the result the work of the Trust's Buildings Classification Committee which enabled large-scale registration proposals. During the 1990s, Trust registrations have slowed (but the quality of the registrations has improved) and the initiative has been taken by local authorities, especially in Wellington, Porirua, Kapiti Coast, and Masterton, to ensure non-registered heritage places are listed and protected. During the 2000s, it is expected that numbers of registered/listed places to continue to increase, however this increase will be offset by the removal of registered/listed places where heritage values have been compromised. It is positive indicator that a number of significant Maori-related heritage inventories have been completed or are in preparation during the last five years.

The district plan rule procedure under the RMA has generally protected heritage places from demolition. Since 1995 this activity has been rare and this is a positive indicator of historic heritage protection. The rules, however, have been less successful in regulating inappropriate partial demolition, relocation, additions and alterations. Relocation of heritage buildings appears to a widespread activity, especially in the Wairarapa and it appears many applicants and the public do not consider relocation has having adverse effects if the fabric of the building is retained and restored. An exception to this rule is Masterton District who realised the threat of relocation and its cumulative effect on the historic character of Masterton township. The Masterton District Council responded by ensuring a large number of heritage buildings listed in the District Plan via a Plan Change. In Wellington, roof - top additions have had high publicity and submissions to the Wellington Draft Heritage Strategy indicate widespread concern about inappropriate additions. Also substantial alterations to some commercial and public buildings have undermined the historic character of the building to the extent that its heritage value is compromised. The outcome of these changes means that very few commercial heritage buildings in the Wellington CBD have high integrity. It is important that those commercial buildings that do retain integrity (for example shops in the Newtown area) are identified and preserved for future generations.

With the exception of commercial buildings, many heritage places in the Wellington Region retain high integrity and are in good condition. The majority of these buildings have compatible uses and are well maintained. Despite this, a select

number of nationally and regionally significant heritage places remain at risk and require urgent conservation intervention. These places should be the subject of cooperative support and assistance at a regional level to enable active management and preservation. A tentative list of such places is outlined below:

Places of Regional and National Significance at Risk. Wellington Region

Place	NZHPT Status
▪ Taylor-Stace Cottage, Pauatahanui	Cat I
▪ Wakelins Mill, Carterton	
▪ Sayers Slab Whare, Carterton	Cat I
▪ Paremata Barracks, Paremata	Cat II
▪ Lars Anderson Schou's Barn, Mauriceville West	Cat I
▪ Mount Street Cemetery, Wellington	
▪ Whalers Wife's Cottage, Kapiti	
▪ Wallaceville Animal Research Centre, Upper Hutt	Cat I
▪ General Officer Commanding Building, Wellington	Cat II
▪ Mental Health Hospital, Porirua	Cat I
▪ John Street Shops, Newtown	
▪ Halfway House, Glenside	
▪ Old Coach Road, Johnsonville	Cat I
▪ Castlepoint Lighthouse, Castlepoint	
▪ Kopuaranga Truss Bridge, Palmer Road, Masterton District	
▪ Masterton Racing Club Totalisator Stables, Opaki	
▪ Paku House, Whakataki/Mataikona	
▪ Omahu Farm Rabbit Fence	Cat II

The above list excludes a large number of archaeological sites. The condition and integrity of all archaeological sites in the Wellington Region is a concern. Evidence in the Wellington and Hutt area suggest the majority of recorded sites are actually either destroyed or seriously modified. Further research associated with the NZAA Site Recording Scheme Upgrade Project should provide improved information and knowledge in this matter. On completion of the NZAA Upgrade Project, a regional strategy should be considered to ensure the long-term preservation of significant archaeological sites in the Wellington Region.

The above analysis also excludes entire historic townscapes and streetscapes that remain at risk. Incremental development in the urban areas is changing the nature of towns with the ongoing demolition or removal of historic buildings. Documentation on these changes are limited and few studies have studied changes in the urban environment with regard to heritage. The risk to heritage townships includes inner-city centres such as Cuba Street, Mt Cook, and Newtown and rural centres on the periphery of the urban environment such as Glenside and Pauatahanui. Regional approaches to town and transport planning can dramatically influence these

changes. For example, the effects of the proposed construction of Transmission Gully Highway on the Pauatahanui historic landscape should be carefully assessed.

Support for private and public owners of heritage places is a critical issue and this study shows such support is geographically uneven. Only Hutt City, Kapiti, Masterton and Wellington City councils provide direct financial assistance to property owners, and such support generally is of limited effectiveness. The Trust's heritage incentive scheme will provide some assistance, but this assistance is currently limited to registered Category I historic places that are under private ownership. There may be scope to explore the establishment of a regional incentive fund to assist all types of heritage. It is possible that such a scheme may attract central government input and donations from the private sector.

Recommendations

1. That both the Greater Wellington Regional Council, NZHPT, DOC, and the territorial authorities adopt the proposed historic heritage indicators in this report.
2. That the proposed historic heritage indicators and the results of this report are the subject of ongoing consultation and review with the public and stakeholders.
3. That the Greater Wellington Regional Council reviews the status and definition of cultural heritage places of regional significance.
4. That a regional heritage monitoring framework is established that ensures the collection of basic resource consent data relating to listed historic heritage and the heritage outcomes of consented activities involving subdivision, demolition, relocation, alterations, additions, and signage.
5. That an inventory of historic heritage places of regional significance is prepared by GWRC with the assistance of NZHPT and the district authorities.
6. That the inventory of historic heritage places of regional significance places includes a list of places 'at risk' and that these places are the subject of targeted assistance and active management by local authorities and NZHPT.
7. That on completion of the NZAA Site Recording Scheme Upgrade Project, a regional archaeology strategy is prepared to facilitate the long-term preservation of archaeological sites. The strategy should be prepared by NZHPT with the assistance of DOC, GWRC, district authorities, and iwi.
8. That the GWRC and district authorities continue to assist tangata whenua to prepare iwi management plans that include information and policies relating to the preservation of places of significance to tangata whenua.

