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Incentives and rules – bricks and mortar

Heritage incentives are a powerful complement to heritage regulation, and the synergy between them is a valuable heritage tool.

Heritage incentives are not a tenable means of heritage protection used alone, but act in concert with heritage rules and evaluation systems.

The use of either alone is potentially weak and problematical.

If sound, meaningful and robust assessment systems and rules are the solid ‘bricks’ of a heritage protection system, then incentives used carefully are the ‘mortar’ that binds the bricks.

While it might be possible to erect a heritage protection approach that uses a mass of dry ‘bricks’ (regulation) alone, it would be potentially unstable.

It is even less likely that one built only of ‘mortar’ (monetary incentives) would be viable ...¹

George Farrant
Principal Heritage Adviser
Former Auckland City Council
2009

1. Introduction

Effective incentives are essential for achieving the preservation of historic heritage for present and future generations. Incentives can be regulatory or non-regulatory, and may include a wide range of policies and methods. Incentives are a key aspect of the economics of historic heritage.

Donovan D. Rypkema is a leading international authority on the economics of heritage buildings. Rypkema visited New Zealand in November 2010 and gave a series of lectures on the economic value of heritage conservation. Rypkema emphasised the critical role of incentives in heritage conservation in ‘bridging the market gap’ which refers to the gap between the costs and value of a property or business. While costs involve the acquisition of the property, cost of the retrofit works and other associated expenses, value relates to operation (rent, vacancy, etc), financing (amount, rate, return), equity (risk, alternatives, tax benefits) and the market return.

In simple terms, an economic market rate of return is calculated by identifying the costs and considering if the value of the property or business outweighs them. If the cost is in excess of value, then the property or business is unlikely to result in a commercial rate of return. The high cost of earthquake strengthening influences the market gap.

Not all heritage buildings are, however, commercial buildings. Community halls, churches, schools, apartments and dwellings operate on a non-commercial basis involving both private and public sources of funding. These places can also suffer from a gap between the cost of acquisition and maintenance of the building and available income and funding support.

This guide provides a toolkit of available heritage incentives in New Zealand. It also promotes the adoption of incentives for historic heritage. The guide provides information about regulatory and non-regulatory incentives. The regulatory incentives include:

- Conservation areas.
- Conservation lots.
- Conservation lots transferable development right (TDR).
- Waivers of zone provisions.
- Specified permitted uses.
- Plot ratios or site intensity zonings.
- Bonus floor area TDR.
- Contributions (development and financial).
- Consent fee waivers.
- Measures relating to the Building Act 2004 (the Building Act).

---

In relation to regulatory incentives, the guide provides some examples currently adopted by local authorities in New Zealand and detailed evaluation of incentives in relation to costs, benefits, transparency and clarity, manageability and legitimacy. The non-regulatory incentives include:

- Private-public partnerships (PPPs).
- Heritage grants and loans.
- Rates relief.
- Tax relief (including tax depreciation).
- Public purchase and revolving acquisitions and funds.
- Insurance rebates.
- Urban design, events and promotion.
- Other heritage incentives.

In addition to providing information about these incentives, the guide promotes the development of: a new central government grant/loans/tax scheme for the strengthening of earthquake-prone heritage buildings; and a heritage credit scheme that rewards owners to carry out regular repair and maintenance of historic heritage.

The guide also promotes good regulatory standards and national consistency in terms of regional and district plan rules for historic heritage and as promoted by the Government’s Code of Good Regulatory Practice.³

The appendices of the guide provide an updated summary of heritage incentives provided by local governments in relation to:

- District plan regulatory incentives.
- Consent fee waivers.
- Heritage-related grants.
- Rates relief available for historic heritage.
- Other types of incentives.
- Former Auckland City Council, list of heritage floor space bonuses granted and recipient sites.

Further, the appendices provide guidance for the establishment and management of a local authority heritage grants scheme.

The guide does not contain all relevant information about the wide topic of heritage incentives. Its focus is on local government, with some information about central government incentives for private owners of historic heritage.

Additional information about incentives and funding sources generally can be obtained by contacting the Funding Information Service⁴ or the Ministry for Culture and Heritage ⁵

In terms of background context, the guide is accompanied by detailed theoretical and legislative research about heritage regulation and incentives as a separate research paper.⁶ Further, valuable information about heritage incentives is provided in the Australian EPHC National Incentives Taskforce Report, Making Heritage Happen: Incentives and Policy Tools for Conserving our Historic Heritage⁷ and the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand (HCOANZ) guide, Incentives for Heritage Protection Handbook: A National Guide for Local Government and the Community.⁸

The following checklist is designed for local authorities as a guide to assist the planning process when considering the use of incentives for historic heritage.

1.1. Checklist for incentives for historic heritage

☐ Is the objective of the incentive to encourage the conservation of historic heritage in the region or district?

☐ Is the incentive developed as part of an overall strategy for historic heritage? Will the incentive be managed under a clear policy or guidelines? What is the process for approval of the policy and guidelines? How will owners of historic heritage be involved and consulted?

☐ Will the incentive complement any rules adopted in the regional or district plans? Are the current heritage rules robust and of high quality?

☐ What type of historic heritage requires an incentive-based approach (an individual place, earthquake-prone heritage buildings, group of places, an area, or all scheduled places)?

☐ What class of historic heritage requires an incentive-based approach (rural, commercial, industrial, recreational or residential places)?

☐ What is the heritage significance of the places or areas?

☐ How will the incentive benefit historic heritage, including Māori heritage?

☐ Have the risks to historic heritage been identified – fire, earthquakes, flood, vandalism, demolition by neglect, etc?

☐ What are the incentive options? Have other valid alternative approaches been identified?

⁴ http://www.fis.org.nz/
What are the costs and benefits of the preferred option(s)? How will the preferred option(s) be effective in achieving the objective?

Will the preferred option(s) be transparent and have clarity? Also will the preferred option(s) be manageable and obtain political support?

How will the incentive be managed and advertised to the public and owners of historic heritage?

How will the incentive be monitored, and what will be the indicators to measure the success of the incentive?

2. Historic heritage regulation

The manner in which heritage regulation is designed and implemented can help to clarify the management of externalities and other issues such as the improved allocation of public goods and reducing information asymmetries. All regulation should be designed to adhere to principles of good regulatory practice. These principles aims to ensure that laws have the following attributes:

- Transparency to both the decision-makers and those affected by regulation.
- Have clarity, being understandable and accessible as well as practicable.
- Should be fair and treat those affected equitably.
- Rules should be the minimum necessary to achieve the desired outcomes.
- Compliance costs should be reasonable with minimal fiscal impact.
- Are compatible internationally.

These principles have informed the government’s The Best Practice Regulation Model: Principles and Assessments.

With regard to historic heritage regulation under the RMA, the NZHPT carried out a national assessment of district plan heritage provisions in 2009 and 2011. The review highlighted a number of issues concerning heritage rules in these plans. In particular, the review revealed there are varying degrees of quality provisions in the district plans. Common issues of quality and information are:

- Overall lack of national consistency of approach with the use of a variety of terms to describe and define historic heritage.
- Lack of clarity with respect to some key rules, such as the repair and maintenance of listed heritage items.

---


Absence of explicit rules, such as relocation, signage and subdivision.

Lack of information about scheduled heritage items, especially with regards to significance.

Absence of geographical boundary information, showing the extent of heritage items listed in district plans.

The NZHPT considers that there is potential for heritage regulation to be more effective with greater national consistency. This will involve action at both national, regional and district levels. At the national level, the NZHPT has published non-statutory guidance for historic heritage under the RMA – The Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series. This series promotes the adoption of best practice standards for the management of historic heritage, including the adoption of common terms, definitions, rules and assessment standards.

In summary, it is hoped that with the adoption of best practice standards, local authority heritage regulation under the RMA will be more robust and efficient. This will involve:

- The availability of public information about historic heritage and its management under the RMA.
- Common approaches in the adoption of best practice processes for the identification of historic heritage.
- The adoption of best practice regulatory and non-regulatory options for historic heritage, especially incentives.
- Common approaches for the regulation of historic heritage in regional and district plans in terms of basic definitions, heritage schedules, consent information requirements and rules relating to repairs and maintenance, alterations and additions, relocation, demolition/damage, subdivision, and new buildings.
- Common approaches for heritage-related resource consent processes, notification and the use of heritage impact assessments.
- Provisions to promote improved building safety with rules that encourage earthquake strengthening, fire safety and physical access.
2.1. Conservation area zoning

Regulation, in relation to listing, affects the value of property in diverse ways depending on the type of regulation and place, and the environmental and social context. As explored in the theoretical overview paper, overseas research has shown that conservation areas or heritage character zoning can have a positive effect on property values.

In terms of residential conservation areas, heritage zoning can often provide ‘certainty’ for owners in relation to maintaining a ‘sense of place’ and the control activities such as infill, subdivision and new buildings. This can result in positive effects in property values for conservation areas in comparison to other non-heritage zones. As explained by Lucian Cook, the positive effect is often related to the management of the surroundings:

To put this in simple terms, the architectural credentials of an individual building mean very little if the property looks out over a 1960’s multi-storey car park. By contrast, a reasonably sympathetically designed modern dwelling located within an area that has retained a sense of place by virtue of the quality of its overriding built heritage will in all likelihood carry a significant premium over the same dwelling within a modern housing estate.

This overseas research tends to support anecdotal evidence of the positive effect on property values of residential conservation areas in Wellington and Auckland.

The positive impact of listing, however, on private property values is not a guaranteed correlation. While conservation zoning may have positive effects on property values in cities such as Auckland and Wellington, the results in smaller provincial centres may be more uncertain. Also as illustrated by the Allen Consulting Group in Australia, registration, listing, or protection of historic residential properties can often have little influence on property values. Other factors such as location, general amenity, and general crime rates can be much more important deciding factors for property values.

---

2.2. Development area zoning

Development area zoning is used extensively in North America and Europe to facilitate the development of a historic area or precinct. This type of zoning is often called ‘regeneration development zones’ or ‘special development precincts’. The zoning aims to assist the development of an area by providing for specific permitted uses, management structures, and private-public funding arrangements. In England, with assistance from the European Union, development zoning has achieved the regeneration and adaptive reuse of substantial historic townscapes such as the historic centre of Newcastle, the Liverpool waterfront and industrial heritage in the Midlands.

In 2008, the Sustainable Development Unit of the Department of Internal Affairs released the draft *Building Sustainable Communities Discussion Document*. This document identified the need for new tools to address development area issues and the creation of new urban development project areas. These areas could be established to facilitate appropriate development of historic areas and achieve conservation objectives. As indicated in the Wellington waterfront example that follows, important considerations are finding the balance between preservation and development and ensuring strong public accountability.

### 2.2.1 Lambton Harbour Development Project (LHDP)

The Lambton Harbour Development Project was established in the late 1980s to facilitate the transformation of the Wellington waterfront. The area was set aside for management as a special development area under the control of a private-public body – Lambton Harbour Management Limited (LHML). The special development area facilitated major changes to the Wellington waterfront with the removal of a large number of former wharf buildings, construction of new buildings and parks and preservation of significant heritage buildings such as the former Wellington Harbour Board offices as the new Wellington Museum of City and Sea.

The special development area, however, was heavily criticised by the public during the 1990s as a result of demolition and the construction of inappropriate new buildings and loss of public space. The criticism resulted in greater control over management by the Wellington City Council and the introduction of new waterfront planning provisions in the district plan to protect historic heritage and preserve public space.17

---

3. Regulatory incentives

3.1. Conservation lots

Conservation lots are a flexible subdivision provision that is the most common heritage-related incentive in district plans. Conservation lots provide the potential to allow an applicant to subdivide a property below the minimum lot size in order to preserve heritage values. The basic standards associated with the flexible subdivision rule are:

- Council can consider, as a discretionary activity, the subdivision of property containing a historic heritage item.
- The proposed subdivision to create a conservation lot may be lower that the minimum lot size of the relevant zone.
- The subdivision will result in the whole of the historic heritage item being physically and legally protected in perpetuity.
- An agreement or covenant should be entered to provide protection in perpetuity. The agreement or covenant should be finalised prior to Council making a decision under section 104 of the RMA or as a consent condition. These agreements or covenants may include:
  - ii. Open space covenants (section 22 Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977).
- An agreement or covenant should incorporate specific protective or enhancement measures to maintain or enhance the conservation values of the property, including public access.
- The proposed subdivision should be of a sufficient area to protect the curtilage and surroundings associated with the listed historic item.
3.1.1 Conservation lot provisions in New Zealand

There are a number of district plans with specific conservation lot provisions for historic heritage (see Appendix 2). Conservation lots are also referred to as ‘environmental protection lots’ or ‘heritage lots’.

In the Far North District Plan, rule 12.5.6.3.1 provides for a ‘development bonus’ “where a site contains a heritage resource and where this resource is proposed to be permanently protected, restored or rehabilitated, the Council may grant consent to an application to subdivide one or more bonus lots. The new lot(s) can be either from the parent title on which the area to be protected, restored or rehabilitated is located or on another title. The new lot(s) may be created in addition to the rights to subdivide which would otherwise apply, and may include the area to be protected, restored or rehabilitated. The minimum area of a bonus lot shall be the minimum area provided for as a discretionary subdivision activity in the relevant zone.”

The Far North District Plan provision requires that a covenant or a consent notice records this commitment to protection, restoration or rehabilitation before any bonus can be given effect to. The Council may impose as a condition of consent that a bond be paid, to be refunded when the Council is satisfied that the conditions attached to that consent have been complied with. The Council may provide assistance in respect of any such application by waiving resource consent charges and reserve contributions. An application made in terms of this rule would see the NZHPT, and where appropriate the tangata whenua, considered an affected party.

Many other plans have provisions for subdivision flexibility to protect historic heritage. For example, The Auckland City Central Area District Plan (Rule 10.4.2) provides that, where a heritage property is the subject of an approved conservation plan, subdivision of the heritage property will be considered as a non-notified application for a discretionary activity and may be exempt from the plan’s standard subdivision requirements.

Conservation lot provisions require ongoing monitoring by local authorities to ensure that consent conditions are being adhered to and that the property is not abandoned resulting in ‘demolition by neglect’. Further, monitoring is required to ensure flexible subdivision rules do not have cumulative adverse effects, resulting in a large number of small subdivisions over an area which can undermine the open-space provisions of the district plan.
**Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of conservation lots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>The costs of conservation lots to owners include the cost of establishing the lot via subdivision; establishing a covenant, and ongoing care and maintenance. The cost of conservation lots to the community involves the expenses associated with management and monitoring of the lots and the potential environmental cost of ‘patchy’ subdivision that is contrary to the objectives and policies of the district plan. Support for long-term maintenance of the conservation lot may require public funds in the form of grants and rates remission.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The benefits of conservation lots to owners include the ability to subdivide to ensure the ongoing conservation of a historic property that would be otherwise not allowed. This may release surplus land available for development to offset the cost of establishing and maintaining the conservation lot. The benefits of conservation lots to the community is the potential long-term conservation of a historic property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and clarity</td>
<td>Conservation lots are relatively simple and straightforward for owners, decision-makers and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>Conservation lots require territorial authority management systems. The decision-making process should be informed by professional heritage advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Conservation lots generally enjoy a high level of political support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of conservation lots

**Comment**

The full environmental compensation implications of a proposed conservation lot require consideration, including the cumulative effects on the environment.

Covenants are required to ensure that conservation lots are subject to continual care and maintenance. There is a risk that conservation lots are abandoned and subject to ‘demolition by neglect’. A covenant should be agreed upon between owner and local authority prior to conservation lot approval.

Demand for conservation lots is associated with general demand for subdivision. The incentive may not be effective in areas of low subdivision demand.

Conservation lots are generally more appropriate for rural heritage, especially archaeological sites.

Establishment of a conservation lot should qualify the owner to rates remission under the local authority rates remission policy.

Establishment of a conservation lot should be informed by a conservation plan and sufficient information on the heritage values of the property.

