

Waikato District Plan Review
Proposed District Plan - Heritage submissions



Dr Ann McEwan
Principal
10 April 2020



HERITAGE
CONSULTANCY
SERVICES

Introduction

I am a heritage consultant with over 30 years' experience in the historic heritage sector. I hold a PhD in Art and Architectural History from the University of Canterbury and lectured at the University of Waikato for ten years before establishing Heritage Consultancy Services in 2006. I was engaged by Waikato District Council (WDC) in February 2016 to provide historic heritage consultancy services as part of the district plan review.

My original brief from WDC was to review all those built heritage items scheduled on the operative district plan (ODP), both Waikato and Franklin sections, and to assess potential additions to the schedule. This process resulted in my recommendation to delete 13 items scheduled on the ODP and add 60 'new' heritage items to the schedule in the proposed district plan (PDP). My recommendations were finalised on 31 May 2017 and presented to council in the following month. A historic overview of the district was produced at the same time to provide the backdrop against which all individually scheduled items were assessed.

The assessment criteria adopted for the built heritage review are those contained in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Attachment 1). I devised a historic heritage item record form to describe and summarise the heritage significance of each built heritage item recommended for scheduling and developed guidance notes (Attachment 2) to establish the methodology for distinguishing between A and B ranked items in the schedule.

A brief report was prepared to justify my recommendation to delete an item from the heritage schedule and I also furnished WDC with a table summarising all those items that were considered but not recommended for scheduling. Digital research files were compiled and presented to WDC for all items either proposed for deletion or recommended for scheduling on the PDP.

Schedule 30.1 in the notified PDP is not the schedule I presented to WDC. A number of the buildings I recommended for scheduling were omitted prior to notification and there are numerous errors and inconsistencies in the presentation of the 'Property Location' information. While I was asked to provide a heading titled 'Physical Description and Significant Features' in each Historic Heritage Item Record Form I did not populate the 'Significant Features to be Protected' column in Schedule 30.1. Furthermore, for most entries in the schedule the 'significant features' itemised are not those identified in the Historic Heritage Item Record Forms. I did not distinguish between Building and General rankings in my assessments, as per the column in Schedule 30.1, nor did I contribute directly to the section 32 report (June 2018).

Appendices to this report include the historic heritage item record forms relevant to specific submissions and the reports I presented to WDC to explain my recommendation to delete items that are scheduled on the ODP.

Review of Submissions

Submission 37.1

Submitter Graeme Ward

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The house known as 'Briarley' is scheduled on the ODP and recommended for inclusion in Schedule 30.1 (item 174). As the submitter has noted the house has been incorrectly mapped by WDC. 'Briarley', the former Tinne / Bourke farmhouse, is indeed located at 8 Titoki Drive and should be mapped accordingly. This will satisfy the submitter's request.

Submission 115.1

Submitter Robina Ross

Submission 559.226

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submission FS1323.134

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

The submitter and further submitter both seek the inclusion of the house at 14 Galileo Street in Ngaruawahia in Schedule 30.1. The house is currently scheduled in the ODP as item 125 with a 'B' ranking; it is not listed by HNZPT. I assessed the house on 28 June 2016 and subsequently recommended to WDC that it should be removed from the schedule. Following a meeting with HNZPT staff on 31 March 2020 I undertook further research about the building but this did not alter my recommendation to omit the building from Schedule 30.1. The house appears to date to c.1907 and to have been built for Jesse and Florence Mines. Local baker William King was a later owner (King family ownership 1926-69). The house is a representative example of the bay villa vernacular style, and therefore has some architectural value, and it contributes to the character and amenity values of the streetscape. It does not in my opinion meet the criteria for scheduling as a significant historic heritage resource.

Submission 217.1

Submitter Alex Kirby / Raglan Properties Limited

Submission 559.228

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submission FS1323.135

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submissions FS1276.269 & FS1276.71

Further Submitter Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society

Recommendation: ACCEPT [submission from Raglan Properties Ltd]; REJECT [submission from HNZPT & both further submissions]

The building at 19 Bow Street is currently scheduled on the ODP as item # 161 with a 'B' ranking; it is not listed by HNZPT. The submission concerns 19 Bow Street not 14 Bow Street, which is the subject of the further submission made by Heritage NZPT. The building has been considerably modified building and does not meet the criteria for scheduling. The submitter owns the property and agrees with my recommendation that it should not be included Schedule 30.1 in the Proposed District Plan. FS1276.269 provided by the Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society identifies the contribution the building makes to the character of Raglan's town centre. FS1276.71 by the Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society supports the submission made by HNZPT. As I noted in the report prepared to support deletion of the item from the heritage schedule, the building is located within the Raglan Design Guide Area. I consider inclusion of the building in the design guide area to be the most appropriate level of recognition and management of its streetscape character, which arises from its height, materials, scale and evident age.