9. That GWRC, NZHPT, and the district authorities investigate a regional approach to the provision of heritage incentives for owners of heritage.

Taylor –Stace Cottage, Pauatahanui (Photo: R McClean, 2005)



Appendix 1

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT – HISTORIC HERITAGE.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM COUNCIL SURVEY ON HISTORIC HERITAGE

PENELOPE LAURENSEN

1. Council's Role in Heritage Management:

Respondent Councils: Porirua City Council, Hutt City Council, South Wairarapa District Council, Wellington City Council.

(a) How would you describe your Council's role in heritage management? For example would you say that your Council is primarily concerned with setting a policy context for heritage management through provisions in the District Plan or does it also support a range of non-statutory initiatives? If the latter, what sort of initiatives has it taken?

Whilst Porirua City Council is primarily concerned with setting a policy context for heritage management through provisions in the District Plan, it has also funded a document prepared by Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira, which aimed to provide a framework for managing sites and places of significance to Maori. Porirua City Council is also involved in a non-statutory initiative, being a Heritage Trail, which identifies and publicises significant heritage features within Porirua. The Hutt City Council also, is more concerned with setting a policy context for heritage management, though it also includes non-statutory initiatives such as the Heritage Advisory Committee, earthquake strengthening assistance, and the promotion of heritage issues and support of heritage groups. The South Wairarapa District Council notes that their primary concern will be with setting a policy context through the development of a combined District Plan for the three Wairarapa District Councils. The Wellington City Council is primarily concerned with setting a policy context for heritage management through provisions in its District Plan, they also have a Built Heritage Policy, which acts as the guiding document for built heritage, and a draft heritage strategy will soon be released. The Wellington City Council also owns and manages a number of heritage properties, as well as parks and reserves, some of which contain Maori cultural sites.

(b) Are there any grants or other forms of funding assistance for owners of heritage items/buildings to encourage restoration and management?

Currently the Porirua City Council has not made funding available for heritage financial incentives; however there is scope to do so under the District Plan with "Financial Incentives" identified as an "Other Heritage Protection Mechanism". The Hutt City Council has adopted measures outside of the District Plan, including the provisions of \$20,000 in the Annual Plan for strengthening earthquake risk buildings, and \$20,000 for the promotion of heritage issues in the City and supporting heritage groups. The Hutt City Council is also investigating the possibility of rates relief to the owners of heritage buildings. South Wairarapa District Council does not provide any form of funding for heritage buildings.

Wellington City Council has a Building Safety Fund available for listed heritage buildings identified as an earthquake risk, as well as a heritage fund.

(c) Does your Council have staff specifically skilled in aspects of heritage management? Do you seek technical or professional heritage advice when needed?

The Porirua City Council's Registrar Pat Stodard, an archaeologist recognised by the NZHPT with considerable knowledge of local historical issues, provides advice to Council staff. The Hutt City Council does not have a Heritage Advisor position but does have a Heritage Advisory Committee from which advice is sought. Both Councils also seek outside expertise when required. The South Wairarapa District Council does not have a specialist heritage advisor. Wellington City Council employs two heritage advisors, this is complemented by contracting expert advice when required.

(d) In your work, what proportion of time would be spent considering heritage management as compared to other responsibilities that you have?

Whilst Porirua City Council has to date spent comparatively little time working on heritage responsibilities, it is currently updating the Suburban Zone of the District Plan and intends to prepare an updated Heritage Inventory and Heritage Management Strategy. Hutt City Council has recently spent a significant amount of time of heritage management in dealing with a Plan Change to make the relocation and demolition of listed heritage buildings a discretionary activity, however in general heritage management work takes up around 5% of work time. South Wairarapa District Council also estimates that little time is spent on heritage matters.

2. Threats/Pressures on Heritage:

(a) As a general observation and drawing on your personal experience, do you think that the threats and pressures on heritage in your District/City are the same, less or greater than they were 10 years ago?

The threats and pressures on heritage buildings in the Porirua area are likely to be similar to those 10 years ago, though it is expected that the magnitude has increased with growing development of the City. Porirua City Council expects that as the City becomes more highly developed, pressures on heritage features and buildings will increase. The Hutt City Council sees the pressures on heritage buildings to be fairly similar to 10 years ago, though perhaps greater as the requirements of the Building Act and Code to either upgrade or demolish buildings that do not meet the standards set out in the Act. In South Wairarapa it appears that people are more aware of heritage now, with many owners voluntarily restoring heritage buildings.

(b) What would you identify, from your Council's involvement with heritage management, as the most serious current pressures and threats to heritage in your District/City area? Do you see any new threats of issues emerging during the next decade?

Urban expansion is seen to be the most serious current pressure on heritage in Porirua City. As the supply of land for development diminishes there will be greater pressure to redevelop existing sites, which could potentially threaten heritage buildings and features, this threat is seen to apply especially to the redevelopment of Titahi Bay and Plimmerton, where

earthworks undertaken to extend properties have uncovered archaeological sites. The Hutt City Council sees building restoration as the most serious threat to heritage, as private property owners may rather demolish than maintain heritage buildings unless they have funding. The Hutt City Council identifies apartments, inner city living, and student accommodation as additional pressures on heritage buildings. In South Wairarapa the major threat for heritage buildings is their removal to other locations, thus a loss of historical context.

