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1.0 Introduction

1.01 Current Situation

The building known as the Melanesian Mission house is located in the Auckland suburb of Mission Bay. It is owned by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage New Zealand), and is currently leased for use as a restaurant. Following its acquisition by the then Historic Places Trust\(^1\), the Mission House served for a time as a museum, but since then as a restaurant or tearooms under a succession of tenants.

Heritage New Zealand is in the process of carrying out seismic strengthening works. It is also reviewing tenancy terms and conditions and wishes to have an up-to-date conservation plan to act as a guide for future adaptive reuse. The purpose is to ensure Heritage New Zealand protects, preserves and conserves existing heritage values by informing the future management of Melanesian Mission house.

1.02 Reasons for this Plan

A Conservation Plan was commissioned in 1990 by the then tenant, Brandy’s Bar (1987) Limited. This was to assist the Trust to evaluate the company’s proposals for change in and around the building. That report documented the extent of change over time to the Mission Building and identified those elements which were of such significance that they should be conserved in any alteration to the building. Its purpose was to guide both the Trust and its various lessees in turn, where any change of use was contemplated.

This report reviews and updates the original conservation plan – in particular, the history of use and change since 1990. The recommended conservation policies have been revised to reflect the current state of the building and to act as a guide for seismic strengthening, engagement and repairs.

The plan is subject to the process prescribed in section 19 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA), and the draft plan will be publicly notified and made available for inspection and comment. The plan will be reviewed in the light of any comments received.

1.03 The Site

The land occupied by the Mission building is a small residue of lot 40A of 47 acres (19 hectares) in a government subdivision of part of the “Kohimarama Block” in 1842. The legal description of the site is Lot 28 DP 19137 and Lots 4 and 6 DP 22640. The land is now zoned ‘Recreation 3’ in the Operative District Scheme of the Auckland City Council.

---

\(^1\) Prior to 14 April 2014, Heritage New Zealand was known as New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT). For clarity, Heritage New Zealand will be referred to as NZHPT for any events that took place prior to April 2014.
1.04 Existing Heritage Listings

The Melanesian Mission Building is classified under Section 65(4)(a)(i) (Category 1) of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, as a place of “special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value.”\(^2\)

The building is included in Appendix 1 to the Operative Auckland Council District Plan under Category A, as one of those buildings “...which have outstanding ... architectural ... significance well beyond their immediate environs”, and which it is of “prime importance” to protect.\(^3\)

This recognition is sustained in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP) – refer Appendix 6. Under the PAUP, The site is also scheduled as a Category B historic place (#1575), for its historical, social, knowledge, physical attributes, aesthetic and context values refer to Appendix 7.

Two Norfolk Pine trees, planted by Bishops Selwyn and Patteson, on the site are included as historic trees commemorating “an important event or person in Maori or European history.”\(^4\)

![Image](FIG1.png)

**FIG 1**
The Melanesian Mission from south east. Bastion Point (left) North Head in background, 1890

*Photograph: James D. Richardson
Source: Sir George Grey Special Collection, Auckland Libraries 4-2280a*

1.05 Identification of Contributors

This report has been prepared for Heritage New Zealand by Salmond Reed Architects, 58 Calliope Road, Devonport, Auckland.

The assessment of significant elements in this document has been undertaken by Jeremy Salmond, principal of the company. Archival and historical research draws upon that originally prepared by Nerida Campbell

---


4. Ibid. p.177, 222
for the 1990 Draft Conservation Plan, and has been supplemented by further research conducted by Tracey Hartley and Anne Shanks of Salmond Reed Architects.

## 2.0 Historical Account

### 2.01 Introduction

The history of Bishop Patteson’s mission at Kohimarama is well documented, especially in the work of R.M. Ross. The site itself has traditional associations with local iwi – notably Ngati Paoa and Ngati Whatua - and important historical connections with early European settlement of the Auckland Isthmus. Particular historical significance derives from a conference arranged by the Colonial Government at which the Governor General, Gore-Brown, sought commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi, but set out also to dissuade rangatira from throughout New Zealand from supporting the establishment of a Maori King movement, and also to justify the Government’s land acquisitions and repressive policies in Taranaki.

In addition, Kohimarama became for a time a nexus for the proselytising mission of the Anglican Church in the Pacific. At the end of the 1840s, the Melanesian Mission was established in the bay by Bishop George Augustus Selwyn, the first Primate of New Zealand, whose diocese included the islands of Melanesia. The school was known also as St Andrew’s College, and its purpose was to provide Melanesian boys with a Christian (Anglican) education.

Following the relocation of the Mission to Norfolk Island in 1867, the buildings of the Mission continued as an educational facility, serving variously as a naval training school, industrial school, an institute for developing work skills to neglected boys and, for a period of five years from 1915, as a flight training school.

---

The surviving building was adapted for use as a museum in 1928, and was ultimately acquired in 1974 by the (then) New Zealand Historic Places Trust (now Heritage New Zealand), under whose stewardship it has been leased to a succession of restaurants.

This stone building was one of a number of structures erected in 1858 to a design by the architect, land agent, and sometime member of the Colonial Legislature, Reader Gilson Wood. These supplemented earlier timber framed buildings.

### 2.02 Site History

Mission Bay is located seven kilometres east of the city centre, on the southern shore of the Waitemata Harbour, between Orakei and Kohimarama. Takaparawhau (Bastion Point) is at the west end of Mission Bay.

The bay and its sandy shore was home to extensive shellfish beds of tuangi (cockle), pipi, kutai (mussel), kakara (whelk) and puputai (sea snail). The Harbour provided assorted fishing and was also the main transit highway to all directions north-south and to outlying islands.

According to oral traditions Te Tini o Toi and Te Uri o Ngaoho people occupied the northern peninsula. Early Tangata Whenua amalgamated

---

6 The traditional history of the site which follows (shaded text) has been provided by Heritage New Zealand staff.
7 The Purewa Stream runs through Orakei
8 Mission Bay is part of the Kohimarama Block Crown Purchase of 1841
with ancestral waka-voyaging Maori, eventually forming the Waiohua confederation of hapu.\textsuperscript{12}

In the Te Puawaitanga Period\textsuperscript{13} Waiohua was attacked and decimated by Ngati Maru of the Marutuahu Confederation, from Tikapa Moana Kapanga (Thames), in retaliation for the death of Kahurautao at Patutahi near Maungawhau.\textsuperscript{14} In the Te Huringa Tahi period\textsuperscript{15} Te Taou Ngati Whatua living at Kaipara expanded into Tamaki Makaurau.\textsuperscript{16}

The property lies within a dense ancestral landscape. There are signs of Maori occupation throughout the area, including complex pa (Orakei), papakainga (Takaparawhau and Okahu), middens, pits, terraces, hearths, Tauranga waka, gardens, springs, caves and burials. It has always been a depot or kai moana processing area for the tribes operating in Tamaki Makaurau.

The sheltered bays were prized territory with numerous claimants including: Te Kawerau a Maki, Marutuahu\textsuperscript{17,18} and Tainui Waka affiliate hapu Waiohua, Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki, Ngati Paoa\textsuperscript{19} and Ngati Whatua.

Kohimarama rohe was a Pou Rangatira place, where large socio political gatherings of the people were held. Thus during the early colonial period it was used by Maori as a convenient place from which to conduct trade and commerce with colonists, up until the Waikato land wars of the 1860s.\textsuperscript{20}

The bay is directly across from the sacred island of Rangitoto\textsuperscript{21} – the mission building is constructed of basalt, the same material used in the construction of Rangiatea and Taputapuatea (sacred precincts and marae in Hawaiki).

\begin{enumerate}
\item Both the Tainui and Te Arawa waka are known to have passed through Kohimarama, Orakei and Purewa. The Te Arawa tupuna Kahumatamomoe living there for a time until establishing permanently in the Kaipara. Okahu Bay pays homage to his time there. Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Orakei Claim (WAI 9), 1987. URL: https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_68494556/ReportonOrakeiW.pdf p. 16.
\item Waiohua consolidated mana over the lands from Te Manukanuka o Hoturoa (Manukau Harbour) to Mangawhai.
\item A Maori concept of time devised by Hirini Moko Mead – correlates to the period 1500-1800AD, in this instance circa 1680.
\item Kahurautao and Kiwi were visiting their Waiohua relations in Tamaki when they were ambushed. It was his son Rautao who led the Marutuahu tribes to attack and capture Kiwi Tamakis and the citadel pa of Waiohua at Tamaki (Maungawhau) to avenge the death of his father and brother. It was this incident that led to the occupation of Tamaki by Marutuahu tribes. http://ngatimaru.iwi.nz/history/ AND Kelly, Leslie G; Tainui: the story of Hoturoa and his descendants, Christchurch, 1980, p. 181.
\item Correlates to the period 1800-1900 and in this instance circa 1741 Te Taou
\item Tamaki Makaurau as in Auckland Isthmus. Te Tao U are an old tribe who amalgamated with Ngati Whatua o Kaipara people, who were a branch of Ngati Whatua who had migrated originally from the Mangakahia-Dargaville area. Et al also New Zealand Herald 24 January, 1925.
\item Ngati Maru camp 1841 Mataharehare Bay (Georges Bay – Mechanics Bay)
\item Judge Monro MB, 29 November 1866, fol 55 & 56
\item Ngati Paoa camp 1841 Mataharehare Bay (Georges Bay – Mechanics Bay)
\item New Zealand Herald, 24 January, 1925.
\item Rangitoto is the abbreviated form of the full name of the island - Te Rangi i totongia a Tamatekapua, which translates as The Day Tamatekapua shed blood, and is an allusion to a stoush Tamatekapua (Captain of Te Arawa waka) had with Hoturoa (Captain of Tainui Waka) over improprieties regarding the latter’s wife. It is sacred because of the blood shed by Tamatekapua and because of the basalt that originates from there, the basalt is a divine element and skin of the patron god of Hawaiki, where ancestral wakas Te Arawa and Tainui were from.
\end{enumerate}
According to Maori religion, basalt is a divine element, the skin of Taha’a and Tangaroa and also the medium by which one could commune with the gods. Modern Mission Bay takes its name from the Melanesian Mission, which was established in the bay by Bishop George Augustus Selwyn at the end of the 1840s. This is a contested area with several overlapping interests and ancestral footprints.

At the time of the mission’s construction, Ngati Paoa were reported as living in this locality and at Orakei and Takaparawhau. The Orakei Creek was the western boundary of the Ngati Paoa lands on the south side of Auckland Harbour. At the time of Hongi Hika’s Ngapuhi invasion of the 1820s, they had cultivations on the Orakei reserve.

The musket war and Ngapuhi invasion forced internal mass migration all over the north island; Maori living in Tamaki Makaurau temporarily withdrew south into Waikato and other areas seeking sanctuary with their kin.

Ngati Whatua, under the Rangatira Apihai Te Kawa, capitalised on this vacuum to strengthen their foothold in Tamaki by occupying vacated pa and cultivations. Eventually Ngati Whatua took possession of the south shore of the Auckland Harbour. They were found in occupation of land at Pitoitoi (Riverhead) and Orakei on the arrival of Governor Hobson in 1840.

Mission Bay falls under land blocks referred to as Kohimarama and Tamaki. In 1837 William Fairburn purchased 82,000 acres of the Tamaki Block out of Maori ownership. There is a claim that a third (27,000 acres) of this acquisition was meant to have been given back to Maori.

In 1841 Bishop Selwyn purchased 140 acres (56.6 hectares) of farmland in this block, running down to the sandy beach of Mission Bay. At its first synod in 1859 the Anglican diocese of Waiapu, on the East Coast, resolved to support overseas missions by the church and, in pursuit of this objective, Bishop Selwyn with the assistance of his protégé and successor, John Coleridge Patteson, established a mission to the islands of Melanesia.

22 Taha’a is the name of a god and the name of the island which he was said to have resided on before being dismembered in a war of the gods. The Maori word for basalt is Tahanga which is Taha’a in ancient Proto Tahitian. The sacred house or whare of Raitatea sits on (Rangiatea in Maori) the divine courtyard of the gods-Taputapuatea, the earthly embodiment was said to have been on the Tahitian island of Raitatea on the sacred marae of Taputapuatea. Taputapuatea was the centre of Polynesia and religious epicentre, which was constructed of basalt from the island of Taha’a. It was the cradle of Polynesia and central headquarters of all religion, higher esoteric learning, magics and waka voyaging. Most of the waka Arika were trained here and most of the waka left from here. When they left, they took basalt as mauri stones to implant in new lands – like Aotearoa.

23 The stone building is built of scoria rock quarried on the volcanic island of Rangitoto.

24 Lineham, Peter J. (13 July 2012). “‘Missions and missionaries - Overseas missions’”. Te Ara. Retrieved 2013-09-26 The school also known as St Andrew's College was an Anglican institution set up to provide Melanesian boys with a Christian education. The stone buildings, designed by Reader Wood, date from 1858 and are built of scoria rock quarried on the volcanic island of Rangitoto.

25 This should be taken into account when taking in information about history.

26 Paul, Monin, This is My Place. Hauraki Contested, 1769-1875, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001, p.113 AND Judge Monro MB, 29 November 1866, fol 33-34 & 35

27 Orakei and Takaparawhau also look toward Takapuna, Takarunga and Takaroro (Devonports maunga).

28 Judge Monro MB, 29 November 1866, fol 45, 47 & 51 & 52

29 Paul, Monin, This is My Place. Hauraki Contested, 1769-1875, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001, p.113
Patteson, an Anglican missionary to the South Seas since 1855, was an accomplished linguist learning 23 of the Solomon Islands’ more than 1,000 languages. On 24th February 1861 he was consecrated as the first Bishop of Melanesia.

In 1847 Selwyn travelled to the islands and returned with a party of Melanesian boys who were to be trained in mission work. By making friends with the Melanesian people, he persuaded them to let their sons be brought to Auckland for this purpose.

Initially installed at St John’s College, this proved “too bleak for creatures used to basking under a vertical sun, and it [was] decided to remove to the sheltered landing space at Kohimarama, where buildings for the purpose had been commenced so as to be habitable in time for the freight of 1859”.

Much of the cost of building the school at Kohimarama was met by Patteson’s cousin and biographer, Charlotte Yonge, from the royalties of her popular novel *The Daisy Chain*. The site for this training institution, which was named St Andrew’s College, and which became more widely known as the Melanesian Mission School, was the land at Kohimarama. Patteson described the setting to Charlotte Yonge in a letter dated 21 December 1859.

"Just opposite the entrance into the Auckland harbour, between the island of Eangitoto [sic - Rangitoto] with its double peak and the easternmost point of the northern shore of the harbour, lies a very sheltered bay, with its sea-frontage of rather more than a quarter of a mile, bounded to the east, south, and west by low hills, which where they meet the sea become sandy cliffs, fringed with the red-flower-bearing pohutakawa. [sic] The whole of this bay, the seventy acres of flat rich soil included within the rising ground mentioned, and some seventy acres more as yet lying uncleared, adjoining the same block of seventy acres, and likely to be very valuable, as the land is capital—the whole of this was bought by the Bishop many years ago as the property of the Mission, and is the only piece of Church land over which he retains the control, every other bequest or gift to the

http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4952/4952-h/4952-h.htm#link2HCH0010

31 David Hilliard. ‘Patteson, John Coleridge’, from the *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. Te Ara - the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, updated 7 January 2014
amount of 14,000 acres, having been handed over by him to the General Synod. This he retains till the state of the Melanesian Mission is more definitely settled.  

A Trust Board, endowed with these large areas of land, was established in 1862 by Bishop Selwyn and Patterson to support the mission work in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, with income derived from rents on the land.

The buildings erected for the mission included both stone and timber framed structures in a roughly quadrangular arrangement open on the north side to the beach. A wooden school building closed the east side, and a stone building containing dining hall, kitchen and storeroom stood on the west. The large schoolroom had previously been located at St John’s College between the hospital and the chapel. Once relocated to Kohimarama, it contained the chapel (north transept), classroom (centre) and printery (south transept).

Over time, the climate of Kohimarama was found to be too cold for the sun-loving Melanesians, so by arrangement with the Australian Government the Mission was moved to Norfolk Island and a grant of 1,000 acres (404.6 hectares) made over to them. The mean temperature of the Island is 29 degrees C. and it lies 645 kilometres north of the North Cape and about 965 kilometres from Auckland.

2.03 Construction History

There is evidence to suggest that plans for the construction of the stone buildings for the mission were under way as early as February 1858, when Bishop Patteson wrote to his colleague Selwyn:

“Everything ready, church built, land assigned for school and parsonage, that is, according to this statement”

32 Yonge, op. cit,
33 Elizabeth Colenso - Her work for the Melanesian Mission by her eldest granddaughter, Francis Edith Swabey, 1956, Transcr. by the Rt Rev. T. Brown, 2007
At the end of 1858, another letter to Selwyn states "Sustins is carrying stone - he has the flat bottomed schooner that belonged to Captain Porter". By December 1858 Selwyn had assembled Reader Wood (architect - see Section 2.07), Hunter (carpenter) and Benjamin Strange (stonemason), to work on the building.

The mechanics of the whole affair, however, had evidently not been explained to Patteson.

"I did not understand that Reader Wood was to negotiate at all with Sustins about carrying stone, I told Sustins that neither you nor I was responsible for anything, that he must make his arrangements with Strange.\textsuperscript{35}

Strange on being applied to agreed to take the work ... both he and Hunter will contract to have the Schoolroom and Dormitories perfectly fit for immediate occupation by the .. of October 1859."\textsuperscript{36}

It appears that Reader Wood had contacted Patteson about the cost of the construction and that Patteson had made arrangements to secure the money:

"Reader Wood's approximate estimate, in which he makes allowances for further expenses etc, amounts to £600 for putting up the Schoolroom and Dormitories up on the stone foundations, and for one wall 6 foot high and 120 foot long. This includes the charge for carrying 300 tons of stone ...\textsuperscript{37}

"Therefore I have written to him further telling him that I am going to draw upon him (Patteson's father) between this time and November 1859 for £500, unless time goes on, local subscriptions on any plan proposed by you allowed of my stopping the [illegible] on him, which will be drawn otherwise to meet monthly payments.\textsuperscript{38}

Patteson also had difficulties with the carpenter (Hunter) with whom he disagreed about the construction of the stone buildings:

"Hunter told me that if the Schoolhouse and Dormitories were placed on the ground in pieces at Kohimarama, the injury from exposure would be very great, to the loss of us proportionately great ... But if these buildings are to be created, the stone foundations must precede, and the southern wall to be the length of 120 feet must be put up."\textsuperscript{39}

Progress was reported in January 1859:

"Sustins has landed perhaps 80 or 90 tons of stone. He gets 4s for carrying stone and does not know whether he is to have any more for quarrying, but supposes he is to receive something more ... The Hospital is nearly boarded throughout ..."\textsuperscript{40}

The stone building consisted of a dining hall, kitchen and storeroom built of Rangitoto stone. [q.v.] The building was L-shaped in plan with the stem of the 'L' being the dining room and the foot of the 'L' containing kitchen and storerooms.

Other wooden buildings had been erected in addition to the large stone building. The arrangement of the group of buildings was quadrangular with

\textsuperscript{34. Letter from Bishop Patteson to Bishop Selwyn, 22 February 1858, SJC}
\textsuperscript{35. Ibid. 14 December 1858}
\textsuperscript{36. Ibid. 29 December 1858}
\textsuperscript{37. Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{38. Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{39. Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{40. Ibid. 14 January 1859}
the stone building on the west side, a large school building to the east and others to the south, leaving the north side open to the beach.

![Figure 6](image6.png)

**FIG 6**
Mission Bay: The Melanesian Mission School House Feb 24 1898
Artist: Harold Young
Source: Auckland Art Gallery

The large schoolroom on the east side had stood at St John's College between the hospital and the chapel. It was a long (about 80 feet) gabled building with three transepts, and when relocated at Kohimarama contained the chapel (north transept), classroom (centre) and printery (south transept). In recent histories it has been generally referred to as St Andrew's Chapel, despite these other uses.

Patteson described the layout of the stone building to Miss Charlotte Yonge, a well-known Victorian novelist and a relative of Patteson, who later used the proceeds of her book *The Daisy Chain* to make a 1,000 pound contribution to the Melanesian Mission:

"The west side consists of a very nice set of stone buildings, including a large kitchen, store room and room for putting things in daily, and immediate use; and the hall, which is the northern part of the side of the quadrangle, is a really handsome room, with simple open roof and windows of a familiar collegiate appearance. These buildings are of the dark grey scoria, almost imperishable I suppose, and look very well. The hall is long just enough to take seven of us at the high table (so to speak), and thirtyfour at the long table stretching from the high table to the end of the room." \(^{41}\)

The Melanesian College, as the Kohimarama settlement became known, was named St Andrew's as a compliment to Miss Yonge who had featured a church named St Andrew in *The Daisy Chain*. The name appears to have

![Figure 7](image7.png)

**FIG 7**
Dr Codrington's house, re-erected on Norfolk Island; from *Bishop Patteson, Pioneer and Martyr Rev. H.N. Drummond*, 1930

---

41. Patteson, quoted by Charlotte Mary Yonge in *Life of John Coleridge Patteson ...*, London, 1874
been disliked by Selwyn who did not consider it appropriate for the area.

Initially, Bishop Patteson had lived in a small wooden house (part of the quadrangle) consisting of “three little rooms, together measuring seventeen feet by seven.”\(^{42}\) In 1866 however, he moved into his own house, shown in a watercolour by J.C. Hoyte to have been a "large two-storied gabled building, with verandah facing east and north, which stood west and north of the dining hall, near the mouth of the creek".\(^{43}\)

Patteson’s occupancy of his new house was very short. He left for Norfolk Island in 1867 and the house was dismantled and rebuilt there, where it became known as Dr Codrington’s.\(^{44}\) On September 20\(^{th}\) 1871 Bishop Patteson was killed by natives in Nukapu in the Solomon Islands, and has since been regarded as a Martyr. His life is celebrated in the Anglican Church in England on September 20\(^{th}\) each year.