[Note: Submission 546.3 and FS1276.231 also support maintaining character values in Raglan.]

Submission 231.1

Submitter Lana & Michael Wells

Further Submission FS1323.139

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission]; ACCEPT [further submission]; amend address in Schedule 30.1

The former Walsh residence at 1 Old Taupiri Road, Ngaruawahia has been recommended for addition to the schedule based on its significant historic, architectural and contextual values (item # 87, 'B' ranking). The building is a well-maintained bay villa erected in 1905 by Matthew Walsh with historic associations to the neighbouring former Lamb's Mill granary and store (item 80, 'A' ranking). The submitter seeks the deletion of the house from Schedule 30.1 on the basis that the modifications undertaken to the house since the 1980s invalidate its heritage significance. Most early 20th century residential buildings have been modified and this in itself does not make the building ineligible for heritage identification and protection. As described in their submission the owners have carefully and thoughtfully maintained and enhanced the house over the last 40 years. The submitter appears to need more information from WDC as to the implications of scheduling, including the incentive funding available to help with ongoing maintenance and repairs. The further submission received from HNZPT supports the consultant's recommendation to schedule the building. It is noted that Schedule 30.1 mistakenly records the address of this heritage item at 2 Old Taupiri Road.

Submission 242.1

Submitter Lodge Te Marama No. 186

Further Submission FS1323.140

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission]; ACCEPT [further submission]

The Masonic Lodge Te Marama, No. 186 has been recommended for addition to Schedule 30.1 based on its significant historic, architectural and contextual values (item # 107, 'B' ranking). It was built in 1912 and extended in 1916 and 1927. The submitter is currently offering the building for sale and believes that the proposed scheduling will limit the marketability of the property. This concern appears to have been prompted by the mistaken inclusion of the 'interior' in the significant features column of Schedule 30.1. I typically did not inspect the interiors of any of the buildings itemised in Schedule 30.1 and where interior fixtures and fittings are noted in the historic heritage item record form these are supplied for information purposes only; consequently the 'Significant Features' column does not record or represent my professional advice to WDC. There are many examples around the country where scheduled heritage buildings have been altered internally in order to achieve a successful adaptive reuse outcome where the original use of a building is no longer tenable. The further submission received from HNZPT supports the consultant's recommendation to schedule the building.

Submission 288.1

Submitter Trustees of the Valmont & Oakfield Trusts

Further Submission FS1323.142

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission & further submission]

The submission concerns the house known as 'Clunes' or 'Cameron's Castle' at Onewhero, which is recommended for addition to Schedule 30.1 as an 'A' ranked item (# 35). The house was built for Duncan and Christine Cameron to the design of Pukekohe architect FW Mountjoy in 1915-16; it is one of a very small number of Waikato buildings featured in Peter Shaw's *A History of New Zealand Architecture* (1991 and later editions). The submitter provides further information about the building and accepts that the building has architectural significance. The submitter seeks that the extent of scheduling is limited to the tower and façade of a building. This approach would be contrary to best practice heritage assessment and management but it is recognised that the tower and principal elevation of the dwelling are defining features that would likely be prioritised should a resource consent application be lodged for alterations, additions and/or demolition. The further submission from HNZPT supports the amendment of the significant features of the dwelling, subject to,

and possibly in conflict with, HNZPT submission 559.218, which seeks the deletion of the significant features column in schedule 30.1.

Submission 303.1

Submitter The Village Church

Further Submission FS1323.141

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT [submission and further submission]

This submission also concerns the Masonic Lodge Te Marama, No. 186 in Ngaruawahia (see above). The submitter is a potential buyer of the building and seeks an amendment to the 'significant features' of the building to allow for 'the development and modernisation of the building'. Removal of the significant features column, which is the subject of HNZPT submission 559.218, would be in line with best practice and would avoid the confusion evident here. Instead the heritage inventory report is the document of record that supports the heritage significance and ranking of all scheduled heritage items. A resource consent application would be assessed on the basis of that record, which includes a description of the building. HNZPT's further submission notes that the rules framework of the PDP 'allow sufficient scope for modernisation of heritage buildings'.

Submission 562.1

Submitter Gladys Button

Recommendation: OUTSIDE SCOPE [Pass on submission and supporting letter to the Waikato District Heritage Forum and/or relevant WDC staff to consider the matter raised in consultation with mana whenua]

The submitter requests that recognition is given to the beginning of Maori missionary education in the Waikato. This submission is outside the scope of PDP process but heritage signage is an important and valuable tool that supports heritage protection and the submission could be actioned in consultation with mana whenua.