Wellington City Council identifies a number of changes that are impacting on the city's built heritage, these include: intensification of development and subdivision, especially in Mt Victoria, Newtown, Mt Cook, Ngaio and Miramar; redevelopment in the inner city including many rooftop additions; development of the port and waterfront area; new legislation; increasing land values; and inappropriate alterations and additions to listed heritage buildings and lack of maintenance. The Council considers that these pressures are likely to continue in the foreseeable future.

3. Current "state" of Heritage:

(a) Are you able to confirm the figures from the Technical Report that relate to the status of heritage items in your Council's area? Can you supply information relating to resource consent applications such that you are able to identify how often heritage rules need to be taken into account and, where appropriate, what conditions or controls might have been applied?

Porirua City Council noted two matters in the Technical Report which require correcting:

1. On page 28 the Report states that the Council is planning to proceed with a 'stand-alone' archaeological upgrade scheme during the summer of 2004-2005. However, whilst such a project has been discussed it has yet to be developed and is unlikely to take place in the summer of 2004-2005.
2. On page 40 the Report refers to a number of Maori reserves including Takapuwhia urupa, this spelling is incorrect; the correct spelling is Takapuwhia.

Porirua City Council was unable to provide information on resource consent applications, but suggest that very few applications have been made concerning heritage features in recent years.

Hutt City Council was also unable to provide information on resource consents, but notes that any alterations to a heritage building require resource consent; however, until recently no consent was required for the demolition or relocation of heritage buildings. The Wellington City Council is currently undertaking a heritage-monitoring project to meet its Resource Management Act requirements. When this project is completed it will give an indication of the effectiveness of the rules in achieving the objectives in the District Plan and wider heritage objectives.

(b) Using a scale of 1-10 how would you assess the overall physical condition of heritage items, areas, places etc, in your District/City area and more generally for the Wellington Region? How would that score compare with 10 years ago?

Porirua City Council's Registrar indicated that the majority of Porirua's heritage features are in good condition, however this does vary from area to area, with features located in around Pauatahanui Inlet, Whitireia Peninsula, and Titahi Bay's coastline, in good condition, whilst

the heritage features located in Paremata, Plimmerton and Inner Porirua Harbour are in poor condition. The Council believes that the condition of heritage features in the Porirua City area are the same as 10 years ago, but does not give a number on the scale from 1-10 for this. Hutt City and South Wairarapa District Council also declined to give a number based ranking, with Hutt City Council noting that only a skilled heritage professional would really be in a position to do so. Both Council's noted that little has changed from 10 years ago, but that there is a greater awareness of heritage issues now.

(c) How would your assessment look if you were to focus on specific aspects of heritage management? For example, how does heritage management for rural areas compare with that for urban areas? How well represented are different periods of human occupation in your City/District? Are heritage “themes” appropriately represented?

The Porirua District Plan Heritage Register does not include any buildings built between 1850-1880 as the last of these was lost in the 1960s. Also the register does not include any building built after the 1920s, and therefore has a limited representation of a fairly restricted period of human occupation in the City area. The Hutt City Council considers that heritage “themes” are appropriately represented in the City area, and whilst most buildings are urban this is representative of the fact that the City has little rural area. In South Wairarapa all periods of colonial development are well represented and heritage themes are being developed. Featherston has developed military and railway heritage themes, and Greytown has developed a colonial heritage theme. The Wellington City Council reports that the majority of listed heritage buildings and sites are pre-1950, and that there is a need for more research to be undertaken on post World War Two buildings and places. As part of the review process in 2001 a thematic approach was established to ensure places representative of all aspects of Wellington's history are taken into account.

(d) From your involvement with heritage management, do you see quite different perceptions of the value of heritage across parts of the community?

The Porirua City Council has noted that people appear to have different perceptions of the value of heritage because of their proximity to heritage sites. The Council has also identified two trends, the first is that older people tend to be more interested in heritage matters than younger people, and that local Maori demonstrate a greater interest in heritage up to a certain date. Hutt City Council observes that whilst some members of the public value heritage buildings and features, others see them as holding an area back, or costly to maintain. The South Wairarapa District Council comments that whilst some buildings are well managed, others are not, and that this depends on the views of the building's owners. In Wellington the current development boom, which has resulted in a lot of adaptive changes to listed heritage buildings in central Wellington, has increased public interest in the City's heritage buildings.

(e) What reasons would you give for why heritage is valued in the way you have described in previous sections?

The Porirua City Council comments that older people are likely to be more interested in heritage features than younger people because they can see aspects of their generation's cultural property being destroyed by new developments, and that Maori have a greater interest in heritage because they have a longer historical connection with Porirua dating back to the 1820s. Hutt City Council explains that the extent to which historic heritage is valued depends on the individual's viewpoint, for example, some businesses see a financial return in

preservation of heritage buildings in the context of café developments. However, others see the heritage status of a building as a potential money drain and development constraint. South Wairarapa District Council sees community interest as the major reason for historic heritage being valued.

(f) What role and responsibility do you understand the Greater Wellington Regional Council currently has for heritage management?

Within Porirua the Greater Wellington Regional Council's role in heritage management is most apparent with regard to the Battle Hill Regional Park, which they manage. Hutt City Council had not previously realised the Regional Council had any role for heritage management in the Hutt City area. Wellington City Council sees the Greater Wellington Regional Council having a low profile in terms of heritage management in Wellington. The Council believes there should be greater emphasis on heritage matters in the Regional Policy Statement.