2.04 Later History of the Mission Building

By April 1867, St Andrew’s College had ceased to exist and the property was leased to a Mr Atkin. Nothing is known about the use of the Mission buildings during the next seven years until March 1874, when the Melanesian Trust Minute Book recorded that repairs were to be made to the shingle roof, using “heart of kauri” shingles at a cost of £189.16s.0d (the successful tender) on the advice of Mr Philcox, builder.\(^{45}\) In November that year, the minutes recorded that the land at Kohimarama was to be “leased to the General Government as a training school for seven years from 1.11.74”, and that “the Government is to put the buildings in repair and to deliver up at the expiration of the term both buildings and schooner in a proper state of repair”\(^{46}\) The rental was set at 100 pounds per annum.

The *Daily Southern Cross* of 24 April 1876 reported on a 'Naval Training School' at Kohimarama:

---
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“There are three buildings facing the beach to the northward, and forming three sides of a square - that to the left, or western side, is constructed of cemented rubble, and is fitted up with a dining hall, kitchen and storeroom. The manager, Captain Breton, occupies a wooden building situated in the centre, to which is attached the hospital etc. On the left, or eastern side, is the school-room and dormitory, lined throughout... the whole of the buildings throughout present a most substantial appearance and are in a good state of repair.”

It must be presumed that as part of this programme of improvements, a fireplace was installed in the west wall of the Hall, as this feature appears in all photographs taken after that date (vide FIG.9). In March 1882, the Naval Training School was re-gazetted as an Industrial School.

These schools were established under the *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867* to cater for both neglected and delinquent children under the age of 15, in the absence of any provincial or state system of social welfare.

Like its predecessor, however, this was not an outstanding success as either a corrective or educative institution, and the school finally closed early in 1893. From then until 1915, the stone buildings were used only as temporary summer holiday accommodation, although various wooden buildings on the property were let.

Heritage New Zealand records refer to ‘serious encroachment’ of the sea frontage in 1906, when a tenant, R. Newcombe, was granted 10 pounds for ‘fascines in the breach’. In 1915, the Board received an application from Messrs Walsh Brothers and Dexter, “proprietors of a school of aviation, asking permission to build a workshop and sheds” and to lease five acres (later increased to seven) at the western end of the Kohimarama property.

The Walsh Brothers were granted use of the land at a rental of 120 pounds per annum, commencing from 1 March 1920, on the condition that “all buildings erected by the lessees to be removable at the termination of the

---
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Buildings used for church services on the property were excluded from the lease.

In conformity with these requirements, a small village of huts, with a few tents, and the necessary hangars sprang up on the ground immediately behind the Mission House. The residential quarters were sited close to the small creek that discharged into the sea, just to the west of the Mission House. The hangars backed onto the long stone wall running east-west across the site.
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After the 1914-18 war the flying school’s fortunes waned, with few clients, and its aircraft assets were eventually transferred to the New Zealand Permanent Air Force (NZPAF) in 1924. Since, however, the Air Force relied solely on land-based aircraft, the machines designed and built by the Walsh brothers for the use of the school had no value for the NZPAF, and the four aircraft are thought to have been burned on the beach.

In 1919, the area now known as Mission Bay began to be sub-divided, followed in 1925 by a second subdivision initiated by the Melanesian Trust Board itself.
In 1926, the New Zealand Gazette recorded ten acres (4 hectares) being set aside as a reserve to be known as ‘Selwyn Domain’.\(^{51}\) The Domain became noted for its old trees - two of the most interesting considered to be the Norfolk pines planted near the mission building prior to 1860, one by Bishop Selwyn and the other by Bishop Patteson. A third Norfolk Pine planted at the same time by Bishop Abraham did not survive (or was destroyed) – see FIG 5.

In 1933, their Excellencies Lord Bledisloe and Lady Bledisloe planted 2 kauri trees near these Norfolk pines.\(^{52}\)

It was decided to re-open the building as a museum containing Melanesian artefacts, with a tenant installed to act as curator. The building was opened to the public in October 1928,\(^{53}\) and officially opened by Archbishop Averill in February 1929.\(^{54}\) About this time it was evident that the condition of the stone buildings had markedly deteriorated and a report from architects Jones and Palmer estimated repairs to the building would cost about 355 pounds.\(^{55}\) Following a vigorous fundraising campaign, the repairs were carried at a cost which eventually escalated to more than one thousand pounds (a tender for 1,132 pounds was considered insufficient and a call for donations of a further two hundred pounds was made in the Church Gazette).\(^{56}\)

Ten years later the building was found to be “in fair condition” by the noted Auckland architect Daniel B. Patterson,\(^{57}\) who again reported on the building in 1945 following complaints by the long-term tenant Captain Burgess – Burgess had been the Master of the third Mission ship, the SS Southern Cross, which completed its last voyage in June 1932. [see FIG.14]

In 1946, the Melanesian Mission Trust Board received a letter from the Mission Bay Progress Association Incorporated complaining about the
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"unsightly church foundations" of the old St Andrew’s chapel. The Association was given permission to remove them on the condition that a marble tablet was installed, bearing the inscription:

"The site and foundation stone of St Andrew’s Chapel.
Melanesian Mission.
Built by Bishop J.C. Patteson 1859."

The building continued as a museum, albeit not very successfully, as it was often closed and it ultimately acquired a local reputation as a ‘mystery building’. In 1972 a proposal was put forward to use the building as office accommodation in Auckland for the Melanesian Mission, but this was abandoned largely on account of community protest and instead it was handed over to the Historic Places Trust which (in its new form as Heritage New Zealand) takes responsibility for the administration of the property.
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The Trust’s original intention was to restore the building and rekindle interest in the mission by informing people of its early history. However it proved impossible to reduce the humidity inside the mission house to levels suitable for displaying artefacts.

Consequently, in 1979 it was decided to transfer the remaining Melanesian artefacts on permanent loan to the Auckland Institute and Museum and close the building to the public while the Trust, in consultation with the Anglican Church authorities, the Auckland City Council and interested local organisations, considered future uses which would be compatible with the building’s history and associations and which would be likely to bring an economic return to the Trust.

As a result of that consultation, and on the basis of the success of other Trust properties so used, a resolution of the Auckland City Council was passed on 16 March 1983, under Section 74 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1977, granting use of “the Melanesian Mission House as an eating house with an associated souvenir shop”. It was leased to a Mr and Mrs Ashmore to operate as a café and tearooms, serving lunches and Devonshire teas during the day and providing dining facilities for private functions in the evenings.

The “Mission House Restaurant” commenced operation in October 1984, and continued to display selected items from the period when it had been the dining hall kitchen and storerooms for the St Andrews College.

The then Director of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Mr John Daniels, supported the new use as follows:

"We believe that this new use will preserve the building’s historic integrity and, at the same time, bring people to it. It will also provide the finance needed for the future maintenance of the Mission house and the development of its grounds. The use of the old buildings in this way is in line with current international trends where historic buildings are not seen just as museums.”
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During the tenancy of this first restaurant, a BYO license was granted. In 1989 the restaurant lease was acquired by Brandy’s Bar 1987 Ltd, whose owners made application in 1990 for a liquor license under the new licensing laws effective in April of that year.

Retaining the name Mission House Restaurant, the new tenants sought (but were declined) permission to provide cover over the courtyard area between the restaurant and separate toilet facilities. The application sought also to extend the use into the wider grounds, by introducing appropriate landscaping to provide areas of outdoor seating for the restaurant and larger functions. [Refer Appendix 4]. In seeking consent for this development, the tenant commissioned the Conservation Plan which preceded this document.

The basic original plan form of the historic building remained unchanged under this tenancy, although brick partitions which had been added to the kitchen area in 1928 were removed, leaving just a mezzanine floor which had been installed in the kitchen and bar areas. Although this was not original, it was considered beneficial in providing access to the roof space and allowing closer views of unaltered original elements of the building.

Having acquired the lease and established the restaurant operation, however, Brandy’s Bar (1987) quickly entered a period of sub-leasing to a series of unsuccessful operators, and during this period various unsympathetic colour schemes and features inappropriate to the age and style of the building were introduced.

The difficulties of balancing the operational needs of tenants against the requirement to maintain and respect the heritage values of the buildings became painfully apparent. The anticipated income, which was to fund maintenance work, failed to materialise as successive tenants came and went.

Loose arrangements made between the former café tenants, the Ashmores, and operators of a twice-monthly craft fair held in the grounds also posed problems, as the crowds which were attracted damaged the area which was part of an archaeological site.
At expiry of the lease in 2000 the premises lay vacant for some time and there were moves by local church groups to use the Mission House as a Community Centre. This proposed use was rejected by the Trust, which was “determined to lease the premises to a restaurateur to ensure income to fund other activities.”  

The building has therefore continued to function as a restaurant since 2001, under the title of “MECCA Stonehouse” – one of a chain of MECCA restaurants in Auckland. Under the management of new proprietor, Dr Bashir Ahmed, the premises underwent a major refit during 2000-2001. The new layout retained the fine dining restaurant activity within the original 1859 Mission House.

A modern steel café structure with canvas sail enclosure has been built in the grounds alongside the reserve, and a well-equipped children’s playground established between the Mission House and the beach. [Refer Plans in Appendix 3]. While the new operation proved more successful than previous enterprises (in 2006 the MECCA Stonehouse Café was voted as ‘Most Favourite Place to Go’ in a poll conducted by The New Zealand Herald 64), the ideal balance between tenants’ business requirements and the concept of an adaptive re-use, in which heritage values are preserved, has remained elusive.
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The restaurant activity has continued successfully, due in large part to the special and appealing ambience that the heritage buildings and the setting lend to weddings and other private and corporate functions – as is the case with other Heritage New Zealand-owned properties such as Highwic and Alberton.

2.05 The Builders of the Mission Buildings

The stone Mission House was designed by Reader Gilson Wood, architect and surveyor, and built by stone mason, Benjamin Strange.

2.05.1 Reader Gilson Wood (1821-1895), Architect:

Reader Gilson Wood was born in England and his education in England included study under William Flint, architect and surveyor.

Wood arrived in New Zealand from Australia in 1844. The northern rebellion of Hone Heke broke out in the following year and Wood, having been made lieutenant of the Volunteer Artillery, was present at the attempted storming of Heke’s Pah at Ohaeawai on 1 July 1845. After the war he returned to Auckland to continue practice of his profession as architect and surveyor.

From May 1846 he shared accommodation with Frederick Thatcher whose services as an architect were in constant demand, in particular by Bishop Selwyn. Wood assisted Thatcher in his work for St John’s College. He supervised the construction of All Saints Howick and the Chapel of St John’s (1847).

Wood remained at St John’s for a short time and then took a government appointment as Inspector of Roads. Later he was appointed Deputy Surveyor-General, retaining this office until 1856. During this period he also married Mary Jane Holland (1850).

He carried out a large number of commissions, possibly working on extensions for Highwic and the Bluestone Store in the central city, although much of his later work displayed little originality.

Although in Bishop Patteson’s letters to Selwyn in 1859, Wood’s name appears only as an initial consultant rather than as “architect” and Benjamin Strange, the stonemason, appears to have been of more importance, it may be presumed that Wood proposed the design for the Mission Building and produced the estimate of 600 pounds for the works. Certainly the Selwynian influence, gained in his work with Thatcher, is apparent in this building.

Wood had a notable career in areas other than architecture, including service as a prominent local government official (1848-61) and as a member of the House of Representatives for Parnell (1861-65 and 1870-78) and for Waitemata, (1879-81).

He was a cabinet minister, holding the positions of Minister of Finance (then called Colonial Treasurer) twice, and Minister of Defence (then called Minister of Colonial Defence). He was part of the Auckland wing of the Liberal Party, sometimes called the "Auckland Rats". He retired from politics in 1881, and became Chairman of the Auckland Gas Company and a trustee of the Auckland Savings Bank.

Reader Wood died in Parnell, Auckland, survived by one son.

2.05.2 Benjamin Strange (1803-1882), Stone Mason:

J. Benjamin Strange was born in Henley-on-Thames in Oxfordshire, England, on 3 December 1803. He worked as a stone and marble mason in nearby Berkshire.

In 1852, he immigrated to New Zealand on board the Catherine Stuart Forbes. He was first employed by the Imperial Government to build the ‘old barrack wall’ (probably the Albert Street Barracks) and later constructed a stone warehouse in O’Connell Street for Messrs Campbell and Brown, and a tunnel under the Harp of Erin Road.

Strange was most noted for his stonemasonry on ‘Native Schools for Bishop Selwyn.”66 These included the house for the Headmaster of the Church of England Grammar School (the Kinder house), the St Stephen’s Priory and Deanery in Parnell (1857) and the Kohimarama school and buildings (the Melanesian Mission) in 1859. He was also responsible for a number of other buildings in Parnell including the well-known ‘Stonemason’s Cottage’ (1863) on the corner of Falcon and Tika Streets.

Strange is described as having been responsible for persuading Bishop Selwyn to build in more permanent stone rather than the less durable timber then in customary use. Strange himself lived in a stone building which he built for himself in Takutai Street, Parnell. This building survives today.

John Stacpoole describes the characteristic stonework used by Strange as:

“usually dark grey rounded rubble with dressed stone of the same kind at doors and windows. The rubble is seldom bigger than a cannon ball and suits the scale of the buildings much better than the oversized square blocks which characterise the stone blocks of, say, Tasmania.”67

Towards the end of his career Strange, described as “a peppery little stonemason,”68 undertook only monumental masonry, especially for
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monuments located in St Stephen’s cemetery. He died suddenly on 7 June 1882 in his 79th year.

2.06 Associated Buildings at the Mission

In 1843, the artist and architect Edward Ashworth sketched an area known today as Mission Bay, but then called Kohimarama. His sketch shows a range of buildings owned by the Land Claims Commissioner, William Spain, with a small cottage which was possibly the home of the early settler Alexander Dalziel.69

An 1860 photograph taken by J.N. Crombie shows the stone Melanesian Mission building and the wooden building known as St Andrew’s Chapel built on a stone foundation. The photograph also clearly shows a long rectangular wooden building to the east of the principal group. This is understood to have been temporary accommodation for visiting Maori chiefs which was later removed. In the foreground at the eastern end of the beach by the mouth of the stream are a group of raupo buildings.

An early resident, Miss Mary Atkin, daughter of theological student Joseph Atkin, recalled these houses and a group of small wooden cottages at the eastern end of the bay which were used by the Captain and Mate of the schooner Southern Cross.70

A second piece of evidence dating from 1860 is the sketch made by John Kinder which also shows the buildings identified in the Crombie photograph, but not the wooden buildings of the inner quadrangle.

In 1863, a house was constructed for another member of St Andrew’s College, Mr Dudley. Because of Dudley’s ill health however, it was shortly afterwards occupied by Mr & Mrs Pritt and became known as the ‘Pritt house’. This one-and-a-half storied gabled building, which is visible in a Kinder photograph of 1863, is often confused with Bishop Patteson’s, whose house built in 1866 was similar in style. According to Ruth Ross, the Pritt
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The house survived until 1925, when the area was subdivided and the old wooden house was sold.\(^{71}\)

Patteson’s house was built ‘between the dining hall and the sea’,\(^{72}\) and is described as a large two-storied gabled building with verandas to the east and north, and ‘french windows which opened on a verandah facing the sea’.\(^{73}\)

The house was near the mouth of the creek, in the vicinity of the raupo cottages in the Crombie photograph of 1860. There is no photographic evidence of a house in that location, but it is known that it was dismantled the following year. The house is clearly shown in a Hoyte sketch about 1866, but the building has a remarkable resemblance to a building on the site of the later Pritt house, and it is tempting to wonder whether Hoyte may have ‘misplaced’ the Patteson house in his drawing.

By 1870, the Melanesian complex (now unoccupied) consisted of the large wooden building with transepts (St Andrew’s Chapel), the Melanesian stone building, and the Pritt house, some distance away at the eastern end, but close to the beach. In 1865, a verandah was added to that house. Several wooden buildings remained in the inner quadrangle.

In 1876, a house was constructed by the Melanesian Trust for Captain Bongard. Despite his short tenancy it was always known as the ‘Captain’s house’. This house, described as ‘a comfortable five-roomed cottage’, no longer exists but its location is marked by two large Norfolk pines near the cottage garden.

In 1874, the property received a new tenant: the Naval Training School. The school found it necessary to erect additional buildings\(^{74}\) so that the complex now consisted of:

> "three buildings facing the beach to the northwards, and forming three sides of a square - that to the left, or western side, is constructed of cemented [mission building] fitted with a dining hall, kitchen and storeroom, ...a wooden building in the centre ...and on the left, or eastern side, the school-room and dormitory [St Andrew’s Chapel]...the whole of the buildings throughout present a most substantial appearance".\(^{75}\)

---

71. Ibid, p.60
72. Miss Mary Atkins recollections, undated (1929) SJC
73. Ross, p.38
74. Southern Cross, 24 April, 1875, p.3
75. Ibid
The remains of this historic building (described by the Mission Bay Progress Association as an ‘unsightly mess’) were clearly visible from the outline of the transepts on the ground, and were surrounded by a low post and rail fence.

Photographs taken of the property in 1890, when the complex had become an Industrial School for boys, show a large number of buildings.

In 1915, the Walsh Bros took over five acres (just over 2 hectares) and the Mission Buildings as a flying school. They had permission to erect hangars and outbuildings on the condition that the buildings were removed on termination of the lease.

The Flying School ceased to function in 1922, and was taken over by the Government, which itself ceased operation there in 1924.
In 1919 and 1925, there were two major subdivision programmes in the area; after the latter programme, most of the remaining wooden buildings were dismantled and sold - the Pritt house for four pounds.

The ‘Captain’s house’ was used by contractors working on the subdivision, and then this too was sold. The stone foundations of St Andrew’s Chapel, which remained clearly to be seen in the late 1940’s, were cleared after complaints from the Mission Bay Progress Association Incorporated.

By 1926, the stone house was in a poor state of repair after the departure of the Flying School. Apart from the Chapel remains, the L-shaped stone building was all that remained of the original complex.

As a result of alterations carried out to convert the building into a museum, several changes were made. Two public toilets were erected at the eastern end of the south wall, and a stone out-building constructed for the curator’s use. All these buildings exist today.

2.07 Repair and Maintenance of the Melanesian Mission

The first indication of the deterioration of the stone buildings is given in the Melanesian Trust Minute books (1874) recording roof repairs costing 189 pounds and 16 shillings, the successful tender being placed by Messrs Rose Bros. The shingles used in the roof repair were stipulated to be ‘heart of kauri’.76

In 1905, Messrs Frazer & Robert were asked to inspect the property and report on damage caused by the ‘encroachment of the sea’. A sub-committee reported that the tenant (R. Newcombe) was to be granted ten pounds towards the cost of fixing ‘fascines in the breach’.77

In 1911, a road was built fronting the beach; this was a triangular strip of land which was given for the purpose to Mr J. Harrison. The following year reports of sea encroachment were again made to the Board; it was estimated that it would cost forty pounds per chain for a wooden embankment and seventy pounds for stone. It was decided on 13 June 1912 to proceed with a breastwork of timber 660 feet long and a tender for 305 pounds was let.78 The result of this tender is not known, however in 1913 South British Insurance ‘declined to re-insure the old Mission and Stone House and Kohimarama’.79

In 1914, a bathing shed was built. In 1915, repairs were made to roof and windows: the roof was painted inside, as were windows and doors, with three coats of oil paint at a cost of ten pounds.

Until 1926, there is little evidence of further repairs. On 16 December 1926, however, Messrs Jones & Palmer (the latter a son of Archdeacon Palmer) submitted a detailed report of repairs they found necessary. Their estimate of 355 pounds did not include the cost of two sets of three-light windows for the west wall of the Church room. These were to be placed each side of the fireplace to improve the lighting and ventilation of the building (and also, they believed, the appearance). Their report was presumably in answer to a Board request. Ruth Ross was of the opinion that a display of Melanesian artefacts at the Auckland Town Hall in 1926 drew attention to the neglected state of the Mission building.

The architects said it would be necessary to re-shingle the whole of the roof, although overall roof timbers were in good condition. Sarking over the
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kitchen would need to be removed. The floor was only in fair condition and should be properly ventilated under the joists (which would necessitate a lowering of the floor to ground level). The flooring in the passages needed to be repaired and ventilated.

Most of the window frames were in good condition, but common sashes had been used on the east side; the architects said they would like to see the old ones repaired and put back. The two cross walls between the kitchen and Church Room had been lined with wood for no apparent reason, and some of the wood had rotted. The removal of the wood lining was accordingly recommended.

The wooden lean-to against the South wall of the kitchen was not original, and its removal was also recommended, along with the removal of the roof over the door to the Church room. ‘If a porch is necessary, a better one should be added.’80 It had been expected that the old stone building would last for centuries. In fact, however:

“the descending hand of the vandal has completed the ruinous work of time. The stout frames enclosing the little diamond-paned windows of the old dining hall have been wrenched from their sockets; even the heavy wooden flooring in the hold kitchen has been torn up. The rafters are rotting and great holes in the shingled roof add a last pitiful touch of the picture of ruin and decay.

...Oh, shame on you, people of Auckland, churchmen and laity alike!”81

As a result of Messrs Jones’ and Palmer’s recommendations to the Board major repairs were carried out, and the Board eventually accepted a tender of over one thousand pounds for this work. A report in the Diocesan Year Book said that the Board would contribute five hundred pounds if the remainder came from private subscription.82

The greatly increased tender for repairs to the building was a consequence of the Board’s decision to install a Curator in the building, which was now to operate as a Museum of Melanesian artefacts. Not only were the repairs carried out as suggested by Messrs Jones & Palmer, but it was decided also to convert part of the building to a curator’s flat. Thus, the old kitchen was completely removed and a new chimney built in another position.

A stone out-building was constructed to house a wash-house and storeroom for the curator; this necessitated the removal of a section of the south west corner of the original stone shelter wall.

---

80. Letter to Board. 16.12.26
81. Ross, p.60
Today only one of three original triangular openings remains. Public conveniences were erected at the eastern end of the stone wall when the museum was opened in February 1928.