Submissions 404 & 563

Submitter Mowbray Group / Andrew Mowbray

Recommendation: OUTSIDE SCOPE [Acknowledge heritage values of the setting of the former dairy factory in consideration of submissions 404 and 563]

While these submissions do not directly relate to the scheduling of item # 172 former NZ Dairy Association factory it is noted that the laudable goal of 'rescuing' various heritage buildings from around the North Island could undermine the heritage values of the scheduled item. The extent of setting recommended for this A ranked heritage item is shown below.



Submission 559.103

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission 559.234

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

I assessed the Ngaruawahia Centennial Memorial Plunket Rooms & Women's Rest Rooms as having significant heritage value and recommended its inclusion in schedule 30.1 with a 'B' ranking (item # 104). The peer reviewer engaged by WDC and HNZPT also support this assessment. In the PDP demolition of the Plunket Rooms is a permitted activity subject to prior notice of 20 working days to the Ngaruawahia Community Board and the preparation of a heritage report and photographic record. There is no justification for treating the Plunket Rooms differently in the PDP from any other B ranked building that has been assessed according to the criteria adopted by WDC. It would appear that the council intends to demolish the building and therefore has created an exemption in the PDP that calls into question the integrity of the scheduling process. The submitter seeks the deletion of the exemption and that the owner is subject to the same provision in the PDP as the owner of any other B ranked item. [See also Submissions 559.95 HNZPT & 697.286 Waikato District Council and FS 1323.57 HNZPT].

Submission 559.128 [see also 559.129, 559.130, 559.131, 559.132, 559.137, 559.138, 559.139, and related submissions 559.133, 559.134, 559.135 & 559.140, 559.141, 559.142]

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The submitter opposes the permitted rule allowing for development on the site of a schedule heritage item subject to its being set back at least 10 metres from the item and that any additional buildings are not located between the front of the heritage item and the road. I identified the extent of setting, within which area heritage values should be protected, on the heritage report for every item included in schedule 30.1. At no time did I provide advice to WDC concerning a 10 metre setback for development, nor did I recommend special treatment of the area between the front of an item and the road. The proposed rule will lead to confusion as to the effect of the 'extent of setting' and, in the provision for not locating a building between the heritage item and the road, it ignores the holistic values of heritage resources. Protection from inappropriate development can only be achieved on a case by case basis, as stated by HNZPT, given that heritage items have different settings, may not be visible from the road but nevertheless possess highly significant heritage values, and sensitive development can occur within 10 metres of a scheduled heritage item.

See also Submission 831.38, Submitter Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally re the 10 metre setback. Also 697.419 & 697.420 WDC and FS 1323.71 & FS 1323.75 HNZPT re setback and road frontage provisions in the notified plan. See also 697.819 WDC & FS1323.73 HNZPT; also 697.916, 697.997 & 697.998 WDC. Also 559.248 HNZPT.

Submission 559.146 [see also submission 559.218]
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT

The definition supplied in Chapter 13 for a 'significant feature of interest' 'Means those parts of a historic heritage building, which is shown on the planning maps and listed in Appendix 30.1, that are described in the individual heritage item sheet.' Schedule 30.1 does not in fact replicate or reference the 'Physical Description and Significant Features' section of the relevant Historic Heritage Item Record Form for each scheduled item. Furthermore this section on each heritage report is not exhaustive and does not necessarily provide the level of detail, such as would be found in a conservation plan, sufficient to assess a resource consent application for alterations and additions, for example, to a scheduled building. Best practice is to provide a link to the heritage record form within the heritage schedule, so that the description of the building and its notable features can be read in context.

See also Submission 697.07 WDC & FS1323.145 HNZPT re amending the significant features column; also, 697.414 & 697.417 WDC & FS1323.61 & FS1323.65 HNZPT re implementation of significant features provisions in the PDP. See also submissions 697.814 & 697.815 WDC & FS1323.59 & 1323.63 HNZPT; also 697.909, 697.994 & 697.995 WDC.

Submission 559.216

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT (noting that acceptance of submission 559.218 would partly address this submission)

The submitter supports the proposed schedule and notes that WDC has commissioned extensive heritage research as part of the district plan review. The submission that the PDP should acknowledge the information available would be met in part by linking the heritage reports to schedule 30.1, in place of the significant features columns (see HNZPT submission 559.218).