4. Responses and Effectiveness:

(a) How well do you think public authorities, including your Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council, the Historic Places Trust and the Department of Conservation are doing with regard to protection of heritage and heritage management generally?

Porirua City Council commented that public authorities tend to be reactive in terms of protection and management of heritage, with the Council using the consents process to stop people from carrying out activities which may adversely impact on heritage features, rather than proactively seeking to fund maintenance projects. The Porirua City Council believes that whilst all public agencies are good at the reactive aspects of heritage protection, most are poor at the proactive aspects. Hutt City Council does not believe any of the above organisations, including itself, are doing very well, due to a lack of funding, as both restoration and maintenance cost money. South Wairarapa District Council believes that public authorities generally do well within the limits of finances; however the Council has also observed that private trusts focusing on individual buildings may do better than public authorities.

(b) Do you monitor the effectiveness of your District Plan in achieving desired heritage management outcomes? Do you have copies of the results that you are able to supply?

At present neither Porirua City Council nor Hutt City Council and South Wairarapa District Council have an active heritage management programme, however, the preparation of an updated Heritage Inventory and Heritage Management Strategy have been included as a key project within the Porirua City Council's Suburban Zone Review.

(c) If your Council has undertaken non-statutory heritage-related actions or initiatives over the last 10 years, how would you assess these initiatives?

The Porirua City Council's Cultural Services Department produces pamphlets about the Porirua Heritage Trail. For the last 10 years, with the exception of 2003/2004, the Hutt City Council Annual Plan has included a financial contribution of \$75,000 for heritage buildings. In 2003/2004 this was cut to \$20,000. The Wellington City Council has created 9 heritage trails throughout the city, including a Maori trail around the harbour, and purchased and

managed significant buildings such as the St James Theatre, Embassy Theatre, and the Museum of City and Sea.

5. The Future:

(a) What do you think should be “done differently” in the future, and by whom? What do you think could realistically be done?

Porirua City Council believes there should be incentives for the owners of heritage features or sites to manage them in an acceptable way. The Council believes that these incentives should come not just from the City or District Council but also from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, especially for items identified as heritage features or sites of “national significance”. The Hutt City Council believes that Central Government should provide funding for the strengthening of earthquake risk buildings and structures. The South Wairarapa District Council comments that small local authorities simply cannot afford major funding for heritage management, and that community support is generally needed for projects to be undertaken. Wellington City Council thought that consideration should be given to revising the Regional Policy Statement to provide for the identification of heritage places throughout the region, and not just those registered as Category I with the Historic Places Trust. The Wellington City Council also comments on the need for consistency in the identification and protection of all types of heritage by local authorities, and the need for better liaison between local authorities and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust in the identification and protection of heritage places at a national, regional, and local level.

(b) Do you have opinions or thoughts on any or all of the various issues for further discussion set out in the Technical Report?

Hutt City Council found that the Council Survey was not very user friendly, and that specifically with question 3 it was not clear what figures in the Technical Report needed confirming.

**GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT
REPORT – HISTORIC HERITAGE.**

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM COMMUNITY SURVEY ON HISTORIC HERITAGE

PENELOPE LAURENSEN

1. Details about the Organisation and its Role in Heritage Management:

Otaki Historical Society Inc

PO Box 50
Otaki

President:	Anne Thorpe 91 Ringawhata Road Otaki Telephone: (06) 364-7301 Email: annethorpe@xtra.co.nz	Secretary:	Jan Harris 58 Waerenga Road Otaki Telephone: (06) 364-7554 Email: jan.harris@xtra.co.nz
-------------------	--	-------------------	---

The Society is an entirely voluntary organisation, which is funded through subscription of a fairly steady membership base of 250 people. Its role is primarily to provide information, though individuals have joined in order to save specific buildings. The society was established in 1977 with the following aims:

- To foster an interest in New Zealand history in general.
- To collect, record and preserve items of historical interest pertaining to Otaki in particular. (Collections primarily include photographs, archives, newspapers, maps etc.)
- To sponsor public meetings, exhibitions, publications etc., in order to preserve the heritage of the past.

The society also produces an annual journal.

Email is currently the easiest way for the Society to provide information.

Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust

c/- 58 Waerenga Road
Otaki

President:	Anne Thorpe 91 Ringawhata Road Otaki Telephone: (06) 364-7301 Email: annethorpe@xtra.co.nz	Secretary:	Jan Harris 58 Waerenga Road Otaki Telephone: (06) 364-7554 Email: jan.harris@xtra.co.nz
-------------------	--	-------------------	---

The Trust is primarily concerned with the management and restoration of the 1918 Otaki Bank building in order to establish it as a museum. The Trust is a charitable organisation which has received funding from the Otaki Community Board, as well as donations, and other applications for funding for restoration work. There is also a Friends of the Museum

group, whose 60 members provide donations as opposed to paying subscriptions. It is difficult to assess the trends in membership to this group as it has only been in existence for a year.

The Trust was set up in 2002 by a group of community members concerned with the deteriorating state of the disused Otaki Bank. From 1965 the building had been used as the Otaki Borough Council chambers, but was no longer needed after the Councils amalgamation with the Kapiti District Council in 1989. In 1998 KCDC tried and failed to sell the building, and by 2002 the building was showing signs of neglect and disrepair. The Trust proposed to lease and restore the building to establish it as a museum. The Trust has a specific interest in this particular building, though most members have an interest in heritage in general, particularly Otaki heritage.