The boundaries of the conservation lot should be sufficient to protect the historic place and its surroundings. For example, a historic farm protected by a conservation lot should include all parts that contribute to the heritage value of the entire farm complex such as the homestead, woolshed, out-buildings and any significant vegetation area.
3.2. Conservation lots transferable development right (TDR)

Conservation lots can form part of a TDR regime for an entire district or area. This regime allows landowners to sell potential development interests from a particular piece of property under the protection of a conservation lot. Purchases would be other landowners who intend to increase the density of their land using the TDR bonus. This regime could be designed to preserve open-space rural and heritage landscapes and provide an incentive for landowners who are restricted to subdivide in a certain location.

3.2.1 Former Rodney District conservation lot TDR

The former Rodney District Council was one of the few local authorities in New Zealand that maintained a conservation lot TDR regime. In the Rodney District Plan (now managed by Auckland Council) conservation lots are a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 17.9.4(g) which provides for “the subdivision of a listed item for the purpose of ensuring the long term preservation of the item, where the sites created will not meet the site area and dimension requirements of the relevant zone.” These lots can become part of a TDR regime under the subdivision rules (Rule 7.14.12.3). This scheme applies to any land that is covenanted or protected within the rural zone (except the countryside living zone) and is no larger than 20 hectares. The recipient sites must be with the countryside living town zone.

The former Rodney District’s TDR scheme has been operating for nine years since the introduction of the district plan. The scheme is currently under review as part of the preparation of the Auckland Unitary Plan. Key issues confronting the scheme include limited opportunity or space for use within the receiving areas (the countryside living zone), the need to transfer titles from a consented subdivision, and the requirement to ensure ongoing maintenance and conservation of land protected in donor areas. Further, while the scheme has been applied to natural heritage, there have been no applications for conservation lots and TDR involving historic heritage.

TDR schemes involving conservation lots require careful district-wide planning. The cumulative effects of land transfer need to be considered as part of an environmental compensation approach. International research on conservation lot TDR notes that the scheme requires strong land use regulations which closely controls the supply and demand of land in a district. Further, TDR schemes need to clearly identify bonus areas (sending areas) and recipient areas (receiving areas). There can be strong opposition from residents in the receiving areas which has the potential to erode political support for TDRs. There can also be substantial administrative costs involving complex land transfer transactions.


### Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of conservation lots TDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Costs</strong></th>
<th>The costs of conservation lots TDR to owners include: the expense of establishing the lot via subdivision; establishment of the covenant(s); ongoing care and maintenance, and costs relating to transfer of the development right. The cost of conservation lots TDR to the community involves the cost of managing the TDR scheme and price of greater intensive subdivision of land in the recipient area (receiving area).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>The benefits of conservation lots TDR to owners involve the potential to receiving a monetary incentive as a result of establishing a conservation lot. The benefit of conservation lots TDR to the community is the potential long-term conservation of land in an area in return for accepting greater intensive subdivision an another area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency and clarity</strong></td>
<td>Conservation lots TDR can be complex and difficult for the general public to comprehend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manageability</strong></td>
<td>Conservation lots TDR require intensive management and regulation by the territorial authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy</strong></td>
<td>Conservation lots TDR may not receive political support as a result of opposition from landowners in recipient areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The full environmental compensation implications of a proposed conservation lot TDR require consideration, including the cumulative effects on the environment. Covenants are required to ensure that conservation lots are subject to continual care and maintenance. There is a risk that funds generated by conservation lots TDR are not invested into the care and maintenance of the conservation lot and are potentially subject to ‘demolition by neglect’. Demand for conservation lots TDR is associated with general demand for subdivision. The incentive may not be effective in areas of low subdivision demand. Conservation lots TDR are generally more appropriate for rural heritage, especially archaeological sites. The range of covenants should be considered (i.e. open-space covenants and heritage covenants). Establishment of a conservation lot and TDR should be informed by a conservation plan and sufficient information on the heritage values of the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Waivers of zone provisions

Waivers of zone provisions ensure that there is flexibility in the district plan for historic heritage in relation to matters such as undertaking a commercial activity in a residential zone, car parking requirements, loading, and site access and landscaping. The waiver for zone provisions should provide:

- That Council can consider, as a discretionary activity, any application to alter, reduce, or waive any activity control or development control specified in any other section of the district plan.
- The proposed waiver may include undertaking commercial activities in residential zones if the purpose of the commercial activity is to achieve the adaptive reuse of the listed heritage item and the adverse effects are minor.
- The proposed waiver must be necessary to achieve the conservation and adaptive reuse of a listed heritage item.
- Council will consider any adverse effects on the environment associated with the proposed waiver.

3.3.1 Waivers of zone provisions in New Zealand

Waivers of zone provisions are provided for in a number of district plans (Appendix 2). In the Rodney District Plan, Plan Change 144 introduced new provisions for the Helensville Town Centre Heritage Policy Area. The provisions include an amendment to Rule 21.10.2.2 which provides an exemption for heritage buildings from the on-site car parking requirements. In its reasoning, the plan states that:

“The Council recognises that the provision of required on-site car parking can be to the detriment of character buildings on sites that currently have little or no available off-street car parking. The priority in the Helensville Town Centre Heritage Policy Area is the preservation and enhancement of heritage value and character. Exemption for off-street car parking is considered appropriate to encourage the retention of buildings while allowing for change and adaptive use.”

The Hauraki District Plan (Rule 71.7) states that “notwithstanding any other provisions in the District Plan, Council may waive or reduce any bulk and location, number and location of parking spaces and landscaping standard which relates to a proposal to modify, add to or alter a Scheduled Feature, provided that in the opinion of Council, such action would: assist with the protection of the feature; and the amenities of neighbouring properties and/or the safe and efficient functioning of the street or road will not be significantly compromised.”

The Whakatane District Plan includes a ‘change of activity’ provision (Rule 3.11.12.2). This rule states that “Council may consent to the redevelopment of Scheduled Heritage items not in conformity with the District Plan’s performance standards where conformity with the zone standards and terms would change the intrinsic value and character of the heritage item and encourage the protection and preservation of the Scheduled Item.”
The Christchurch Central Recovery Plan introduced substantial zone waiver provisions in July 2012 to facilitate the heritage recovery of the city. The rule (applying to the central city) means that in respect of any activity on any site involving historic heritage, applicants are not required to comply with a number of standards such as scale of activities, retailing, car parking space numbers, building setbacks and continuity.

| Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of waivers of zone provisions |
| Costs | The costs of waivers to owners include the expense of application and process under the RMA. The costs of waivers to the community may involve some adverse environmental effects in relation to matters such as traffic, parking, noise, loading and access being relaxed or waived. |
| Benefits | The benefits of waivers to the owners involve the potential for flexible rules to facilitate adaptive reuse of a historic place, especially in relation to commercial activity. The benefits of waivers to the community is the potential long-term adaptive reuse of a historic place. |
| Transparency and clarity | Waivers are relatively simple and straightforward for owners, decision-makers and the community. |
| Manageability | Waivers require territorial authority management systems. The decision-making process should be informed by professional heritage advice. |
| Legitimacy | Waivers generally enjoy a level of political support. |
| Comment | The full environmental compensation implications of proposed waivers require consideration, including the cumulative effects on the environment. Waivers are generally associated with demand for commercial development. The incentive may not be effective in areas of low development. Waivers are generally limited to built heritage used for a commercial or public purpose. Consent fees should not be charged for waiver of zone provision applications. Local authorities should be informed by professional heritage advice. |
3.4. Specified permitted uses

Specified permitted use rules are a similar method to waivers of zone provisions. However, instead of a general waiver, the rule specifies particular uses that will be allowed for listed heritage items as a permitted activity. Currently, district plans in New Zealand are limited to providing for repairs and maintenance of a listed heritage item as a permitted use. Some local authorities have certain permitted uses for zones.

Providing for specified permitted uses is an important method of encouraging sensitive adaptive reuse and could include activities such as:

- Bed and Breakfast (B&B) accommodation.
- Small-scale entertainment and wedding-related functions.
- Social functions and public meetings.
- Specialised small-scale retail activities (i.e. crafts, pottery, merchandising, Devonshire teas, cafe).
- House museums and art galleries.

As an example, the proposed Waipā District Plan (notified June 2012), encourages the ongoing protection of Waipā’s heritage items through the implementation of incentive rules relating to the reuse of such buildings. For this purpose, Policy 2.3.6.5 (which is implemented by rules) makes provision for medical centres, offices, restaurants, cafes and other eating places, and childcare and pre-school facilities to occur within buildings listed in the heritage schedule (Appendix N1). The transportation zone also contains relaxation of parking, loading and access requirements.

Specified permitted uses are also relevant to the Building Act. It is common in New Zealand for historic commercial centres to have active ground floor retail areas. However, often these commercial centres are characterised by vacant floor space above the ground level. The change of use provisions in the Building Act can be a significant disincentive to convert retail or office space for apartment accommodation (see section 3.9 of this guide). Allowing a specified accommodation use in a district plan could be part of an overall incentive strategy to promote adaptive reuse in a particular area or zone.

### Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of specified permitted use provisions

| Costs | The costs of specified permitted use provisions to owners include the expense of application and process under the RMA. The costs of specified permitted use provisions to the community may involve some adverse environmental effects in relation to matters such as traffic, parking, noise, loading and access. |
| Benefits | The benefits of specified permitted use provisions to the owners involve the potential for flexible rules to facilitate adaptive reuse of a historic place, especially in relation to commercial activity. The benefit of specified permitted use provisions to the community is the potential long-term adaptive reuse of a historic place. |
### Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of specified permitted use provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and clarity</td>
<td>Specified permitted uses are relatively simple and straightforward for owners, decision-makers and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>Specified permitted uses require territorial authority management systems. The decision-making process should be informed by professional heritage advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Specified permitted uses generally enjoy a level of political support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The full environmental compensation implications of specified permitted uses require consideration, including the cumulative effects on the environment. Specified permitted use provisions are generally associated with demand for commercial development. The incentive may not be effective in areas of low development. Specified permitted use provisions are generally limited to built heritage used for a commercial purpose or a change of use. It is important to align any waivers of zone provisions with similar flexibility under the Building Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5. Plot ratios or site intensity zonings

A plot ratio is the measure of the total floor area of a building that is able to be constructed on any given site. Higher plot ratios will encourage larger and taller buildings. Most cities have the highest plot ratios in the CBD with lower plot ratios in suburban and industrial zones. Generally, higher plot ratios on heritage properties have the potential to promote more intensive development and adversely affect heritage values.

The Wellington City District Scheme in 1983 contained an additional floor space incentive which allowed owners to construct extra floor levels over the permitted height levels on the same site as a listed heritage item. This incentive was strongly criticised by community groups in allowing the Kirkaldies development on Lambton Quay which involved a large tower built over a preserved façade. With the introduction of the Wellington City District Plan under the RMA in the mid-1990s, the additional floor space incentive was removed.

The Auckland City Central Area District Plan contains the most detailed plot ratio zonings in New Zealand. These site intensity zonings are provided for in Planning Overlay Map 5. The zonings show Basic Floor Area Ratio (BFAR) and Maximum Total Floor Area Ratio (MTFAR). The BFAR is the gross floor area allowed as a permitted activity. The total floor area allowed, plus the accumulation of any bonus floor area, cannot exceed the MTFAR.

The Auckland City Central Area is divided into 11 different site intensity zones which make up the precincts and quarters. As an example, the Karangahape Road Precinct has a site intensity ratio of BFAR 4:1 and MTFAR 6:1. The highest site intensity zone is the high-rise area to the west of Queen Street which has an BFAR 6:1 and MTFAR 13:1.

There are specific site intensity zones for some heritage precincts in the Auckland City Central Area. The Britomart Precinct has its own site intensity map in the appendix of Part 14.6 with two basic site intensity zones, Areas 1 and 2. Within Area 1, the MTFAR are the same or similar to the maximum provided for the western side of Queen Street (BFAR 6:1 and MTFAR 13:1/11:1).

This measure is designed to “encourage tower height in exchange for reduced building bulk. This is a form of development which would not be compatible with the relatively low scale form of development proposed in Precinct Area 2.” Within most of Area 2 of the Precinct, the floor area ratio is limited to the gross floor area within the existing scheduled heritage buildings. It is commented in the district plan that the average total floor area ratio of approximately 6:1 within Precinct Area 2 “has been set in order to retain the Precinct’s strong heritage character and the sense of intimacy imparted by the heritage buildings.” Further, the absence of MTFAR for the existing heritage buildings enables “some flexibility for internal alterations within the inherent constraints of each heritage building.”

---

20 Robert McClean ‘Regulation and Incentives for Historic Heritage, Theoretical and Legislative Overview, Historic Heritage Research Paper No.6 (draft working paper), NZHPT, 22 February 2010.
21 Rule 14.6.7.2, Part 14.6 Britomart Precinct, Auckland City Central Area Plan.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
The site intensity zonings of Auckland City Central Area District Plan are the foundation for the bonus floor area regime which is a form of TDR described below.

In July 2010, the Auckland Council notified Plan Modification No. 42 to the Central Area section of the District Plan. This plan change made some significant changes to the bonus floor area system of Auckland City. In particular, the plan reduced the number of bonus features and increases the bonus floor area provided for heritage floor space. The bonus floor area system is currently under review as part of the preparation of the new Auckland Unitary Plan.

The Christchurch City Plan included potential scope for a heritage floor space bonus by providing for the floor area of any retained heritage buildings to be excluded from the permitted plot ratio for the site up to a stated maximum for developments in certain zones.24

**Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of plot ratios/site intensity zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The costs of specified permitted use provisions to owners include the</td>
<td>The benefits of site intensity zoning are certainty to the owner about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The costs to owners and developers of compliance with site intensity</td>
<td>the scope and potential for development on a particular site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning requirements and forgone development opportunities.</td>
<td>The benefits of site intensity zoning to the community which reduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of site intensity zoning to the community involves the</td>
<td>the potential demand for adverse development of a heritage property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation and management of the site intensity zoning regime</td>
<td>and provide greater certainty over the form of urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and any development opportunities that are restricted by the regime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency and clarity</th>
<th>Site intensity zoning can involve complex formulae that may make it difficult for the general public to understand and comprehend the intention behind the zoning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>Site intensity zoning requires intensive territorial authority management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Site intensity zoning generally enjoys political support if there is a strong rationale for the regulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of plot ratios/site intensity zoning

Comment

The full environmental effects associated with site intensity zoning requires consideration.

Site intensity zones are generally designed to manage demand for inner-city commercial development. The incentive may not be effective in areas of low development demand.

It is important that site intensity zones do not encourage the loss of significant interior heritage fabric by the maximisation of floor area ratios within heritage buildings.

Site intensity restrictions should be accompanied by bonus floor area incentives for heritage buildings.

3.6. Bonus floor area TDR

3.6.1 Former Auckland City bonus floor area TDR

Site intensity regulation can be accompanied by bonus floor area ratios as a TDR. The Auckland City Central Area District Plan is the only district plan in New Zealand that maintains an active TDR system with regard to bonus floor area provisions. Bonus floor areas are available where a development incorporates a number of ‘public good’ features.

The former Auckland City Council introduced TDR as a variation to its Third Review of the District Scheme in December 1987 under the Town and Country Planning Act 1977. The scheme was continued under the RMA 1991 and the Auckland City Central Area District Plan included a range of bonus floor area provisions involving public good features: accommodation, pre-school facilities, rest rooms, cycle parking, amenities, plaza, landscaping, works of art, heritage floor space and pedestrian facilities. The scheme was revamped by Plan Modification No.42 in 2010. This plan change amalgamated some activities and removed landscape and amenity areas from the bonus floor area provisions.

Obtaining a heritage floor space bonus is a restricted discretionary activity and the use or transfer of a heritage floor space bonus is a restricted controlled activity. Prior to Plan Modification No.42, heritage floor space bonus was a restricted controlled activity.