Submission 559.217
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT

The submitter seeks the inclusion of HNZPT list status in Schedule 30.1; this is best practice in district plan heritage schedules as an aid to owners and consenting staff.

Submission 559.218

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The significant features column is contrary to best practice for historic heritage schedules in district plans and in any event the column information as supplied in the notified plan is inaccurate and confusing. As the submitter notes, the itemisation of features implies that all other aspects of the built form are not significant and therefore could be considered to be irrelevant or dispensable. HNZPT cites an example of a currently A ranking scheduled building [former FH Edgecumbe house, 11 Lower Waikato Esplanade, HNZPT list # 4256, category 2 historic place] that no longer merits scheduling because of the modifications that have been

allowed under the operative plan. See also HNZPT submissions 559.104, 559.105, which is also relevant to this submission point; also submission 697.307 by Waikato District Council and FS1323.145 by HNZPT.

Submission 559.219

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The house at 11 Lower Waikato Esplanade, which is scheduled as an 'A' ranking item on the ODP with an address of 13 Market Street, is also listed by HNZPT as a category 2 historic place (list entry # 4256). The submitter seeks the inclusion of the building in Schedule 30.1 with a 'B' ranking. My original recommendation was that the building be removed from the schedule unless further information supported a revised 'B' ranking. Input from the submitter and further research into Francis Edgecumbe and his family has established the historic heritage values of the dwelling. A historic heritage record form has been prepared and I recommend the house is included in Schedule 30.1.

Submission 559.220

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

The former Komakorau Hall was built in 1914 and extended in c.1960. In 1997 it was relocated to Gordonton School for use as the school and community hall; more recently it has been extended further. The building is not scheduled on the ODP, although it is listed by HNZPT (#7129, category 2 historic place). The submitter seeks inclusion of the building in Schedule 30.1. I have reviewed my recommendation to omit the building from Schedule 30.1 on the basis of the submission and confirm my finding that the building has historic interest but does not possess sufficient historic heritage significance to warrant inclusion on schedule 30.1.

Submission 559.221

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

The former Burnett residence, which may pre-date 1870 and has been relocated at least once, possibly twice, is currently scheduled on the ODP (item # 116, 'A' ranking). The building is listed by HNZPT as a category 2 historic place (list entry 4250). The submitter seeks inclusion of the building in Schedule 30.1 but does not suggest a ranking for the building. I have reviewed my initial assessment in light of the HNZPT submission and confirm my recommendation to omit the building from Schedule 30.1 because, although it has some historic interest, the house does not meet the criteria for significant historic heritage items.

Submission 559.222

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

The 1924 former Arapuni Post Office and postmaster's residence was relocated to Puketaha in 2004, having spent the previous ten years in the depot of Jack House Transit in Hamilton. The building is not scheduled on the ODP, although it is listed by HNZPT (#4241). The submitter seeks inclusion of the building in Schedule 30.1 but does not suggest a ranking for the building. I have reviewed my initial assessment in light of the HNZPT submission and confirm my recommendation to omit the building from Schedule 30.1 because although it has some historic interest the house does not meet the criteria for significant historic heritage items.

Submission 559.223

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The submission relates to the extent of setting for the Potatau Monument (item # 98), which was listed by HNZPT as a category 1 historic place (list entry # 757) in July 2019. Whereas I proposed that the extent of setting should be limited to the immediate environs of the monument within the Kingitanga [Octagon] Reserve, the setting of the monument as described by HNZPT (see Attachment 3) encompasses the whole of the reserve, including the 2013 Kingitanga Memorial. This approach is supported to achieve consistency and clarity for all concerned. The heritage report for the monument has been revised in light of the submission.

Submission 559.224

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT

The building at 92B Te Onetea Road, Rangiriri is scheduled on the ODP as item 17A with a 'B' ranking; it is not listed by HNZPT. The submitter supports the omission of the so-called Firth Industries' cottage from schedule 30.1 and notes that an archaeological authority may be required at the time of demolition, if the building can be shown to pre-date 1900. Information gathered to review this item has been filed by WDC to assist in any future archaeological authority process.

Submission 559.225

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

The former governmental building (c.1913) that was relocated from Stratford, Taranaki in c.1993 is scheduled on the ODP as item 76 with a 'B' ranking; it is not listed by HNZPT. The submitter seeks inclusion of the building in Schedule 30.1 and suggests a B ranking. The building does not contribute to an understanding of Waikato District's development and identity, has been modified for residential use and about 25% of its fabric had to be rebuilt after an accident occurred when it was being trucked up from Stratford. Upon review of my initial assessment I confirm my finding that the building has historic interest but does not possess sufficient historic heritage significance to warrant inclusion on schedule 30.1.