Email is currently the easiest way for the Trust to provide information.

Porirua Historical Association Inc

C/- 2 Cluny Road
Plimmerton

President:	Roger Beauchamp 2 Cluny Road Plimmerton	Secretary:	Brain Mosen 6 Rawhiti Road Pukerua Bay
-------------------	---	-------------------	--

The Historical Association, set up 38 years ago as a result of a need for a museum in Porirua, is actively involved in heritage as a watchdog, activist group, source of information, and as a body concerned with the management and restoration of heritage items. The Association receives some funding from the Porirua City Council, Licensing Trust, and Lotto. Membership to the Association has decreased but is now increasing again.

Wellington Historical and Early Settlers Association

Fax: (04) 499-0669

Contact: Con Coffey
17 Hugh Street
Newtown
Wellington
Telephone: (03) 232-7893

The Association is dedicated to celebrating the history of Wellington and its achievements, with particular interest in preserving the history of Wellington's early settlers. The society provides research scholarships of \$2000 annually to a student of Victoria University completing a major study on some aspect of Wellington History. As well the Association has placed commemorative plaques on historic sites. The Association has been active for 91 years, it was set up by descendants of Wellington's early settlers to keep alive the history and memory of the achievements of their forebears. Whilst membership is decreasing, it is still active with a dynamic committee.

Rail Heritage Trust of New Zealand

PO Box 2493
Wellington

Contact: Euan McQueen
PO Box 2493
Wellington
Telephone: (04) 495-3000
Email: railheritage@nzrailcorp.co.nz

The Trust works as a facilitator to heritage and community groups dealing with railway heritage, as well as acting as a source of information, and advisor. The Trust receives funding from railway companies, which allows payment to contractors working for the Trust; the Trust also seeks funding from funding agencies for restoration work. The Trust came into existence in 1991 as a charitable trust, as a means of outsourcing heritage inquiries related to railway heritage and railway history. The Trust does not have a membership base, but there is a 'Friends of the Trust' group.

David Kernohan – Specialist: Conservation Architect

No contact details.

David works as an architect preparing conservation plans, providing advice to private and public organisations and appearing in various legal and quasi-legal settings as an expert on heritage matters.

2. Threats/Pressures on Heritage:

(a) As a general observation, do you think that the treats and pressures on heritage are the same, less, or greater than they were 10 years ago?

Both the Otaki Historical Society and Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust see pressures on heritage as around the same as ten years ago. The Porirua Historical Association sees the threats and pressures on heritage as greater than ten years ago because of a lack of action by strategy planners at the Porirua City Council. The Rail Heritage Trust sees pressures on rail heritage as less than 10 years ago as there is now more recognition of heritage values in most communities, however the Trust notes that there are still threats, especially in the form of young local body representatives and officers who have little interest in railways. David Kernohan believes that the threats and pressures on heritage are different from 10 years ago.

(b) Can you identify specific pressures and threats in relation to your area of heritage interests/responsibility?

The Otaki Historical Society and Heritage Bank Preservation Trust see developers wanting to redevelop heritage buildings as a threat to heritage. The Porirua Historical Association sees the reduction of items on the Heritage register and the difficulty in getting new items registered as a key threat to heritage interests. The Wellington Historical and Early Settlers Association see major building sites and roading construction as threats to their heritage interests. The Rail Heritage Trust sees an ignorance of the role of railways, and a lack of recognition of their role in our social and economic history as being a major threat to rail heritage. David Kernohan notes that whilst there is more awareness and support for heritage, there is still reluctance at all levels of government to properly resource heritage matters, and conversely, the growth of "preservation at all costs" mentality can stifle the ability to re-use older buildings to meet modern standards, needs and expectations.

3. Current State of Heritage:

(a) Using a scale of 1-10, how would you score the overall physical condition of heritage items, areas, places etc. in the geographical area in which you operate? How would that score compared with 10 years ago?

Community Group/Individual	10 years ago	Today
Otaki Historical Society	2	6
Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust	2	6
Porirua Historical Association (Inc)	6	5
Wellington Historical and Early Settler Assn	5	8
Rail Heritage Trust	5	7
David Kernohan (Conservation Architect)	4	6.5

(b) For your specific place, item, area of interest, how does the physical condition compare with 10 years ago?

The Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust rates the condition of the Bank building as a 5 both 10 years ago and in 2004, however notes that 3 years ago it would have rated a 1. The Rail Heritage Trust considers that the condition of railway heritage is much better than it was 10 years ago, and would now rate an 8 out of 10, compared with 5 out of 10 a decade ago.

(c) More generally, how would you describe perceptions of the value of heritage held by different parts of the community?

(d) What reasons would you give for why heritage is valued in the way you have described in the previous question?

The Otaki Historical Society and Heritage Bank Trust believe that positive perceptions held by the public reflect a sentimental attachment to older buildings, they go on to state that business generally do not value heritage highly, and whilst attitudes of the local council are improving, both local and central government have in the past tried to sell or demolish buildings. The Society and Trust believe that the reasons for some negative attitudes towards heritage are because Otaki is an economically deprived area, and heritage concerns could be seen to get in the way of economic development opportunities.

The Porirua Historical Association notes that there is good interest in heritage issues in the community at large, but that whilst the public have a high perception of the value of heritage, the local authority employees do not. The reasons for the local authority's low perception of heritage issues, is thought to be because the staff are more concerned with city management, and there is no provision of Heritage in long or short term plans.