Of the original kitchen, only the blank stone shield remained, fixed above the fireplace in the dividing wall of the curator’s flat, but this too has since disappeared in subsequent reconfigurations of the interior.

During the inter-war period the care of the building was entrusted to tenants who reported to the Board if repairs were necessary.

In 1935, examination of the outside walls revealed that the old mortar had perished; the mortar was described as ‘small rubble stones set in lime mortar’. The exterior pointing was replaced with a dense Portland cement mortar, and the following year the internal faces of external walls were plastered with a dense Portland cement render. It is probable that the original interior wall lining was some form of timber wainscoting, since Richardson’s excellent 1927 photographs clearly show a line of pockets in the stone which may have held timber blocks for fixing. [see Fig 27]

The timber floor, removed in 1927, was replaced for a second time with concrete on a damp proof membrane. At this time, deterioration of the lean-to (said to be made of packing case timber), which abutted the wash-house, was reported.

In 1937, a jarah (sic) paling fence was erected on the north-west side and window sashes painted. Four rewarewa trees were planted (by 1941 three were dead).
In 1939, a report to the Diocesan Trust Board by the Board’s architect, Daniel B. Patterson, advised that he had found the stone building in fair condition only:

"During the recent storms many of the windows leaked badly and there are places where the water has penetrated the outside walls...the trouble is due to the porous nature of the stone and again without plastering the outside walls which would destroy the appearance of the building it would be practically impossible to remedy the defect."

Patterson remarked on the galvanised supply tank in the roof, which had perished, as well as the waste pipe in the kitchen and the lead supply pipe in the bathroom which had also perished.83

In 1944, the tenant reported that the room facing north-east leaked, and three years later there were complaints of the kitchen and bathroom flooding.

Patterson again reported to the Board in 1945 about the building's condition. This was almost identical to his letter of 1939, except that on this visit he noticed that:

"...some settlement seems to have occurred in the building probably due to some weakness in the foundations ... it would probably be necessary to form a trench on the outside of the building, underpin the walls and lay a new floor in the museum, the cost of the work would be very considerable"

This does not appear to have been carried out. It was also noted by the architect that the paling fence on the front and side boundary had deteriorated:

"practically the whole of the posts are rotten at the feet and some of the rails are also perished."84

Following the war, complaints from the tenant continued.
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In 1947, the kitchen and bathroom flooded; in 1951 the Board reported that a roof leak had been fixed, and a damaged barge-board repaired.

In 1952, a gable-end was repaired and the sitting room and kitchen painted. The exterior woodwork was also painted, and electrics overhauled.

In 1953, a new sink and copper tank were installed, and two years later a lintel over an opening in the lounge was replaced and interior painting was done.

In 1956, the tenant reported damp walls yet again.

In 1961, a new cylinder was put in, shortly afterwards a new sink, bench and cupboard in the kitchen. In 1964, it was reported that more electric wiring had perished.

In 1967, fairly substantial repairs were carried out for a new tenant, Mrs de Serville. Spouting and downpipes were repaired, a W.C. was installed and the interior of the building painted. There was talk at this time of re-roofing the building. A letter at this time to the tenant from the Board instructed that the old garage and shed were not to be removed.

An attempt to ‘waterproof’ the building was made in 1977 after it was acquired by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Tate Grouting, part of the Ceramco Group, claimed to be able to give the building an ‘invisible chemical raincoat’ for a quoted cost of $5,500. This was done over a period of three weeks by:

"lifting the flooring slabs, and replacing shelly base material with suitable sand which was covered with polythene sheathing then a chemical grout."

"The slabs were then replaced and pointed (the seams sealed). Next chemical grout was injected under pressure around the building’s foundations inside and out through inch diameter tubes. After that we sprayed the outside walls with the same kind of chemical grout which was sucked into the stone pores, clogging them with impervious gel."

At this time also (1977), the mortar around the chimney was repointed, this job being carried out by the Ministry of Works, which frequently provided services for buildings owned by the Historic Places Trust.

Later alterations to facilitate the building’s use as a café included, in 1985, the erection of a colonial-style fence. This was built of totara and matai: "not a nail to be seen, all the railings slot into each other, resting in holes drilled by an auger". The fence replacement cost about $6,000 for the timber, and the fence was erected by a Dargaville builder, Mr Peter McKenzie.

In 1996, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust commissioned the repointing of the external walls, because of the high moisture content in the walls. It was understood that the rich Portland cement mortar previously used for repointing posed a major problem for masonry originally built using a lime mortar. The aim of the repairs was, therefore, to use a lime-based mortar to assist the drying of the walls.

It was also recognised that the internal cement plaster was causing significant problems, trapping moisture in the walls, but it was decided not to remove this since, during a trial, major damage was caused to the basalt walls.

85. Auckland Star. 30.06.77
86. New Zealand Herald. 08.10.85
Further repairs were carried out to the west wall of the building in 1997 by Cornwall Stone Masons.

In 2011, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust sought advice from Salmond Reed Architects regarding ongoing defects arising out of failure of the external pointing. Plant growth in the external stone work was indicative of dampness, and internal efflorescence was an ongoing problem. The Trust also required advice on appropriate replacement rainwater disposal system, following theft of the existing copper system.

Salmond Reed’s recommendation was to undertake a programme of progressive replacement of the exterior pointing, as and when this failed. Such a staged programme would gradually regain the breathability of the walls. Recommendations included removing the vegetation from mortar joints, raking out the joints on the west wall and performing some trial repointing using an hydraulic lime mortar, in specific locations which would be monitored for performance over period of 12 to 18 months.

A further recommendation was the installation of a ‘drying’ margin at the base of the external walls to assist with the evaporation of moisture at low level.

A cast iron rainwater disposal system was recommended as an appropriate replacement for the former copper system. Heavier and hence less subject to theft, this was considered the most appropriate material for a building of this type and, from observation of historic images, was thought to be the most likely material used on the building when first constructed. It also had the benefits of low maintenance requirements and longest replacement cycle.
3.0 Structure and Condition

3.01 The Site

The Mission Building sits on sandy soil at the edge of Kohimarama Beach, close to the estuary of a small stream. Ground water levels in this area vary with tidal movements, but are commonly found within one metre of the surface. Although there is occasional historical mention of soil settlement, the site appears generally stable.

A Geotechnical assessment of the site carried out in 2014 has concluded that:

“... the soils at the site are not likely to liquefy under seismic events for a SLS [serviceability limit state] event. However, under a ULS [ultimate limit state] earthquake the results indicate that liquefaction of the saturated sand layers / lenses is likely to occur within infrequent lenses below 3.0m.”88

3.02 Foundation and Floors

Foundation details for the building are not presently known, but it may be expected that the stone walls sit on a rubble bed of slightly greater width than the wall thickness.

In 1926, architect A.J. Palmer reported brick paving under some of the timber floors. In 1945, architect Daniel B. Patterson referred in a report to the Board to concrete slabs on the floor in the Museum. 1970 investigations also referred to “flooring slabs”. Existing timber floors are understood to have been installed during major reconstruction of the interior in 1928.

There have been consistent reports of water entry in the building, including through floors, but this no longer appears to be a problem. A chemical injection process applied in 1970 included cement grouting of the foundations and the introduction of a chemical underlay to floor paving slabs.

3.03 Walls

Wall construction is Rangitoto Basalt, laid as random rubble bedded in a non-hydraulic lime mortar (pure lime putty with aggregate). Squared scoria blocks were used for quoins at corners and facings around openings. The Rangitoto scoria of the walls is very porous and has been a major factor in the water entry commented on by Patteson and by investigators in 1970. The 1970s waterproofing programme included chemical grouting of walls to exclude water, and the application of a low viscosity chemical grout which was intended to solidify as a stiff gel. These interventions have had a detrimental effect on the building, which has a long history of internal dampness and efflorescence.

The internal faces of external walls were originally left unplastered (see FIG.26). Internal partitions of single skin plastered brickwork were erected in 1928 (since largely removed) and the original stone walls were subsequently also plastered in 1936.

---

88 Soil & Rock Consultants Ltd: “Geotechnical Investigation, Melanesian Mission Seismic Study”, 16 September 2014
3.04  **Roof**

Roof construction in the building is generally of simply framed gables over kitchen and storerooms with a simplified hammer beam/scissor truss system over the hall, all supporting underpurlins and 225x25mm tongued and grooved sarking - probably dating from 1928. The entire roof is clad in wooden shingles. Rainwater disposal is by way of copper gutters with cast iron spouting and downpipes discharging into drains, although originally collected in tanks.

3.05  **Summary of Structural Changes**

3.05.1  The original plan of the building consisted of three principal spaces, arranged somewhat in the form of an inverted 'F' as follows (refer to floor plan attached):

- A large hall on a north-south axis
- Storage rooms next to the hall running east/west
- Kitchen beyond storerooms, also running east/west

The storerooms were subdivided by "rough single lined" wooden partitions and the stone walls of these rooms were also wood lined. A large fireplace with substantial side ovens, which originally occupied the west end of the kitchen, appears to have been removed in 1928.

Since its construction in 1859, the building has undergone major reconstruction in 1928 with minor changes before and since that date. The changes to the building may be summarised as follows (some original features will require to be confirmed by further investigation):

3.05.2  **1859 Construction**

- Stone walls of Rangitoto scoria - small boulders laid in two skins of random rubble with granular filling between the skins and with corners and opening defined by large squared scoria blocks;
- All windows in 'collegiate' style of narrow casements with small diamond panes, except west windows in rooms 6 and 7, and north window in room 2;
- Main roof construction, including simple pitched rafters over kitchen and storerooms, and hammer beam/scissor trusses over hall;
- Kitchen fireplace and side ovens, demolished 1928;
- Exterior doors (all openings assumed original);
- Porch at hall outer door, demolished 1928;
- Stone garden wall erected on west and south sides, with three triangular 'view ports' in west wall

3.05.3  **1928 Reconstruction and Repair**

- North-east corner porch removed;
- Roof sarking of 225x25mm tongue and groove kauri;
- Interior partitions of plastered brickwork erected;
- Kitchen fireplace demolished and new fireplace erected within former kitchen - possibly incorporating some demolition stone from the original;
moulded plaster architrave with heraldic device in scoria stone above incorporated in new chimney breast;

- North window added in former storeroom;
- Windows added to west wall of former kitchen;
- Reveals of existing windows trimmed with beaded moulding;
- Timber floor installed;
- Fibrous plaster ceilings with moulded cornice installed on new ceiling framing in all rooms except hall;
- Stone outhouse built in south west corner of garden wall and new gate formed in west wall, removing 2 triangular openings;

### 3.05.4 Changes Since 1928

- Interior faces of stone walls plastered (1936);
- 1928 brick partition walls removed;
- 1928 fireplace reversed;
- west wall of former kitchen strapped and lined;
- Sanitary fittings, and (later) coolroom, installed in room 7;
- Toilet facilities installed in outhouse – since modernised;
- Remnants of chapel/schoolroom removed by Mission Bay Improvement Society;
- Successive tenants have added kitchen facilities in differing parts of the building, and added a stair to the roof space;
- Roof space subdivided to provide office space, storerooms and sanitary facilities;
- A new opening has been formed in the masonry partition wall between rooms 2 & 5 (1990s);
- Interior walls painted variously in non-heritage colours;
- Timber sarking and structural roof timbers in Hall finished in *faux* wood grain effect;
- A proliferation of services and wires throughout the building, attached to various heritage surfaces;
- Totara and matai post and rail fence erected around Mission House, from east end of stone wall and enclosing Norfolk pines in north east corner

### 3.06 Present Condition of the Building

A report on the exterior of the Mission House was prepared by Salmond Reed Architects in 2011. The report recommended “a staged approach to carry out work that continues to regain the breathability of the walls, in a programme of partial replacement of the exterior pointing, as and when it fails [and] also ... the installation of a ‘drying’ margin at the base of the external walls to assist with the evaporation of moisture at low level.”

Much of this work has been implemented progressively, although the drying margin has not.

---

The Draft Conservation Plan of 1990 also made a number of specific recommendations concerning the roof, windows and external walls. Subsequent work has included renewal of spouting, repointing of external masonry and repairs to windows.

More generally, it was recommended that:

“Any future use of the building and its site should not alter or destroy elements identified as having ... exceptional or considerable heritage significance.”  

Recent inspection of the building suggests that the principles and recommendations set out in the 1990 conservation plan have had little effect on the management of impacts on the building, more especially in the condition of much of the interior fabric.

The most immediate impression is the use of colour in the building. While the application of paint is inherently reversible, the colours presently used on the interiors are not considered to be an appropriate reflection of the authentic character of the interior – although this is problematic in any case because of the irreversible action of plastering the walls in the 1930s.

It is not just the walls that have been painted. The whole of the roof sarking has been finished in a faux wood-grain effect – including also the notable scissor trusses in the main hall. This is an unfortunate action that diminishes the integrity of the interior.

The upper level in particular shows a history of casual and unsympathetic change to original fabric – the most disturbing example being the cutting away of historic fabric to facilitate the reticulation of ductwork, since removed. Apart from this, the manner in which various services have been attached to the fabric of the building has been left largely to the discretion of the various tradesmen engaged for the purpose.

The regulatory requirements for the restaurant trade necessitate a preoccupation with hygiene in the installation of kitchen equipment, and the associated requirement for systems to extract cooking odours from the building. Such interventions can be seen to be an inevitable consequence of accommodating this commercial use of the building.

The present kitchen is, however, in a different part of the building from earlier installations, and it is undesirable to continually reconfigure the building for this purpose.
FIG 29
Mission House from east, 1927
Photographed by: C.F. Bennett
Source: Auckland War Memorial Museum
PH-NEG-B6267
4.0 Cultural Heritage Significance

4.01 Statement of Cultural Significance

The former Melanesian Mission building at Kohimarama is one of exceptional significance to the Auckland region, and to the history of Christian missions in the South Pacific.

The site of the Mission is a place of exceptional national cultural significance in New Zealand. It also has significance beyond New Zealand for its association with the Islands of Melanesia and with the missionaries of the Anglican faith. It thus provides tangible evidence of colonial links between New Zealand and other Pacific Islands.

This significance is explained in detail in the section that follows, but may be summarised as follows:

4.01.1 Historical

The site is significant for the traditional kai moana gathering activity of many iwi over centuries of occupation. The land was purchased from local iwi by the Colonial Government, and subsequently acquired by Bishop G.A. Selwyn. It was the venue for an important month-long meeting between Governor Gore-Brown and Maori leaders at the “Kohimarama Conference” of 1860. Although this failed to altogether prevent the growing desire for Maori self-government, the rise of the Kingitanga movement or the spread of conflict beyond Waitara after 1860, it confirmed the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi for many iwi.

The building and street wall have particular significance as remnants of a much larger original complex erected to house the Mission on this site.

The site is connected with developments in transport, as well as New Zealand’s role in the First World War.

4.01.2 Social

The site is linked with prominent members of colonial society, including Bishops Selwyn and Patteson, and the architect and Colonial Treasurer Reader Wood.

It has considerable value for its connection with changing forms of education during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including those of the Anglican Church.

Its use reflects prevailing attitudes to race, class and gender within education, including an emphasis on boys’ schooling.

4.01.3 Architectural

The building is architecturally significant in New Zealand for its connections with the British collegiate tradition in design, exemplified in the original
larger complex of structures, including a church and schoolhouse, arranged around a quadrangle.

The interior of the hall is a notable space, distinguished by deep-set windows, a fireplace set within a Tudor arch of shaped scoria stone and a steep roof supported by hammer beam/scissor trusses.

The design of the building reflects the influence of the noted colonial architect Frederick Thatcher.

It is thus one of a small collection of buildings of distinctive character and enduring materials that date from the earliest decades of European settlement in Auckland.

4.01.4 Technical

The building is significant as a particularly fine remnant example in Auckland of random rubble stone masonry construction by the noted early mason Benjamin Strange.

The construction is a comparatively rare example in Auckland of use of the difficult volcanic scoria in the form of random rubble walls finished at corners and around openings with squared blocks of the same material.

The roof construction of the main hall is of particular interest for its hammer beam/scissor truss construction.

4.01.5 Aesthetic

The building, with its stone wall, is a distinctive Auckland landmark with high aesthetic value for its setting in contemporary Mission Bay.

As the oldest building now standing in this locality, it contributes greatly to the historic character of the area.

4.01.6 Spiritual

The site is associated with the early mission work of the Anglican Church in the Pacific, and has national and international significance for its role in the religious education of Melanesian peoples. The use of basalt in the construction of the building links it to Rangitoto and early sacred marae elsewhere in the Pacific.

The Mission Building thus has important spiritual significance for these religious associations.

4.01.7 Archaeological

The grounds of the former mission have been occupied over time by a range of structures associated with differing uses of the site. The site must therefore be considered one of significant archaeological interest.
4.02 **Assessment of Significant Elements**

The Statement of Significance above gives a general account of the significance of The Melanesian Mission building and its immediate surrounds. It is, however, desirable to identify individual parts of the building and surviving structures which contribute to, or detract from, its heritage significance, and to give some measure of the relative contribution of each part. The purpose in making such an evaluation is to assist the development of a sound understanding of the building and its parts and, in the light of this understanding, to set out a reasonable and sustainable policy for its conservation, as well as its continued use and development.

These assessments are necessarily made without particular regard to the practical considerations that must be acknowledged when developing conservation policy - that is to say, the absolute worth of each element is considered rather than the practical consequences of its conservation. Consequently, the policy implication of a given assessment may not be invariably capable of practical application. The assessments remain, however, a key factor in determining policies for the treatment of principal elements and individual features in the building.

The value of each part of any building may be defined by an assessment of its cultural significance. Value is by definition a subjective view, but it is susceptible to reasonably dispassionate analysis. It is most useful to assess the contribution made to the building as a whole by each major interior and external space or element. These in turn are made up of numerous constituent parts, which may add to or detract from the net value of the relevant space or element.

In the assessment that follows, values are assigned to principal features, spaces or external elements of the building and to constituent parts and details. These values are partially a result of expert judgment, but are principally informed by the findings of the research outlined earlier in this report, together with a detailed understanding of the building and its fabric.

4.02.1 **Assessment Values**

The following schedule assigns values to principal elements, individual features and spaces of the building, including its setting, using a graduated scale of relative significance. Refer to attached plan for the identification of spaces – room names reflect the current uses of these spaces.

The tabulation schedule has five levels, which have consequential conservation policy implications summarised as follows (terms are those defined in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, refer Appendix 5). Where a feature is considered to be hostile to conservation values in the building, the term ‘intr’ - intrusive - is used. It is acknowledged that in some instances ‘intrusive’ elements may be necessary for the present use of the building as a place of public access and for code compliance.

Primary spaces and building elements are assessed in UPPER CASE while secondary components of such spaces or elements are assessed in lower case:
A, a  items of **exceptional** significance
Spaces, elements or items which should be preserved and protected if at all possible. Only processes of maintenance, stabilisation, repair, restoration, or reinstatement are appropriate for such features.
These include the building as a whole, all views of the building, original elevations, spaces and surviving elements of the 1859 design.

B, b  items of **considerable** significance
Spaces or items which should be preserved and protected where they do not conflict with the conservation of a feature of higher heritage value. Category B spaces may be adapted to new uses (as long as the adaptation is reversible) but should otherwise be subject only to the processes of maintenance, stabilisation, restoration, reconstruction and reinstatement.
These include the stone outhouse, shingle roof and parts of some windows.

C, c  items of **some** significance
Retention is preferred, but modification may be justified where there is no conflict with items of higher heritage value. Removal of such items may be justified where this assists the recovery of overall significance.
These include elements of the 1926 alterations such as timber strip flooring, the internal chimney, roof sarking and some doors.

D, d  items of **little** significance or not relevant
May be retained for functional reasons where there is no conflict with items of significance. Retention or removal of such items are options.
These include the internal fireplace, remaining internal brick partitions, interior plaster to masonry walls, plasterboard linings and some moulded features around windows.

**intr**  items which are **intrusive** on conservation values
Should be replaced or concealed if practicable, where this will assist the recovery of heritage significance.
### 4.02.2 External Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External stone walls of random rubble with squared facings and corners, including garden walls, external chimney (including brick chimney elements)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 1859 windows, (excludes north casements in bar area, and west casements in reception room)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wall (1859)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North casements in bar area, and west casements in reception room, all exterior doors (1928)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle roof, with copper valley gutters</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney in reception area fireplace (1928)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masonry toilet block (1928)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Stone masonry toilet block" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathering canopy between Mission House and toilet block (modern)</td>
<td>Intr</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Weathering canopy" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern paving adjacent to building</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Modern paving" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter fence (1985)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Perimeter fence" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.02.3 Interior Features – General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber outhouse with shingled roof (post 2011)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal stone walls – very little of the original stone masonry is now visible within the building. This is limited to the reveals of door openings, and gable walls in the roof space</td>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewash finish to some gable end walls</td>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster on original stone walls (1936)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint colours to internal wall plaster</td>
<td>intr</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber strip flooring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining plastered single brick partitions</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casing to window reveals</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber moulded trims to window reveals and door frames</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface-mounted wired services</td>
<td>Intr</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.02.4 Interior Features – Specific – Ground Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Kitchen Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fittings and equipment</td>
<td>Intr</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Fittings Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Reception Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace (1928; fire opening reversed post 1990)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Fireplace Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-original partitions</td>
<td>d</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Partitions Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair to first floor (post-1990)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Stair Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial fittings and services</td>
<td><strong>Intr</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer beam/scissor trusses</td>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof sarking</td>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fireplace – c.1860, later plastered over and now painted</strong></td>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.02.5 Interior Features – Specific – Attic Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong> (above private dining area)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Office Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof framing</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Roof Framing Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Sarking</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Roof Sarking Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry gable walls</td>
<td>a</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Masonry Gable Walls Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storeroom</strong> (above Bar area)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Storeroom Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof penetrations for services</td>
<td>Intr</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storeroom</strong> (above Kitchen area)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber flooring throughout Attic area (1928)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-original (post-1990) partitions, including Attic toilet partitions</td>
<td>Intr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG 30
Mission House from north-east showing the dining hall entrance canopy 1927
Photograph: James D. Richardson
Source: Sir George Grey Special Collection, Auckland Libraries 4-2886
5.0 Factors Affecting the Conservation and Use of the Melanesian Mission

The conservation of the Melanesian building and wider site is constrained and limited by a number of factors which will influence its restoration and future maintenance. By the same token, the use of the building and site is constrained by the need to have regard to the heritage significance of the place, and the corresponding importance of preserving those elements and features which materially contribute to that significance.