Submission 559.226

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT

See above – Submission 115.1.

Submission 559.227

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submission 1276.70

Further Submitter Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society

Recommendation: REJECT [submission and further submission]

The building at 11 Bow Street is currently scheduled on the ODP as item # 155 with a 'B' ranking; it is not listed by HNZPT. The building was built in 1924 and has been considerably modified since 1997. FS1276.70 by the Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society supports the submission made by HNZPT. As I noted in the report prepared to support deletion of the item from the heritage schedule, the building is located within the Raglan Design Guide Area. I consider inclusion of the building in the design guide area to be the most appropriate level of recognition and management of its streetscape character, which arises from its height, materials, scale and evident age.

Submission 559.228
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Further Submission 1276.71
Further Submitter Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society
Recommendation: REJECT

See above – Submission 217.1.

Submission 559.229
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Further Submission FS1022.1
Further Submitter Jackson Property Group
Recommendation: ACCEPT [submission]; REJECT [further submission]

The former Marist Juniorate Training College building was built in 1925-26 to the design of S & A Luttrell of Christchurch. The college closed in 1974 but continued to be held by the Marist Brothers and used to host conferences and retreats until 1997. Felix Donnelly College then operated at the property and, although it has been privately held since 2011, it remains in educational and hospitality use. The building was one of a number peer reviewed by Adam Wild for WDC in 2018 (see Attachment 4); both the review and the submission by HNZPT support scheduling of the former Marist Juniorate Training College building as an 'A' ranked building. As notified the PDP omits the building from Schedule 30.1, contrary to my recommendation. The further submitter opposes scheduling of the item and appears to be in some confusion as to the role HNZPT will play if the building is scheduled; it is not listed by HNZPT at this time.

Submission 559.230
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Further Submission FS1097.1
Further Submitter Rimu Buildings Ltd
Recommendation: ACCEPT [submission]; REJECT [further submission]

I recommended that the former Kosoof bungalow in Huntly, which is known as 'Rimu House', be included in Schedule 30.1; as notified the building was not scheduled. The submitter supports scheduling of the building, which is opposed by the further submitter, who owns the building. The building was one of a number peer reviewed by Adam Wild for WDC in 2018; Mr Wild found the building merited scheduling as a 'B' ranked item. The further submitter provides the following statement in support of their submission: 'Rimu Buildings Ltd (Kosoof Family beneficial owners) have a binding agreement with Council that Council would not place any heritage protection order on this property since September 2004.' No such agreement was brought to my attention and thus the building was assessed in good faith. If such an agreement exists then it may be that scheduling cannot proceed. The further submitter appears to have confused scheduling on the district plan with a protection order, which under the RMA can only be placed on a property by a heritage protection authority and, if one exists, will be lodged against the relevant title. The further submitter mentions redevelopment plans that if constrained will lead to the natural decay of the building. Neither of these considerations are relevant to the assessment of heritage significance, which I can confirm and are supported by the peer reviewer and HNZPT.

Submission 559.231
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT

I recommended that the former Taupiri Post office and postmaster's residence be included in Schedule 30.1; as notified the building was not scheduled. The submitter supports scheduling the building as a B ranked building. I confirm my recommendation that the building is scheduled due to the heritage significance outlined in the heritage record form.

Submission 559.232
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Further Submission FS1001.1
Further Submitter Ben Laing
Recommendation: ACCEPT

The former Robinsons' boarding house is scheduled on the ODP as item 21; as notified the building was not included in Schedule 30.1. The building was one of a number peer reviewed by Adam Wild for WDC in 2018; Mr Wild found the building merited scheduling as a 'B' ranked item. The submitter supports retention of the former Robinsons' boarding house as a 'B' ranked building on schedule 30.1. The further submitter, who owns the property, also supports scheduling. The further submitter describes the importance of the building as a local landmark and teaching opportunity for local school children and states that renovations have been undertaken in sympathy with the historic values of the building. I confirm my recommendation that the building is scheduled due to the heritage significance outlined in the heritage record form.

Submission 559.233
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT

I recommended that the former Cavanagh residence at 67 Ellery Street, Ngaruawahia be included in Schedule 30.1; as notified it was not. The house was built in c.1912 by JJ Cavanagh, a local businessman and active community member. The building was one of a number peer reviewed by Adam Wild for WDC in 2018; Mr Wild found the building merited scheduling as a 'B' ranked item. The submitter supports the inclusion of the former Cavanagh residence as a 'B' ranked building on schedule 30.1. I confirm my recommendation that the building should be scheduled due to its architectural, historic and contextual heritage values as outlined in the heritage record form.