The Rail Heritage Trust believes that in general perceptions of heritage are more positive now than 10 years ago, due to effective advocacy by heritage organisations, and an increasing sense of New Zealand's history within the community. David Kernohan notes that whilst generally the public is in favour of retaining heritage, as reflected in legislation, in practice public interest can vary.

(e) What legal protection mechanisms do you know about for managing and protecting heritage? Which agencies and bodies do you think have legal responsibilities for

heritage management? What role and responsibility do you think Greater Wellington Regional Council has for heritage management?

The Otaki Historical Society, Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust, Porirua Historical Association, and Rail Heritage Trust all identify local authorities as having a legal responsibility to protect heritage items listed in their District Plans. The Otaki Society and Association, as well as the Rail Heritage Trust identified the role of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, and Heritage Register in providing protection for heritage features and archaeological sites. The Otaki Society and Association also identified the Department of Conservation as having legal responsibilities for heritage places under its control. David Kernohan noted that the relationship between the Greater Wellington Regional Council and Territorial Authorities is unclear, though there is a perception that heritage is not in the mainstream of the Greater Wellington Regional Council's concerns.

4. Responses and Effectiveness:

(a) How well do you think the agencies you have identified above are doing with regard to protection of heritage and heritage management generally? Do you know how you can influence the policies and actions of these agencies and organisations?

The Otaki Historical Society and Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust mention that that whilst staff at the Kapiti Coast District Council are aware that not all heritage buildings are listed in the District Plan, and are working to rectify this, however they also feel that the Council has not done a satisfactory job of looking after its heritage buildings. David Kernohan believes that the New Zealand Historic Places Trust has a number of problems impacting on its effectiveness. He mentions that it can be doctrinaire yet inconsistent in its responses to various heritage issues, and that it can be difficult and time consuming, especially for a lay person, to get a building onto the register. He commends the Department of Conservation for doing a lot of good work, but notes that a lack of resources and expertise can adversely impact on outcomes.

The Otaki Society and Trust identify submissions, presenting proposals, meeting with individual councillors and council staff, and voting for councillors who care about heritage, as ways of influencing the policies and actions of local authorities. The Rail Heritage Trust also use letters, submissions and lobbying to influence agencies. The Otaki Society and Association go on to note that the New Zealand Historic Places Trust can be influenced by becoming a member and by working with the local branch committee. The Porirua Historical Association believes that keeping an eye on what agencies and organisations approve and pointing out their deficiencies, as well as constant lobbying, is one way of influencing them.

(b) Which organisations that you know of offer funding and grant support for heritage management? Have you successfully sought such funding?

The Otaki Historical Society and Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust identify Lotto Environment and Heritage and Pub Charities as funding sources that they have successfully sought funding from. They also identified 'Fundview' as a useful way to ascertain suitable funding options. The Porirua Historical Association has successfully sought funding from the Porirua City Council, Porirua Licensing Trust, Lotto, Community Trusts, Rotary, and the Lions Club.

(c) With specific reference to your area or place of interest, can you specify what actions, positive and negative, your local authority has taken over the last 10 years?

The Otaki Society and Trust note that over the last 10 years Kapiti Coast District Council has done little regarding heritage, though it is currently identifying heritage sites in the area. The Porirua Historical Association identifies the Porirua City Council's funding of heritage trails as a positive action taken by the Council, however the removal of items from the city's heritage register, and a failure to upgrade the register and add new items are seen as negative actions. The Wellington Historical and Early Settlers Association note the establishment of the Museum of City and Sea as a major positive action by the Wellington City Council. However, David Kernohan points out the negative actions of Wellington City Council, noting that there is still a mentality that preserving heritage is anti-development, he believes that there needs to be debate over issues such as the significance of heritage, who decides it, and on what basis. The Rail Heritage Trust notes that there has been little positive action by local authorities regarding railways, and that most have shown a marked disinterest.

5. The Future:

(a) What would you like to see “done differently” in the future, and by whom?

The Otaki Historical Society and Otaki Heritage Bank Preservation Trust would like to see greater consistency in the application of the Resource Management Act by territorial authorities; they also believe that there could be some merit in Regional Councils managing heritage as it may lead to more consistency. Whilst they recognise the statutory limitations and lack of resources of the Historic Places Trust they would still like to see a more active advocate role for threatened heritage. The Porirua Historical Association would also like to see greater involvement by the Greater Wellington Regional Council in heritage issues, as well as a change in mindset of the Porirua City Council. David Kenorhan would like to see more information and discussion of heritage issues, especially on the questions of: what is heritage significance? Who decides? On what basis? What is Preservation/Conservation? Who decides the priority in saving a building?

(b) What ideas do you have for improved heritage management for your specific area of interest, and more generally?

The Otaki Society and Trust would like to see greater support of community efforts, as from their experience, most heritage is preserved because of community efforts. The Porirua Historical Association want the Porirua City Council to dedicate an experienced staff member to rectifying the problems that exist at present. The Rail Heritage Trust believes there is an urgent need to establish a heritage council for the funding of industrial and transport heritage, to avoid the perceived elitism in council funding of arts and heritage. David Kernohan believes that we cannot and should not preserve all heritage, and that we cannot and should not conserve all heritage; he would like to see clearer statement about the significance of heritage sites, places and buildings, so that people know why a particular item is important.

**WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL AND NZHPT STATE OF THE
ENVIRONMENT REPORT HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS EXPLANATORY
SAMPLE SURVEY GUIDELINES**

The following guidelines are to assist recorders to make assessments of places, and to enable others to interpret those assessments. They relate to the list of questions addressed by recorders in carrying out the sampling project.