The primary objectives of conservation will be to ensure the integrity of the building and other site features, and in so doing to preserve its essential character and original fabric to the extent that this is possible.

All actions to conserve and strengthen the structure should aim to retain the surviving original physical entity, as remodelled in 1928, with as little further change as is practicable. Such actions should have regard to, and be influenced by the following considerations.

5.01 The Cultural Significance of the Place

As a relic of the former Melanesian Mission, including one of Auckland’s oldest buildings, the site and its original features should be preserved as an embodiment of its history and the important associations with those who created it, those for whom it was established, and those who have subsequently occupied and used the site.

Its continuing use, and the extent to which it may be modified for any purpose other than its conservation, should be limited to those activities which do not require physical change to surviving original fabric – i.e., those parts of the building dating from its original construction (including elements added in 1860).

Any development of or within the site should seek to protect key views of the original building and to avoid any action which has the potential to damage known site features, where these have value for understanding the early history of the place. This may include the management of trees and other organic growth, the control of utilities, and the location of new structures and associated surface treatments.

Consideration should be given to the development of a site management plan which identifies all remnant original features and key views, and defines a scope for use of the site consistent with the protection of those features.

Heritage New Zealand should maintain constructive relationships with those associated with the Mission, including the Melanesian Mission and Ngati Paoa.

5.02 External Constraints

5.02.1 District Plan scheduling

The significance to the community of the site is officially acknowledged by its inscription as a Category A item in the Auckland Operative District Plan (ODP), and similarly under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP). Similarly, its listing in Category 1 under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is an indication of special or outstanding significance. Equally, its ownership by Heritage New Zealand, the country’s leading heritage authority, predicts that the site will be subject to exemplary standards of conservation and protection.
Where it is contemplated to undertake further development of the Melanesian Mission Building site in a manner consistent with the recommendations of this Conservation Plan, key town planning provisions from both plans will be applicable. These include:

- The Open Space 1 (Conservation) zone provisions of the Operative District Plan – Isthmus Section 1999 (“ODP”); and
- The Heritage scheduling of the building and site and two Norfolk Island pine trees under both the ODP and Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (“PAUP”).

Under the ODP, Scheduling of the Melanesian Mission building and site surrounds means that virtually all development works and activities on the site are regarded as discretionary activities and will require resource consent.

The level of protection of heritage features provided by the PAUP, as this affects the activity status and assessment requirements, is similar to that of the ODP.

The PAUP zoning of the site anticipates a greater level of development potential than the ODP, provided that the conservation plan provides for the envisaged development activity.

The PAUP recognises earthquake strengthening as a discrete activity, and provides for this as a restricted discretionary activity (whereas other modifications would be fully discretionary). A heritage impact assessment is required to be prepared to support a resource consent application for any development works on the site.

The relevant provisions of the operative and proposed plans which affect use of the site are set out in greater detail in Appendix 6.

5.02.2 Statutory constraints

The conservation plan as a whole, and the overarching conservation policy, are informed by various statutory constraints and conservation best practice guidelines identified here. These should influence all works carried out on the building.

- Resource Management Act 1991:
  
  Section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act, added August 2003, identifies the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance.

- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA).
  
  Part 1 of the HNZPTA makes it unlawful for anyone to damage an archaeological site without prior authority from Heritage New Zealand. Before any works are undertaken that might damage, modify or destroy an archaeological site an authority must be obtained. The HNZPTA’s definition of an archaeological site includes any place associated with pre-1900 human activity that may through archaeological methods provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. The Melanesian Mission House is originally of pre-1900 construction. There is also evidence of Maori occupation in the surrounding property. An authority is required for work on public and private land, even if the activity is permitted under a District or Regional Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted. Part 5 of the HNZPTA identifies other offences, including (section 85) lighting of fires causing damage; alteration, damage, removal or destruction of plaques / signs / posters erected by the NZHPT, or removal of any NZHPT property.

- Building Act 2004:
Schedule 1(a) of the Building Act (2004) states that building consent is not required for the lawful repair and maintenance using comparable materials, or replacement with a comparable component or assembly in the same position of any component or assembly incorporated or associated with the building [...];

Upgrading, alterations or change of use are all works likely to trigger a requirement for Building Consent and Building Code compliance. Councils may, however, grant dispensation from full compliance if it can be shown that such compliance would cause unreasonable and adverse effects on heritage values of the building in question.

- ICOMOS Charter (NZ) 2010:

  The ICOMOS Charter identifies conservation principles that should be applied to places of cultural value, including ‘The spirit of place’. The 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS met in 2008 and ratified the Quebec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place (see Appendix 7). It identifies the importance of recognising both the tangible and intangible elements that make up the spirit of place, the need to identify threats to it, and to safeguard and transmit spirit of place. Central to these principles is the need for interdisciplinary research and interaction, long-term strategic plans and community involvement.

5.03 Procedural Factors

5.03.1 Special Skills

The conservation of historic structures requires special skills and training. All conservation work on historic elements of the structure should be carried out under the direction of professionally skilled persons with recognised training, specialist skills and proven experience in historic restoration.

5.03.2 Maintenance

Regular maintenance is an essential part of preventive conservation and is critical to management of the significance of the Melanesian Mission building. There are various approaches to maintenance:

- Day-to-day maintenance and housekeeping duties. This is a very important part of the maintenance of the Melanesian Mission property. It is important to note any evidence of deterioration, and either undertake the appropriate actions to remedy the problem or report it to the appropriate Manager or Heritage New Zealand as soon as possible. Ongoing monitoring of the building/structure during the course of other duties can prevent unnecessary loss or damage of significant fabric through the early detection and remedy of defects.

- Systematic cyclical maintenance works. This can be divided into two forms:
  - maintenance activities undertaken by competent property staff with appropriate equipment, which can be completed safely and without risk to the building/structure;
  - maintenance activities undertaken by contractors with demonstrated competency for such works. The scope of works should be specified to ensure that these are carried out in such a way as to prevent direct or indirect damage to significant fabric.
5.03.3 **Preventive conservation**

Preventive conservation is a proactive approach and follows the dictum that ‘prevention is better than cure’. It focuses on identifying and understanding the causes of deterioration rather than treating the symptoms. This approach manages the various threats to heritage significance and thereby reduces the frequency and extent of repair (remedial conservation), loss and replacement. To achieve this, preventive conservation methodology relies on regular surveys of building fabric (exterior and interior), collections and monitoring of environmental conditions of the interior and exterior of the building to inform decisions.

5.03.4 **Conservation Plan**

This conservation plan is a policy document for a publicly owned and maintained structure of exceptional cultural significance. The purpose of this Plan is to document the history of the site and its component parts, to identify its primary significance and to outline a strategy for preserving its integrity as an historic site.

The plan recognises the value of ensuring a continuing use for the building which does not result in any loss of heritage value and, equally, the importance of providing a form of protection of the building to resist damage in the event of an earthquake.

It is important that the Conservation Plan is formally adopted by Heritage New Zealand as its definitive policy statement for the conservation and ongoing management of the site and the building.

5.03.5 **Managing threats to heritage significance**

Neglect of maintenance, poorly specified building works, poor risk management and unsympathetic activities or uses of the building can all unnecessarily place heritage fabric at risk.

5.04 **Physical Risks to the Building**

It is possible to identify a range of physical risks to the building arising out of non-human phenomena. Such risks are common to all buildings, but the effects on heritage values can be significantly greater than the direct physical result. For heritage buildings also, measures necessary to anticipate such threats can themselves have a deleterious effect on the fabric or appearance of a building.

The following risks may require some intervention to address potential loss of heritage value:

5.04.01 **Fire**

Fire is an ever-present risk to all buildings. Historic material once burned is likely to be permanently destroyed, and while it is usually always possible to reconstruct the form of a structure, the loss of original material diminishes the strength of intangible associations with historical events and persons.

Equally, measures adopted to control the effects of fire can themselves affect heritage values, but this can be mitigate where such measures are implemented in a manner that is reversible.
Fire precautions:

- Fire extinguishers should be appropriate to the risks posed in the Melanesian Mission house in individual spaces. Extinguishers should be regularly serviced.
- It is important that fire detection system and extinguishers are kept up to date with changing uses of the building and spaces.
- Installation of sprinkler systems to the Melanesian Mission house should be investigated.

5.04.02 Earthquake

The phenomenon of earthquake activity is a constant risk in any part of New Zealand, but is understood to be comparatively low in Auckland. Nonetheless, the risk is recognised, and it will be appropriate to introduce reasonable measures to protect the building in such an event.

A BECA high level survey of the property in August 2013 indicates that key risks relating to the seismic performance of the Melanesian Mission are:

- out-of-plane performance of stone walls, particularly the high gable ends
- performance of the slender chimneys
- the potential effects of liquefaction on the performance of the stone walls.

Whilst the risk of an earthquake in Auckland is regarded as low, seismic strengthening to address these risks should be prioritised.

5.04.03 Vandalism

Vandalism is a social behaviour that has no regard for the value of property to other sections of society, and affects equally public and private property. Buildings which are un-occupied and places which are publicly visible are more likely to be targeted.

The effects of such behaviours on heritage values, and the range of remedial options available, will depend on the type of action taken.

It is recommended that security systems and lighting are installed to discourage vandalism.

5.04.04 Tsunami

The effects of tsunami are well understood as a result of media coverage of notable recent events. Properties close to the sea edge are more likely to be affected, and the Melanesian Mission must be seen as particularly vulnerable in the event of a tsunami reaching this country.

There is little that can be done to provide meaningful protection in such an event, and it will be most important to have in place an escape strategy for occupants of the building at that time.

5.04.05 Damage from surrounding vegetation

Risks due to vegetation close to the building can be summarised as those of:

- damage from falling trees or parts of trees;
- invasive plants growing onto and insinuating into the structure; and
- fire risk from plants desiccated by weather conditions.

Such risks will be most effectively be dealt with through a specific site management policy and regular inspection of trees on site.
5.05 Use of the Site

The successful conservation of places of heritage value depends in part on the capacity to accommodate an active use consistent with those values. Such uses will be important for the general well-being of the place, and may also contribute materially to the cost of maintaining buildings and artefacts.

It is well-recognised that buildings which are not occupied are susceptible to more rapid deterioration than those which are in active use.

Since, in the case of the Mission House, it no longer fulfils its original function, it is highly desirable to find contemporary uses which will benefit from the qualities of the place (as an historic site) while correspondingly ensuring that it is used in a way that assists its preservation.

There is an established recent history of use of the building for the restaurant trade, and the building has already been adapted for that purpose. It will be reasonable to continue such use of the building, providing there is clear guidance on the manner in which any physical effect on the building is designed and managed.

5.05.1 Preservation of distinctive identity

The uniqueness of the Melanesian Mission house and its wider physical and historical setting means that the special character or ‘spirit’ of the place is a quality which need to be protected through the conservation process.

5.05.2 Threat of unsympathetic development of the site

The setting of the Melanesian Mission house as a whole should be protected from unsympathetic development of the site. The construction of new structures, addition of signage and interpretation, alterations to landscaping and plantings must be considered very carefully to ensure that they are compatible with the significance of the site and the house, and that they do not have a negative impact on ‘the spirit of place’. Large scale display advertising on the site should be prohibited. This document should inform any feasibility study and design initiative.

5.05.3 Incremental loss of significance

While every effort must be made to avoid traumatic loss of significance, it is equally important to have regard to the cumulative effects of small changes made over time, as these can be equally damaging to the heritage significance of the place. Loss of significance can be caused by the removal of significant fabric, or the addition of new fabric which is intrusive, or which obscures existing significance. Minor alterations to a building over time, which in isolation may appear to have little impact on significance of a place, can cumulatively erode significance. It is important that even minor changes are assessed carefully against the Melanesian Mission house conservation plan to ensure that these are consistent with its objectives. All changes, whether deemed necessary or not, should be recorded.

5.05.4 Loss of or damage to significant fabric

Any works which adversely affect significant fabric – whether directly or indirectly - should be avoided. There may, however, be rare occasions where works deemed essential to secure the survival of the buildings, will necessitate intervention (for example the installation of sprinklers and seismic strengthening). In all such circumstances the works must be clearly documented and specified and should be undertaken by consultants and contractors competent to undertake the works. Such works should be informed by the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand charter and by the specific recommendations of this conservation plan.
6.0 Conservation Policy

6.01 Conservation Principles

There are three primary objectives of a conservation policy applied to the Melanesian Mission building and site. These are:

- conservation of historic fabric identified as being of historic significance;
- management of activities in the building and on the site which will complement its heritage significance, and which do not damage or conceal its primary form or component parts;
- integration of new functional elements (related to the use of the building from time to time) into the historic fabric without physical change or damage to original (1859) fabric, and without loss or compromise of heritage significance;

The ICOMOS New Zealand 2010 Charter for the Conservation of places of Cultural Heritage Value sets out conservation principles applicable to all cultural heritage sites, and these correspond also to guidance published by Heritage New Zealand. While these have been developed as principles for conservation actions, they apply equally for all activities related to the heritage place.

i. Do as little as possible and as much as necessary, with minimal intervention and loss of original fabric;

ii. Any change should be based on evidence, not conjecture;

iii. Repair rather than replace;

iv. Maintain the building to a high standard;

v. Legibility of new work, and respect for the evidence of time and the contributions of all periods;

vi. Keep records of maintenance and repair work;

vii. Reversibility - any intervention, including conservation action should be reversible if technically possible, or at least should not prejudice future interventions;

viii. Lost features should be restored only where there is clear evidence of the original.

While these objectives may be adopted by the Owner, as landlord of the premises, it is extremely important for the on-going well-being of the place that all tenants of the Melanesian Mission building are given a clear understanding of the objectives and the reasons for these, and that they form part of any tenancy agreement for the building.

6.02 Conservation Policies

The following conservation policies are recommended to ensure the preservation of identified heritage values and the historic integrity of the Mission House building.

6.02.1 The Statement of Cultural Significance should be accepted as the basis for all future planning within the building and its site. This means that the cultural heritage values identified for each component part of the building should determine acceptable actions in relation to those components.
6.02.2 All parts of the building with cultural significance A/a or B/b should be retained. This will involve the application of techniques of preservation and maintenance.

6.02.3 All future development of the building and its site should be consistent with the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter (2010), published by the New Zealand Committee of ICOMOS, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (refer Appendix 5).

6.02.4 No future use of the building and its site will be acceptable which will alter or destroy elements or fabric identified as having heritage significance of A/a or B/b (i.e. “exceptional” or “considerable” significance).

6.02.5 Repairs to, and maintenance of, the building, and work to seismically strengthen heritage structure, should be designed to take account of the heritage value of the building as a whole and its component parts.

6.02.6 Features or fabric of the building and site assessed as having ‘some significance’ (category C/c) should be retained, reused or replaced, so long as this has no adverse impact on elements of considerable or exceptional significance.

6.02.7 Alteration of the original building fabric should be limited to areas and fabric of low significance (category C/c). Any alteration to the building should be so constructed that it is capable of removal at some later time, leaving no permanent change to original building fabric.

6.02.8 No addition should be permitted to the exterior of the building that cannot be shown to have a documented precedent, and then only if it is designed to conform as accurately as possible to the original. While it may be acceptable (but is not essential) to contemplate the reinstatement of such features, this would involve the use of techniques of restoration of existing fabric, or reconstruction of elements for which there is known provenance and clear physical or documentary evidence.

6.02.9 Because of the historic significance of the Mission building and garden wall, no work should be carried out within or on the building or wall which will impair or confuse that significance. Under no circumstances should any further alteration of Category a or b fabric be permitted in order to facilitate a new use of the building or to adapt it for some new non-permanent purpose.

6.02.10 Original spaces in the building should be reinstated when the opportunity permits, and no new use of the building should be contemplated which depends on the permanent subdivision of original spaces into smaller volumes.

6.02.11 Because of the historic significance of the building and site, any new development on the site should be controlled in location and design to ensure consistency with the principles set out at 6.01 above and with the recommendations of this plan.

6.02.12 No new construction within the cadastral site of the Mission should be contemplated in the absence of an approved Master plan for the entire site, which takes account of the recommendations of this Conservation Plan.

6.02.13 Competent professional direction of all conservation work should be maintained during all stages of the restoration, maintenance and any adaptive reuse of the building. It is recommended that a conservation architect be appointed by Heritage New Zealand to oversee all stages of any work on the site. In the event that a tenant takes conservation advice for any work, such advice and any recommendation which flows from this should be subject to peer review by Heritage New Zealand.
**6.02.14** No ground disturbance should be undertaken before a competent archaeological assessment of that part of the site has been made to assess whether or not an archaeological authority is required to be applied for.

**6.02.15** Interpretation of the Mission Building and site should be publically accessible to allow the public to fully understand the importance of the place.
7.0 Implementation

The following specific conservation policies are recommended as applicable to individual parts of the building. Exterior policies relate to repair and maintenance of the historic fabric and, since such works are regarded as specialised and may affect heritage value, are properly the concern of the Owner rather than tenants of the building. These policies may involve the exercise of professional advice and specialist trade skills:

### 7.01 Exterior Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masonry walls</td>
<td>Refer to Appendix 4 for recommendations on the maintenance of masonry walls. The building will benefit from the implementation of a systematic conservation maintenance plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle roof</td>
<td>Such claddings have a limited life, due to the inherent qualities of the material. Regular inspections of the roof are, therefore, desirable – ideally every 5 years. When re-shingling is under-taken, it will be preferable to use hand split shakes if these can be obtained, and prudent to use preservative treated timber for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing historic features</td>
<td>Consideration may be given to reconstructing the front porch shown in early photographs, following on-site investigation for physical evidence. This, however, may conflict with the adjacent 1928 window, and so may best be left as a matter for interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site features</td>
<td>The entire site should be regarded as an archaeological site. Any site works which will disturb the surface of the ground should be preceded by sufficient archaeological investigation to establish and record the extent of earlier structures. The landscape adjacent to the building (defined by Tamaki Drive, Kohimarama beach and the public reserve to the east) should be subject to a development and interpretive Masterplan agreed with Auckland Council, and should aim to recover as practicably as possible the spatial qualities which characterised the setting of the building in 1928 (refer to 6.02.11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.02 **Interior Policies**

There is wider tolerance for activities carried out within the building, provided these do not result in change to primary structure or original building fabric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floors</strong></td>
<td>Timber floors were installed as part of the 1928 repair and reconstruction and these appear to be in good condition. Timber floors should remain as a serviceable surface, but any opportunity to examine the sub-floor area should be taken and this policy reconsidered in the light of any new discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls &amp; Partitions</strong></td>
<td>Existing external masonry walls are finished in non-original hard-wall cement plaster with openings trimmed in a moulded timber bead fitted. Elements of the timber structure are still clearly expressed. While initial attempts to remove the hard-wall plaster coating have proved unsuccessful, consideration should still be given at some future stage to investigating methods of removing this. In the short term there is no urgent need for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single brick partitions erected in 1928 have been largely demolished, and new spaces formed with plaster board on timber frame.</td>
<td>All post 1928 partitions should ultimately be removed from the building, and original (pre-1928) surfaces made good. Continued use of the building should be based on the use of demountable structures erected within the envelope, which are entirely self-supporting, require no mechanical fixing to existing surfaces, contain all services within their construction and do not conceal the spatial qualities of any part of the interior. The 1928 fireplace may incorporate stones salvaged from the original kitchen fireplace and chimney – this needs to be established through investigation, and a policy direction established based on those findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1928 fireplace has been reversed to face the present reception area.</td>
<td>The 1928 fireplace has no heritage significance, but the concept is not inappropriate for the current uses of the building. The moulded cornice and trims to openings are inappropriate. Depending on the intended function of the building, removal or reconfiguration of this construction can be contemplated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceilings</strong></td>
<td>A false ceiling was installed in 1928 to all rooms except the hall. This ceiling, with its moulded cornice at the walls, alters the original character of these spaces. The false ceiling has no heritage significance, but the concept is not inappropriate for the current uses of the building. The moulded cornice and trims to openings are inappropriate. Depending on the intended function of the building, removal or reconfiguration of this construction can be contemplated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Joinery

A number of windows were added in 1928 (refer to plans). It is probable that others were replaced or rebuilt at that time and further investigation will be needed to confirm this.

Doors and joinery hardware probably also date from 1920.

Existing external joinery is intrinsic to the character of the Mission House, and should be retained in the building.

Full conservation will require further investigation and re-evaluation of all joinery elements.

### Services

As originally constructed the building had no wired or piped services.

Some services continue to be warranted for the protection of the building for the purposes of fire and security.

An appropriate lighting installation will be warranted.

While piped services are not original to the building, the desirability of these for the ongoing sustaining use of the place is appropriate – no new penetrations of original fabric should be made to accommodate new reticulated pipework.

Electrical services necessary for lighting and security are also a contemporary necessity for the continued use of the building. Clear and firmly-enforced guidelines are needed to establish a non-invasive approach to attachments to building fabric, and new penetrations of original fabric should be avoided.