The bonus floor area is available in locations set out in Planning Overlay Map 5 of the district plan comprising most of the core CBD of Auckland City. The heritage floor space bonus may be granted by Council in relation to buildings of heritage value listed in Appendix 1, Schedule D of Part 6 – Development Controls of the district plan. This schedule comprises most of the core CBD heritage buildings listed in the plan that are in private ownership. The list is mostly comprised of commercial buildings, but includes some apartments, former public buildings and churches. The heritage floor space bonus is designed for two primary matters:

- Compensation for the loss of development potential that arises as a consequence of the building being scheduled for heritage purposes.
Compensation for the cost of conservation.\textsuperscript{25}

The sum of the bonus is calculated by a formula that includes:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Area of heritage floorplate.
  \item Development potential multiplier.
  \item Gross floor area of the scheduled building.
  \item Heritage schedule point ranking.
\end{itemize}

The ‘development potential multiplier’ is an estimated average development potential based on the relevant development controls applicable to the area within which the heritage building is located. This multiplier and the point ranking is listed for each scheduled building in Appendix 1, Schedule D of Part 6. Essentially, schedule point ranking reflects the significance of the building. Greater heritage floor space bonuses are potentially available for the more significant buildings with higher development potential multipliers.

If consent is granted by Council, the calculated amount of heritage floor space bonus may be ‘sold’ by private agreement from a donor site to a recipient site(s) or used within the site of a scheduled building. The transfer of this bonus is a restricted controlled activity. Council usually require a conservation plan to be prepared for the donor heritage building. If the building is already subject to an approved conservation plan, the gross floor area of the heritage building is excluded from the floor area ratio calculations. Council maintains a register of heritage bonus floor space which includes:

\begin{itemize}
  \item The address and legal description of the donor site.
  \item The address and legal description of the recipient site(s).
  \item The area of heritage floor plate on which the scheduled building is situated and the amount of heritage floor space obtained from the floor plate.
  \item The amount of bonus floor space transferred to the recipient site(s) or used within the site of scheduled building, the date of the transfer or use, and the residual floor area remaining after the transfer or use.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{itemize}

Since the introduction of the heritage floor space bonus provisions, there have been 18 granted applications (see Appendix 7). The bonus properties have included the Bluestone Store, Eden Hall, Civic Theatre, Town Hall, St Andrew’s Church, St Paul’s Church and St Mathews in the City. Council-owned buildings had a prominent role in the early development of the scheme, and by 2004 over 50 percent of the heritage floor space bonuses were owned by Council.\textsuperscript{27} As an example, Council held potentially 105,000 m\textsuperscript{2} in the ownership of former Chief Post Office building. This building became the primary focus of the Britomart Project and some 31,882 m\textsuperscript{2} of the bonus was sold for development. The transaction was criticised in the media over a number of years for lack of transparency and

\textsuperscript{25} Rule 6.7.2.5, Auckland City Central Area Plan.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
for allowing development in excess of the standard building rules. As a result, during the review of the Central Area District Plan, the rule was changed so that Council could no longer obtain heritage floor space bonus from its own properties.

Since the early 1990s, the demand for heritage floor space bonus has declined. A key issue is that the heritage floor space bonus is just one of a number of other bonus elements in the district plan. This means that the heritage floor space bonus must compete with other bonus elements such as accommodation, plaza and works of art. Plan Modification No.42 sought to address this issue by removing landscape and amenity works from the scheme.

In addition, the demand for heritage floor space bonus is dependent on consent applications for new development. Consequently, the price of the heritage floor space bonus has dropped from a range of $230-$350 m² to approximately $50 m² (2004). As an example, in November 2001, St Matthews in the City was granted resource consent to restore the church and received a heritage floor space bonus of 28,229 m². A bonus of 310 m² was transferred to the Auckland Drape Company Ltd site for an 11-apartment floor tower. The heritage floor space bonus was sold for $107/m² plus GST. St Matthew’s have retained a bonus of 27,919 m².

By 2004, the church had sold a further lot of bonuses for $60/m² for the PriceWaterhouseCoopers Building on Quay Street. However, it was noted at the time that the building could have been permitted using the Light & Outlook bonus and the BFAR, without the need for the additional heritage floor space bonus from St Mathews in the City.

George Farrant provides a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of TDRs associated with the Auckland City bonus floor area scheme:

Advantages:

- Operates as an effective counter to the very real constraints of robust protection of small-scale heritage in a high-density area.
- Compensates effectively for the acceptance of strong heritage controls, such as ‘prohibited activity’ status for demolition of ‘Category A’ (highly-ranked) heritage properties in Auckland’s CBD.
- Is a low-cost incentive solution.
- Is normally an effective advocacy mechanism and a shield against claims of inequitable loss to an owner.
- May be applicable to donor sites in larger local centres as well as central high-density areas.

---

31 'Transferable Development Rights', Report to the Finance and Corporate Business Committee, Auckland City Council, 10 September 2004. A further example involved two terrace houses on Airedale Street and the Bluestone Store in Durham Lane. These were awarded heritage floor space bonuses of 853 and 3,035 m² respectively. Part of this bonus (2,127 m²) was sold to the owners of the Durham Street West Parking Building in 2001. Most of this bonus was later transferred to another recipient site on Turner Street. The Bob Dey Property Report, 17 October 2001, www.bdcentral.co.nz
May be usefully applicable to non-built heritage sites, such as ecological or archaeological.

Disadvantages:

- TDRs are a commodity, and therefore their market value fluctuates, particularly if supply exceeds demand (or when uptake demand is low, such as at present).
- Consideration needs to be given as to whether TDRs are contingent on a development proposal which offers conservation/restoration, or are able to be claimed in the absence of any development proposal.
- TDR value will be depressed if other bonuses exist that deliver developer’s requirements for floor space, without the need to purchase TDRs.
- Large heritage sites in public ownership can easily flood the TDR market and depress value and effectiveness.
- Care needs to be exercised in having recipient sites beyond central areas due to public sensitivity about suburban intensification.
- Can be difficult to monitor if a free-market TDR situation reigns, so issues arise about closer local authority control of the commodity, such as the authority possibly acting as ‘banker’, controlling prices, and maintaining market stability.\(^3\)

George Farrant also notes that the “transferred floor space must only be donated to a site that has the capacity to accept the extra area without breaking any other non-negotiable district plan rules, e.g. sunlight preservation height limits or view shaft protection.”\(^3\)

The Auckland City bonus floor area TDR system is currently under review as part of the preparation of the new Auckland Unitary Plan.

As outlined in the associated research paper,\(^3\) TDR schemes have been attempted by other urban areas in New Zealand with limited success. In Australia, the most well-known TDR scheme is the City of Sydney which has a heritage floor space credit scheme. For this incentive, a credit is awarded following the completion of conservation work on a heritage property. Once the works have been completed to the Council’s satisfaction, the floor space can be sold/exchanged to enable additional floor space to be built in a new development.


\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Robert McClean ‘Regulation and Incentives for Historic Heritage, Theoretical and Legislative Overview, Historic Heritage Research Paper No. 6 (draft working paper), NZHPT, 22 February 2010.
## Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of bonus floor area TDR

| Costs | The costs to owners and developers includes compliance with site intensity zoning requirements, conservation of historic properties, including preparation of a conservation plan and the TDR process. The cost of a bonus floor area TDR to the community includes the management of the TDR scheme and potential effects of excessive site intensity developments on recipient sites. The public may express concerns about recipient sites beyond the CBD in relation to suburban intensification. |
| Benefits | The benefits of a bonus floor area TDR to the owner is the potential for an incentive to be obtained by the transfer of the bonus. It assists in the protection of small-scale heritage buildings in high-density areas. The benefit of bonus floor area TDR to the community is the conservation of historic properties in the inner city. As the TDR does not involve a grant or other payment, it is a low-cost incentive option. |
| Transparency and clarity | Bonus floor area TDRs can involve complex formulae that may make it difficult for the general public to understand and comprehend the intention behind the scheme. |
| Manageability | Bonus floor area TDRs requires intensive territorial authority management and monitoring systems. |
| Legitimacy | Bonus floor area TDR may lack political support if there is public opposition to bonus-related development on recipient sites. |
Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of bonus floor area TDR

| Comment | The full environmental compensation implications of a proposed bonus floor area TDR require consideration, including the cumulative effects on the environment. A total conservation benefit assessment is required to evaluate the overall benefit to the city with regard to restoration of the individual heritage building and the effect on the streetscape or townscape in terms of urban design.

Covenants are required to ensure that conservation lots are subject to continual care and maintenance. There is a risk that funds generated by bonus floor area TDRs are not invested into the care and maintenance of the property and are potentially subject to ‘demolition by neglect’.

Demand for bonus floor area TDRs is associated with general demand for property and development. The incentive may not be effective in times of recession. Owners of bonus floor area TDRs may find them difficult to sell.

Demand for a heritage-related TDRs may be affected by other bonuses that are available which may deliver the developer’s requirements for floor space.

Large heritage sites in public ownership can ‘flood’ the TDR market and depress value and effectiveness.

Strong and robust heritage rules are required that regulate demolition, relocation, new buildings and roof-top additions. |

3.7. Contributions

The RMA provides for financial contributions, including bonds and reserve contributions, and the Local Government Act 2002 provides the regulatory basis for development contributions. Both contributions can be designed to encourage positive heritage outcomes.

3.7.1 Financial contributions

Secton 108 of the RMA provides that financial contributions may be made as part of conditions of resource consents. The term ‘financial contribution’ means:

a. Money; or

b. Land, including an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip (other than in relation to a subdivision consent), but excluding Maori land within the meaning of the Maori Land Act 1993 unless that Act provides otherwise; or

c. A combination of money and land.\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) Section 108(9), RMA 1991.
A financial contribution must be imposed in accordance with the purposes specified in the plan or proposed plan (including the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to offset any adverse effect), and the level of contribution is determined in the manner described in the plan or proposed plan. Land, in the form of reserve contributions, may also form part of subdivision consent conditions.

In addition, the RMA allows local authorities to require a bond as part of a consent condition. The purpose of a bond is to secure the ongoing performance of conditions relating to long-term effects, including alterations, removal of structures, remedial works, restoration, maintenance work and monitoring of long-term effects.

Policies for financial contributions, including bonds and reserve contributions, in regional and district plans can provide protection for historic heritage. As a basic requirement, the regulatory provisions should provide the flexibility to waiver any required financial contribution in relation to a heritage-related application. Further, the plan should state that a monetary contribution will not be required where land is set aside in perpetuity, under a covenant, for the conservation of heritage values.

### 3.7.2 Financial contributions for historic heritage

Many district plans in New Zealand include historic heritage matters in financial contributions provisions (see Appendix 2). The most common is the provision that financial contributions will not be required when land is set aside as a conservation lot or reserve for the conservation of heritage values.

Objectives and policies for financial contributions should refer to historic heritage matters. As an example, Policy RCP5 of the Hastings District Plan states “where a heritage site (such as an archaeological site or a wāhi tapu) has been set aside, either as a reserve, a conservation lot or consent notice as part of a subdivision, this will be taken into account when assessing any reserve contribution for the subdivision.”

The Far North District Plan (Rule 14.4.1) states that a financial contribution in the form of land will be preferred where that land has “important natural, amenity, heritage or cultural values that should be protected.” The plan further states that “where any person wishes to protect, conserve or restore a scheduled heritage resource, and in doing so is required to pay a financial contribution, consideration will be given to the reduction or waiving of that contribution” (Rule 14.6.3).

---

36 Section 108(10), RMA 1991.
The Auckland City Isthmus District Plan provides environmental and heritage financial contributions (clause 4B.7.4) to remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of a development and use the financial contribution for the benefit of heritage or environmental features in the vicinity or elsewhere in the city. This policy means a contribution is required for all new development that is either land or cash (or any combination of the two). The amount of the contribution is based on a case-by-case assessment. The Auckland City Central Area District Plan also provides for an exemption from financial contributions where a heritage property is the subject of an approved conservation plan (Rule 10.4.2). This provision is also provided for in the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan.

The Gisborne Combined Regional Land and District Plan waives financial contributions totally or in part for the adaptive reuse of an item and the waiving of reserve contributions either totally or in part (Rule 3.11.2).

3.7.3 Development contributions

‘Development contributions’ are provided for under subpart 5 of Part 8 of the Local Government Act 2002. They allow territorial authorities to compulsorily require those who create demand for new or enlarged community facilities to pay the capital costs of providing them. Community facilities are reserves, community infrastructure and network infrastructure (roads, transport, roads, wastewater, stormwater). Development contributions are managed under a development contributions policy as part of the Long Term Plan (LTP) and can give effect to the principles of the Local Government Act 2002 outlined in section 14. Development contribution policies are also prepared under subpart 3 which relates to financial management and strategy.

Development contributions can only be required when an individual development creates demand for new capital expenditure. For this reason, these contributions are not a uniform charge and cannot be adopted for maintenance costs. The Local Government Act 2002 provides three statutory ‘triggers’ for requiring a development contribution for any given project:

1. It is a development within the meaning of section 197.
2. The development, which either alone or in combination with other development will have the effect of requiring expenditure on infrastructure (section 199).
3. The contribution is provided for in the Council’s development contribution policy (section 198(2)).

Historic heritage is a relevant matter with regard to development contributions. The justification for consideration and inclusion of historic heritage matters includes:

---

Historic heritage can provide for social, economic and cultural interests of people and communities and enhance the quality of the environment.

The development of historic heritage involving adaptive reuse of historic buildings is an important community outcome and has been identified in numerous community outcome strategies.

Historic areas, precincts and landscapes may form an identifiable part of the community.

Development in historic areas, involving the adaptive reuse of existing historic townscapes, provides a basis for urban renewal and can maximise the use of existing infrastructure and services.

On this basis, development contribution policies should provide a credit incentive for development that involves the adaptive reuse of historic areas and precincts. As stated in Local Government New Zealand’s guidance:

Broadly, credit should be given for any works or services provided by the developer which appropriately reduce the demand for works or services to be provided by the Council. One should reduce or exempt those special cases where the effects of development can be shown to be less than standard units of development or nil.39

The Wellington City Council has adopted an equivalent household units (EHU) credit approach which provides an incentive for infill residential subdivision, residential development of a CBD site, additional bedrooms to a one-bedroom household unit, additional household units and development within the Northern Growth Area. Auckland Council provides an exemption for all alterations and additions to existing residential dwellings.

This approach can be adopted for historic areas and precincts as specific catchment areas in a development contributions policy. Councils can consider the provision of an EHU credit for consent applications that involve the adaptive reuse of historic buildings, including earthquake strengthening and change of use applications under the Building Act.

Historic heritage can also form part of hypothecation (targeted) funding from development contributions.40 It is particularly important that development contribution policies ensure funding is targeted to establishing historic reserves and other heritage-related open space areas and maintaining them in the long term. Development contribution funding can also assist to upgrade and maintain existing historic public buildings and services, including earthquake strengthening. In Auckland City, the restoration and expansion of the Auckland Art Gallery was funded, in part, by development contributions.

---

40 ‘Hypothecation refers’ to a tax or fund where a certain portion is tagged or allocated to a specific, usually a popular, cause. Theoretically, people will be willing to pay more in taxes if they believe a certain amount is going towards a cause they believe in. Report of the Local Government Rates Inquiry, Funding Local Government, August 2007, p 274.
Note. Development contributions are currently under review by the Government – see the discussion paper on the Department of Internal Affairs website.  

**Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>The costs to developers involve financial charges and the provision of reserves. The cost of contributions to the community includes the management of contributions, monitoring and enforcement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The benefits of contributions mean that development can be provided with an incentive to invest in existing historic townscape to facilitate adaptive reuse. They can be designed to benefit a particular historic area or precinct. The benefits may also involve the establishment and maintenance of public space and facilities for historic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and clarity</td>
<td>Contributions are transparent and have clarity for developers and the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>The management framework for contributions is provided for in the RMA and Local Government Act 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>If supported by a strong rationale and research, contributions for historic heritage should obtain political support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The use of financial contributions for historic heritage under the RMA is well established and can result in substantial benefits. While having potential, the use of development contributions for historic heritage is generally untested in New Zealand with the exception of community heritage projects that have benefited from development contribution funding. Development contribution credits should not provide an incentive to demolition or relocation. They must be limited to adaptive reuse of historic buildings, involving appropriate alterations and additions (including earthquake strengthening) and change of use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3.8. Consent fees

Section 36 of the RMA empowers local authorities to fix a range of charges for matters relating to plans, policies and consents. This power is exercised in accordance with section 150 of the Local Government Act 2002. This section means that fees may be prescribed by bylaw or using the special consultative procedures of the Act.

A bylaw may provide for the refund, remission or waiver of a fee in specified situations or in situations determined by the local authority.\(^\text{42}\) Section 36(5) also allows, a local authority, in “any particular case and in its absolute discretion, to remit the whole or any part of any charge of a kind.” The Building Act contains similar powers for territorial authorities to impose fees or charges with respect to building consents.

Resource consent fee waivers for historic heritage is a relatively common form of incentive adopted in New Zealand. As outlined in Appendix 3, a large number of local authorities have some form of consent fee waiver policy for historic heritage. This policy is often included in the district plan or as part of Council’s general policy framework under the Local Government Act 2002.

The resource consent fee waiver should provide an incentive to undertake changes to historic heritage and a disincentive to inappropriate changes such as relocation and demolition. The fee waiver should be designed, therefore, to apply to activities such as:

- Repair and maintenance when this work requires a resource consent.
- Earthquake strengthening.
- Works to comply with the Building Act such as physical access and fire safety.
- Creation of conservation lots by subdivision.
- Works that comply with the provisions of a relevant conservation plan.
- Alterations that are appropriate (including adaptive reuse) as assessed by a heritage professional.

In addition to a fee waiver, an increased fee could be charged for consents that involve demolition or destruction of listed historic items as a disincentive.

**Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of fee waiver**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>The costs to local authorities of the fee waiver.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The benefit of fee waivers is to provide an incentive for owners to carry out appropriate changes to historic buildings, including alterations, retrofit of buildings and earthquake strengthening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and clarity</td>
<td>Fee waivers are transparent and have clarity for the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{42}\) Section 150(2), Local Government Act 2002.
Evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of fee waiver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manageability</th>
<th>The management framework for fee waivers is provided for in the RMA, Building Act and Local Government Act 2002.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Fee waivers generally have political support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The use of fee waivers for historic heritage under the RMA is well established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee waivers should not provide an incentive to demolition or relocation. They must be limited to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate changes to heritage buildings (including earthquake strengthening) and change of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9. Building Act 2004: alterations and change of use

The Building Act regulates all building work in New Zealand. Building work includes making changes to buildings such as alterations, additions, relocation and demolition. Under section 112(1) a building consent authority must not grant a building consent for the alteration of an existing building, or part of an existing building, unless the building consent authority is satisfied that, after the alteration, the building will—

a. comply, as nearly as is reasonably practicable, with the provisions of the building code that relate to—
   i. means of escape from fire; and
   ii. access and facilities for persons with disabilities (if this is a requirement in terms of section 118); and

b. continue to comply with the other provisions of the building code to at least the same extent as before the alteration even if no other significant building work is being undertaken at the same time. All alterations to existing buildings must comply as nearly as is reasonably practicable with specific provisions of the building code.

The compliance test of ‘as nearly as is reasonably practicable’ means there is some flexibility in approaching alterations as a territorial authority may allow the alteration of an existing building, or part of an existing building, without the building complying with provisions of the building code. The territorial authority, however, must be satisfied that — (a) if the building were required to comply with the relevant provisions of the building code, the alteration would not take place; and (b) the alteration will result in improvements to attributes of the building that relate to—(i) means of escape from fire; or (ii) access and facilities for persons with disabilities. For this provision to apply, the territorial authority needs to be convinced that the fire escape and access improvements outweigh any detriment that is likely to arise as a result of the building not complying with the relevant provisions of the building code.

In addition to alterations, the Building Act regulates the change of use of buildings. Under section 114, in cases of change of use that involves the creation of new one or more household units, the territorial authority must be satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that
the building, in its new use, will comply, as nearly as is reasonably practicable, with the building code in all respects.\textsuperscript{43}

Building Act-related provisions can present significant challenges for the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Common obstacles can involve situations such as:

- Retrofit work for improving structural performance (earthquake strengthening) for individual heritage buildings and historic precincts.
- The conversion of commercial buildings to residential or other uses.
- The adaptation of buildings to provide for new physical access, and fire safety requirements.

Managing Building Act-related heritage buildings issues requires a strategic approach by local authorities. First, there must be strong connections between building consent staff and policy within councils. It is important that local authorities have a ‘united front’ when dealing with heritage buildings under the Building Act.

Local authorities should use the full range of incentive-based tools for managing heritage-related building issues. These tools will involve:

- In-house training for Council staff on dealing with heritage building issues.
- Public information, advice and guidance about managing changes to heritage buildings under the Building Act.
- Use of heritage professionals to provide advice on heritage building projects.
- Adoption of best practice alternative solutions to achieve heritage and safety objectives.
- Preparation of conservation plans to guide adaptive reuse of individual buildings and groups of buildings.
- Targeted funding assistance, especially for earthquake strengthening, fire safety and physical access-related work.
- Project management approach for historic precincts and areas as ‘special development areas’ using a master or structure plan involving owners, building officials, and Council policy planners, incorporating earthquake-prone risk assessments.

The NZHPT has published a separate guide to the Building Act as part of the Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series. This guide provides an explanation of matters such as heritage-related terms, project information memorandum and notification, building consents and general guidance for making changes to heritage buildings.\textsuperscript{44} The NZHPT has prepared further technical guidance for improving physical access and fire safety.

\textsuperscript{43} It is noted that the provisions of the Building Act for waivers and alternative solutions only apply to new building work and building code compliance. For alterations and change of use, waivers and alternative solutions do not apply since the work does not require this compliance. Instead, alterations or change of use must comply to a level that is ‘as nearly as is reasonably practicable’.

4. Non-regulatory incentives

4.1. Private-public partnerships

Private-public partnerships (PPPs) come in a wide variety of types and forms. In most PPPs there is some degree of shared responsibility for funding and management involving a collaboration of private interests and government.

PPPs for historic heritage include a range of non-profit trusts, organisations and corporate agencies. Overseas, PPPs are becoming a common approach for historic heritage, especially for the revitalisation or adaptive reuse of large abandoned historic buildings or economically depressed areas. As part of a review of European heritage initiatives commissioned by the Helsinki University of Technology, Donovan D. Rypkema provides a list the common denominators for successful heritage PPPs:

- The heritage building is identified as a community asset regardless of who actually holds title to the property.
- There is a core group who initiates the action which often comes from the non-government organisation (NGO) sector.
- There is an imaginative catalyst to move the redevelopment idea forward. This may come from the business community, local government, an NGO or elsewhere, but rarely from the current owner of the property (even if that owner is a level of government).
- There is broad-based support for the project within the local community that spans horizontally sector and political interests.
- There is always public sector participation, including from levels of government that are not directly involved as the formal public partner.
- There are multiple sources of financing from traditional private sector, non-traditional and public institutions.
- There is a commitment on all parties to be willing to be as flexible as possible in use, financing, timing and particulars of the transaction until a mutually acceptable and feasible alternative scenario is developed. This requires both compromise and patience from all partners. Even the most successful heritage PPPs tend to experience significant public scepticism during the process.\(^{45}\)

Further information about heritage PPPs is available online in the Helsinki University of Technology study.\(^{46}\)

In New Zealand there are many examples of heritage PPPs. One of the most high profile and successful projects is the Britomart Transport Centre in Auckland. While the project was highly controversial during the late 1990s, the Britomart Transport Centre was opened


in 2003 as a result of substantial public and private investment and partnership, with the cornerstone achievement being the restoration of the Chief Post Office building.\(^{47}\)

In provincial New Zealand, the most common PPPs for historic heritage is the ‘main street’ model. In this model, main streets and town centres are actively managed by the collaboration of business owners by the contribution of funds or targeted differential rates. These funds are used to promote and market the town centre and maintain a management structure by the employment of a town centre manager. The model is promoted by organisations such as members of the Town Centres Association of New Zealand and Towns and Cities New Zealand. The structure is also often facilitated and part-funded by local authorities.

The main street model has significant advantages for the management of historic town centres. Town centre managers provide an important link between business owners, Council and the community. Often these managers can facilitate funding applications for, and on behalf of, owners of historic commercial buildings. By promoting local business investment, town centre managers can make a significant contribution to the ongoing use and maintenance of historic commercial buildings.

---

**Pride in Putaruru**

Pride in Putaruru is a non-profit town centres association established by the community. It promotes the town centre of Putaruru in a large number of ways, including a website, blog-site and newsletter.\(^{48}\) By encouraging local business investment, Pride in Putaruru has made a valuable contribution to the long-term maintenance and use of historic commercial buildings in the town. The organisation is promoting further benefits to the heritage of Putaruru by the establishment of heritage trails, festivals and improving historic shop facades.

Pride in Putaruru employs two full-time staff (manager and assistant). Funding for it comes from business owners, the South Waikato District Council and community grant applications. The organisation has assisted with the development of a Putaruru Concept Plan which provides a shared vision for the future of the town.

---

\(^{47}\) [http://www.britomart.co.nz/history1.html]

\(^{48}\) [http://www.putaruru.co.nz/](http://www.putaruru.co.nz/)
4.2. Heritage grants and loans

Heritage grants take three main forms: entitlement grants, discretionary grants and performance grants. The Australian National Incentives Taskforce provides the following explanation of the three main types:

[Entitlement grants are] given to any owner whose property meets pre-set eligibility criteria. Equal benefits are paid to all, not discriminating between those managing their properties to a high standard and those that simply meet the criteria. Recipients are not generally required to spend the grant on conservation works.

Discretionary grants have flexible guidelines and applicants must compete for selection. Typically, a grant assessment committee or board determines the most worthy projects to be funded.

Performance grants operate with strict criteria that define the types of conservation project that will be supported (e.g. structural repairs, external restoration).

Heritage grants are the most common non-regulatory incentive offered in New Zealand, and most of these are discretionary-type grants. Heritage grants are provided by a large number of territorial authorities. Most funds are relatively small and individual grant amounts are often between $5,000 to $10,000. Some of the largest funds are the Auckland Council Built Heritage Protection Fund, Wellington City Council’s Built Heritage Incentive Fund and the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Buildings Fund.

Some local authorities also provide performance grants for specific types of work. The most common in New Zealand are grants for façade enhancement or purchase of paint.

In addition to the territorial authority heritage grants, Bay of Plenty and Southland regional councils provide regional heritage grant schemes. The Southland Regional Heritage Development Fund is unique as it involves both Environment Southland and the three territorial authorities as a joint initiative.

A list of local authority heritage grants available in New Zealand is outlined in Appendix 4.

The only other specific heritage grant fund available for private owners of historic heritage, or groups who are not eligible to the Lotteries Board Heritage Grant Fund, is the National Heritage Preservation Heritage Incentive Fund managed for the Crown by the NZHPT. Individual grants cover 50 percent of conservation work (including repairs, earthquake strengthening and fire protection) to a maximum of $100,000. The fund is only available to private owners of Category 1 historic places (or those places that satisfy the requirements for Category 1), wāhi tapu or wāhi tapu areas registered under the Historic Places Act 1993.

While heritage grant schemes are the most widespread form of non-regulatory incentive for historic heritage in New Zealand, they can be affected by a number of issues, including:

---


As indicated in Appendix 4, grant assistance is not available in all parts of New Zealand. Generally, there are more grants available in the North Island, especially Northland, Auckland, Bay of Plenty and the Waikato. Elsewhere, assistance to owners is ‘patchy’.

Information about available grants can be difficult to obtain. Some local authorities do not advertise the grants by not providing public information on websites or using information sheets and brochures.

Many owners of historic heritage are unwilling to apply for funding assistance. It is the common experience of some local authorities that applications for funding assistance fall short of expectations or anticipated demand. It appears that many owners do not bother applying if the amount of grant available is manifestly too low.

Many owners refuse to seek financial assistance because of perceived interference with property rights and wish basically to be ‘left alone’. Also they may not submit applications to avoid ‘paper work’ or associated conditions to funding assistance such as public access provisions or covenants.

Grants often do not provide solutions to situations of building abandonment (demolition by neglect) when owners either do not have other funds available for repair works or simply refuse to take care of a place.

Grants do not provide solutions to ‘orphaned buildings’ when owners cannot be identified or contacted.

Best practice guidance for the design and management of a local authority heritage grants scheme is outlined in Appendix 1.

As indicated in Appendix 1, funds should also be made available for emergency situations. This should be tagged as an ‘Emergency Heritage Contingency Fund’ to allow for “moderate, but urgent expenditure in the public interest to cope with or secure an unexpected situation involving an item of heritage interest.”

4.2.1 Heritage loans

Loans can be in the form of direct loans or loan subsidies. Generally direct loans are made to “property owners at a lower interest rate that would be commercially available.” In the case of loan subsidies, the ‘loan finance is supplied by a commercial lender, while the interest rate ‘gap’ is funded by the organisation giving the loan.

Heritage-related loans are uncommon in New Zealand, and only a few local authorities indicate that it may be possible for owners to obtain a low-interest loan to assist in the repair or restoration of a historic property.


George Farrant notes that heritage loans can provide larger ‘catalytic’ funding amounts, especially when an owner may not be eligible for traditional loan or grant sources.53 Other advantages of heritage loans may include:

- Providing larger heritage outcomes and private investment than most heritage grants schemes.
- Acting as a subsidy (1:1 or otherwise) to an owner’s own fundraising efforts.
- Contributing towards a revolving heritage fund in the long term.
- Stimulating goodwill of owners to conserve historic heritage.

George Farrant also notes the disadvantages of heritage loans: they may involve an occasional risk of default, facilitating the opportunity for capital gains (when owners resell the building at a profit and capitalise on the heritage loan); involve relatively high administrative burden; and the real costs of the loan may be less transparent than a simple heritage grant.

Suspensory loan conditions can be adopted to reduce the risk of an owner obtaining significant capital gains arising from a loan. They can also encourage long-time owners to carry out restoration works and retain ownership on a long-term basis. Suspensory loans mean that the repayable amount is set at a sliding scale. The scale may vary according to the period of time following the grant, repayable amount, ownership and individual circumstances. For example, the repayable amount could be reduced to 50 percent after five years conditional on the property being retained by the owner.55 In this case, the “loan progressively becomes a grant while ownership remains unchanged.”56

54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 Ibid.
4.2.2 Grants for earthquake-prone heritage buildings

The risk of heritage loss from earthquake damage is a major issue for New Zealand. Earthquake strengthening work (or improving structural performance) of heritage buildings not only improves public safety, but can create jobs and ensure the survival of historic heritage.

The NZHPT’s research for the Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission shows that heritage grant schemes and other sources of funding had a major influence in facilitating earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings in Christchurch prior to September 2010. This resulted in the survival of some heritage buildings of national significance such as the Arts Centre, Canterbury Museum and Christ’s College.

The Building Act requires territorial authorities to prepare earthquake-prone buildings policies. In some territorial authorities, this policy framework involves an active approach to the identification and regulation of earthquake-prone buildings. These provisions are currently under review following the release of the recommendations of the Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission.

In addition to research by the NZHPT, the Seismic Retrofit Solutions project at Auckland University has investigated issues relating to earthquake-prone buildings, including heritage. For example, Temitope Egbelakin, a former PhD student, researched incentives and motivators to enhance seismic retrofit implementation. Her research highlights the need for greater incentives for seismic retrofit in the form of a cost-sharing approach involving government and owners and the provision of low or no-interest loans.