Judgement on Condition

Poor There are signs of damage from water penetration, rot, instability or structural failure of buildings, or erosion of major disturbance of sites. This might include the loss of a roof, fire damage, wall collapse or subsidence, major rising or falling damp damage, or major disturbance or damage to the site. Internally walls, floors, or joinery are missing, or in a dilapidated condition.

Fair A building is structurally sound, but has had inadequate maintenance and is in need of minor repair. Internally walls, floors and joinery are in need of minor repair, painting etc. A site retains its important features but these are in need of conservation action and maintenance.

Good A building is structurally sound, weather tight, and with no significant repair needed. Internally walls, floor and joinery are well maintained. A site has its important features well maintained.

Judgements on Integrity

Low A building has major elements, which would contribute substantially to its heritage values removed or extensively altered. Original cladding of walls or roof may have been replaced with newer materials or removed entirely; interiors may have been removed or destroyed, or re-arranged with the insertion of a new interior. A site has had important features (such as structures, machinery, archaeological deposits etc) removed, or a new structure covers the site.

Where the values of the place do not relate directly to fabric (such as in a place valued for association with an historic event), judgement must be made on the impact of changes in diminishing the ability of the viewer to understand the associations of the place.

Medium There has been some loss of important elements, but the site or building still retains sufficient original or historically associated fabric for its value to be understood and interpreted.

High The features that contribute to the value of the place are very largely intact and not compromised by significant removals, modification or additions.

Is the use of a place consistent with its heritage values?

The best use for most heritage places is the continuation of their original use. For example the following list of possible continued uses would in most cases be consistent with their heritage values, unless major changes have been made.

- The use of a house or flat for residential use;
- The use of an office block for office accommodation;
- The use of an industrial site for the same industry;
- The use of a farm or property for pastoral or agricultural production;
- The use of military sites for defence purposes;
- The use of government buildings for continuing government functions;
- The use of military sites for defence purposes;
- The use of a bridge, railway or road for transportation;
- The use of a shop for retail sales etc.

New uses may also be consistent with the heritage values if they require minimal changes to the place, and are respectful of the values for which the place is important. Examples might include:

- The use of a warehouse for commercial or residential purposes;
- The use of an office block for medical chambers;
- The use of government buildings for low-impact commercial or community use;
- The use of a place for museum purposes.

Judgement of the compatibility of the use to a heritage place should be based on assessing if the significant fabric and non-fabric values of the place can be retained by such a use

Assessing presence of maintenance works

It is sometimes difficult to decide if observed works are of a conservation nature. In this survey a generous interpretation of 'conservation works' is adopted, and would include obvious works such as replaced guttering, recent painting, and construction of sympathetic additions to allow new uses.

Public versus private ownership

It is useful to know if a place is in public or private ownership. This may not always be apparent to the recorder, so 'unknown' is an acceptable response. Public ownership would include ownership by the Government, Regional and Local Authorities, and by Government owned bodies.

Appendix 3: Wellington Region, NZHPT Registered Historic Places, Sample Survey

Carterton District Council			
Name of place, category	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Glendower Category II	Ponatahi Road, R.D.2 Carterton	Former: House Current: House	
2. Public Library Category II	Holloway Street Carterton	Former: Library Current: Library	Public – Local Government
3. Westpac Building Category II	124 High Street North Carterton	Former: Bank Current: Bank	Private
4. Sayers Slab Whare Category I	Arcus Road Carterton	Former: House Current: Miscellaneous	
5. St Mary's Church (Catholic) Category II	1 Howard Street and King Street Carterton	Former: Church Current: Church	Church

Hutt City Council			
Name of place, category	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Petone Settlers Museum Category I	The Esplanade Petone	Former: Civic Facilities and recreation Current: Museum, Memorial – Early Settler	Public – Local Government
2. House Category II	6 Patrick Street Petone	Former: House Current: House	Private - ?
3. Post Office Category II	151 High Street Lower Hutt	Former: Bank; Dentist Surgery; Post Office; Office Building Current: Postal sorting and distribution; Office Building; Shop	Public – State Owned Enterprise (NZ Post?)
4. Norbury Category I	38 Normandale Road Normandale, Lower Hutt	Former: House Current: Conference Centre	Public – Local Government
5. Glenwood (dwelling) Category II	287 Muritai Road Eastbourne	Former: House Current: House	Private - ?

Kapiti Coast District Council			
Name of place	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Otaki Railway Station Category II	Arthur Street Otaki	Former: Railway Station	
2. Aparawaiti Category II	2 Otaihanga Road Otaihanga	Former: House Current: House	
3. Goods Shed (Old Rial-Air Shed) Category II	Paekakariki Railway Yard Paekakariki	Former: Railway Shed	
4. Lovat House Category II	Hadfield Road Te Horo	Former: House Current: House	
5. St Mary's Church (Catholic) Category I	Convent Road Otaki	Former: Church Current: Church	

Masterton District Council			
Name of place	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Brentwood Category II	127 Upper Plain Road Masterton	Former: House Current: House	
2. National Bank Building Category II	189-191 Queen Street Masterton	Former: Bank	
3. Tinui Post Office Category II	Alfredton Tinui Road Tinui	Former: Post Office	
4. St Albans Church (Anglican) Category II	Vallance Street Tauweru	Former: Church Current: Church	
5. Tinui General Store (Former) Category I	24 Castle Point Road Tinui	Former: Shop	
6. Brancepeth Homestead Category I	Masterton Stronvar Road Brancepeth Station Wainuioru	Former: House Current: House	