Under no circumstance should original fabric be cut or removed to facilitate reticulation of services.
## Appendix 1

### Chronological Summary of Events

**The Melanesian Mission:** Tamaki Drive, Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>First buildings sketched at Kohimarama (owned by Spain, Land Claims Commissioner), plus cottage owned by early settler (Dalziel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Bishop Patteson arranged construction of Melanesian Mission building with Reader Wood/Hunter/Strange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Melanesian Mission (stone) building constructed. St Andrew’s Chapel (wooden) transported from St John’s College to Melanesian Mission site. Stone shelter wall built (120’), wooden buildings erected, including rooms for Patteson (17’x7’), dormitories, known as ‘inner quadrangle’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Crombie photo showed raupo cottages at creek mouth, wooden cottages at eastern end of beach belonging to Captain and Mate of Southern Cross. John Kinder also sketched this scene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>House constructed for Mr Dudley (now known as Pritt House for later tenants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Verandah added to Pritt house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Two storeyed gabled building for Bishop Patteson built near mouth of creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Patteson’s house dismantled, re-assembled on Norfolk Island. Patteson left Melanesian Mission. St Andrew’s College ceased to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Roof shingles replaced on Mission Building. Mission building became Naval Training School - some buildings erected for School purposes; seven year lease granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Captain Bongard’s house built (between two Norfolk pines near cottage garden) - a five roomed single storey cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Mission Building now an Industrial School for boys; more wooden buildings erected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Industrial School closes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Damage reported by ‘encroachment of sea’ (no more specific than this) - ten pounds for ‘fascines in the breach’ to tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1915</td>
<td>Mission building used as temporary summer accommodation, some wooden buildings on property let.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Road built fronting beach (triangular strip of land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>More reports of sea encroachment. Tenders called for wooden breastwork 660' long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>South British Insurance declines to reinsure old Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Bathing shed built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Roof repairs, doors and windows painted (oil paint) to stone Mission building; Walsh Flying School occupy stone building plus five acres (later seven). Three hangars and outbuildings constructed on condition they are removed upon termination of lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>First subdivision of area (known as Mission Bay).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Government takes over flying school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Government vacates flying school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Second subdivision of area (by Melanesian Trust Board). Pritt’s wooden cottage removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Selwyn Domain established (ten acres) for public use. Report made to Board by Messrs Jones &amp; Palmer, architects, who suggest repairs to roof shingles, ventilation, lighting, lowering of floor, wood linings removed, original window sashes to be repaired and replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Restoration carried out, roof, windows, flooring replaced, kitchen gutted, curator’s flat created in rear of building, south west corner of wall removed, (triangular openings lost), stone outbuilding constructed, conveniences built at eastern end of stone wall. Original porch not replaced. New chimney built in another position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Old mortar perished on outside walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Internal walls plastered. Lean-to on wash house deteriorating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Jarrah paling fence erected on north west side, window sashes painted. Four rewarewa trees planted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Report on Mission Building by Board Architect D.B. Patterson. Building in fair condition only; windows leaking, water penetrating outside walls, galvanised supply tank in roof perished, waste pipe in kitchen and supply pipe in bathroom (lead) perished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Of rewarewa trees planted, only one survives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Room facing north east leaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Patterson again reports to Board; paling fence deteriorated, settlement occurred in building, more leaking in building from windows and roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Remains of St Andrew’s Chapel removed after complaints from Mission Bay Improvement Association Incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Kitchen and bathroom flooded in Mission building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Roof leak fixed, damaged barge-board repaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Sitting room and kitchen painted, gable-end repaired; electrics overhauled,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>New sink and copper tank installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Lintel re-plastered in lounge, interior paintwork done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Tenant reports damp walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>New kitchen cylinder installed, new sink bench and cupboard in kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>More electric wiring perished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Objections to mission building being used for private use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Building purchased by Historic Places Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Tate Grouting 'chemically' waterproof building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Building opened to the public as a café and tearooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>New fence - totara and matai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Lease taken over by Brandy's Bar (1987) Ltd, who obtain license to sell liquor and establish restaurant and bar. Internal partitions removed from kitchen area, but mezzanine retained. Basic original building footprint remains but outdoor areas re-landscaped for external café seating. Series of relatively unsuccessful restaurant sub-tenancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/7</td>
<td>Ongoing problems of dampness and efflorescence lead to repairs to the west side of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Premises vacant for some time and local church groups propose using the building for a Community Centre. New Zealand Heritage Trust determine to lease to a restaurateur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Lease taken over by MECCA Stonehouse Restaurant which retains general layout of the existing buildings for restaurant/dining/functions use but gains consent to erect a separate, distinctly new and modern café structure to the east side of the building and re-landscapes the outdoor areas with an orientation to the new café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Application made to install (removable) ice-cream kiosk to rear of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A series of problems with non-consented and inappropriate temporary structures, signage, and sail shade structures along with alteration and damage to the fabric of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Salmond Reed Architects commissioned to assess condition and advise on repairs to stonework and recommend a replacement rainwater disposal system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MELANESIAN MISSION:

Purpose of Report:

This report has been commissioned by New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT). The purpose of the report is to advise on defects in connection with external pointing failures and on an appropriate replacement rainwater disposal system, following its recent theft.

Background:

The Melanesian Mission has a long history of repairs associated with the external walls. In order to understand the present failures, it is worth reviewing some of these previous repair programmes in order to recommend repairs.

The rainwater disposal system, which included a simple half round copper spouting and a series of round copper downpipes were stolen from the building recently. The building is in a very public location and this presents problems in terms of security, and has a history of theft of copper spouting. The spouting is fixed at eaves, which are ground floor level and all sections are easily reached without special access.

This report was compiled by Tracey Hartley, Chartered Building Conservation Surveyor.
OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

1. EXTERNAL WALLS

1.1 BACKGROUND:

The building was constructed in 1859 and consists of Rangitoto Basalt as random rubble bedded in a non-hydraulic lime mortar ie. pure lime putty with aggregate. The internal faces of external walls were originally left unplastered.

In 1929, after the building had been in decline for a number of years, it underwent a major renovation. As part of that work, a number of interventions were undertaken. The exterior pointing was replaced with a dense Portland cement mortar, internal faces of external walls were plastered with a dense Portland cement render, the timber floor removed in 1927, was replaced for a second time with concrete on a damp proof membrane.

In 1977, the walls were grouted with a low viscosity chemical grout which was meant to solidify as a stiff gel.

These interventions have had a detrimental effect on the building, which has a long history of internal dampness and efflorescence.

In 1996, the NZHPT commissioned the repointing of the external walls, because there was high moisture content in the walls and it was understood that the rich Portland cement mortar a major problem for masonry built in a lime mortar. The aim of the repairs was to use a lime based mortar to help assist the walls drying out.

Unfortunately, although it was known that the internal cement plaster was also causing problems at the time with trapping of moisture in the walls, it was decided not to remove it, because during a trial, it caused major damage to the basalt walls.

1.2 FINDINGS:

The external walls were inspected on 17 February 2011, and we noted the following defects:

- Plant growth in masonry joints mainly in the chimney stack and gable wall (see Figure 1)
- Widespread shrinkage cracking in pointing mortar (see Figure 2)
- Weakened mortar which is friable
- Areas of pointing which appear to be on a hollow background
- Loss of pointing with advanced deterioration of the bedding mortar behind in localised areas (see Figure 3)
The internal faces of walls were inspected and the moisture content was checked with a moisture meter. The following was noted:

- there is evidence of efflorescence in the plaster in the large dining area on the internal face of the external wall adjacent to the chimney stack
- readings taken of the external walls indicate that the external walls have very high moisture content, reaching almost 100% meter reading.

1.3 **Discussion:**

There is a continuing issue of high moisture levels in the external walls. Although the removal the dense rich cement pointing in 1996 will have aided evaporation from the exterior pointing, there still remains the problem of the dense cement layer internally over the walls and the impervious concrete floor. These impervious layers prevent evaporation internally, but also provide a source of soluble salts within the wall and this is a source of the efflorescence internally.

Plant growth in mortar joints is a good indicator that the core of the wall is providing a moisture source for plants to thrive in the walls.

The pointing mix used in 1996, which included the addition of a small amount of cement to a lime mortar, although thought to be appropriate at the time, is now known to be a potential problem for causing early failures in lime mortar.

This is because the addition of only a small amount of cement to a lime mortar has the effect of weakening the mix, rather than making it stronger or acting as an aid for initial set. This phenomenon is called segregation.

Segregation is a major hazard of gauging lime mortars with cement. As the mortar sets, the cement colloid tends to migrate into the pores of the lime mortar as they form, clogging them and leading to a greatly reduced porosity. If the proportion of cement is high enough, segregation is much less likely to occur, but the resulting mortar will be hard. If the cement proportion is low, the mortar will be less hard, but segregation is more likely to occur. The resulting mortar will be seriously weakened, with a poorly formed pore structure leaving it very susceptible to damage and deterioration, even after carbonation of the lime present has taken place.

The exterior pointing, in certain areas, does have the consistency of weakened mortar with a very sandy consistency which is easy to remove. The segregation of the mortar, described above, appears to have taken place. Having said this, the mortar has served its purpose in that it has not caused any damage to the stones and is allowing a certain amount of evaporation to take place.

A second issue is that the lime available in 1996 would have been agricultural quality hydrated lime. This is an inferior lime for building conservation, because has already been partially slaked\(^1\) through the hydration process and so produces much lower quality lime putty. This may have also contributed to partial early failure of the mortar.

The original building was built in traditional ‘soft’ construction, without the use of modern membranes, and relied upon the free evaporation of moisture from all materials to stay dry. This equilibrium has been altered because some of the materials have been changed and are now effectively impermeable. The sources of moisture are trapped rising damp and falling rain.

The high levels of moisture and subsequent damage from salts migrating to internal surfaces cannot be eradicated completely, unless major work is undertaken to reverse some of the past interventions. This is impracticable, as the

\[^1\] The addition of water to burnt limestone to produce lime putty
1.4 **Recommendations:**

We recommend a staged approach to carry out work that continues to regain the breathability of the walls, in a programme of partial replacement of the exterior pointing, as and when it fails. We also recommend the installation of a ‘drying’ margin at the base of the external walls to assist with the evaporation of moisture at low level. See Fig. 5

The recommended repointing mix should consist of an hydraulic lime mortar and an angular sharp sand. This will provide a technically suitable mix for this type of masonry. The hydraulic lime will be more robust than a pure non-hydraulic lime, without compromising its ability to breathe. Some trials will be needed to establish a suitable mortar mix in terms of colour, and we recommend a toned down darker cream would be most suitable rather than the stark light cream of the existing. This is specialist work which requires specification and a mason with proven skills.

The small areas to be repointed should be treated as trial areas, which will enable a suitable mix to be established for the rest of the walls and these are illustrated in Figure 6.
2. **Rainwater Disposal System**

2.1 **Background:**

The spouting and downpipes at the Melanesian Mission have been stolen on more than one occasion. It is not known what material was used for the original or first system installed.

A photograph, dated 1860-69, shows spouting discharging via a central downpipe into a water collection tank; given the date, it was likely to have been cast iron. There is an early cast iron soil pipe on the building.

![Figure 6. Melanesian Mission – 1860-69. Note: spouting discharging to water tank adjacent to chimney stack.](image)

Photographs in the early 1900s and up to the 1920s, illustrate that the spouting and downpipes on the building had either been removed or lost.

![Figure 7. Melanesian Mission – 1927 before renovation - no spouting and downpipes.](image)

In 1939, a photograph shows a new rainwater disposal system had been installed as part of the major renovation work at this period.

In 1997, copper spouting and downpipes were stolen from the building.

In 2010, another set of copper spouting and downpipes were stolen from the building.

2.2 **Findings:**

All the spouting has been removed from the main building plus 6no. downpipes. Spouting brackets have been damaged, but most have been left attached to the soffit. One section of eaves board has been damaged.

![Figure 8. Melanesian Mission – Missing downpipe and spouting.](image)

2.3 **Discussion:**

The accessibility and easy public access to the site presents a number of challenges for security. Copper is a high value easily removable material, which can be easily recycled without trace.

The options are limited for the use of other materials. The building has copper-lined valleys and therefore care must be taken on choice of materials to avoid problems with dissimilar metals and subsequent corrosion.

Galvanised steel or Colorsteel™ is not an option because the copper valleys drain into the spouting and this would cause corrosion of the spouting and downpipes because of the galvanic reaction between the two metals. Aluminium spouting and downpipes are also not an option because the copper valleys drain into the spouting and this would cause corrosion of the spouting and downpipes because of the galvanic reaction between the two metals.
Unplasticised polyvinyl carbonate (plastic) spouting and downpipes could be employed but these have a very limited life, are not appropriate for a building built in quality materials, and are unlikely to stand up to the wear and tear that is likely on such a highly visited property. Installing a plastic rainwater disposal system, whilst initially appears to be the most economical, it is more expensive if the long term view is taken into account, because of the frequent replacement cycle that is necessary for the material.

Cast iron is a robust material that is highly appropriate for a masonry building of such quality. It is unlikely to be stolen, because it is so heavy and difficult to remove. If maintained well, it has a very long life (100+ years), and it can be re-cycled, making it environmentally a better choice than for eg. plastic.

The capital cost of installation of cast iron is more than copper, mainly because of the cost of the materials, it requires painting and also because it is an imported product currently. However, the labour cost for installation is not too dissimilar to other materials, and the sections are all standard sections, with no special welding required.

2.4 Recommendations:

Our recommendation is that cast iron half round 100mm spouting and 75mm round downpipes be installed, which provides the most robust and appropriate long term solution for the building and takes away the risks of theft.

When taking into account the long term costs for typical replacement of plastic on regular cycles and the likely period for loss of copper through theft, it is interesting to note that both copper and plastic prove to be more expensive. The installation of cast iron also means that less time and energy will be spent on replacements and repairs, it is a much more permanent material.

Set out below are a table showing the advantages and disadvantages of different materials and a table showing estimated total life cycle costs for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uPVC</td>
<td>• readily available;</td>
<td>• not aesthetically appropriate for quality historic buildings;</td>
<td>Approximately 40-50% less than copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• low capital cost;</td>
<td>• needs decorating but does not hold paint well;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• simple to install</td>
<td>• short life (5yr typical replacement cycle);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• easily damaged;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• deteriorates in UV light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>• readily available;</td>
<td>• vandalism and theft a major problem making it an expensive option;</td>
<td>$6,349*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate aesthetically</td>
<td>• easily damaged;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• requires painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>• costs less than copper</td>
<td>• incompatible because of dissimilar metals (copper valleys/lead flashings)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanised steel</td>
<td>• costs less than copper</td>
<td>• incompatible because of dissimilar metals (copper valleys)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorsteel™</td>
<td>• costs less than copper</td>
<td>• not appropriate because of dissimilar metals (copper valleys/ lead flashings)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast iron</td>
<td>• longevity;</td>
<td>• imported product so has a lead-in for delivery of 6-8 weeks from order;</td>
<td>$15,000 Estimate depends upon exchange rates and import charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• simple to install;</td>
<td>• requires decorating;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• aesthetically most appropriate;</td>
<td>• material cost more expensive than other options;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• robust and strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Continuous Spouting quotation dated 8 Feb 11
Table showing estimated life cycle costs of cast iron, plastic and copper, using a small annual inflationary increase

**Assumptions:**
- average life cycle of copper = 14 years (last stolen 13 years ago)
- average replacement cycle for plastic = 7 years (often only lasts 5 years before major repairs needed)
- 5 yearly painting of cast iron will keep it in good condition,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Maintenance Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast Iron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Recommendations:**

**Exterior Walls:**

1. Spray all plant growth with a biocide and leave for 3 weeks
2. Remove vegetation from joints
3. As a trial area – rake out joints on the west wall and repoint with an hydraulic lime mortar, in locations shown in Figure 6.
4. Monitor mortar for performance over period of 1 year – 18 months
5. Install a drying margin at base of walls – reduce ground levels for width of 300mm and depth of 150mm lay weed mat and single size pea shingle

**Rainwater Disposal System**

We recommend the installation of a cast iron rainwater disposal system to the building. This is the most appropriate material for a building of such quality and it has the least maintenance requirements and longest replacement cycle. It is also the most likely material used on the building when first constructed.
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ICOMOS New Zealand Charter
for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value

Revised 2010

Preamble

New Zealand retains a unique assemblage of places of cultural heritage value relating to its indigenous and more recent peoples. These areas, cultural landscapes and features, buildings and structures, gardens, archaeological sites, traditional sites, monuments, and sacred places are treasures of distinctive value that have accrued meanings over time. New Zealand shares a general responsibility with the rest of humanity to safeguard its cultural heritage places for present and future generations. More specifically, the people of New Zealand have particular ways of perceiving, relating to, and conserving their cultural heritage places.

Following the spirit of the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter - 1964), this charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand. It is a statement of professional principles for members of ICOMOS New Zealand.

This charter is also intended to guide all those involved in the various aspects of conservation work, including owners, guardians, managers, developers, planners, architects, engineers, craftspersons and those in the construction trades, heritage practitioners and advisors, and local and central government authorities. It offers guidance for communities, organisations, and individuals involved with the conservation and management of cultural heritage places.

This charter should be made an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.

Each article of this charter must be read in the light of all the others. Words in bold in the text are defined in the definitions section of this charter.

This revised charter was adopted by the New Zealand National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites at its meeting on 4 September 2010.

Purpose of conservation

1. The purpose of conservation

The purpose of conservation is to care for places of cultural heritage value.

In general, such places:

(i) have lasting values and can be appreciated in their own right;
(ii) inform us about the past and the cultures of those who came before us;
(iii) provide tangible evidence of the continuity between past, present, and future;
(iv) underpin and reinforce community identity and relationships to ancestors and the land; and
(v) provide a measure against which the achievements of the present can be compared.

It is the purpose of conservation to retain and reveal such values, and to support the ongoing meanings and functions of places of cultural heritage value, in the interests of present and future generations.
Conservation principles

2. Understanding cultural heritage value

Conservation of a place should be based on an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of its cultural heritage value, both tangible and intangible. All available forms of knowledge and evidence provide the means of understanding a place and its cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance. Cultural heritage value should be understood through consultation with connected people, systematic documentary and oral research, physical investigation and recording of the place, and other relevant methods.

All relevant cultural heritage values should be recognised, respected, and, where appropriate, revealed, including values which differ, conflict, or compete.

The policy for managing all aspects of a place, including its conservation and its use, and the implementation of the policy, must be based on an understanding of its cultural heritage value.

3. Indigenous cultural heritage

The indigenous cultural heritage of tangata whenua relates to whana, hapu, and iwi groups. It shapes identity and enhances well-being, and it has particular cultural meanings and values for the present, and associations with those who have gone before. Indigenous cultural heritage brings with it responsibilities of guardianship and the practical application and passing on of associated knowledge, traditional skills, and practices.

The Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of our nation. Article 2 of the Treaty recognises and guarantees the protection of tino rangatiratanga, and so empowers kaitiakitanga as customary trusteeship to be exercised by tangata whenua. This customary trusteeship is exercised over their taonga, such as sacred and traditional places, built heritage, traditional practices, and other cultural heritage resources. This obligation extends beyond current legal ownership wherever such cultural heritage exists.

Particular matauranga, or knowledge of cultural heritage meaning, value, and practice, is associated with places. Matauranga is sustained and transmitted through oral, written, and physical forms determined by tangata whenua. The conservation of such places is therefore conditional on decisions made in associated tangata whenua communities, and should proceed only in this context. In particular, protocols of access, authority, ritual, and practice are determined at a local level and should be respected.

4. Planning for conservation

Conservation should be subject to prior documented assessment and planning.

All conservation work should be based on a conservation plan which identifies the cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of the place, the conservation policies, and the extent of the recommended works.

The conservation plan should give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Other guiding documents such as, but not limited to, management plans, cyclical maintenance plans, specifications for conservation work, interpretation plans, risk mitigation plans, or emergency plans should be guided by a conservation plan.
5. **Respect for surviving evidence and knowledge**

Conservation maintains and reveals the authenticity and integrity of a place, and involves the least possible loss of fabric or evidence of cultural heritage value. Respect for all forms of knowledge and existing evidence, of both tangible and intangible values, is essential to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Conservation recognises the evidence of time and the contributions of all periods. The conservation of a place should identify and respect all aspects of its cultural heritage value without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

The removal or obscuring of any physical evidence of any period or activity should be minimised, and should be explicitly justified where it does occur. The fabric of a particular period or activity may be obscured or removed if assessment shows that its removal would not diminish the cultural heritage value of the place.

In conservation, evidence of the functions and intangible meanings of places of cultural heritage value should be respected.

6. **Minimum intervention**

Work undertaken at a place of cultural heritage value should involve the least degree of intervention consistent with conservation and the principles of this charter.

Intervention should be the minimum necessary to ensure the retention of tangible and intangible values and the continuation of uses integral to those values. The removal of fabric or the alteration of features and spaces that have cultural heritage value should be avoided.

7. **Physical investigation**

Physical investigation of a place provides primary evidence that cannot be gained from any other source. Physical investigation should be carried out according to currently accepted professional standards, and should be documented through systematic recording.

Invasive investigation of fabric of any period should be carried out only where knowledge may be significantly extended, or where it is necessary to establish the existence of fabric of cultural heritage value, or where it is necessary for conservation work, or where such fabric is about to be damaged or destroyed or made inaccessible. The extent of invasive investigation should minimise the disturbance of significant fabric.

8. **Use**

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose.

Where the use of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that use should be retained.

Where a change of use is proposed, the new use should be compatible with the cultural heritage value of the place, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value.
9. Setting

Where the setting of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that setting should be conserved with the place itself. If the setting no longer contributes to the cultural heritage value of the place, and if reconstruction of the setting can be justified, any reconstruction of the setting should be based on an understanding of all aspects of the cultural heritage value of the place.

10. Relocation

The on-going association of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value with its location, site, curtilage, and setting is essential to its authenticity and integrity. Therefore, a structure or feature of cultural heritage value should remain on its original site.

Relocation of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value, where its removal is required in order to clear its site for a different purpose or construction, or where its removal is required to enable its use on a different site, is not a desirable outcome and is not a conservation process.

In exceptional circumstances, a structure of cultural heritage value may be relocated if its current site is in imminent danger, and if all other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. In this event, the new location should provide a setting compatible with the cultural heritage value of the structure.

11. Documentation and archiving

The cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of a place, and all aspects of its conservation, should be fully documented to ensure that this information is available to present and future generations.

Documentation includes information about all changes to the place and any decisions made during the conservation process.