Submission 559.234
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT

See above – Submission 559.103.

Submission 559.235
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Recommendation: ACCEPT IN PART (in relation to precinct recognition)

The submission relates to both the individual scheduling of a group of former railway workers' cottages at Huntly (Schedule 30.1 #s 64-69 incl) and the identification of the group as a heritage precinct. The submitter seeks further information about my recommendation that the cottage be given a revised 'B' ranking; the houses are ranked 'A' in the ODP. I consider the revised ranking better accords with the guidance notes for ranking; it also establishes consistency within the former railway workers' cottages in Ngaruawahia (Schedule 30.1 items # 125-128 incl), which are contemporary with the Huntly cottages. I recommended recognition of the cottages as a precinct in June 2017 (see Attachment 5) and recorded in each relevant heritage record form that railway cottages of the same era and similar design are also located at 17, 21, 23, 25, 27 & 29 Harris Street and 4, 5, 7 & 9 Semple Street.

Submission 559.236
Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Further Submission FS 1043.1
Further Submission Te Uku & District Memorial Hall Inc

Recommendation: ACCEPT IN PART (ACCEPT scheduling of former Karioitahi School building (within which the Roll of Honour is located), the Otawa Memorial Bowling Club gates and boundary wall, the Rangiriri Maori War and Early Settlers Cemetery arch & boundary wall, the Te Hoe Memorial Hall and the Whitikahu Hall and McCallum memorial gates; REJECT scheduling other items proposed by HNZPT including the Te Uku Memorial Hall)

The submitter itemises a number of buildings and memorials associated with war commemoration. None of the proposed inclusions are currently listed by HNZPT; they arise from a c.2015 War Memorials Inventory Project. The former Karioitahi School / Hall, which houses the community's World War I memorial, is item 23 (A ranking) in schedule 30.1.

The Rangiriri Maori War and Early Settlers Cemetery Arch & Boundary Wall is item 49 (A ranking) in Schedule 30.1. The extent of setting encompasses the entire land parcel and it is noted that the Ministry of Culture & Heritage maintains the two New Zealand Wars monuments in the cemetery; see <https://mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/national-monuments-war-graves/list-historic-graves-and-monuments>. The cemetery is an archaeological site under the HNZPTA and is also subject to the provisions of the Burials Act as regard historic cemeteries. It is considered that these provisions, taken as a whole, adequately address the submission made by HNZPT.

A further submission from the Te Uku & District Memorial Hall Committee opposes the scheduling of the hall. This submission is accepted and the Te Uku Memorial Hall is not recommended for inclusion in Schedule 30.1.

** See Attachment 6 for a review of the proposals made by HNZPT that are not recommended for scheduling.*

Submission 697.307

Submitter Waikato District Council

Further Submission FS1323.145

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: ACCEPT IN PART

The submitter, at submission point 6 seeks the following: 'A revision of the historic heritage item descriptions in Schedule 30 is required to be undertaken, as there are several errors and omissions in this document and it does not presently align with the information that was provided from Council's technical expert'. The further submission partly supports the submission, in light of HNZPT's submission that the significant features column should be deleted and the schedule provided with hyperlinks to the relevant heritage record forms. Submission point 36 seeks alignment between the planning maps and schedule 30.1. This is supported to ensure consistency and clarity within the plan and thereby facilitate protection of scheduled heritage resources. [See also 559.218 above.]

Submission 600.1

Submitter Susanne Giessen-Prinz

Further Submission FS 1323.144

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submission 1276.72

Further Submitter Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society

Recommendation: ACCEPT [on the basis that it is recommended that the significant features column should be deleted from schedule 30.1]

The submitter has requested clarification as to the notation included for item 140 in the 'significant features' column in schedule 30.1. This column should be removed, to avoid such confusion and in line with best practice, and the protection extended to the former dairy factory by the relevant provisions in the PDP explained to the owner. As it stands, schedule 30.1 states that the significant feature to be protected for the former Raglan Co-operative Dairy Company factory is 'the location' and only the location. This makes no sense in view of the assessed heritage values of the building. The further submission by the WEDS simply supports

the original submission. HNZPT supports the submission in light of their submission seeking deletion of the significant features column (see 559.218).

Submission 781.21

Submitter Ministry of Education

Further Submission FS1323.136

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission], ACCEPT [further submission]

The Te Mata School was established in 1877 and a purpose-built schoolhouse was erected in 1905. The building has been assessed as meeting the criteria for scheduling; having architectural, cultural and historic significance. The building contributes to the village hub that also encompasses the former Te Mata Post & Telegraph Office (Schedule 30.1 item # 182) and the Te Mata Public Hall (Schedule 30.1 item # 183). The submitter seeks removal of the Te Mata School building from schedule 30.1. A further submission by HNZPT supports scheduling of the school building. I confirm my recommendation that the building is scheduled due to the heritage significance outlined in the heritage record form.