The NZHPT advocates for improved incentives and assistance for owners of earthquake-prone heritage buildings. A new grants and loans scheme is required at a national level not unlike the current EECA ENERGYWISE funding scheme to improve energy efficiency. Another approach would be to allow the cost of strengthening to be claimed as a tax deductible expense in a similar manner to repairs and maintenance, particularly if the works do not improve the capital value of the property.

A grant, tax incentive and/or loans scheme for earthquake-prone heritage buildings would enable targeted assistance to be provided to owners which will create jobs, save lives, and preserve heritage.

---


4.3. Rates relief (including remission, postponement and differential rating)

Rates relief is a property tax abatement. It can involve the “full or partial reduction, freezing, or deferment of property taxes or rates.” Rates relief is regulated under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and the Local Government Act 2002. Rates relief can only be adopted if the local authority has provided for this incentive under a rates remission policy or rates postponement policy prepared under sections 109 and 110 of the Local Government Act 2002. Rates remission or rates postponement policies must state the objectives to be achieved and the conditions and criteria for remission or postponement.

An overview of the rating system and a discussion of key rating issues is provided in the Report of the Local Government Rates Inquiry, *Funding Local Government*, August 2007 (the rates inquiry report).61

The rates inquiry report found that 57 local authorities (67 percent) provide rates remission for land protected for natural, historic or cultural conservation purposes.62 Most of these local authorities provide rates relief for heritage-related properties. A list of heritage-related rates remission schemes currently available in New Zealand is outlined in Appendix 5.

It is often unclear, however, about the nature of the local authority rates policy for historic heritage and often there is a lack of certainty if the rates relief applies to urban built heritage as opposed to rural heritage properties protected by covenants. Perhaps, as a consequence of the degree of uncertainty about the application of rates relief to historic heritage, this incentive is not commonly implemented by local authorities to protect and maintain historic heritage.

In 2007, the Wellington City Council commissioned Graham Spargo Partnerships Ltd to examine financial and other means to manage built heritage in the city (the Spargo report).63 The report provides information on a range of incentives for historic heritage, especially rates-relief policies:

Rates postponement means that the payment is not waived, but is delayed until a certain time or trigger event occurs. This event can be a change of use or a change of ownership. Rates postponement enables the money that is postponed to be ‘clawed back’ once a trigger event occurs.64

[Rates remissions] A local authority may remit rates on any rating unit, to any extent and for any reason providing that it complies with the policy that has been developed by the council ... A remissions policy can be framed to include criteria

---

60 Ibid, p. 5.
61 www.ratesinquiry.govt.nz
64 Rates postponement is often adopted in cases of financial hardship. “Postponed rates are registered as a statutory land charge on the title of the property. This means when the property is sold, the rates must be paid out of the proceeds before any other debts are settled.” Report of the Local Government Rates Inquiry, *Funding Local Government*, August 2007, p. 275.
that need to be met to qualify. For built heritage, this could include ensuring that appropriate and adequate maintenance of buildings is undertaken.

Differential rating has typically been used as a mechanism to distinguish the level of rates paid per dollar of property value by the commercial sector compared with the residential sector.65

[Targeted rates] provide funding to meet the cost of a particular function by a specific rate which may or may not be targeted to a particular category of property.66

George Farrant also notes that a ‘rates freeze’ can be adopted. For example, such a freeze could be applied at the time of protection of a heritage property or immediately before a development takes place.67

The Spargo report provides an assessment of the various rating tools to achieve positive heritage outcomes in terms of advantages and disadvantages. After considering the options, the report recommends that the Wellington City Council offers a rates postponement and rates write-off as a public good contribution to minor (less than $50,000) built heritage work delivering heritage outcomes and a commercial area rates remission policy which “enables reduced rates for contributing heritage buildings around the CBD in the defined ‘heritage areas’ where owners are maintaining buildings but otherwise leaving them unaltered.” Further, the Spargo report recommends a “residential areas rates remissions policy which enables rates for listed heritage buildings in residential zones where owners are maintaining buildings but otherwise leaving them unaltered.”68

The Dunedin City Council is one of the most active local authorities in providing rates relief for historic heritage. In addition to a general non-profit community rates relief scheme, Dunedin has a Targeted Rate Scheme for Earthquake Strengthening of Heritage Buildings. This allows building owners to obtain funding for earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings and to pay this back through a targeted rate on their property. Eligible building owners may obtain amounts of up to $50,000 to assist with earthquake strengthening. Larger amounts may be considered on a one-off basis. Additional assistance may also be available through the Dunedin Heritage Fund.

Also, the Dunedin City Council has rates relief available to heritage building reuse and strengthening projects. This is typically a 50 percent rebate on the general rate. For example, the owners of the NZ Loan and Mercantile Agency Co building in Thomas Burns Street were granted rates relief in July 2011. The 50 percent rates relief amounted to $5,244.27 for 2011–2012.69 In addition, the Council has established a heritage residential B&B rates category in June 2011. This is available for owners of heritage B&B who were paying commercial rates following assessments by Quotable Value (QV) in 2010.

65 Differential rating can also be based on location, area, use or activities allowed for under the RMA.
66 Ibid.
George Farrant provides a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of rates relief for historic heritage:

**Advantages:**
- Is facilitated by existing legislation.
- Recognises the maintenance burden to owners in a tangible way.
- Is transparent and can be publicly debated.
- Is highly visible to ratepayers via rates notices.
- Gives the ability to ensure maintenance or ‘claw-back’ rates.

**Disadvantages:**
- Costs to administer.
- Costs to rating income.
- Difficult to anticipate uptake levels and impact on rates income.
- Needs to be clearly linked to actual maintenance costs and heritage outcomes.

4.4. Tax relief

Tax-related incentives have proved to be a major influence for the preservation of historic heritage in the United States (see below). New Zealand does not provide a central government tax incentive scheme for historic heritage.

Currently, the only environmental-related tax incentive is under the Income Tax Act 2004 which provides a system of environmental restoration accounts that relate to expenditure by business to avoid, remedy or mitigate the detrimental effects of contaminant discharge. This system could be amended by the Government to provide for the repair and maintenance of historic heritage.

4.4.1 Tax deductible expenses

In the past, owners of commercial properties could claim depreciation as set out under the Tax Administration Act 1994 and the Income Tax Act 2004. As from April 2011, owners will no longer be able to claim depreciation on buildings.

The ability for owners of commercial properties to claim repairs and maintenance as an allowable deductible expense is available under tax law. Advice should be obtained from the Inland Revenue Department (IRD) or a Chartered Accountant on the types of repair and maintenance works that can be claimed as an allowable deductible expense. Generally,

---

72 While the ability to claim depreciation has been removed, IRD state that provisional depreciation rates will still be able to be set for ‘classes of buildings’. If the Commissioner for Inland Revenue issues a provisional rate for a class of building stating that it has an estimated ‘useful life’ of less than 50 years, owners of affected buildings will be able to claim depreciation deductions: IRD, Guide to the tax changes proposed in the Taxation (Budget Measures) Bill 2010, 20 May 2010.
the incentive is limited to repairs and maintenance that are not capital expenditure and the maintenance of assets in same condition as when acquired. Substantial work, over and above maintenance for ‘wear and tear’, is not deductible.

4.4.2 Tax relief for historic heritage in the United States

Tax reforms in the United States have revolutionised the way that developers and private investors think about old buildings. Established in 1976, the Rehabilitation Tax Credit has revitalised countless communities and is internationally recognised for its success. The credit applies to costs incurred for the rehabilitation, renovation, restoration, and reconstruction of historic buildings. The percentage of costs taken as a credit is 10 per cent for buildings placed in service before 1936, and 20 per cent for certified historic structures.

The credit is available to any person or entity that holds the title for an income-producing property. Expenses that qualify for the credit include expenditure for structural components of a building such as: walls, partitions, floors, ceilings, tiling, windows and doors, air conditioning and heating systems, plumbing, electrical wiring, chimneys, stairs, and other components related to the operation or maintenance of the building. Soft costs such as architect or engineering fees also qualify for the credit.73

The United States Secretary of the Interior established 10 Standards for Rehabilitation which projects must meet to be eligible for the 20 per cent Rehabilitation Tax credit. They are:

- A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
- The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
- Each property shall be recognised as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
- Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
- Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterise a historic property shall be preserved.

- Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, colour, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

- Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

- Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterise the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

In addition to the federal tax incentive, some 30 States of the United States have some form of heritage tax incentive programme. 

4.5. Public purchase and revolving acquisitions

Many local authorities have purchased historic properties as key strategic assets for the community. Also, many of these properties have been adapted for public purposes such as meeting rooms, libraries and parks.

In addition to strategic asset purchase, unforeseen circumstances may arise when “the security of a heritage site or item may depend, after all else fails, on purchase by an entity with sufficient resources and conservation motives to do so.” Considering the significant capital expenditure involved, these circumstances will be exceptional and need to be assessed on a ‘case-by-case’ basis.

74 United States National Park Service A Guide to the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program for Income-Producing Properties
http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/tax/incentives/index.htm

75 For an overview of State-level tax incentives, see
http://www.preservationnation.org/resources/find-funding/additional-resources/taxincentives.pdf

Stoneycroft is located on the outskirts of Hastings, Hawke’s Bay. The property is registered as a Category 2 historic place under the Historic Places Act 1993 and protected by a heritage covenant and listing in the district plan.

Stoneycroft dates from 1875 and forms part of a historic property with 2.4 hectare grounds containing mature trees. In July 2005, the Hastings District Council purchased the property for community use with the aim of preserving the historic building and the notable trees on the property and fulfilling some of the reserve contributions for the development of the Lyndhurst subdivision. Since purchase, the Council have undertaken extensive repair and restoration of the building and the grounds. Following the completion of these works, Council consulted the community to determine a new future use for the property and the property is now the home to a new digital heritage centre for the Hawkes Bay.

4.5.1 Revolving funds

Revolving funds are a proven method of providing financial and community assistance for historic heritage in Australia and New Zealand. In this country, two successful revolving funds have operated in Christchurch (Christchurch Heritage Trust) and Invercargill (Troopers Memorial Corner Charitable Trust). Auckland Council has recently established a new revolving fund as part of the Auckland Built Heritage Protection Fund.

‘Revolving funds’ is a pool of capital created and reserved for a specific activity. The capital is used to purchase, restore, sell and reinvest for historic conservation purposes. Basically, the system involves:

1. Establishment of a community trust or incorporated society with financial resources.
2. Acquisition of strategic historic proprieties by purchase or donation.
3. Repair and restoration of properties.
4. Protection via heritage covenants.
5. Sale or lease of properties to generate further income for other purchases or restoration projects.

As outlined by the Australian EPHC National Incentives Taskforce, revolving funds involve two main challenges:

Firstly, an initial capital injection is required to get the scheme up and running. This can be obtained through government funding (either from general revenue or other sources such as lotteries, bond issues, etc); donations or bequests (cash or property); and fund-raising or borrowings. The second challenge is that management of a revolving fund needs considerable expertise, including real estate, marketing, finance and heritage expertise.77

---

4.5.2 The three former miner’s cottages, Arrowtown

Arrowtown is an important heritage town and is a significant tourist destination in Central Otago. Research by the Arrowtown Promotion and Business Association indicates that more than 400,000 people from outside the Wakatipu region visit Arrowtown each year. The majority of the visitors are attracted by the historic streetscapes of the town.

Early miners cottages form a part of the Arrowtown streetscapes. The three former miner’s cottages at 59, 61 and 65 Buckingham Street, Arrowtown, were built between the early to mid-1870s out of rudimentary local materials or red beech timber and schist rock. The cottages were owned by property developer Eamon Cleary. He owned two of the cottages and their sections outright and a third cottage which stood on council leasehold land. Cleary allowed the buildings to fall into disrepair and had planned a large-scale accommodation complex behind the three buildings incorporating replicas of the historic cottages.

After a public outcry about the state of the cottages, Queenstown Lakes District Council purchased the properties for $1.9 million – including 59, 61 and 65 Buckingham Street, together with 6 Merioneth Street. The purchase was conducted on behalf of the Council by a local developer. After the purchase of the cottages, the Council called on members of the public to put their names forward as members of a new charitable trust, the Arrowtown Trust, responsible for the future of the buildings. Since its establishment, the trust has raised some $600,000 from applications to the NZ Lotteries Grant Board and other community funding sources for the restoration of the cottages. The restoration work was completed in October 2011 and the cottages are now venues for a café, art gallery and office space.

65 Buckingham Street, Arrowtown. Photo, Jo Boyd, Riverlea Photography

79 Mountain Scene: Queenstown, 1 February 2007, p 5.
81 The Dominion Post, 21 February 2007, p 11.
82 Gisborne Herald, 10 February 2007, p 13.
4.6. Insurance rebates

Insurance is a system that provides recompense to owners in the event of loss or damage in order that repairs or reinstatement may be financed in whole or part. All heritage places should be covered by adequate insurance. The NZHPT provides guidance on insurance of heritage properties as part of the Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series. As with general properties, some insurance companies provide discounts or rebates if buildings are maintained to a high standard or safety measures are installed such as:

- Fitting smoke detectors and sprinkler systems.
- Upgrading electrical wiring systems.
- Safeguarding your property from vandals.
- Ensuring your property is occupied.

The NZHPT also advocates for discounts and rebates to recognise earthquake strengthening works.

For further information about insurance-related options and incentives, contact your insurance company, the Insurance Council of New Zealand or the Insurance Brokers Association of New Zealand.

4.7. Urban design, events and promotion

The design of the urban environment has a huge influence on historic heritage. The planning of the public domain, in both residential and commercial areas, has the potential to either undermine the conservation of historic heritage or enable greater adaptive reuse and economic viability. Achieving positive urban design and historic heritage outcomes will require careful planning and management of aspects such as:

- Public transport, traffic and car parking.
- New buildings.
- Parks and green spaces.
- Pedestrian access and footpaths.
- Cycle ways.
- Street furniture.
- Signage.

Many urban centres in New Zealand have positive examples whereby urban design initiatives have enabled historic heritage preservation and adaptive reuse. These examples include the Kerikeri Basin (construction of the Kerikeri bypass), Vulcan Lane and Britomart Transport Centre (Auckland), Emerson Street (Napier), Cuba Street, Blair

---

and Allen Streets (Wellington), Worcester Street (Christchurch) and Queenstown heritage precinct (Queenstown). These are a few of many other examples, where local authorities have aimed to achieve the right mix of traffic and pedestrian spaces in an urban landscaped environment that has facilitated the economic and cultural viability of historic heritage.\(^4\)

4.7.1 Auckland’s shared streets initiative

Since 2010, Auckland Council has been developing shared streets within the Auckland CBD. Shared streets provide space for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles to encourage ‘cohabitation’ and improved accessibility. Elliot and Darby streets were the first shared streets and recently Jean Batten Place and Fort Lane have become new shared spaces. The initiative has been overwhelmingly successful in encouraging urban revitalisation and adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, including the former Jean Batten Departmental Building and the old Imperial Buildings resulting in new boutique retail, office and restaurant businesses. Ludo Campbell-Reid, Urban Design Champion for Auckland Council, reported that in February 2013 that pedestrian numbers in Fort Street were up by more than 50 percent on average during the week and increased consumer spending.\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Further information about urban design and historic heritage is available from the *Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series*, Discussion Paper No.4.

\(^5\) ‘Building the world’s most liveable city’, *NZ Construction News*, 1 February 2013.
In addition to urban design, historic heritage can be promoted by a wide range of initiatives, events and functions. The contribution of these events towards economic and cultural viability of historic heritage cannot be underestimated. As an example, the Hawke’s Bay Art Deco Trust commissioned an economic impact study in 2006 which revealed that Napier Art Deco tourism (based on the Napier Art Deco Walking Tours, shop and Art Deco Festival and related events) had a direct economic impact of $11 million. It had an indirect multiplier effect of $12 million, totalling $21 million p.a.\(^{86}\)

Other more well-known heritage-related events and initiatives include:

- Auckland Heritage Festival.
- North Shore Heritage Festival.
- Jackson Street Carnival (Petone).
- Cuba Street Carnival (Wellington).
- Wellington Walking Tours.
- Christchurch Heritage Week.
- Caroline Bay Carnival (Timaru).
- Oamaru Victorian Heritage Celebrations.
- The Dunedin Heritage Festival.
- Invercargill Rural Heritage Day.