Documentation should be carried out to archival standards to maximise the longevity of the record, and should be placed in an appropriate archival repository.

Documentation should be made available to connected people and other interested parties. Where reasons for confidentiality exist, such as security, privacy, or cultural appropriateness, some information may not always be publicly accessible.

12. Recording

Evidence provided by the fabric of a place should be identified and understood through systematic research, recording, and analysis.

Recording is an essential part of the physical investigation of a place. It informs and guides the conservation process and its planning. Systematic recording should occur prior to, during, and following any intervention. It should include the recording of new evidence revealed, and any fabric obscured or removed.

Recording of the changes to a place should continue throughout its life.
13. **Fixtures, fittings, and contents**

Fixtures, fittings, and contents that are integral to the cultural heritage value of a place should be retained and conserved with the place. Such fixtures, fittings, and contents may include carving, painting, weaving, stained glass, wallpaper, surface decoration, works of art, equipment and machinery, furniture, and personal belongings.

Conservation of any such material should involve specialist conservation expertise appropriate to the material. Where it is necessary to remove any such material, it should be recorded, retained, and protected, until such time as it can be reinstated.

**Conservation processes and practice**

14. **Conservation plans**

A conservation plan, based on the principles of this charter, should:

(i) be based on a comprehensive understanding of the cultural heritage value of the place and assessment of its cultural heritage significance;
(ii) include an assessment of the fabric of the place, and its condition;
(iii) give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place;
(iv) include the entirety of the place, including the setting;
(v) be prepared by objective professionals in appropriate disciplines;
(vi) consider the needs, abilities, and resources of connected people;
(vii) not be influenced by prior expectations of change or development;
(viii) specify conservation policies to guide decision making and to guide any work to be undertaken;
(ix) make recommendations for the conservation of the place; and
(x) be regularly revised and kept up to date.

15. **Conservation projects**

Conservation projects should include the following:

(i) consultation with interested parties and connected people, continuing throughout the project;
(ii) opportunities for interested parties and connected people to contribute to and participate in the project;
(iii) research into documentary and oral history, using all relevant sources and repositories of knowledge;
(iv) physical investigation of the place as appropriate;
(v) use of all appropriate methods of recording, such as written, drawn, and photographic;
(vi) the preparation of a conservation plan which meets the principles of this charter;
(vii) guidance on appropriate use of the place;
(viii) the implementation of any planned conservation work;
(ix) the documentation of the conservation work as it proceeds; and
(x) where appropriate, the deposit of all records in an archival repository.

A conservation project must not be commenced until any required statutory authorisation has been granted.
16. Professional, trade, and craft skills

All aspects of conservation work should be planned, directed, supervised, and undertaken by people with appropriate conservation training and experience directly relevant to the project.

All conservation disciplines, arts, crafts, trades, and traditional skills and practices that are relevant to the project should be applied and promoted.

17. Degrees of intervention for conservation purposes

Following research, recording, assessment, and planning, intervention for conservation purposes may include, in increasing degrees of intervention:

(i) preservation, through stabilisation, maintenance, or repair;
(ii) restoration, through reassembly, reinstatement, or removal;
(iii) reconstruction; and
(iv) adaptation.

In many conservation projects a range of processes may be utilised. Where appropriate, conservation processes may be applied to individual parts or components of a place of cultural heritage value.

The extent of any intervention for conservation purposes should be guided by the cultural heritage value of a place and the policies for its management as identified in a conservation plan. Any intervention which would reduce or compromise cultural heritage value is undesirable and should not occur.

Preference should be given to the least degree of intervention, consistent with this charter.

Re-creation, meaning the conjectural reconstruction of a structure or place; replication, meaning to make a copy of an existing or former structure or place; or the construction of generalised representations of typical features or structures, are not conservation processes and are outside the scope of this charter.

18. Preservation

Preservation of a place involves as little intervention as possible, to ensure its long-term survival and the continuation of its cultural heritage value.

Preservation processes should not obscure or remove the patina of age, particularly where it contributes to the authenticity and integrity of the place, or where it contributes to the structural stability of materials.

i. Stabilisation

Processes of decay should be slowed by providing treatment or support.

ii. Maintenance

A place of cultural heritage value should be maintained regularly. Maintenance should be carried out according to a plan or work programme.

iii. Repair

Repair of a place of cultural heritage value should utilise matching or similar materials. Where it is necessary to employ new materials, they should be distinguishable by experts, and should be documented.
Traditional methods and materials should be given preference in conservation work.

Repair of a technically higher standard than that achieved with the existing materials or construction practices may be justified only where the stability or life expectancy of the site or material is increased, where the new material is compatible with the old, and where the cultural heritage value is not diminished.

19. Restoration

The process of restoration typically involves reassembly and reinstatement, and may involve the removal of accretions that distract from the cultural heritage value of a place.

Restoration is based on respect for existing fabric, and on the identification and analysis of all available evidence, so that the cultural heritage value of a place is recovered or revealed. Restoration should be carried out only if the cultural heritage value of the place is recovered or revealed by the process.

Restoration does not involve conjecture.

I. Reassembly and reinstatement

Reassembly uses existing material and, through the process of reinstatement, returns it to its former position. Reassembly is more likely to involve work on part of a place rather than the whole place.

II. Removal

Occasionally, existing fabric may need to be permanently removed from a place. This may be for reasons of advanced decay, or loss of structural integrity, or because particular fabric has been identified in a conservation plan as detracting from the cultural heritage value of the place.

The fabric removed should be systematically recorded before and during its removal. In some cases it may be appropriate to store, on a long-term basis, material of evidential value that has been removed.

20. Reconstruction

Reconstruction is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material to replace material that has been lost.

Reconstruction is appropriate if it is essential to the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place, if sufficient physical and documentary evidence exists to minimise conjecture, and if surviving cultural heritage value is preserved.

Reconstructed elements should not usually constitute the majority of a place or structure.

21. Adaptation

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose. Proposals for adaptation of a place may arise from maintaining its continuing use, or from a proposed change of use.
Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.

Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric.

22. Non-intervention

In some circumstances, assessment of the cultural heritage value of a place may show that it is not desirable to undertake any conservation intervention at that time. This approach may be appropriate where undisturbed constancy of intangible values, such as the spiritual associations of a sacred place, may be more important than its physical attributes.

23. Interpretation

Interpretation actively enhances public understanding of all aspects of places of cultural heritage value and their conservation. Relevant cultural protocols are integral to that understanding, and should be identified and observed.

Where appropriate, interpretation should assist the understanding of tangible and intangible values of a place which may not be readily perceived, such as the sequence of construction and change, and the meanings and associations of the place for connected people.

Any interpretation should respect the cultural heritage value of a place. Interpretation methods should be appropriate to the place. Physical interventions for interpretation purposes should not detract from the experience of the place, and should not have an adverse effect on its tangible or intangible values.

24. Risk mitigation

Places of cultural heritage value may be vulnerable to natural disasters such as flood, storm, or earthquake; or to humanity induced threats and risks such as those arising from earthworks, subdivision and development, buildings works, or willful damage or neglect. In order to safeguard cultural heritage value, planning for risk mitigation and emergency management is necessary.

Potential risks to any place of cultural heritage value should be assessed. Where appropriate, a risk mitigation plan, an emergency plan, and/or a protection plan should be prepared, and implemented as far as possible, with reference to a conservation plan.
Definitions

For the purposes of this charter:

Adaptation means the process(es) of modifying a place for a compatible use while retaining its cultural heritage value. Adaptation processes include alteration and addition.

Authenticity means the credibility or truthfulness of the surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage value of a place. Relevant evidence includes form and design, substance and fabric, technology and craftsmanship, location and surroundings, context and setting, use and function, traditions, spiritual essence, and sense of place, and includes tangible and intangible values. Assessment of authenticity is based on identification and analysis of relevant evidence and knowledge, and respect for its cultural context.

Compatible use means a use which is consistent with the cultural heritage value of a place, and which has little or no adverse impact on its authenticity and integrity.

Connected people means any groups, organisations, or individuals having a sense of association with or responsibility for a place of cultural heritage value.

Conservation means all the processes of understanding and caring for a place so as to safeguard its cultural heritage value. Conservation is based on respect for the existing fabric, associations, meanings, and use of the place. It requires a cautious approach of doing as much work as necessary but as little as possible, and retaining authenticity and integrity, to ensure that the place and its values are passed on to future generations.

Conservation plan means an objective report which documents the history, fabric, and cultural heritage value of a place, assesses its cultural heritage significance, describes the condition of the place, outlines conservation policies for managing the place, and makes recommendations for the conservation of the place.

Contents means moveable objects, collections, chattels, documents, works of art, and ephemera that are not fixed or fitted to a place, and which have been assessed as being integral to its cultural heritage value.

Cultural heritage significance means the cultural heritage value of a place relative to other similar or comparable places, recognising the particular cultural context of the place.

Cultural heritage value/s means possessing aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, commemorative, functional, historical, landscape, monumental, scientific, social, spiritual, symbolic, technological, traditional, or other tangible or intangible values, associated with human activity.

Cultural landscapes means an area possessing cultural heritage value arising from the relationships between people and the environment. Cultural landscapes may have been designed, such as gardens, or may have evolved from human settlement and land use over time, resulting in a diversity of distinctive landscapes in different areas. Associative cultural landscapes, such as sacred mountains, may lack tangible cultural elements but may have strong intangible cultural or spiritual associations.

Documentation means collecting, recording, keeping, and managing information about a place and its cultural heritage value, including information about its history, fabric, and meaning; information about decisions taken; and information about physical changes and interventions made to the place.
Fabric means all the physical material of a place, including subsurface material, structures, and interior and exterior surfaces including the patina of age; and including fixtures and fittings, and gardens and plantings.

Hapu means a section of a large tribe of the tangata whenua.

Intangible value means the abstract cultural heritage value of the meanings or associations of a place, including commemorative, historical, social, spiritual, symbolic, or traditional values.

Integrity means the wholeness or intactness of a place, including its meaning and sense of place, and all the tangible and intangible attributes and elements necessary to express its cultural heritage value.

Intervention means any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric. Intervention includes archaeological excavation, invasive investigation of built structures, and any intervention for conservation purposes.

Iwi means a tribe of the tangata whenua.

Kaitiakitanga means the duty of customary trusteeship, stewardship, guardianship, and protection of land, resources, or taonga.

Maintenance means regular and on-going protective care of a place to prevent deterioration and to retain its cultural heritage value.

Matauranga means traditional or cultural knowledge of the tangata whenua.

Non-Intervention means to choose not to undertake any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric.

Place means any land having cultural heritage value in New Zealand, including areas; cultural landscapes; buildings, structures, and monuments; groups of buildings, structures, or monuments; gardens and plantings; archaeological sites and features; traditional sites; sacred places; townscape and streetscape; and settlements. Place may also include land covered by water, and any body of water. Place includes the setting of any such place.

Preservation means to maintain a place with as little change as possible.

Reassembly means to put existing but disarticulated parts of a structure back together.

Reconstruction means to build again as closely as possible to a documented earlier form, using new materials.

Recording means the process of capturing information and creating an archival record of the fabric and setting of a place, including its configuration, condition, use, and change over time.

Reinstatement means to put material components of a place, including the products of reassembly, back in position.

Repair means to make good decayed or damaged fabric using identical, closely similar, or otherwise appropriate material.

Restoration means to return a place to a known earlier form, by reassembly and reinstatement, and/or by removal of elements that detract from its cultural heritage value.

Setting means the area around and/or adjacent to a place of cultural heritage value that is integral to its function, meaning, and relationships. Setting includes the structures, outbuildings, features, gardens, curtilage, airspace, and accessways forming the spatial context of the place or used for its activities.
In association with the **place**, **setting** also includes **cultural landscapes**, townscapes, and streetscapes; perspectives, views, and viewpoints to and from a **place**; and relationships with other **places** which contribute to the **cultural heritage value** of the **place**. **Setting** may extend beyond the area defined by legal title, and may include a buffer zone necessary for the long-term protection of the **cultural heritage value** of the **place**.

**Stabilisation** means the arrest or slowing of the processes of decay.

**Structure** means any building, standing remains, equipment, device, or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the land.

**Tangata whenua** means generally the original indigenous inhabitants of the land; and means specifically the people exercising **kaitiakitanga** over particular land, resources, or **taonga**.

**Tangible value** means the physically observable **cultural heritage value** of a **place**, including archaeological, architectural, landscape, monumental, scientific, or technological values.

**Taonga** means anything highly prized for its cultural, economic, historical, spiritual, or traditional value, including land and natural and cultural resources.

**Tino rangatiratanga** means the exercise of full chieftainship, authority, and responsibility.

**Use** means the functions of a **place**, and the activities and practices that may occur at the **place**. The functions, activities, and practices may in themselves be of **cultural heritage value**.

**Whanau** means an extended family which is part of a **hapu** or **iwi**.

---
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Appendix 6

Extracts from Auckland Council Operative District Plan (ODP), and Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP)
There are two key town planning provisions that currently apply to any development of the Melanesian Mission Building site. These are:

- The Open Space 1 (Conservation) zone provisions of the Auckland Council Operative District Plan – Isthmus Section 1999 (“ODP”); and
- The Heritage scheduling of the building and site and two Norfolk Island Pine trees under both the ODP and Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (“PAUP”).

The PAUP was notified in September 2013, with submissions and further submissions having closed and the first hearings underway. Decisions on submissions and a final version of the PAUP are currently scheduled for September 2016. However, some rules of the PAUP have immediate legal effect, including those relating to the heritage provisions, and therefore must be considered when undertaking a development options assessment.

**Operative District Plan** – Open Space 1 zone and heritage features

The operative zoning of the site is Open Space 1. This zone is applied to land in the Auckland Isthmus that has particular heritage or natural value. To protect these features of heritage or natural value, this open space zone has the most restrictive limits land use activities and development. For example, most activities are non-complying and building development is limited.

Due to the heritage or natural values of the land in this zone, earthworks are limited to 5m³ as a permitted activity.

In this regard, the following key development controls for the Open Space 1 zone:

- No maximum height stated for this zone;
- 5% maximum building coverage;
- 6m yard (front, rear, side);
- Discretionary activity consent for walkways/footpaths.

Discretionary activity consent for removal of native trees or other indigenous vegetation;

- Discretionary activity consent for an information centre. All other land use activities (cafés/restaurants etc) require non-complying activity consent.
- Carparking for any proposed activity would be in accordance with Chapter 12 and any activity would require a shortfall on this site as no parking is provided.

Three key heritage features are protected on the site. These are:

1. Building: the Melanesian Mission Building, the building interior, and building site surrounds (Category A);
2. Archaeological feature: Melanesian Mission site - St Andrew’s chapel site, associated buildings and quadrangle (Category A); and
3. Trees: Two Norfolk Island Pine Trees (Category A and C).

Due to the scheduling of the Melanesian Mission building and site surrounds, nearly all development works and activities on the site require resource consent for a discretionary activity.

Notably (having regard to the different provisions of the Open Space 1 zone and the Heritage provisions), where an activity (such as a café/restaurant) is proposed in a heritage building, and where it is not permitted by the zone, the heritage provisions provide for an assessment under the heritage criteria relating to economic viability of the heritage building.

The inclusion of this provision in the Operative District Plan is supportive of adaptive reuse and development of heritage properties and is key in supporting...
development to facilitate economic viability of a heritage property, provided the heritage values of the property are not compromised.

The site is also within the Coastal Management Area and the Tamaki Drive Scenic Way overlays. These overlays require additional resource consents with regard to new structures or buildings on the site, and involve consideration of visual amenity values and coastal character. The ODP Open Space 1 zone and associated provisions are currently operative (Feb 2015), and will remain operative until decisions on the PAUP are made in September 2016. Any development of the Melanesian Mission Building and site prior to this date will be subject to the ODP zone and rules.

**PAUP – Public Open Space - Conservation zone and heritage features**

The proposed zoning of the site in the PAUP is Public Open Space - Conservation. While the zone rules do not have immediate legal effect, consideration needs to be made of the objectives and policies. The zone has been similarly applied to the land zoned Public Open Space 1 under the Operative Plan to recognise and protect land with natural or historic value. This zone provides for a level of development that is commensurate with differing open space management methods, such as reserve management plans and conservation plans. This anticipates a greater level of development potential than the operative plan provided that the conservation plan provides for the envisaged development activity. Restaurants and cafes remain a non-complying activity in this zone.

The PAUP protects the same heritage features on the site than that of the ODP, as follows:

- **Natural Heritage:** Notable trees (#90 – x2 Norfolk Island Pine);
- **Historic Heritage:** Place – #1575, Melanesian Mission House Site;
- **Historic Heritage:** Extent of place – #1575, Melanesian Mission House Site; and
- **Historic Heritage:** Place – #1886, Melanesian Mission House (Restaurant 1995).

The entry for the Melanesian Missions site is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Maori Interest or Significance</td>
<td>Melanesian Mission House and site R11_1706 including Norfolk pine tree/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Controls for Archaeological Sites or Features</td>
<td>01575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Heritage Values</td>
<td>Refer to planning maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Feature</td>
<td>A,B,D,F,G,H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mission House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Legal Description</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Location</td>
<td>40-44 Tamaki Drive and 48-56 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Name and/or Description</td>
<td>Melanesian Mission House and site R11_1706 including Norfolk pine tree/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule ID</td>
<td>01575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of protection of heritage features, in terms of the activity status and assessment requirements, is similar to that of the ODP.

The PAUP recognises earthquake strengthening as a discrete activity, and provides for this as a restricted discretionary activity (whereas other modifications would be fully discretionary). A heritage impact assessment is required to be prepared to support a resource consent application for any development works on the site.
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Detailed Seismic Assessment of the Melanesian Mission
DETAILED SEISMIC ASSESSMENT OF
THE MELANESIAN MISSION
40-44 TAMAKI DRIVE
MISSION BAY

Andrew Clarke
October 2014
Ref 14-87
INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the results of a Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA) based on a site walkover, review of the conservation plan by Solmond Architect (1987), and calculations based on the New Zealand Loadings Standard and guidelines from the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Melanesian Mission was constructed in 1859. Since its construction, the internal walls have been modified slightly to accommodate its new use as a café and the external walls have been repointed and waterproofed.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

The foundations are thought to be a rubble bed slightly wider than the stone walls. The ground floor slab in the dining hall is concrete with timber flooring to the remainder of the building. The majority of the building’s walls are constructed from stone and lime mortar. There is a small amount of unreinforced masonry brick used on the internal walls and in the chimney construction. The mid-floor and roof are lightweight timber construction.

PURPOSE OF INVESTIGATION

The purpose of the investigation is as follows:

- Undertaking a detailed engineering evaluation, assess the structural adequacy of the building compared to the standard to which the building would be required to be constructed today. i.e percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS).
- Identify critical elements of structure which require improvement, also referred to as critical structural weaknesses (CRW).
- Comment on the remedial works required.

SEISMIC EVALUATION

Assumptions

We have assumed there has been no previous seismic strengthening done to the building.

We have also assumed that the structure was designed and constructed using the current standards at the time and to good practice.
Site Investigation

A geotechnical investigation has been carried out by Soil and Rock Consultants which has determined that given the soil profile and foundation type, the risk of liquefaction is very low. As the risk is very low, we have not allowed to upgrade the foundations.

We assessed an existing core hole through the stone wall beside the fireplace in the hall. At this location the stone wall was solid rubble with lime mortar binding it together. This is different to how the wall construction is described in the heritage report which states that the walls are "laid in two skins of random rubble with granular filling between the skins".

Further investigation is required to determine which is correct. This will affect the extent of the upgrade works.

Background

Current seismic research of URM buildings (similar to stone buildings) at Auckland University and observations made from the recent Christchurch earthquake suggest that protection of "out of plane" wall failures is the dominant area that must be addressed. This is therefore the major focus of determining the %NBS rating for this building in conjunction with the effect of chimneys and gable ends.

It has been observed that "in plane" failure is of a lesser concern and that the four recognised failure modes i.e. rocking, bed joint sliding, toe crushing and diagonal tension cracking do not result in the same catastrophic consequences as does a failed face loaded wall.

It is also believed that energy dissipation by virtue of "rocking" foundations may have also contributed to the observed structural integrity of "in plane" walls being maintained to a level better than theoretically predicted.

Research is also being currently undertaken to consider the effects of floor /ceiling diaphragm stiffness. This was found to have a dramatic influence on the behaviour of the face loaded wall and its dynamic response under lateral load. It has been observed by full scale testing that significant stiffening of a floor / ceiling can be achieved by simply placing a well nailed ply sheet membrane over the entire floor.

Analysis

The seismic analysis considered the vertical span of the stone walls between the floor and ceiling. The loads for this analysis were calculated from the “Assessment and Improvement of Stone Masonry Buildings for Earthquake Resistance” published by The University of Auckland.

It assumes that a horizontal crack will form at a height of approximately two thirds up the vertical span of the stone wall.

Dynamic analysis is then used to calculate a horizontal deflection of the two segments of wall at the crack height, the deflection at which instability occurs is then compared to the theoretical deflection of the wall under seismic load, the ratio of these deflections is deemed the %NBS for the wall under face load.
Results

Outlined below are the various elements we checked, their %NBS and potential strengthening proposals for items under 33% NBS.

The potential strengthening is also shown on attached sketches at the rear of the report. Steel sizes and member thickness are indicative only and will most likely change during detailed design. The potential strengthening proposals could change as more detailed investigation, design and input from a heritage architect is incorporated.

The potential strengthening proposal has been based on achieving a minimum building strength of 67% NBS.