The Glen Massey school building (# 111) and Waerenga School Library (# 37) are currently scheduled on the ODP and buildings owned by the Ministry of Education are scheduled on district plans in other jurisdictions, e.g. two buildings at Hamilton East School (HCC ODP items H52 and H53). State houses and courthouses are other government building types that are routinely scheduled on district plans for the protection they merit, and require, under the RMA s 6(f). The 2004 policy for government departments' management of historic heritage resources requires ministries to acknowledge and provide for heritage protection and management.

Submission 781.22

Submitter Ministry of Education

Further Submission FS1323.137

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission], ACCEPT [further submission]

The Harrisville School teacher's house was built in 1883-84; the school having been established in 1877. The building has been assessed as meeting the criteria for scheduling with an 'A' ranking owing to its high cultural and historic values and its architectural significance. The submitter seeks removal of the Harrisville School teacher's house from schedule 30.1. A further submission by HNZPT supports scheduling of the school building. I confirm my recommendation that the building is scheduled due to the heritage significance outlined in the heritage record form.

The Glen Massey school building (# 111) and Waerenga School Library (# 37) are currently scheduled on the ODP and buildings owned by the Ministry of Education are scheduled on district plans in other jurisdictions, e.g. two buildings at Hamilton East School (HCC ODP items H52 and H53). State houses and courthouses are other government building types that are routinely scheduled on district plans for the protection they merit, and require, under the RMA s 6(f). The 2004 policy for government departments' management of historic heritage resources requires ministries to acknowledge and provide for heritage protection and management.

Submission 781.23

Submitter Ministry of Education

Further Submission FS1323.138

Further Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Recommendation: REJECT [submission], ACCEPT [further submission]

The Tamahere School building dates to the opening of the school on 12 May 1884; it was originally a single classroom space with separate entrance porches for boys and girls. The building has been assessed as meeting the criteria for scheduling and is recommended for an 'A' ranking based on its high architectural significance and significant cultural, historic and technological values. It is listed by HNZPT as a category 2 historic place (list # 342). The submitter seeks removal of the Tamahere School building from schedule 30.1 (item # 177). A

further submission by HNZPT supports scheduling of the school building. I confirm my recommendation that the building is scheduled due to the heritage significance outlined in the heritage record form.

The Glen Massey school building (# 111) and Waerenga School Library (# 37) are currently scheduled on the ODP and buildings owned by the Ministry of Education are routinely scheduled on district plans in other jurisdictions, e.g. two buildings at Hamilton East School (HCC ODP items H52 and H53). State houses and courthouses are other government building types that are commonly scheduled on district plans for the protection they merit, and require, under the RMA s 6(f). The 2004 policy for government departments' management of historic heritage resources requires ministries to acknowledge and provide for heritage protection and management.

Submission 946.1

Submitter Dee Bond

Further Submission FS1387.1595

Further Submitter Mercury NZ Ltd

Recommendation: Provide the submitter with information about the impact of scheduling, including the availability of heritage incentive funding for repairs, maintenance and, if necessary, seismic strengthening etc.

The submitter would like more information about the implications of having the Tuakau Hotel scheduled at 30.1. The further submission does not relate to the specific heritage-related comments made by the submitter.

Submission 946.2

Submitter Dee Bond

Recommendation: Advise the submitter that the redoubt site is principally an archaeological and cultural site and therefore has protection under the HNZPTA and is not best 'suited' to inclusion in a built heritage schedule.

The submitter would like more information about why the Alexandra Redoubt is not included in schedule 30.1. In the Built Heritage Items report dated 30 November 2016 and updated 31 May 2017, the consultant advised WDC to remove the redoubt and cemetery site from the built heritage schedule, but also advised that ODP *Areas D.2 Alexandra Redoubt, Alexandra Redoubt Road, Tuakau*, which includes the Tuakau cemetery, 'has built heritage values, in addition to its cultural and archaeological significance'. My report went on to say that 'the management of this significant heritage resource should be fully cognisant of the historic fabric of the graves, some of which are in need of repair and careful maintenance'. The intention was not to ignore or undermine the significance of the Alexandra Redoubt and Cemetery site, but rather to recommend holistic management and protection of the site by other means than inclusion on the built heritage schedule. A reserve management plan is recommended as the best tool to facilitate heritage protection in this instance, taking in to account the Burials Act as well as the HNZPTA.