Porirua City Council			
Name of place	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Taylor-Stage Cottage Category I	State Highway 58 Pauatahanui	Former: House Current: House	Private - ?
2. St Joseph's Church (Catholic) Category I	State Highway 58 Pauatahanui	Former: Church Current: Church	Private Trust
3. St Alban's Church (Anglican) Category II	Paekakariki Hill Road Pauatahanui	Former: Church Current: Church	Private Trust
4. Blackies Woolshed Category II	Paekakariki Hill Road Pauatahanui	Former: Woolshed	Private - ?
5. Mental Health Museum, Porirua Hospital Category I	Kenepuru Drive Porirua	Former: Psychiatric Hospital Current: Museum	
6. Gear Homestead 'Okivi' Category II	Okowai Road Porirua	Former: Community Centre; House Current: House	

South Wairarapa District Council			
Name of place	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Anzac and Kiwi Halls Category I	62-64 Bell Street Featherston	Former: Hospital; Military Current: Community Hall; Memorial Hall	Public – Local Government
2. Longwood Former Cookhouse Category II	Longwood Longwood Road Featherston	Former: Cookhouse	
3. Rototowai Homestead Category I	Kahutara Road Featherston	Former: House Current: House	
4. Te Kopura Homestead Category II	Kahutara Road Kahutara	Former: House Current: House	

5. Rototawhai Machine Shop-Store Category II	Kahutara Road Kahutara	Former: Agriculture and Horticulture	
6. Borough Council Building Category II	110 Main Street Greytown	F: Local Government Buildings	
7. Bank of New Zealand Category II	75 Main Street Greytown	Former: Bank Current: Shop	
8. First Greytown Hospital Building Category II	175-177 Main Street Cobblestone Museum Greytown	Former: Musuem	

Upper Hutt City Council			
Name of place	Address	Type of Building	Owner details
1. Upper Hutt Blockhouse Category I	Upper Hutt	Former: Barn; Scout Hall; Courthouse; Police Station; Blockhouse; House Current: Clubrooms; Historic Property	NZHPT
2. Wallaceville Animal Research Centre Category I	62 Ward Street Upper Hutt	Current: Scientific Laboratory	Private
3. Tweed House Category I	5 Brentwood Street Trentham Upper Hutt	Former: House Current: Conference Centre; Hotel	Private
4. Golder's House Category II	707 Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt	Former: House Current: Museum	Private Trust
5. House Category II	1 Chatsworth Road Silverstream	Current: House	Private

Appendix 4: Wellington Region, NZHPT Registered Historic Places, Sample Survey Results

Results Abbreviations

D: Demolished or does not exist
 NF: Not found or located

GCE: Good condition exterior
 FCE: Fair condition exterior
 PCE: Poor condition exterior
 GCI: Good condition interior
 FCI: Fair condition interior
 PCI: Poor condition interior

LI: Low integrity
 MI: Medium integrity
 HI: High integrity

AU: Active use
 NU: No use
 CU: Compatible or consistent use
 IU: Incompatible or inconsistent use

RW: Recent maintenance work
 NW: No recent maintenance work

PR: Private
 PU: Public

Wellington Region, NZHPT Registered Historic Places Sample Survey Results 2005							
District	Name of place, category	Status	Condition	Integrity	Use	Maintenance	Ownership
Carterton	1. Glendower Category II						
	2. Public Library Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	3. Westpac Building Category II		FCE GCI	LI	AU CU	NW	PR
	4. Sayers Slab Whare Category I		PCE PCI	HI	NU	NW	PR
	5. St Mary's Church (Catholic) Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
Hutt	1. Petone Settlers Museum Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	2. House Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PR
	3. Post Office Category II		FCE FCI	MI	AU CU	RW	PR
	4. Norbury Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	5. Glenwood (dwelling) Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PR
	1. Otaki Railway Station Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PR
	2. Aparawaiti Category II						
	3. Goods Shed (Old Rial-Air						

	Shed) Category II						
	4. Lovat House Category II						
	5. St Mary's Church (Catholic) Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
Masterton	1. Brentwood Category II		GCE	HI	AU CU		PR
	2. National Bank Building Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	3. Tinui Post Office Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PR
	4. St Albans Church (Anglican) Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	5. Tinui General Store (Former) Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PR
	6. Brancepeth Homestead Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
Porirua	1. Taylor-Stace Cottage Category I		PCE PCI	HI	AU IU	NW	PR
	2. St Joseph's Church (Catholic) Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	3. St Alban's Church (Anglican) Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	4. Blackies Woolshed Category II	NF					
	5. Mental Health Museum, Porirua Hospital Category I		PCE PCI	HI	AU CU	NW	PU
	6. Gear Homestead 'Okiwi' Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
South Wairarapa	1. Anzac and Kiwi Halls Category I		FCE GCI	HI	AU CU	NW	PU
	2. Longwood Former Cookhouse Category II		GCE	HI	AU CU		PR
	3. Rototowai Homestead Category I		GCE	HI	AU CU		PR

	4. Te Kopura Homestead Category II		GCE	HI	AU CU		PR
	5. Rototawhai Machine Shop-Store Category II		GCE	HI	AU CU		PR
	6. Borough Council Building Category II		FCE	HI	NU	NW	PU
	7. Bank of New Zealand Category II		GCE GCI	MI	AU CU	RW	PR
	8. First Greytown Hospital Building Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU		PU
Upper Hutt	1. Upper Hutt Blockhouse Category I		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	2. Wallaceville Animal Research Centre Category I		PCE PCI	HI	NU	NW	PU
	3. Tweed House Category I						
	4. Golder's House Category II		GCE GCI	HI	AU CU	RW	PU
	5. House Category II						