Earthquake Prone / Risk Categories

| %NBS <33 | Building is earthquake prone in terms of building act. Building is required to be upgraded in a prescribed timeframe. |
| %NBS >33 | No further action required by law however may be considered as an unacceptable risk and further work may be recommended. |
| %NBS >67 | Not considered an earthquake risk |

Critical Structural Weaknesses and Potential Structural Strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>%NBS</th>
<th>Potential Strengthening to 67% NBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of plane loading of 2.2m high stone walls (assuming there is a rubble core between two stone skins)</td>
<td>Approximately 16% NBS</td>
<td>Tie the two external skins of stone together and prop the top of the wall with either a steel beam or floor diaphragm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of plane loading of 2.2m high stone walls (assuming the walls are solid stone)</td>
<td>Approximately 45% NBS</td>
<td>Strengthening as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of plane loading of gable ends</td>
<td>Less than 33%NBS</td>
<td>Prop the gable end at mid height with either a steel beam or floor diaphragm. Prop the top of the gable with either steel rod bracing or a roof diaphragm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-floor / roof diaphragm</td>
<td>Less than 33%NBS</td>
<td>Install a plywood diaphragm to mid-floor and roof and connect to stone walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimneys</td>
<td>Less than 33%NBS</td>
<td>Install a steel beam and lightweight concrete in the chimney flu. Grout strengthen the foundations to improve the bearing capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Design

As shown in the attached plans, we have provided a number of different options to strengthen the building to 67%NBS.

To proceed with detailed design, the desired strengthening option or combination of options will need to be chosen.

During this process, we would advise that a heritage architect is involved to check our design and make any other improvements that may be triggered if a building consent is lodged, i.e., fire or accessibility requirements.

We will also require additional geotechnical investigation around the chimney in the hall to design the under grouting of the chimney foundations.

A peer review of our work by an independent engineer will also need to be undertaken before it can be lodged for building consent.

CONCLUSIONS

From our detailed seismic assessment of the Melanesian Mission, we have found that it has a %NBS rating of less than 33%. This classifies the building as earthquake prone which requires it to be upgraded.

In our report and attached plans we have outlined a number of strengthening options to increase the strength of the building to 67%NBS.

Mitchell Vranjes Consulting Engineers

Report prepared by:

(signed)

Andrew Clarke

CPEng No: 1004870
Auckland Council No: 2161
Archaeological Monitoring of Geotechnical Tests
ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING OF GEOTECHNICAL TESTS: MELANESIAN MISSION, MISSION BAY AUCKLAND

HNZPT List 111, NZAA R11/1706

Photo 1. Former kitchen, store and dining room built of basalt in 1859: the only remaining building of the Melanesian Mission (14/8/2014).

Figure 1. “Mission Bay: The Dining Hall and Other Buildings of the Mission” Harold Young, 25 February 1898
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Introduction
On 5 August 2014, I was contacted by Peter Walker, Heritage Destinations Project/Programme Manager at Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), and asked to provide archaeological services in relation to the proposed geotechnical tests to be undertaken at the Melanesian Mission.

The Melanesian Mission, at 40-44 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay, Auckland is owned by HNZPT. The stone building is listed as a Category 1 place, number 111 (Photo 1). The site is also recorded as NZ Archaeological Association Site Record R11/1706 and is scheduled Category B historic place 1575 (with historical, social, knowledge, physical attributes, aesthetic and context valued) under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.

The tests were being undertaken in preparation for earthquake strengthening works.

I visited the site with Peter Walker and discussed the number, type and location of the tests.

I then visited the Auckland office of HNZPT to view the property file and undertook additional archival research. I prepared a sketch of the layout of the mission.

As I considered that the test holes would not impact on any known structures, I advised that an authority from HNZPT was probably not required. However, I recommended that archaeological monitoring be undertaken, to ensure that if any archaeological evidence was uncovered the test holes could be shifted to avoid damaging it. This procedure was approved by Bev Parslow, Auckland Regional Archaeologist, HNZPT.

On 2 September, Soil and Rock Consultants undertook the geotechnical tests.

This report outlines a brief history of the mission buildings and reconstructs a layout of the main buildings and spaces; it then describes the hand auger and CPT test holes and presents the results.

Brief History
A number of histories have been produced about the Melanesian Mission (Figure 2). The principal one was that by Ruth Ross in 1983. It has been the main source for other accounts in the NZAA site record form, Salmond Architect (c.1990) and Foster (2002).

The name Kohimarama was probably the name of a small pa on what later became known as the Bastion and is now a small reef at the base of Bastion Point. The name was listed on one corner of Lot 40A and then moved to refer to the whole of Lots 32 and 40A being the mission property ‘Kohimarama Estate’. In 1919, the bay became known as Mission Bay and the name Kohimarama moved east to the next bay.

The land was purchased from the Maori owners in 1841 and subdivided into several allotments, and in 1846 Bishop Selwyn purchased Lots 32 and 40A, SO 814. Rev Kissling and his wife built a ‘Native Girls School’ somewhere on the mission land, but it was burnt down in 1848. The location of this building is unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Land purchased by government &amp; subdivided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>“Tamaki Farms”</td>
<td>SO 814 survey plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Bishop Selwyn purchases Lots 32 &amp; 40A, known as Kohimarama Estate</td>
<td>Kinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Stone building erected on mission site in Lot 40A</td>
<td>Kinder painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Schoolroom &amp; dormitories moved from St John’s to site</td>
<td>Kinder painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crombie photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Bishop Patteson ordained, Norfolk Island pine/s planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-3</td>
<td>Superintendent’s house built</td>
<td>Kinder photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Bishop Patteson’s house built</td>
<td>Hoyte painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Bishop Patteson’s house dismantled, mission moved to Norfolk Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-74</td>
<td>Land vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Naval Training School occupies site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Additional wooden buildings erected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Industrial School occupies site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Armed Constabulary camp outside quadrangle, while constructing</td>
<td>Anon photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bastion on Bastion Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Industrial School leaves</td>
<td>Beattie photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-</td>
<td>Buildings and site rarely used, schoolroom and some wooden buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>removed 1898, other wooden buildings removed before 1915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Walsh’s Flying School occupies site, erects buildings mainly south of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quadrangle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Mission land becomes known as Mission Bay</td>
<td>Walsh photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Flying School leaves site</td>
<td>Anon photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Subdivision of mission land (Kohimarama Estate)</td>
<td>DP 17827 survey plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Superintendent’s house demolished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Subdivision of mission land (Kohimarama Estate), Selwyn Domain</td>
<td>DP 19137 survey plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established as recreation reserve along beach, including mission station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Subdivision of mission land (Kohimarama Estate)</td>
<td>DP 20244 survey plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Reconstruction and repair works to stone building, including removal of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Melanesian Mission museum established in stone building, land in</td>
<td>DP 22640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selwyn Domain resurveyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Foundations of the chapel/schoolroom/printery</td>
<td>Anon photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aerial photograph (AC GIS viewer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Stone footings of the chapel/schoolroom removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Melanesian Mission museum handed over to NZ Historic Places Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Museum closed, objects removed and conserved by conservators,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Café development in part of quadrangle, archaeologically monitored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster 2002 (HP authority 2002-34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aerial photograph (AC GIS viewer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Geotechnical tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Church of England was educating Maori and Melanesian as potential missionaries. Lot 40A was considered to be a sheltered spot, especially in contrast to the windy ridge of St John’s College, and therefore more healthy for the Melanesian students, who frequently succumbed to respiratory illnesses in the New Zealand winter. However, work to begin a mission station was held off, as a station in the Pacific Islands (North Vanuatu, Santa Cruz and Central Solomon Islands) was thought to be even more preferable.

When arrangements for construction of the mission in the Pacific fell through, work commenced at Kohimarama by Bishop Selwyn, although paid for by Bishop Patteson’s father.

Initially, in 1859, a kitchen/dining room and a shelter wall were constructed of basalt from Rangitoto.

In 1860, wooden buildings were transferred from St John’s College. The 80 feet (24 m) long wooden schoolroom on a foundation of basalt was positioned on the east. In between, what was termed the ‘quadrangle’ by Patteson, were two small wooden L-shaped buildings and an adjoining wooden building. One of these was Patteson’s dwelling which he described as measuring 17 x 7 feet (5 x 2 m). None of the buildings in the painting and photographs of the complex (see Figures 4-7) appears to be that small, so it may be that he had part of one of these three quadrangle buildings.

It seems likely that all these wooden buildings were constructed on stone foundations to keep the damp out. Certainly the schoolroom and one of the small L-shaped buildings had a stone foundation. Shell and/or sand paths were laid between the main buildings. Fences marked the property boundaries and internal paddocks and gardens. Toilets were situated overhanging the riverbank, with additional ones in the dormitory buildings. Photographs show additional buildings, possibly storehouses, and an area ploughed in front of the quadrangle.

The schoolroom was subdivided, with a chapel being formed in the northern part, and a printery in the southern section – Patteson was a gifted linguist and the Kohimarama mission station printed all the teaching texts and scriptures required by the mission.

Patteson was ordained bishop in 1861, and one or two trees were planted to mark the event. These may or may not be the same trees that exist today – two trees in a similar position to the current specimens appear on photographs dating from 1863.

In 1862-3, a two-storey house was built to the east of the quadrangle for Superintendent Dudley and his wife. This was expanded with a large classroom and veranda in 1865.

In 1866, a house was built for Bishop Patteson, which also included a hospital. This was located west of the quadrangle and closer to the shore than the mission buildings, like the superintendent’s house.

There were frequent deaths from consumption and possibly typhoid (possibly due to having the toilets on the edge of the stream). In 1863-4 there were 14 deaths, said to be more than all the previous years put together. This would suggest that there were between 20-40 deaths of Melanesian men, women and possibly children. The location of the cemetery where they were buried is unknown.
These deaths combined with the long voyages to and from the islands each year resulted in a decision to move the mission to Norfolk Island. Bishop Patteson’s house was dismantled in 1867 and taken to Norfolk Island and the mission at Kohimarama closed.

In 1874 the property was used as a Naval Training School, when additional buildings were built in the quadrangle and to the rear. The western side of the central building was gazetted a school gaol for absconding pupils. The property’s use changed in 1882, when it became an Industrial School. In 1893, that institution closed.

Over the next few decades most of the wooden buildings were removed. In 1898, Rev. Smallfield moved one of the small classrooms to St John’s. The 24 m long schoolroom and neighbouring dormitories were moved by Rev. Boler to Howick, to be used as a reading and recreation room for the Howick residents and a Sunday school. The remainder of the wooden buildings were removed by 1915, except for the superintendent’s house, which stayed until 1925.

In 1915, the New Zealand Flying School was established by the Walsh brothers on the property. They built a series of hangars and other structures mainly to the south of the mission quadrangle, although one shed overlapped the schoolroom and one house was built near to the former bishop’s residence. When the school closed in 1924 all their buildings were removed.

The Kohimarama Estate was subdivided over the next few years, with the remaining mission buildings – the stone kitchen/dining room and the stone shelter wall – being retained in a beach front reserve named Selwyn Domain. The stone foundations of the chapel/schoolroom were also present and fenced off.

Curiously, in 1925, the stone building and part of the wall were surveyed off from the rest of the quadrangle, as Lot 28 DP 19137 (see Appendix 2). In 1929 it was resurveyed with a different boundary around the stone building overlapping the previous one. The current HNZPT property comprises Lots 2, 3 and 6 DP 22640, and extends over approximately half of the former mission quadrangle.

During the second half of the 20th century the building was repaired (see Salmond c.1990). Toilets were built in the adjacent council property, as well as adjacent to the stone building, additional buildings were built between the stone building and the wall, including a barn with concrete foundation. The latest addition was a café building in 2002, the earthworks of which were monitored by Russell Foster (2002).

**Mission Layout**

These histories identify a number of buildings, principally within the ‘quadrangle’ formed between the two principal buildings of the wooden chapel/schoolroom/printery and the stone dining/store/kitchen.

Key sources of information used to construct the plan of the mission site were the illustrations in Auckland Libraries and National Library of New Zealand (Figures 3-15). These, together with survey plans, Auckland Council contour maps and aerial photographs, provided a series of changing views of the buildings and landscape over time.
Figure 2. John Kinder, 1860 “Melanesian Mission College. Kohimarama, July 1860, from Maori village on the cliff”. Photograph of original painting held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-3211).

Figure 3. John Nicol Crombie, July 1860. “Kohimarama near Auckland NZ. Photograph taken during the Kohimarama Conference. This meeting of Maori chiefs, called by Governor Browne, was held at Kohimarama while Patteson and his Melanesian scholars were absent in the islands. Sleeping accommodation for the chiefs was provided in the long low wooden building specially erected (and later removed by the Government). Photograph of original print held National Library (Ref: PA1-q-250-17).
Figure 4. John Kinder. c.1863-4. Photograph showing the two-storey house for the superintendent in the middle distance was built in the summer of 1862-3 for Benjamin Dudley and his wife. The two small trees in the quadrangle could be the two Norfolk pines still growing. The cottage on the beach at the eastern end of the bay was the ‘captain’s house’. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-3209).

Figure 5. John Kinder. c.1863-4. Photograph showing the rear of the mission with the quadrangle buildings and fences. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-3210).
Figure 6. Untitled painting by J. C. Hoyte, 1866-7. This shows Bishop Patteson’s house on the right which was first occupied in February 1866 and dismantled in March 1867. Original held in St John’s College, Auckland (Ross 1983, frontispiece).

Figure 7. Anon photographer. c.1885. Showing bell-tents, possibly Armed Constabulary camp during the construction of Bastion Point (pers. comm. Dave Rudd). This shows the extra buildings to the rear and in the quadrangle. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 7-A599).
Figure 8. William Beattie. c.1895. Photograph of the Industrial School within a year or two of its closure (according to Ross 1983: 55). This shows the same layout of buildings as Figure 8. Note fenced area to rear. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-2880a).

Figure 9. The Superintendent’s house in 1908, showing the additions with the veranda, the Norfolk pine in the background is in front of the quadrangle. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-2877).
Figure 10. Sketch by Harold Young in 24 February 1898, entitled ‘Mission Bay: The Melanesian Mission School House’, of the schoolroom building, with the chapel at the left end, shortly before it was moved. It shows the stone foundation of the schoolroom, the building that crossed the wall (seen in Beattie’s c.1895 photograph) is to the rear, and the corner of one of the original L-shaped buildings at the far right. Original sketch is held by Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tamaki (Accession Number 1935/18/6).

Figure 11. Anon. photographer 1891, from a similar angle as Young’s sketch above, with detail of the L-shaped dormitory and the schoolroom to the rear and the sand or sand and shell paths. Note the position of the chimney in the centre of the photograph and the stone foundation. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 4-3164).
Figure 12. Photograph by Vivian Walsh, 1918. This shows the position of the superintendent’s house to left, a house on the stream bank (probably east of Patteson’s house) and the Flying School buildings, most of which are south of the stone wall. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 7-A260).

Figure 13. Anon photographer, 18 September 1924. Photograph from original negative held Auckland Libraries (Record ID 7-A6264).
There have been a number of disagreements between the authors, especially when it comes to interpretation of the archival photographs and illustrations. It was necessary to try and sort these out in order to understand the context of the mission site as a whole – defined here as the mission kitchen/store/dining room, stone shelter wall, chapel/schoolroom/printery, quadrangle buildings, superintendent’s house, bishop’s house and adjacent fences, buildings, gardens and paddocks – but not the outlying ‘captain’s house’, which was at the eastern end of the bay (Figures 16-17).

Finally, as no clear plan of the mission has been previously created, it was unknown how much is within the current HNZPT property, what it was used for and when, and, therefore, what might be affected by any proposed works development (Figure 18).

As mentioned above, the curtilage of the mission includes the quadrangle incorporating the main buildings, the site of the superintendent’s and bishop’s houses and various stores. To the north along the shore was a fence and another fence ran immediately to the east of the superintendent’s house (Figure 16). To the west was the boundary with the Maori land, now Bastion Point, and the stream, while to the south was a swampy lagoon.

This area was also used for gardens - a ploughed area is visible in front of the quadrangle in Figure 5. Paddocks for cattle, including milk cows, are indicated by the various fences visible in the different photographs.
Figure 15. Contour map, showing stream channels, the Lot 40A in green, the mission quadrangle and main fenced area in red, with current property outlined in grey (based on Auckland Council GIS).

Figure 16. Aerial photograph (dating 2010), showing the main stream channel, with mission quadrangle and main fenced area in red, and current property in white (based on Auckland Council GIS).
There must also have been rubbish disposal, presumably near the kitchen, and possibly in the area between the stone building and the stream. There may have been other rubbish pits associated with the printery and school, possibly to the east of the schoolroom.

Finally, there was the cemetery where 20-30 Melanesians were buried. Ross (1983:73-4) listed 17 deaths between March 1860 and January 1866. In autumn of 1864 Patteson wrote that there had been in “fourteen months not less than fourteen [deaths]: more than in the other years put together” (Patteson 27 April 1864, cited in Ross 1983:34). Patteson mentions taking one body to the chapel and “I shall bury him presently” (Patteson letter 31 March 1863, cited in Ross 1983:74). It seems likely that the cemetery was close to the chapel, or at least not far away from the quadrangle. Ross could find no mention of its location in the church records.

However, in 1926 when the subdivision of the Kohimarama Estate was being planned, Mrs Brown of Pukekohe, who had attended some of the burials, visited the site and later forwarded a photograph showing the position of the graves. These were not visible on the surface at this time, but appeared to fall within an area of road reserve, so the section adjoining the road reserve was withdrawn from sale (Ross 1983:75).

It is unclear from the survey plans if there was a section planned to the west of Lot 28, which was withdrawn – this would now be the parking area. Kinder’s photograph of 1863-4 does show earthworks behind the quadrangle, the 1885 photograph shows a fenced area to the rear of the chapel while there is a smaller fenced area in 1895. It is unknown if any of these relate to the cemetery.

Further research of any provisional survey plans and Mrs Brown’s photograph in church records may assist in locating the cemetery. Geomagnetic surveying might identify the location of the burials if they are within the reserve, as well as rubbish pits and the foundations of the other buildings.

Beyond this, the land was used for grazing, and possibly hay, and the collection of firewood, but the main focus of the mission and probably the later schools would have been the area bounded in red and the waterways shown in Figure 16.

The present-day situation is shown in Figure 17, which shows that the western half of the quadrangle lies within the HNZPT property, much of the rest of the property is within the current reserve, although the western part has been modified by parking, the north by a playground and the east by the fountain. To the south the land has been subdivided for shops, housing and roading.

An attempt to reconstruct the detail of the mission site using georectification of the photographs was attempted, but the extremely low angle made it impossible to achieve with any accuracy (pers. comm. Ben Thorne 2014). Therefore, the reconstruction was achieved by comparison of elements visible in vertical aerial photographs and in relation to the two main buildings within the quadrangle and the wall (which have been surveyed in relation to each other) and ‘best fit’ derived from the photographs and illustrations. The result is shown in Figure 18, showing the angles of the photographs used to construct the overall plan.
Figure 17. Nineteenth century layout of the Kohimarama Mission, showing the surveyed buildings in black and the best fit locations of the other buildings and structures in the curtilage (compiled by Caroline Phillips 2014).
In particular: the superintendent’s house was fixed from the trees still present in the vertical 1940 aerial photograph; the bishops house was fixed from the high ground shown clearly in Figure 3, which was very close to the fence and path to the shore; the quadrangle buildings were fixed from the results of the geotechnical tests (described below).

Figure 18 shows that the current HNZPT property includes the kitchen/dining hall stone building, one of the quadrangle dormitories, and another building possibly dating to 1874 when the Naval Training School was in operation (it might have been the school gaol mentioned as being on the west side of the quadrangle). The property also includes an access to what is now Tamaki Drive. It is not known if this was only a paddock while the mission and the later 19th century schools were in operation, or if there were other activities undertaken in it.

**Geotechnical Tests**

Mitchell Vranjes Consulting Engineers are undertaking a detailed seismic assessment in connection with the proposed seismic retrofit of the stone mission building. As part of this assessment Soil and Rock Consultants were engaged by HNZPT to undertake a geotechnical site investigation to assess the potential for liquefaction, with DCN Drilling Ltd providing and operating a track-mounted cone penetration rig (Photo 2). This had anchors at either end of the rig, 300 mm diameter and 1.5 m from the central drill hole – therefore each CPT resulted in three holes being dug, but none of the deposits that these drilled through were visible (Photo 3).

On 2 September 2014 they undertook:

- two hand auger boreholes 50 mm diameter, 2.3 m deep,
- three additional shallow hand auger boreholes (50 or 100 mm diameter and 1.5 m deep) as part of the service clearance for the cone penetrometer tests (CPTs),
- one hand auger borehole as part of the service clearance for the CPTs, aborted after it encountered an archaeological feature (Photo 4),
- four CPT tests to maximum depth 13.77 m, and

The locations were recorded using a combination of a hand-held GPS and measurement by tape from existing site features (Figure 19).

The results were:

- CPT 02 and HA 1 had 400 mm dark topsoil, over natural sand,
- CPT 04 and HA 2 had 200 mm dark topsoil, over 100-200 mm shell (presumably a shell path), over 50 mm buried topsoil, over natural sand,
- CPT 03 had 400 mm dark topsoil over a trace of shell (possibly the edge of the same shell path) over natural sand,
- CPT 01 had 300 mm shelly topsoil, over natural sand,
- The aborted CPT 01 had 150 mm shelly topsoil, over 200 mm mortar and rock, over buried topsoil.
Photo 2. Drill unit being remotely driven to first CPT hole.

Photo 3. Detail of drill unit, showing anchor drill being positioned, with central drill arrowed.

Photo 4. Auger hole for original CPT 01 that was aborted after encountering a layer of mortar and basalt rocks that were probably the chimney foundation.
After the mortar and rock layer were discovered, the area around auger hole was probed and the mortar/rock was found to extend c.500 mm in all directions. A new CPT 01 position was located 1.10 m north and 1.70 m east, to ensure that both the anchor holes and the CPT hole would avoid damaging the feature.

It was thought most likely that that mortar and rock was the base of the chimney for the western L-shaped dormitory in the quadrangle (see Figure 1). This allowed the internal buildings to be keyed into the overall surveyed plan (Figure 18).