Submission 946.3

Submitter Dee Bond

Recommendation: Advise the submitter about the other submissions relating to this matter, and the hearings outcome, in due course.

The submitter would like more information about why Lavalla is not included in schedule 30.1; by implication this suggests that the submitter supports scheduling. My recommendation is that the former Marist Juniorate Training College building, Lavalla College in Dominion Road, Tuakau is included in schedule 30.1.

See submission 559.229 and further submission FS1022.1 above.

Submissions relating to heritage precincts and related matters:

Submission 264.1

Submitter Cathy Miller

Further Submission FS 1386.272

Further Submitter Mercury NZ Ltd

Recommendation: REJECT

The submitter seeks the inclusion, and enlargement, in the PDP of the Rangiriri heritage precinct, which is included in the ODP at Appendix D. I recommended that the Rangiriri design guide be removed from the PDP because it is too narrowly focused on a single building and a historic cemetery (see Attachment 7); furthermore the cemetery arch and Rangiriri Hotel are both included in Schedule 30.1 (items # 49 & 50). While there may be a case for creating a town centre design guide to promote and manage the development of the streetscape of Rangiriri there is insufficient evidence to support protection of a historic heritage precinct. This assessment in no way detracts from the historic interest and importance of Rangiriri. The further submission does not relate to the specific heritage-related comments made by the submitter.

Submission 559.143

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission 559.243

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission 559.244

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission 559.245

Recommendation: REJECT

The submissions concern the provisions for the residential heritage precincts at Matangi and Huntly. The submitter requests that the activity status for construction of buildings has a restricted discretionary status, rather than a controlled one. In the case of Matangi all of the houses located within the precinct are individually scheduled (#s 163-171, A ranking), meaning that protection under RMA s6(f) is provided for under Chapter 7 of the PDP. In the Huntly precinct six of the seven houses in the precinct are scheduled heritage items (#s 64-69, B ranking) – the empty lot and one other house are therefore the only properties that would be immediately affected by Rule 16.3.11.6 C1. A controlled activity status seems appropriate in the circumstances, given that the rule identifies ‘effects on historic heritage’ as a matter of control and references the relevant Design Guides, and that the underlying zoning supports residential redevelopment on these sites. In a similar vein, the submitter also requests that alterations have a restricted discretionary status; the same points raised as regard construction of buildings can be made in this instance. The relevance of Rule 16.3.11.6 C3 is questioned in relation to residential dwellings and it should also be noted that the ranking of the individual scheduled items within the areas, A for the Matangi houses and B for the Huntly ones, may need to be reflected in the relevant precinct rules, which should defer to the rules for scheduled heritage items.

Submission 559.215

Submitter Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Further Submission FS1388.810

Further Submitter Mercury NZ Ltd

Recommendation: REJECT

See commentary re Submission 264.1 above. The submitter provided no further information to support an assessment of historic heritage significance for area recorded in the ODP as the Rangiriri heritage precinct. The further submission does not relate to the specific heritage-related comments made by the submitter.

See also Submission 559.76 [HNZPT] re inclusion of Rangiriri Heritage Precinct within the planning maps etc.

Submission 620.1
Submitter Waikato District Heritage Forum
Further Submission FS1035.103
Further Submitter Pareoranga Te Kata
Further Submissions 1123.1 & FS1123.2
Further Submitter Christine Madsen
Recommendation: REJECT

See commentary re Submission 264.1 above.

Submission 749.117
Submitter Housing New Zealand Corporation
Recommendation: REJECT

The submitter requests that the words ‘amenity values and character’ are not used in regard to matters of control that can be exercised by council in regard to the residential heritage precincts at Huntly and Matangi. ‘Amenity values’ are referenced in RMA s7 (b) and ‘character’ is used in best practice assessment of residential areas in particular in order that territorial authorities can give effect to section 7 of the Act. It might be argued that amenity values and character are not relevant to heritage precincts, which come within the ambit of section 6 of the Act, nevertheless any new buildings erected in either precinct will not be heritage items but will instead contribute to the overall amenity and character of the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the rules at 16.3.11.6 include reference to ‘amenity values and character’.

Submission 980.1
Submitter Christine Madsen
Further Submission FS1323.50
Further Submitter Heritage NZPT
Recommendation: REJECT

See commentary re Submission 264.1 above.

Submission 780.18 & 825.18
Submitter John Lawson for WEDS
Submission 831.27
Submitter Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally
Recommendation: That these submissions can only be considered with reference to an assessment of heritage values in the Raglan town centre.

The submitters request that a Raglan heritage precinct is included in the PDP.