### 4.8. Other heritage incentives

In addition to the regulatory and non-regulatory incentives outlined in this research paper, there are many other types of incentives. The most common are listed in Appendix 6 and include:

- Provision of free technical advice and information.
- Heritage awards.
- Support for preparation of conservation plans.
- Support for fencing and painting.

4.8.1 A heritage credit scheme

The adoption of a heritage credit scheme has been promoted by the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand (HCOANZ). In a research report for HCOANZ in 2005, the Allen Consulting Group investigated the use of a heritage credit scheme. A type of heritage credit TDR has operated in the Sydney CBD for some years.

Heritage credits work on a ‘beneficiary-pays’ principle whereby owners who adopt practices or works that result in improved heritage outcomes would be awarded with ‘heritage credits’. The scheme could operate nationally or locally not unlike the United States Tax Relief scheme outlined earlier in this document. Heritage buildings that are maintained and repaired to a certain national standard could receive the ‘credits’. The awarding of the credit could operate in a similar manner to the EECA Home Energy Rating Scheme (HERS) or other green star rating systems overseas.

Private individuals, companies or local governments could purchase the heritage credits from the owners. Alternatively, the heritage credits could entitle the owner to receive rates relief, tax incentives or eligibility to apply for grants. The Allen Consulting Group provide the example of a tourist operator who relies on the conservation of a particular historic area as a basis for running walking tours. This operator may be willing to purchase credits to “ensure maintenance of their business.”

The heritage credit scheme aims to reward an owner for keeping a heritage building in good repair and maintenance. Unlike other incentives, the award is not triggered by a development-related application. The design of a heritage credit scheme could also recognise embodied energy and waste minimisation that is gained from building preservation. In other words, the credit could recognise the ‘green heritage’ values and associated public benefits. Private companies may purchase these credits in order to brand their company as both environmentally and culturally sustainable.

---
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Appendix 1.
Best practice guidance for design and management of a local authority heritage grants scheme

The Office for the Community & Voluntary Sector has published good practice funding guidance for government agencies. The guidance covers issues relating to funding relationships, funding options, managing risk and monitoring and evaluation and is available on the good practice funding website:


The principles and processes recommended in the good practice funding guidance will be relevant for the design and management of local authority heritage grant schemes. For example, the guidance states that public entities should adopt principles for the management of public resources, including lawfulness, accountability, openness, value for money, fairness and integrity.

In 2004, the Environment Protection and Heritage Council of Australia (EPHC) undertook a review of incentives and policy tools relating to historic heritage. This review examined the full range of incentives and other policy tools available in both Australia and internationally, and evaluated the effectiveness of incentives. The EPHC review highlighted the importance of integration of incentive review processes with state of the environment reporting relating to the historic environment. Key questions in evaluating effectiveness developed by the EPHC were:

- To what extent does an incentive induce conservation outcomes that would not have occurred in the absence of that incentive?
- To what extent does an incentive provide equity for owners of heritage places?
- How effective are heritage incentives in relation to other forms of government expenditure?
- How effective is one form of incentive compared with another?

Some of the findings of the EPHC review are outlined below.

---
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Key findings Australian EPHC Review

Most of the grant, loan and tax schemes provided in Australia have been quite small, and have fallen well short of the amount required to make a significant impact on heritage conservation activity within a state or locality.

Over-subscription is the norm for grant and loan schemes in Australia.

[The] disproportion between applications and available funds masks the broader pool of applicants who do not even bother to apply, because the quantity of available funding is manifestly too low.

Over-subscription can lead to disenchantment, particularly given the paperwork involved in making applications.

For grant schemes targeted at State Registered places, “it suggested that a suitable minimum quantity would be $2.5 million in grants per annum per 1,000 places in the State, and an ratio of less than 3.1.”

In the case of loan schemes targeted at State Registered Places, it is suggested that “a suitable minimum quantity would be a minimum of $1 million in subsidised loans per annum per 1,000 places in the State Register, and an over-subscription ratio < 3.1”

No single financial incentive or other policy tool offers a ‘magic wand’ solution; rather, a combination of complementary tools produces the best results. Ideally, a comprehensive heritage program incorporates: strong financial incentives; advisory services for owners; a planning regime that is sympathetic to conservation outcomes, or is at least neutral; promotion of conservation outcomes through a system of ‘revolving’ acquisitions, donations, and restorations; and a strong focus on community promotion, information and demonstration.

Without a strong commitment by government, an incentive scheme or policy tool will tend to be a ‘token’ programme that raises public expectations only to disappoint them.

---
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NZHPT recommended approach for design and management of local authority heritage grant schemes

The following recommended approach is based on the National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund Policy.\(^{93}\) A copy of the fund policy is available, on request, from the NZHPT. Information about the fund and a copy of the application forms are available from the NZHPT’s website:
http://www.historic.org.nz/heritage/funding_nhpif.html

Fund planning and administration

1. The scope and type of heritage grant scheme should be carefully considered with preliminary research being undertaken with regards to the need for the scheme and experience of other similar local authorities. The NZHPT should be contacted at the early stages of the project.

2. If Council is a registered charitable trust under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957, then it is possible that the income that is received to fund grants could be tax-free at source.\(^{94}\) It is recommended that local authorities obtain advice from the IRD or a tax adviser on this matter.

3. Council should seek expert advice on any GST-matters relating to administration of the fund. Applicants may or may not be GST-registered.

4. The fund should be managed by a dedicated staff member within Council. It is preferable that they have some experience in historic heritage. The role of the dedicated staff member should include:
   - Preparation of the fund policy and application forms.
   - Establishment of the Heritage Fund Advisory Committee (the advisory committee) and liaison.
   - Seeking external advice from professionals with expertise in historic heritage.
   - Checking fund applications for sufficient information and eligibility.
   - Preparing fund applications for consideration by the advisory committee.
   - Preparing fund applications for approval by Council.
   - Preparing fund agreements for written signature by Council and applicants.
   - Seeking legal advice for fund applications and written agreements.
   - Monitoring funded works and progress.
   - Checking that work has been completed to sufficient standard and all paperwork is completed.
   - Preparing and obtaining authorisation for payment of fund to applicant.


5. Council can delegate funding decisions to a dedicated sub-committee.

6. Council should establish an external advisory committee that consists of persons experienced in historic heritage. The NZHPT is a member of a number of local authority heritage advisory committees and the NZHPT’s participation should be agreed upon with the relevant NZHPT regional or area manager.

7. The role of the advisory committee should include:
   - Providing advice on applications to the fund in terms of eligibility criteria relating to proposed conservation work.
   - Considering applications and making recommendations to Council.
   - Providing advice if funded works have been completed to sufficient conservation standard.
   - Providing general advice to Council on administration of the fund.

Fund policy

8. The heritage grant scheme should be established by a clear policy approved by Council (the fund policy).

9. The fund policy should be part of Council’s Long Term Council Community Plan and related financial and reporting requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.

10. The fund policy should include critical information about the nature and type of the scheme, including:
    - The purpose of the fund.
    - How the fund will be administered.
    - How much funds will be available for distribution.
    - What type of funds will be made available.
    - What are the eligibility criteria in terms of historic heritage and conservation works.
    - How the Council will receive applications (the policy should include an application form template).
    - How the Council will assess the applications (process and criteria for assessment).
    - What conditions will be required in relation to approved grants.
    - How the fund will be monitored and reported.

11. The approved fund policy, application forms and information about application deadlines and decisions should be made available on Council’s website.
Fund purpose

12. The purpose of the fund should be to encourage the conservation of historic heritage in the region or district. The fund should complement any regulation adopted in the regional or district plan.

Administration of the fund

13. The delegation for the administration of the fund should be stated in the fund policy. Normally, the funding decisions are delegated to a Council sub-committee or individual staff member. It is best practice for decisions to be informed by a specialist advisory group which includes professional expertise in historic heritage.

Funds available for distribution

14. The fund policy should outline the total amount of the fund allocated by Council on an annual basis and the maximum total of individual grants.

15. The maximum total of individual grants should have flexibility to provide a small number of large grants for substantial conservation (landmark) projects and a larger number of small grants for small-sized conservation projects.

16. Some funds may pay the full 100 percent costs of conservation works, others may limit the contribution to a percentage of the total cost (e.g. 50 percent). This percentage amount should be explicit in the fund policy.

17. Funds should be made available for emergency situations. These funds should be available, at short notice, to deal with situations such as emergency repairs following a storm or an unexpected discovery under construction works.

Type of fund

18. Normally, the type of fund will be a simple grant. Other types, however, such as loans should be considered.

Eligibility criteria

19. Since the purpose of most heritage fund schemes is to provide a ‘carrot’ to complement the ‘stick’ of regulation, the fund should be limited to owners of properties that are:

- Listed for protection in the regional and district plan.
- Registered under the Historic Places Act 1993.
- Recorded as archaeological sites as defined in the Historic Places Act 1993.
- Subject to a protective covenant or heritage order.
20. The definition of ‘owners’ should be clarified to include owners who hold a long-term lease to the property under the Land Transfer Act 1952, tenure under the Crown Pastoral Land Act 1988 or other long term lease or concession. In these cases, eligibility should be decided upon a case-by-case basis considering:

- The nature and history of occupation and lease.
- Evidence of the commitment of the owner to occupy and maintain the property.
- Any relevant covenant over the property.

21. While the eligibility criteria should exclude Council-owned properties, it should allow Council to obtain funding assistance in special circumstances. It is often the case in situations of ‘demolition by neglect’ or ‘orphaned buildings’ that an owner may refuse to apply for funding or no record of ownership can be discovered. In these cases, Council may wish to apply for funding and carry out the conservation works without the owner’s participation.

22. Other places, that are not protected under the RMA or Historic Places Act 1993, should be able to be considered for funding assistance as part of an ‘exceptional circumstances’ provision. For example, if a district plan only protects historic buildings, then other types of heritage, such as wahi tapu, will not be eligible for funding assistance.

23. The fund policy should provide clear guidance on the type of work that is eligible for funding assistance. This should be limited to work that has a positive conservation outcome. It will normally involve:

- Stabilisation, repair, maintenance and restoration to historic buildings and structures (e.g. earthquake strengthening, fire protection, roofing, repairs to masonry, joinery, plaster or glazing).
- Conservation work relating to land or archaeological sites (e.g. site stabilisation, repair, vegetation management, fencing).
- Conservation work relating to places and areas of significance to Maori (e.g. marae restoration, pou repair, urupa maintenance, landscaping).
- Professional services (e.g. research, condition reports, conservation plans, archaeological assessments, cultural values assessments, management plans, supervision of work).
- Interpretation and public education and information.

24. The fund policy should provide clear guidance on the types of work that are not eligible for application to the fund. This type of work will involve construction of new buildings, alterations and additions, reconstruction, relocation, demolition, insurance and debt repayments.

25. The fund policy should state that heritage conservation projects that have already been completed at the time of the fund application will not be eligible to apply to the fund. An exception, however, should be provided for so that situations such as urgent works can be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Application process

26. The fund policy should state how the public can apply for funding and include matters such as:
   ▶ Public advertisement of the fund and any funding deadlines.
   ▶ Application information requirements.
   ▶ The type of information to be included in the application form.
   ▶ Applicants may be asked to provide further information.
   ▶ Applicants must agree that the information in the application and information subsequently generated will be made available if required under the Official Information Act 1982.
   ▶ Applicants will be made aware of how Council will manage any private information with regard to the Privacy Act 1993.
   ▶ How many applications for the same property will be allowed each year.
   ▶ How unsuccessful applicants will be notified.

27. Further, the fund policy should state how funding will be granted. This will normally involve a decision by Council which is conditional on a written agreement between Council and the applicant which outlines the details of the grant and the associated conditions.

28. Funding should only be paid when the agreed work has been completed, inspected and approved.

Assessment of applications

29. The fund policy should outline the process by which Council will assess the applications. As stated above, the process should involve a technical advisory committee that includes professional heritage expertise. In some instances, the NZHPT is a member of technical advisory committees or local authority heritage grant schemes.

30. The fund policy should provide criteria that will guide Council's decision-making. The criteria should include matters relating to heritage significance, risk, urgency, conservation standards, public benefit and cost effectiveness.

Conditions of receipt of funding

31. All grants, and subsequent funding agreements, should include a number of standard conditions that include:
   ▶ That compliance with all applicable statutory requirements is the responsibility of the recipient.
   ▶ That payment of approved grant money is conditional on work being completed to satisfaction of Council and meeting best practice conservation standards (as assessed by a heritage conservation professional).
The property must be available for inspection of the conservation work.

That, wherever possible, acknowledgement of the funding given is provided by the erection of suitable signs and banners (supplied by Council).

The conservation work should normally be commenced and completed within a stated period of time (e.g. commenced within 12 months and completed within two years of Council approving the grant).

The recipient must agree to the public reporting of information such as: name of the recipient; name and address of the property and its heritage significance; funding allocation; and conservation work carried out.

That the Council retain power at its discretion to require repayment if information in the application proves to be false or if conditions are breeched.

**Monitoring and reporting**

The fund policy should state how Council will monitor all funded conservation work and reporting processes.
Recommended Process for Local Authority Heritage Grant Schemes

1. **Council receives grant application**

2. **Council officer checks application for sufficient information and eligibility**

3. **Application accepted**

4. **Heritage Fund Advisory Committee considers application and makes recommendation to Council**

5. **Council grants (or declines) application subject to conditions**

6. **Council officer prepares written agreement for signing between Council and applicant**

7. **Written fund agreement signed by Council and applicant**

8. **Applicant undertakes conservation work subject to the conditions of the agreement**

9. **Work completed**

   - The applicant should include photos of the work completed and attach invoices from contractors.
   - The applicant pays the contractors following receiving the grant from Council.

