

# **Appendix Two**

## **Conclusions from the Historic Places Trust Report and Heritage Technical Report**

### **Edited version of the Historic Places Trust Report Conclusions**

1. In terms of the “pressure-state-response” model of assessing the environment, the “**state**” of the historic heritage environment cannot be easily measured in a physical or mathematical sense. By its very nature, historic heritage is defined and redefined by people whose values about the heritage environment change with time and place, so it is something of a moving target. Currently, the historic heritage resource is expanding with new places, areas, and landscapes identified and selected for a range of reasons. For example, there are 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.
2. The issue of historic heritage and places of regional significance, as currently used in the RPS, needs further investigation and possible revision. 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 the Wellington Region. Clearly, Category I places alone (the current area of interest for the RPS) do not represent all places that are of regional significance.
3. The number of heritage places registered and listed by the Historic Places Trust is increasing, as are numbers of places within local authority heritage inventories and plans. During the 1980s the increase was largely the result the work of the Trust’s Buildings Classification Committee which brought forward 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 will 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.

4. District Plan rules have generally protected heritage places from demolition. Since 1995, demolition 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 that 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 Council, where recognition was given to the threat of relocation and its cumulative effect on the historic character of Masterton township by ensuring a large number of heritage buildings were listed in the District Plan via a plan change. In Wellington, rooftop 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 buildings to the extent that their 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.
  
5. 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 identified by the Historic Places Trust in its report is shown below:

**Places of Regional and National Significance at Risk: Wellington Region**

<b>Place</b>	<b>NZHPT Status</b>
Taylor-Stace Cottage, Pauatahanui	Cat I
Wakelins Mill, Carterton	
Sayers Slab Whare, Carterton	Cat I
Paremata Barracks, Paremata	Cat II
Lars Anderson Schow'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

6. 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 areas suggests the majority of recorded sites are either destroyed or seriously modified. Further research associated with the New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme Upgrade Project should provide improved information and knowledge on 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.
7. 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 is limited and few studies have examined 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.
8. 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 Coast District, Masterton District and Wellington City councils provide direct financial assistance to property owners, and such support generally is of limited effectiveness. The Historic Places 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.

### **Concluding comments from the Heritage Technical Report**

This section contains some concluding comments about data availability, the process of assessment and some implications of the results for the Review of the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).

In terms of data availability, the Heritage part of the Landscape and Heritage chapter is rather better provided for than the Landscape part (see parallel Technical Report 08/01).

For heritage, the one area of information shortage of some significance is resource consent data. From the HPT report, there is some anecdotal inference that certain items may have experienced damage despite rules and provisions in plans. It is difficult also to assess how far modifications and changes have taken place without the appropriate resource consent or permission being sought. It will be helpful for the next SER exercise to be better informed about the effectiveness of the statutory processes in achieving the desired policy outcomes.

The process of assessment has relied almost exclusively on two people. Within the Regional Council, no one has a responsibility in their job description or the technical training or qualifications for heritage management. Heritage is a peripheral topic for the Council, and the responsibility for on-going oversight of the heritage portfolio has fallen to a staff member as an add-on to other responsibilities. This Technical Report, and the process of information/opinion acquisition necessary for its preparation could not really have been achieved without the support of the HPT, and especially through the efforts of Robert McClean. The SER process has been very fortunate to have had Robert's input to a piece of work that has produced mutual benefits for the HPT and GW. This issue of staffing capacity and appropriate skills will continue to be a barrier to GW having a more active heritage management role in future.

The possible **implications of the results for the Review of the RPS** have been mentioned at various points through this document. Foremost among these are the set of recommendations from the HPT Report. As noted in 5.3 (in the Technical Report), some of these recommendations may well find expression through agreements and actions taken by various agencies outside of any statutory framework, while others could usefully and beneficially be considered in the Review of the RPS.

Without making comment on the recommendations, there does seem to be merit (and statutory cause) in reconsidering the definition of heritage used in the current RPS to be more inclusive of the range of historic heritage that exists in the Region.

If a more comprehensive definition or interpretation was to be given, this may not mean that the Regional Council's role would change. It would merely give a more holistic and comprehensive policy basis for heritage management. However, it may be that public input to the RPS Review supports a more active role for GW. This role might potentially be somewhat free standing, or it could be working actively in a collaborative way with other agencies that have more formal responsibility and roles in heritage management, especially in the area of monitoring the effective implementation of resource consents and associated conditions where heritage protection or maintenance is involved.