In addition, Foster (2002) had located one posthole in the footings for the new café and the approximate position of this has also been added to the plan. It seems likely that this posthole may have belonged to the 1874 building that might have been used as a school gaol. If this is the case it seems that only the original buildings were constructed on stone foundations, and that the later ones may have just had wooden piles.
Conclusions

Many developments have taken place within the HNZPT property since 1974. Only the footings for the café and the geotechnical tests have been archaeologically monitored, but in both cases this work revealed that evidence of the former mission and later schools at the site still exist below the surface.

Examination of the photographs and illustrations show that the current property only includes the western half of the quadrangle (the core of the mission site), and that the curtilage extended in all directions out from that (Figures 18 & 19).

It is likely that there is surviving evidence of many of the other structures, as well as unrecorded structures, rubbish pits, possibly burials and other structures still within the HNZPT property and adjacent reserve.

These results must be viewed as ‘best fit’, due to the small amount of ground examined and the difficulty of aligning the illustrations. Greater clarity might be achieved by use of geomagnetic survey, which would locate any surviving stone foundations as well as rubbish pits and graves.

Any future earthworks within the property should be done under an authority from HNZPT.
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**Site Record Form**

**NZAA SITE NUMBER:** R1/1/1706  
**SITE TYPE:** Mission station  
**SITE NAME(s):** Melanesian Mission  
**DATE.Recorded:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE COORDINATES (NZTM) Easting: 1783113</th>
<th>Northing: 5920554</th>
<th>Source: On Screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPERIAL SITE NUMBER:</strong></td>
<td><strong>METRIC SITE NUMBER:</strong> R1/1/1706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding aids to the location of the site  
'Selwyn Reserve, Mission Bay.'

**Brief description**  
Mission Station

**Recorded features**  
Building, Building foundations (unspecifed)

**Other sites associated with this site**

Printed by: carolinephillips  
27/09/2014
SITE RECORD HISTORY

Site description

Updated: 19/03/2014 (field visit), submitted by carolinephillips, visited 02/03/2014 by Caroline Phillips

Archaeological monitoring of geotechnical tests resulted in the location of a chimney base belonging to one of the small dwellings in the quadrangle and remains of a shell path to the west of the stone kitchen/dining hall.


Updated: 23/03/2012: NZTN E1733113 / N5920504 (On Screen).

The Mission House was erected in the mid 19th century to house the Melanesian Mission Training School founded by Bishops Selwyn and Patteson. The existing “Mission House” now used as a cafe, is the sole surviving building.

The land at Mission Bay was purchased by Bishop Selwyn from William Spann in 1846 and was used to house the Rev Keasleys school for Maori pupils. However, that building was burnt down in 1848. Construction of the Melanesian mission (to be known as St Andrew’s College) began in 1869-70. In 1859 Patteson described the premises as consisting of:

“Three sides of a quadrangle, but the south side is only partially filled up. The large school room, eighty feet long, with three sets of transepts, has been removed from the College (St John’s), and put up again to form the east side of the quadrangle. This is of wood, so is the small wooden quadrangle which contains dormitories, and part of which I occupy, my house consisting of three little rooms, together measuring seventeen feet by seven. These dormitories are on the southern side of the quadrangle, but do not reach more than half way from the east to the west side, room being left for another set of dormitories of equal size, when we want them and can afford them. The west side consists of a very nice set of stone buildings [the present Mission House]…” (J.C. Patteson quoted in Ross 1883: 22).

Later additions to the mission were a staff house (1865) east of the main buildings and a house for the bishop to the west. An 1867 watercolour by J.C. Hoye shows the bishop’s house at the right hand side, the surviving mission house in the centre and the oncopark schoolrooms at the extreme left side. Wooden dormitory buildings are visible occupying the eastern portion of the southern side of the quadrangle. Also evident is the long stone wall along the southern side. A large part of this wall is still present, but the eastern end has been demolished from a short length that is present between the modern public toilets.

Patteson obtained plans for replacing the dormitory buildings in about 1865, but it appears that nothing came of these as by the end of 1866 the removal of the college to Norfolk Island had been decided.

After the move to Norfolk Island Patteson intended the Kohimarama buildings should be used as a Maori school, but nothing came of this (Ross 1983: 54) and in 1874 the government leased the buildings from the Melanesian Trust for use as a Naval training school. At this time there were apparently three buildings, the stone mission building, the chapel/school room and a third between these buildings along the southern side (Salmond n.d: 9). It continued in this capacity until 1892 when it was gazetted as an industrial school in 1892. This establishment did not have a long life and it was officially closed in 1892.

A photograph taken in 1980 shows the complex looking from the south east. The main western and eastern buildings are visible, whilst there are a number of other buildings between them. It is not known exactly when these were erected, but they must date from the period after 1874 when the government leased the property. It is known that at least one additional classroom and dormitory block had been added. Ross (1983: 55) suggested that some of these buildings may have been built by Patteson but as only three buildings are referred to in 1874 this would seem unlikely.

In 1898 one of the government erected class rooms was bought for use at a private school at St John’s and shortly afterwards the vicar of Howick purchased and removed to Hawick the original chapel/classroom building (moved to the site from St John’s College in 1859) and neighbouring dormitory buildings to re-erect at Howick. By 1910 all wooden buildings at the site had been sold or demolished. All that remained were the stone mission building and the stone foundations of the chapel building.

In 1915 the property was leased to the Welsh brothers for use as a flying school and hangars and other buildings were erected. Ross (1983: 55) states that in 1916 "hangars were built facing the beach, more or less where the former classrooms and dormitories had stood, with aas leading down to the water for launching the flying boats." This would not appear to be correct. Aerial photographs of the flying school dated to 1919 and 1920 show hangars with south facing doors. I.e. They were built on the southern side of the stone wall, facing away from the beach. The stone wall is visible and the...
NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The building was not on the site of the former mission or later school buildings as suggested by Ross.

The building at the entrance to the site is now a museum with a curator's office in the former kitchen and store rooms. One of the two present public toilets at the eastern end of the site were constructed by the council at this time. It was presumably the more eastern of the two original mission baths which still stand between the current two toilets and the large stone walls on the eastern side of the site.

The stone foundations of the chapel and school room building were still visible in 1998 and shortly after the museum opened. A large stone was laid inside the foundations and a plaque commemorating the mission chapel erected. These foundations remained visible for many years and it was not until much later, possibly as late as the late 1960s (C. Reynolds, NZHPT pers. comm.) that a local beautification society persuaded the council to remove the foundations and grass the area over.

References:

| Updated: 23/03/2012 | Foster, Russell |

Condition of the site

Statement of condition

Current land use:
Updated: 23/03/2012 - Reserve/recreation

Threats:
Updated: 19/06/2014, Visited: 02/09/2014 - Road track formation or maintenance, Services/Utilities, Visitor impacts/vandalism
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NZAA SITE NUMBER: R11/1706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Observations about this site made in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
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</thead>
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Supporting documentation held in ArchSite
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Record Form (Metric)</th>
<th>NZAA Metric Site Number: K1121706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Visited</td>
<td>Site Type: Mission Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name: Waihi</td>
<td>SITE NAME: WAIHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric Reference Number</td>
<td>Metric Projector: Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Reference</td>
<td>Ending 0.0, Working 630.0,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Aim to relocation of existing structure
   at eastern end of Sibyra Domain, Mission Bay, Auckland. Around existing store building.

2. Site of site and possible future damage
   In 1969 a ACC workshop, report by survival of timber elements.

3. Description of site (Supply full details history, brief excavation, photograph, etc.)
   In 1965, site is mainly to original site of existing Store/Mission House
   (former office and dining hall), remaining 400-500m to east of site of former
   school, and chapel building (demol in 1965). The stone foundation of lateral
   building visible to 1930's/40's, once then removed/demolished. Articulated
   posthole to west of kitchen in 1960's, below of other buildings in vicinity.

4. Owner: NZERC
   Address: Wellington

5. Nature of Information: (Strengths & challenges, etc.)
   Brief visit
   Photographs (reference numbers, and stone, grey stone)
   Archeological (reference numbers, and existing status)

6. Described by: M. Debld
   Address: TOC
   Date: 27/09/14

7. New Zealand Historic Places Trust for Approval

Printed by: carolinephillips 27/09/2014

4 of 4
Kelmisram, July 1866. (Ross 1983: 19)

J.C. Hoyte watercolour of St Andrew’s College, 1865-7. (St John’s College)
Kohimarama buildings in 1890 (Ross 1883: 55)

Walsh Flying School, Kohimarama 1919 (Harvie 1974: 91)
Walsh Flying School, 1926 (Ross 1983: 58)

St. Andrew's chapel foundations, 1929. (St. John's College)
SO 814, drafted in 1842.

DP 17827, dated 1924
DP 19137, dated 1925

DP 20244, dated 1926.
DP 22640 dated 1929.
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under HNZPT authority no: 2015/1207 and resource
consent (S9) R/LUC/2015/1941

5. Hans-Dieter Bader excavating the first test pit on what was probably the wall of Alexander
Dalziel’s house, note fencing around pine trees (31/6/2015)
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Introduction

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) own part of the historic Melanesian Mission site at Mission Bay, Auckland. The stone building is the main surviving structure of the mission; both it and adjacent newer facilities are used for hospitality.

HNZPT wish to undertake earthquake strengthening works on the historic stone building and in 2014 geotechnical tests were undertaken in preparation for earthquake strengthening works and were archaeologically monitored (Phillips 2014).

Research for this project showed that no layout of the mission and the extent of its curtilage had been previously developed. In order to provide a context for the results of this monitoring project and information for any future conservation or management plan, Phillips (2014) analysed all the existing illustrations to determine the layout of the Melanesian Mission Station (Figure 1). Mission correspondence (Ross 1983) often referred to the quadrangle, which comprised the main group of buildings. Outside these there were various other buildings, located within the fence to the east, the sea to the north, the stream to the west and a wetland to the south. These are referred to in this document as the curtilage.

Currently HNZPT property encompasses just over half of the quadrangle. The remainder of the quadrangle, with other related buildings and structures, are in Selwyn Reserve, which is owned by Auckland Council.

In May 2015, in order to verify the layout plan, a geomagnetic survey was undertaken of most over the presumed curtilage of the mission, including that part within Selwyn Reserve (but not under roads, carpark or playground). The geomagnetic results indicated that the layout plan devised in 2014 was correct (the error in the placement of buildings was in the order of only 1-2 m). Additional anomalies in the survey indicated that there were other features which required testing to determine whether or not they were historic, and what their nature and significance was.

In order to understand the impact the strengthening of the existing stone building might have on the archaeological evidence, a programme of exploratory archaeological testing within the HNZPT property was devised (Phillips 2015a). The tests were designed to understand the extent of subsurface remains as indicated by the geomagnetic survey and analysis of illustrations and suitable for incorporation into any conservation and management plan of the place.

An application was prepared (Phillips 2015a) to HNZPT for an authority to undertake a series of test pits. Ngati Paoa and Ngati Whatua o Orakei were consulted as part of this application. The application was approved (authority no. 2015/1207) on 15 May 2015.

Resource consent was also required from Auckland Council, so an assessment of effects was prepared with an application which was approved 26 June (consent (s9) R/LUC/2015/1941). Of fundamental concern for Auckland Council were the Norfolk Island pine trees, which are scheduled in the District Plan as Notable Trees.
Figure 19. Layout plan of the mission, based on analysis of archival photographs and illustrations (see Phillips 2014).
Fieldwork

Prior to the fieldwork commencing Nick Stott, Heritage Arborist with Auckland Council was contacted. On 30 June a pre-start meeting was held on-site to discuss the proposed methodology. Stott was satisfied that the hand-dug test pits would not affect the trees, but required temporary fencing around the areas of the roots (Photo 1) and rehabilitation of the grass when the tests were completed.

On 30 June and 1 July 2015, Hans-Dieter Bader and I excavated 10 test pits (Figure 2). These were aimed to test:

- geomagnetic anomalies that suggested the outline of a house (TP 1, 2 and 3);
- geomagnetic anomalies suggestive of pits (TP 4 and 5);
- layout plan that predicted the presence of a path (TP 6);
- layout plan and geomagnetic anomalies that indicated the wall of a mission building (TP 7);
- layout plan that predicted the presence of a path (TP10); and
- if there were any archaeological deposits beside the chimney (TP 8 and 9).

Each of the test pits measured 600 x 300 mm and was up to 900 mm deep. The turf was first removed and set aside, then the pit was excavated by layer, with each layer being spaded into a bucket (Photo 2). In the test pits with deeper deposits (beyond which it was not possible to hand-dig such a small hole) the ground was probed to determine the depths of the various layers. The details were recorded.

One or two layers from seven of these test pits was sieved to recover any small items that were in the soil (Appendix 1 & 2). Two of the test pits were in disturbed ground (TP 9 & 10) and one was under a former house (TP 7), so sieving was not undertaken in these.

The items that were recovered and two soil samples collected for the charcoal content were taken for further analysis.

Bev Parslow, Heritage New Zealand regional archaeologist, visited the excavations.

At the end of the project all the test pits were back-filled, the turf replaced, and the temporary fencing removed.
Figure 20. Location of the exploratory test pits (marked in red), geotechnical tests (marked in blue) and geomagnetic survey, showing the combined findings

Photo 6. Excavation of TP 1 showing the different layers of soil in each of the buckets, and the sieve to be used.
Photo 8. Finds from TP 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix 2).

Photo 7. Finds from TP 4, 5, 6, 8 & 9 (see Appendix 2).
Findings

The findings described below are grouped according to the features that they related to: Alexander Dalziel’s house, underground pits, missionary path, quadrangle house and chimney.

The stratigraphy is described in Appendix 1, the list of artefacts is in Appendix 2, the identified charcoal in Appendix 3 and the identified faunal remains in Appendix 4 (see also Photos 2 & 3).

Alexander Dalziel’s House - 1842

TP 1 and 3 revealed charcoal-rich soil with historic artefacts. The artefacts included 4 nails, 2 screws, brass staple, bent wire, zinc strapping, 1 each fragment of blue, amber and plain glass, a fragment of brick and two pieces of shelly mortar. Charcoal was floated from the soil samples and submitted for analysis. The charcoal was identified by Rod Wallace as kauri, possibly construction timber remains.

These findings are consistent with the initial interpretation that this was a house built and later burnt down prior to the construction of the mission, and therefore most likely to be that belonging to Alexander Dalziel (see discussion in Phillips 2015b: 17, 39-44). Another building of the same period may exist within Selwyn Reserve (see Feature 2, Phillips 2015b: 35 & 37).

Additional geomagnetic survey indicated the size of the building (Figure 2, Photo 5). TP 2 was excavated outside the building and showed a very different stratigraphy, similar to a shell path. This was most likely to be a path laid by Dalziel.

Photo 9. Location of Dalziel’s house around the Norfolk Island pine tree, with test pits and pegs marking the geomagnetic signal of the burnt house walls (yellow dashed lines).
**Underground pits**

A number of apparent underground pits were identified from the geomagnetic survey on the north-east side of the HNZPT property, and extending further eastwards into Selwyn Reserve (Phillips 2015b: 35, 37). It seemed unlikely that these related to the mission as they were within the open space in front of the main buildings. All the archival photographs showed that this open space was maintained as a lawn.

It was thought possible that they were rubbish pits relating to Dalziel’s house, although the pits did not appear to contain any metal which is commonly found in rubbish pits of this period.

Two test pits were excavated in these (TP 4 & 5). One was in a larger pit identified in the reported geomagnetic survey and another was in a possible pit identified by further geomagnetic survey undertaken as part of the exploratory investigation.

These two tests showed that the underground pits were 700 mm deep and filled with uncompacted sand. These were too deep to fully excavate to the bottom and had to be probed to determine their depth. No items were found within the pits. Their purpose is unknown.

**Missionary path**

TP 6 contained a very similar stratigraphy to the three geotechnical holes (HA 2, CPT 3 & 4) that encountered shell paths (Figure 2).

Below the crushed shell layer was a buried topsoil that contained three fragments of a moa long bone which had been extensively chewed by a dog. This was an unexpected finding. It is possible that this area had formerly been an early Maori settlement, or alternatively, the shell had been gathered from, or near, an early Maori settlement.

The crushed shell was not sieved or analysed as it was assumed to have been natural beach shell.

TP 10 aimed to discover the route of the paths towards the beach. Part of this route could be determined by probing, however the ground was very compact at the northern end and the path could not be clearly defined. The test pit in this area showed mixed ground which was probably disturbed, and further excavation was aborted.

**Quadrangle building**
The probable chimney base of this building had been discovered during archaeological monitoring of the geotechnical tests (Figure 2), and the geomagnetic survey indicated the placement of the wall.

TP 7 was excavated on this wall and uncovered a shell foundation 700 mm deep (Photo 6).

![Dense shell used as a foundation for the north wall of the quadrangle building.](image)

This was presumably the foundation under the layer of basalt rocks (seen in the archival photographs and illustrations), on which the bearers were placed. This may have been to aid drainage.

Probing showed the shell foundation to be between 400 mm wide and 2.7 m long. This shell foundation only appeared to be at the northern end of this building and did not follow the outline of the building to the south. Despite this, the findings supported the identification of the quadrangle building and its placement.

**Chimney**

TP 8 and 9 were excavated beside the chimney on the western side of the stone building.

The first of these test pits encountered a shell path with a scatter of artefacts, showing that historic evidence was present immediately beside the building (Photo 7).
The other test pit encountered a recent, shallow electricity trench with disturbed deposits above. This test pit was aborted. (Note: any future contractors should be made aware of this shallow underground wire).

Photo 11. Base of chimney showing wider foundations below the ground surface on the right and scatter of shells from the edge of the path on the left.
Discussion

These findings have identified a more complex history for the property. Assessment of any future development at the property requires consideration of issues around conservation of the archaeology and the need for the property to generate income.

Summary of Findings

The excavations aimed to test the site plan based on the combination of the layout plan (derived from analysis of archival photographs) and the geomagnetic survey. The tests confirmed the arrangement of buildings and paths within the Melanesian Mission. The shell foundation for the quadrangle building shows that the missionaries were concerned about flooding.

The excavations designed to test the likelihood of Alexander Dalziel’s property being present have also been confirmed. This historic house built in 1842 is one of the earliest constructed in Auckland.

The underground pits are an anomaly that has not been solved by the test pits. It is clear that pits had been dug into the natural sandy gravels, but the purpose is unknown and the identity of the people who dug them is also unknown. It would take a larger area excavation to find out what these pits were for and when they were made.

The finding of dog-gnawed moa bone may indicate that there is even earlier Maori occupation on the site. It may be that the underground pits relate to a Maori occupation rather than the early historic period. However, the small size of the excavations, and the possibility that this bone was associated with the overlying shell path, means that this remains a tentative possibility only.

Artefacts in the soil, by the pine trees (TP 4, 5) and even close to the chimney (TP 8 & 9), show that over time the whole property has become an archaeological site, containing evidence outside the areas of known structures.
Conclusion

The combination of techniques (archival photographic analysis, geomagnetic survey and exploratory test pits) has shown that this property contains a dense archaeological landscape. At least two, possibly three, phases of occupation were identified. Evidence of these was present in the buildings, paths and underground pits. It may be that other evidence is also present which cannot be found by these techniques.

This exploratory investigation has shown that any stability works or development of the property that affects the ground below the current topsoil, which is only 150 mm thick, will affect archaeological and historic evidence.

It should be noted that excavating small areas (often called key-hole archaeology) means that the ability to interpret what is found is often not possible, or at least very difficult. Examples of this have been shown by the two tests excavated in the underground pits and the difficulty in interpreting the moa bone finds. It is important to be aware that the proposed and any future works involving small areas might lead to an incremental destruction of the archaeological evidence.

It is also important that archaeological findings which are discovered in subsurface works should be incorporated into the growing history of the place through conservation and management plans. It would be useful to have public recognition of this through signs, publicly available documents and other media.
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## Appendix 1. Test pit stratigraphy

Test pits with layer numbers, depths (mm) and description of layers and contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 1</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Buried topsoil, charcoal-rich, burnt building, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sandy with some topsoil, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 2</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Buried topsoil, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shell path, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Sandy with some topsoil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 3</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Topsoil, with some shell &amp; sand inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Buried topsoil, charcoal-rich, burnt building, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 4</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mixed topsoil &amp; sand, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Very soft uncompacted sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 5</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Shell/soil mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mixed topsoil &amp; sand, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Very soft uncompacted sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP 6</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth (mm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Shell path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Buried topsoil, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sandy with some topsoil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Topsoil, with some shell &amp; sand inclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shell foundation for wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buried topsoil, sieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shell path (not excavated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed soil - disturbed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Electric danger tape - excavation halted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed soil - disturbed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compacted ground - excavation halted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2. List of artefacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>mix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* fragment of glass from TP 1 layer 3 was lost, but is similar to that found in TP 4 layer

List of materials and samples recovered from the test pits.
Appendix 3. Charcoal identification

Caroline Phillips floated the two soil samples to recover any charcoal fragments from TP 1, layer 2 and TP 3, layer 2 (see Photo 3). Very few small fragments were present in TP 3 sample, so the one from TP 1 was sent to Rod Wallace for identification. His result is as following:

Rod Wallace - 10th July 2015

The charcoal is mainly kauri plus a tiny pohutukawa twig, so possibly construction timber remains.

July 2015

Prepared by Sheryl Cawte
Results

The two larger mammal sp (TP 2 & 3) fragments are chopped vertebra fragments. One is an unfused centrum and the other is a vertebral spine. Angle-wise we could tentatively say that it reflects the longitudinal halving of the carcass which is typical for someone experienced such as a butcher. The centrum fragment has extensive dog gnawing.

The moa sp (TP 6) is a long bone and also has extensive dog attrition, the kind that occurs when it has been in a dog’s mouth for a while with saliva.

The small bird bone (TP 1) is a femur, but I think it must have broken in-transit because it was in multiple pieces [it was definitely one bone when sent see Photo 3). The head was still in good shape and I can see it is definitely a bird, but there isn’t much to be able to identify the species unless more bird bone is recovered. However, based on its size, it is a small species probably a passerine such as a bellbird or tui.

The final sample (TP 8) contained a rat pelvis fragment.
Site Plan with Archaeological Overlay