10. **Applicant notifies Council that work has been completed and requests payment**

11. **Council staff check that work has been completed and all paperwork is correct**

12. **Council transfers grant into bank account of applicant**

   - Council should seek legal advice in the preparation of the grant applications and written fund agreements.
   - Council should consult Heritage Fund Advisory Committee (or heritage professional) for advice with regard to eligibility as required.
   - In the absence of an advisory committee, Council should seek advice from a professional with expertise in historic heritage.
   - Council should seek advice from Heritage Fund Advisory Committee or heritage professional that work has been completed to sufficient conservation standard.
# Appendix 2.
## Summary of district plan regulatory incentives (excluding consent fee waivers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan</th>
<th>Summary of incentive provisions for historic heritage</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North</td>
<td>Scale of activity (potential to increase to 100 percent). Subdivision, development bonus (form of conservation lot and possible consent cost waiver). Potential waiver of financial contribution.</td>
<td>12.5.6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5.6.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara</td>
<td>Within the Subdivision Rules in the Zone Chapters, there is provision of increased development rights where protection of heritage resources is offered by an applicant as part of a subdivision process.</td>
<td>Part B: Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei</td>
<td>Subdivision, environmental benefit.</td>
<td>73.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Central Area</td>
<td>Heritage floor space bonus, existing use and activity incentive, exemption from consent fees, exemption from subdivision and financial contribution requirements if conservation plan has been prepared. Currently under review as part of preparation for unitary plan.</td>
<td>10.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Isthmus</td>
<td>Transfer of development rights, existing use and activity incentive, exemption from consent fees, exemption from subdivision and financial contribution requirements if conservation plan has been prepared. Currently under review as part of preparation for unitary plan.</td>
<td>5C.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Hauraki Gulf</td>
<td>Conservation lots. Currently under review as part of preparation for unitary plan.</td>
<td>7.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Potential to waiver any development control of other non-heritage rule provision. Currently under review as part of preparation for unitary plan.</td>
<td>11.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Conservation lots, also note saying Council may consider relaxing other plan provisions. Currently under review as part of preparation for unitary plan.</td>
<td>22.11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Plan</td>
<td>Summary of incentive provisions for historic heritage</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hauraki</td>
<td>Relaxation or waiving parking requirements or bulk and location rules where this would encourage sustainable reuse and protection of heritage values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Waipa</td>
<td>Encourages the ongoing protection of Waipā’s heritage items through the implementation of incentive rules relating to the reuse of such buildings. Policy 2.3.6.5 Makes provision for medical centres, offices, restaurants, cafés and other eating places, and childcare and pre-school facilities to occur within buildings listed in Appendix N1 (includes rules). The transportation zone also contains relaxation of parking, loading and access requirements.</td>
<td>Policy 22.3.6.2/2.3.6.5 plus rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata-Piako District Plan</td>
<td>Subdivision, conservation lots, waiver of car parking requirements.</td>
<td>6.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed South Waikato</td>
<td>Any otherwise non-complying subdivision in the Rural zone or Rural Residential zone, if as a result of the subdivision a significant natural area or a significant archaeological site is to be protected in perpetuity by covenant or other legal means to the satisfaction of Council. One additional protection lot is allowed under this provision per significant natural area or significant archaeological site that is being protected (conditions apply).</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames-Coromandel</td>
<td>Subdivision, conservation lots.</td>
<td>752.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Western Bay of Plenty (Operative 2012) | 7.6.3 Building Act Flexibility  
Council may consider more creative solutions to building consent issues through section 47 of the Building Act.                                                                                                                                                                      | 7.6.3   |
<p>| Whakatane                  | Flexible zoning provisions, restoration.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 4.1.14/4.1.8.4 |
| Gisborne                   | Economic incentives section (parking dispensations, waiver of financial and reserve contributions).                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 3.11.2  |
| Hastings                   | Subdivision, conservation lots. Plan Change 47                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 15.1.8.2 |
| Marlborough Sounds         | Subdivision, special purpose lots.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 27.3.3.1.2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan</th>
<th>Summary of incentive provisions for historic heritage</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Christchurch  | The Christchurch Central Recovery Plan introduced substantial zone waiver provisions in July 2012 to facilitate the heritage recovery of the city. The rule (applying to the Central City) states that in respect of any activity on any site involving any heritage building, place or object, any activity in or upon the same site shall not be required to comply with any of the relevant standards specified below:  
|               | a. Scale of activities and residential coherence (Living Zones);  
|               | b. Retailing (Living Zones);  
|               | c. The following car parking and cycle parking standards in Vol.3, Part 13 Central City Zones: 2.4.1 (a) Car parking space numbers; 2.4.1 (c) Car parking space numbers; 2.6.1 Car parking space numbers.  
|               | d. The following standards in Vol.3, Part 3: 2.2.1 Building Setbacks and Continuity (Central City Business Zone); 3.4.5 Street Scene (Business 1 Zones within the Central City).  
|               | e. The following standards in Vol.3, Part 3 or Part 11, for alterations to heritage buildings only: 2.2.6, 2.2.16 and 2.2.12 Verandas, Minimum Unit Size, Outdoor Living and Service spaces (Central City Business Zone, and 3.2 Business 1 Zones within the Central City); 1.3.4(h) Acoustic insulation (Central City Business and Business 1 Zones within the Central City); 3.6.2 Gross Leasable Floor Area (Business 1 Zones within the Central City) |
| Kaikoura      | Subdivision, allotment size flexibility.            | 13.12.11|
| Dunedin       | Council may reduce or waive any control in the district plan if they are certain the proposal will restore, protect or maintain a heritage building. |
## Appendix 3.
Summary of local authority resource consent fee waivers for historic heritage

### Resource Consent Heritage Fee Waivers (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North District</td>
<td>Fees may be waived for applications concerning heritage orders, plan changes to the schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei District</td>
<td>Possible resource consent application fee waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Auckland, Manakau, North Short, Rodney, Waitakere and Franklin Districts</td>
<td>Consent fees waivers were provided under operative district plans. Under review as part of new unitary plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>Possible waiving of resource consent fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata-Piako District</td>
<td>Resource consent fees are waived for applications concerning heritage sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga District</td>
<td>Possible waiving of resource consent fees for resource consents which result in the protection, maintenance or upgrading of heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Coromandel District</td>
<td>Possible financial assistance for resource consents required under the district plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomo District</td>
<td>Possible waiver of resource consent fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua District</td>
<td>No charge for applications for consents related to conservation, restoration and protection of heritage buildings and features listed in the district plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resource Consent Heritage Fee Waivers (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne District</td>
<td>Waiving of resource consent fees for applications for additions or alterations to heritage buildings and structures or for changes of use provided that the change of use is for adaptive reuse that complies with the ICOMOS charter provisions and the resource consent is granted. Refund of consent application fees when an archaeological site survey is undertaken and an archaeological site is identified and mitigating measures, including legal protection of that site, are undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairoa District</td>
<td>Possible waiver of application fees for use, development and subdivision activities that safeguard resources of value to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District</td>
<td>There is no processing fee payable for non-notified resource consent applications for alterations or additions to district plan listed heritage buildings or items. Charges will apply to any external and specialist inputs if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowhenua District</td>
<td>Possible waiver of administration fees in the protection of heritage features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Possible waiver of fees to both complement the rules contained within the plan and to encourage the retention of buildings of cultural heritage value in private ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui District</td>
<td>Where an activity would have been a permitted activity under the underlying zone, but requires resource consent under the above provisions, the Council will waive resource consent fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiti Coast District</td>
<td>Waiver of building consent fees for work which protects or enhances heritage values for the first $20,000 of building work and waiver resource consent fees where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterton District</td>
<td>Resource consent fees will be waived for applications for alterations to heritage items or for changes of use provided that the change is for adaptive reuse and the resource consent is granted. Refund of consent application fees where an archaeological site survey is undertaken and an archaeological site is identified and mitigating measures including legal protection of the site are undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua City</td>
<td>Possible waivers of fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City</td>
<td>$3,000 is set aside to waive resource consent fees for alterations to heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resource Consent Heritage Fee Waivers (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>Wellington City Council will reimburse resource consent fees to owners of listed heritage items or items in listed heritage areas. Private owners and charitable trusts, including church organisations, are eligible. A decision to grant resource consent fee reimbursement is at the discretion of the Council’s Principal Heritage Advisor. Before granting reimbursement, heritage advisors may specify certain conditions. Applicants are required to agree in writing to these conditions and pay any reimbursed resource consent fees if the conditions are violated. The Council allocates $50,000 each financial year to heritage resource consent fee reimbursement. A cap of $2,500 is applied to each application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough District</td>
<td>Possible waiving of resource consent application fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>The Council introduced Zero Fees for non-notified resource consent applications to conserve and restore heritage buildings, places or objects. In the 2011/12 financial year resource consents to the value of $2,500 were waived under this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selywn District</td>
<td>Historic Buildings, Places and Objects Fund: To help applicants meet the processing costs for resource consent applications related to the maintenance or restoration of cultural or historic buildings, and for projects involving the maintenance or restoration of cultural or historic sites or buildings. Maximum grant is $2,000 (plus GST) available to those requiring some sort of consent due to their item being a listed heritage item in the district plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District</td>
<td>Possible waiving of resource consent application fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie District</td>
<td>Process resource consent applications relating to historic buildings free of charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago District</td>
<td>Council recognises the public benefit in maintaining and enhancing heritage precincts by waiving application fees associated with resource consents for work within a heritage precinct that requires resource consent only because that activity is located within a heritage precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>Council waives resource consent fees for minor works on heritage items listed in the district plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4.
### Summary of local authority heritage-related grants

#### Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North District Council Community Fund</td>
<td>Heritage Assistance Fund replaced by general community fund from 1 July 2009.</td>
<td>Applications to fund projects which promote, maintain, improve, develop or undertake recreational and community amenities, facilities, programmes and services in the district, other than those normally considered in Council’s annual or long-term planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara District Council Heritage Assistance Fund</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Up to $10,000 but individual grants are capped at 50 percent of the total cost of a project.</td>
<td>Funds could be used to support the structural review of these buildings and the identification of suitable means of improvement. The work to be undertaken is essential and appropriate to ensure preservation of the heritage resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Auckland City, Manukau, North Shore, Rodney and Waitakere heritage funds</td>
<td>Various – combined total is about $50,000</td>
<td>Various – most grants tend to be up to $10,000.</td>
<td>The former Auckland City, Manukau, North Shore, Rodney and Waitakere councils developed grant funds for historic heritage. These funds are now managed by Auckland Council. Information about the funds is available from the Auckland Council website. There are also other sources of funding such as the local boards discretionary grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council Built Heritage Protection Fund</td>
<td>$10.3m</td>
<td>Established June 2011. $10.3 million in 2011/2012. $4.6 million per annum in following years. The primary role of this fund is to assist in purchase of heritage buildings at risk as a revolving initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waikato District Council Heritage Assistance Fund</strong></td>
<td>Funding available on a three-yearly cycle.</td>
<td>The next heritage funding round is late February 2014.</td>
<td>To assist with the conservation, restoration and protection of valued heritage items within the Waikato District Council boundaries that are not Council owned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Environment Bay of Plenty Regional Council Environmental Enhancement Fund** | Up to 300,000 | A single application should not exceed 10 percent of the total available funding. | The fund’s purpose is to assist regional organisations and community groups by providing financial and technical support for activities and projects whose primary purpose is to directly promote, enhance or protect:  
  - the natural or historic (including cultural) character of;  
  - public access to; and/or  
  - public understanding.  
  More specifically, it focuses on projects that look at public access of, the public’s understanding of, and the natural or historic character of the environment. |
| **Napier City Council Art Deco Improvement Fund** | Grants paid at a rate of $25 per linear metre per floor and applies only to walls facing the street. | Eligible for buildings either in the Art Deco Heritage District or those commercial, industrial or community purposes buildings outside the CBD which are significant examples of art deco. Also for buildings listed with the NZHPT and buildings listed under the district plan. The fund does not apply to residential buildings. |
| **Hastings District Façade Enhancement Scheme** | $16,000 | The programme provides grant assistance to owners and tenants of heritage buildings in the CBD for the painting and enhancement of building façades of architectural and historical significance primarily within the CBD. However buildings along key traffic routes and within suburban commercial shopping areas can also be considered for a grant. The amount of grant is determined by the Urban Design & Parks Planner, and varies according to façade size, colour scheme costs and the profile and significance of the building. |
### Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District Council Heritage Protection Fund</td>
<td>The Council contributes $25,000 per year towards its Heritage Protection Fund and unspent funds are carried over to successive years.</td>
<td>Provided the work in question meets the Council’s criteria for consideration, the amount of funding will be dependent on the importance of its building, the necessity, the availability of funds and applicant’s resources.</td>
<td>The Heritage Protection Fund was established by the Council to help private landowners manage, maintain and preserve the heritage values of their properties. It provides a partial contribution towards the cost of a specific heritage project or work. Applications can be made for any item identified in the heritage schedule of the district plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui City Building Assessment Assistance Fund</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>Assistance is given as a dollar for dollar grant to a maximum grant of $1,500 for any one report.</td>
<td>The fund helps owner or purchaser to have preliminary expert reports done for a building so they know what is needed to comply with the Building Act. These reports may be Initial Evaluation (IEPs) Procedures for earthquake-prone buildings or cover fire safety and physical access. The Fund is not for detailed design or physical works but for assessing the condition of the building and scoping necessary works. Buildings in the Old Town Conservation Overlay Zone, the Central Commercial Zone and on (or potentially on) the District Plan Heritage list are eligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District Council Heritage Improvements Fund</td>
<td>Fund was reduced from $50,000 for 2009/10, noting that fund currently has a positive balance (combines heritage incentive grants fund, heritage incentive planning grants fund, and earthquake risk building fund).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Palmerston North Council Natural and Cultural Heritage Incentive Fund | | Grants are 50 percent of the cost of approved works up to a maximum of: Commercial properties 10,000; Community properties (not subject to rates) 10,000; residential properties $5,000; Conservation asset management plans $5,000. | The primary targets of the incentive fund are:  
- Heritage conservation work.  
- Heritage research, education and promotion initiatives.  
- Earthquake-prone heritage buildings.  
- Notable trees.  
Available for:  
- Owners of listed buildings, sites, objects or trees.  
- Rangitaane Iwi.  
- Non-profit incorporated heritage groups/organisations.  
- Specialist heritage places conservation/management bodies. |
<p>| Tararua District Council Heritage Protection Reserve | $36,797 | There is no specific amount for the size of any grant. A minimum of 50 percent of the project's total cost is required. | Applications can be made for any item identified in the Heritage Schedule of the District Plan including: historic buildings and places, historic churches, structures and monuments, archaeological sites and waahi tapu and registered historic areas. It may also apply to items that are not listed in the district plan if they meet the Heritage Advisory Group's criteria for significance. |
| Ruapehu District Council Heritage Grants Policy | | | An incentive for owners of heritage buildings listed in the District Plan Schedule of Heritage Buildings to maintain the buildings at a high standard. Note: to the NZHPT's knowledge, there have been no grants made under the policy and no specific money is set aside in the annual planning process. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City Council Heritage Fund</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Maximum not documented.</td>
<td>Any applications over $15,000 will require a heritage report or advice from a suitably qualified heritage conservation professional. In all but exceptional circumstances, Hutt City Council will not pay more than 50 percent of the cost of conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiti Coast District Council Heritage Fund</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>Up to $5,000.</td>
<td>To be eligible the place must be: a registered heritage feature (registered in the Kāpiti Coast District Plan Heritage Register, the New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme, or the Historic Places Trust Register); or any other heritage feature (including trees, buildings, wahi tapu or wahi taonga, heritage objects, or archaeological, historic or geological sites). However, the place must meet the General Criteria listed in this document; and b) have a heritage management plan. With respect to (a) above, the site does not have to be listed in the District Plan Heritage Register at the time the funding is applied for. It is sufficient to agree to registration in the Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterton District Heritage Fund</td>
<td>Annual Rates Credit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each property with an item listed in Appendix F.4A and F.4B of the Masterton District Plan will be given an annual credit of $50 to be used for work that enhances or maintains the heritage item. The credit will be held and recorded by the Council until such time as the owner requests the money for these works and the consent is granted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wellington City Council Built Heritage Incentive Fund                        | $329,000                  | Up to 25 percent of the cost of the work to a maximum of $80,000. Funding for conservation reports, technical advice and for domestic fire protection systems will be generally up to a maximum of $10,000. | Criteria: The project relates to buildings and objects listed in the district plan. The project enhances the heritage significance of the item concerned, and where elements of the item are protected by provisions of the District Plan (eg the exterior of a heritage place). The project must be for:  
  ▶ stabilisation, repair or restoration of original heritage fabric relating to historic buildings, structures, or objects, or  
  ▶ professional services (ie, structural strengthening reports, maintenance reports, conservation plans), or  
  ▶ reimbursement of Council resource consent fees for approved conservation work requiring a resource consent (note: projects which have received funding for either items above cannot also obtain reimbursement of Council resource consent fees). |
| Nelson City Council Heritage Incentive Fund                                   | Over $60,000              | Grants of $1,000 (+GST). | To be eligible, the building, object or site must be listed in the Nelson Resource Management Plan and it must not be owned by the Crown, Council, or its agencies.  
The following types of projects are eligible for funding:  
  i. stabilisation, repair or restoration of original heritage fabric relating to historic buildings or structures (e.g. repairs to masonry, joinery, plaster or glazing, earthquake strengthening or fire protection), provided the work is to the standard approved by the Council;  
  ii. professional services (e.g. research, condition reports, conservation plans, heritage plans, conservation work specifications, management plans);  
  iii. the proposed work must have all necessary Council and NZHPT approvals. |
<p>| Tasman District Council Heritage Building Restoration Initiatives Fund        | $5,000                    | Grants of up to $500.   | Available for specialised restoration work on buildings identified as having heritage values and listed in the Tasman Resource Management Plan. Eligible restoration works any of repiling, repainting, reroofing, replacing guttering, earthquake strengthening and fire protection. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District Council Heritage Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$60,831</td>
<td>The maximum individual grant from this source shall be no greater than 50 percent of the cost of the approved project and in any event shall be no more than $7,000.</td>
<td>Projects which relate to heritage buildings/items that are scheduled Category A in the Operative District Plan, Group A or Group B in the Proposed District Plan. Projects may be for specialised maintenance or may involve repairs to heritage buildings/items that suffered damage in the Canterbury Earthquakes, such as replacing matching cladding or windows or other fittings in order to retain the heritage values of the building/item. Projects shall provide a full project plan (including the proposed work schedule) and financial statements (including quotes, other funding and the details of an EQC claim if applicable). Projects must be on private land (not owned by the Council) unless a heritage building/item on Council land is managed by a community group or organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council Heritage Incentive Grant Fund</td>
<td>383,000 (also a Character Maintenance Grant Fund of $45,310)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants of between $5,000 and $49,999 require a Limited Conservation Covenant to be registered on the property and grants of $50,000 or more require a Full Conservation Covenant to be registered on the property in perpetuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Building Fund</td>
<td>Up to 50 percent total cost of repair or restoration project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The fund was established with contributions from Council, NZHPT, Government and private donations. It is a special appeal that was launched to help fund the repair, restoration and strengthening of character and heritage buildings damaged during the Canterbury earthquakes. The purpose of the fund is to provide assistance to owners of heritage buildings to repair damage caused by the Canterbury earthquake of 4 September 2010, Christchurch earthquake of 22 February 2011, and aftershocks. Funding is targeted at the gap between insurance cover, and the actual cost of repairs and associated works including conservation works, structural upgrading and Building Code compliance works. The fund consists of contributions from territorial authorities, the NZHPT and donations. Any funds received will be matched by the government who have set aside up to $10 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Authority Heritage Grants as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mackenzie District Council Heritage Protection Fund | $5,000 | This is a contestable fund with applications to be called for during March each year. Any remaining funds may be allocated to individual applications throughout the year at the Council’s discretion. Available for: Buildings, items or places currently listed in the Heritage Items Schedule as Category X, Y or Z heritage items; Buildings, items or places which have been approved by Council to be included in the Heritage Items Schedule as Category X, Y or Z heritage items; Trees or groups of trees in the Protected Trees Schedule; Archaeological sites; and waahi tapu sites or areas as identified by the NZHPT. Each individual application will be eligible for a maximum grant of $2,500 or the following percentage of the sum required, whichever is the lesser:  
  - Category X items 75 percent.  
  - Category Y items 60 percent.  
  - Category Z items 45 percent.  
  - Protected Trees 50 percent.  
  - Archaeological or waahi tapu sites 50 percent. |
<p>| Selwyn District Council Heritage Fund | $15,000 | A contestable fund distributed among successful applicants as grants (anywhere from $500–$7,500). The purpose of the fund is to encourage and assist owners with work required to maintain and enhance heritage buildings in the district as well as that required on protected trees. Funds usually cover part of the work to be done with applicants making up the difference. The work must be completed in one calendar year. Payment is made upon receipt of the work being done. |
| Waimate District Council Heritage Fund | $5,000 | Normally grants will be limited to $1,000. Not more than 50 percent of the total cost of a project can be granted from the fund. Available to non-profit organisations that serve the social, educational, cultural or environmental well-being of the community. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Fund</th>
<th>Total size of fund (2012)</th>
<th>Individual grant amount</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui Heritage Fund</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Available to assist owners in the preservation of historic heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City Council Heritage Fund</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>The majority of grants are between $5,000-$15,000, with occasional maximums up to $60,000.</td>
<td>Available to non-profit organisations that serve the social, educational, cultural or environmental well-being of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitaki District Council Heritage Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Grants up to $1,000. Loans negotiable.</td>
<td>Eligible for owners of an historic building in the Waitaki District or those who own land upon which an historic site is located. Priority will be given to assist buildings that are owned by groups or organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore, Invercargill &amp; Southland District Councils – Southland Regional Heritage Development Fund – Venture Southland</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Grants will normally be limited to a maximum of $10,000 to provide seeding funds for heritage projects of regional significance. Amounts above this limit may be considered for large projects of outstanding merit.</td>
<td>The purpose of this fund is to provide grants for projects and initiatives which preserve, communicate and promote Southland’s heritage and are significant in a regional context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.
Summary of local authority rates relief for historic heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North District</td>
<td>The Council may postpone or remit rates where an area is afforded permanent legal protection through a covenant or reserve status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei District</td>
<td>Possible rates relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney District</td>
<td>Remission on rates (100 percent), excluding water or sewerage rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>Possible rates relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata-Piako District</td>
<td>Possible rates relief to owners of heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga District</td>
<td>Council will give consideration to rates relief on covenanted sites of heritage value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waikato District</td>
<td>Council will resolve, on a case-by-case basis, what amount of rates (excluding rates for refuse collection, sewage disposal and water supply), up to a maximum of 33 percent, qualify for a remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupo District</td>
<td>Will consider rates relief for landowners to help encourage voluntary protection or enhancement of sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato District</td>
<td>A 100 percent remission of all rates may be applied to land protected for historic or cultural conservation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomo District</td>
<td>Possible rates relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opotoki District</td>
<td>Providing rates relief for voluntary protection of resources on private land where such protection is of benefit to the wider community and in keeping with Council policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga City</td>
<td>Possible rates relief to assist heritage management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Authority Heritage Rates Relief Schemes (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne District</td>
<td>Partial rates relief for properties or the affected parts thereof, provided the heritage value of the item is maintained and, in respect of archaeological sites, suitable protection measures such as covenants are taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Hawkes Bay District</td>
<td>The extent of the rates remission if approved is to be 100 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings District</td>
<td>Land taken out of production and vested in a formal conservation covenant may be granted 100 percent remission of rates, with the exception of targeted rates for wastewater disposal, water supply and refuse collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier City</td>
<td>Rates remission for land subject to a heritage covenant under the Historic Places Act 1993 or any other covenant or agreement entered into by the owner of the land with a public body for the preservation of existing features of land, or of buildings, where the conditions of the covenant or agreement are registered against the title to the land and are binding on the subsequent owner of the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairoa District</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis subject to a maximum of 50 percent of the rates owing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki Regional</td>
<td>Remit all or part of the rates owed by the ratepayer in respect of rating units provided the conditions of the policy have been met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Taranaki District</td>
<td>Rates remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford District</td>
<td>Will provide rates remission of up to 100 percent of the rates on land with a heritage structure on it to all ratepayers who meet the objectives, conditions and criteria of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowhenua District</td>
<td>Each application will be considered on its merits. If approved the value of the remission will be 100 percent in the case of Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust covenants and 50 percent in other cases, of the general rates of that part of the rating unit covered by the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District</td>
<td>100 percent of rates relief for listed Group A places and 50 percent for Category B places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Authority Heritage Rates Relief Schemes (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis subject to a maximum amount of 33 percent of rates assessed for that rating unit per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapehu District</td>
<td>Maximum of $500 to be granted for a residential heritage property listed in the district plan as discretionary rates relief. Maximum of $2,000 to be granted for a non-residential property listed in the district plan as discretionary rates relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui District</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis subject to a maximum amount of 33 percent of rates owing per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis subject to a maximum amount of 50 percent of rates owing per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wairarapa</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt City</td>
<td>Allows Council to remit or postpone rates under selected criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough District</td>
<td>Possible rates remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City Council</td>
<td>Owners of heritage buildings listed as either Group A or Group B in the Nelson Resource Management Plan, who commit to maintaining their buildings, are eligible for the remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners of buildings listed as Group A in the Nelson Resource Management Plan will be eligible for up to a 50 percent remission, and owners of buildings listed as Group B will be eligible for up to a 25 percent remission of their general rates based on land value. The remission does not include storm water, uniform annual general charges or waste water charges. Each application will be considered on its merits and provision of a remission in any three-year cycle does not set a precedent for similar remissions in future cycles. Rates remission will be made by passing a credit to the applicant’s rates assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman District</td>
<td>Rates remission is available for owners of heritage buildings with a commitment to maintain their buildings in return.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Authority Heritage Rates Relief Schemes (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>Ratepayers who own rating units which have some feature or cultural, natural or historic heritage is voluntarily protected may qualify for remission of rates under this policy. Applications should be supported by documentary evidence of the protected status of the rating unit, for example, the copy of the covenant or other legal mechanism. In granting remissions under this policy, the Council may specify certain conditions before remission will be granted. Applicants will be required to agree in writing to these conditions and to pay any remitted rates if the conditions are violated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District</td>
<td>There is a process regarding rates remission through the Rating Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikoura District</td>
<td>Rate remission will be made by passing a credit to the applicant’s rates assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District</td>
<td>Rates remission available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimate District</td>
<td>Council will grant full remission of the general rate where application is made to Council and is satisfied that the owner of the land has voluntarily preserved or enhanced natural, historical or cultural features of the land. Council may also consider the extent to which public access to the land is provided by the landowner and commercial gain is derived by them. This remission will be funded from within the general rate urban, or general rate rural as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago District</td>
<td>Council will decide what amount of rates is to be remitted on a case-by-case basis, subject to a maximum of 30 percent of rates assessed in a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha District</td>
<td>Council will consider up to 100 percent of general rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Authority Heritage Rates Relief Schemes (as at October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dunedin City           | Available to non-profit organisations that serve the social, educational, recreational, cultural or environmental well-being of the community. Owners of heritage buildings undertaking major restorative works may be eligible for rates relief. Heritage rates relief aims to reward imaginative and/or productive reuse of heritage or townscape buildings. Rates relief is allocated from a contestable fund and the following considerations will guide decisions on who receives relief and the amount given:  
  - The level of investment (there is a typical investment threshold of $100,000).  
  - The significance of the building.  
  - The type of building use.  
  - The location of the building.  
  Dunedin also has a Targeted Rate Scheme for Earthquake Strengthening of Heritage Buildings. This allows building owners to obtain funding for earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings and pay this back through a targeted rate on their property. Eligible building owners may obtain amounts of up to $50,000 to assist with earthquake strengthening. Larger amounts may be considered on a one-off basis. Additional assistance may also be available through the Dunedin Heritage Fund.  
  In addition, Dunedin City Council has established a heritage residential B&B rates category in June 2011. This is available for owners of heritage B&B who were paying commercial rates following assessments by Quotable Value in 2010. |
| Queenstown Lakes District | The extent of any rates remission will be determined on a case-by-case basis.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Environment Southland  | Council officers will be delegated authority to remit 100 percent of rates on those portions of land which qualify.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Invercargill City      | Council will decide what amount of rates will be remitted on a case-by-case basis.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Southland District     | Council will grant a 50 percent remission of general rates. Where only part of a rating is affected, a separate rateable assessment will be required to be established for the area involved.                                                                                                                                                           |
## Appendix 6.
Summary of other types of incentives provided by local authorities

### Other type of local authority incentives, as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitomo District</td>
<td>Possible assistance towards professional advice/information or the preparation of a conservation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne District</td>
<td>Annual plan provisions for: i) two hours of free advice from a heritage consultant for items scheduled in the Post European Contact Schedule in respect of conservation or maintenance, restoration of original architectural elements and shop fronts, adaptive reuse and colour schemes; ii) two hours of free advice from an archaeologist or other suitably qualified person for items scheduled in the archaeological site or waahi tapu schedule regarding the preparation of a conservation or management plan; iii) heritage paint fund available to owners of heritage buildings on the Central Business District Schedule; and iv) a fencing fund to facilitate the protection of significant archaeological sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Hawkes Bay District</td>
<td>Funding is available for the identification of historic sites that arise from any subdivision or resource consent applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings District</td>
<td>Subject to funding being available the Council will assist landowners to enhance the heritage nature of the building by the use of grants to upgrade and paint the facades of buildings above veranda height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District</td>
<td>Up to two hours of Council paid architectural advice and up to one hour of Council paid colour scheme advice by the Council’s advisors is available for buildings listed in the Councils Heritage Inventory, to promote design and colour compatible with the heritage values of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowhenua District</td>
<td>Possible offer of low-interest loans in the protection of heritage features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District</td>
<td>There are low-interest loans for people who for some reason are ineligible for funding grants or rates remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāpiti District</td>
<td>Financial contributions for fencing and a range of other protective measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other type of local authority incentives, as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutt City</td>
<td>Council to subsidise on a case-by-case basis basic consultant fees for conservation advice for heritage buildings. Council offers to provide free advice to owners of heritage buildings on how to conserve heritage buildings in accordance with Council policies and other statutory requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterton District</td>
<td>Fencing fund to protect significant archaeological sites. Applications will be considered according to: the level of threat and potential damage that could result if the site remained unfenced; and the significance of the archaeological site based on its uniqueness, representative nature, condition and importance to tangata whenua, the community and landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua City</td>
<td>Possible low interest loans, free information and assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>Heritage awards are being investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>Council continues to offer heritage advice at no charge to the building owner, recognising the importance of this as an incentive for heritage protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago Regional</td>
<td>To provide for parking demand in the Business Resource Area through the provision of public car parking development except for on-site requirements associated with large traffic-generating activities. On-site requirements for parking may be relaxed where this will result in retention of a heritage item that would otherwise be lost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other type of local authority incentives, as at October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>Awards for individuals or groups in recognition of restoration or protection of heritage items; Free advice on architecture and design to owners of heritage items; Repainting initiative: buildings identified as having heritage value with the Heritage Precinct are eligible for a financial contribution upon repainting. Initiatives are only granted where the repainting is in accordance with the principles outlined in the Council’s Renovation and Colour Guidelines. The contribution is calculated at $20 per lineal metre of building viewed from the street for every storey of the building. A contribution of $10 per lineal metre of verandah paint is also available. The Council may award greater contributions for the repainting of heritage buildings with unique characteristics such as ornate decoration. Free advice to help in planning heritage improvements. Promote pre-application meetings to discuss options when undertaking work on a heritage building. Can bring together a heritage project team consisting of a Building Control Officer, Resource Consent Planner, and Heritage Planner to work with applicants during the consent process. Awards for individuals or groups in recognition of restoration or protection of heritage items. There are now awards for earthquake strengthening, heritage interior restoration, and re-use of a heritage building. Each receives a certificate, plaque and $1,500 prize. These are awarded at the Dunedin Heritage Re-use Awards in March annually. $70,000 in the Warehouse Precinct Heritage Area for heritage reuse assistance in 2012/2013 only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invercargill City</td>
<td>In order to promote quality development and redevelopment in the city centre the Council awards Civic Plaques to projects including those contained within the City Centre Heritage Precinct that comply with the guidelines and contribute to the vibrancy of the city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.
Summary of Auckland City Central Area District Plan, heritage floor space bonuses granted and recipient sites (as at May 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address Where Bonus Granted</th>
<th>Building Description</th>
<th>Heritage Floor Space Bonus Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-32 Auckland Street</td>
<td>Tamil Tampered Houses</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8 Chancery Street</td>
<td>Chancery Chambers</td>
<td>9.6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-38 Customs Street East</td>
<td>Australia House</td>
<td>6.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52 Customs Street East</td>
<td>A H Nathan Building</td>
<td>8.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-32 Customs Street West</td>
<td>Former Geelong House</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 Durham Lane</td>
<td>Bluestone Store</td>
<td>3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Eden Crescent</td>
<td>Eber Hall</td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a Prince Street</td>
<td>Former Synagogue</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Prince Street</td>
<td>Former Synagogue</td>
<td>6,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Queen Street</td>
<td>Former Chief PC</td>
<td>31,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-285 Queen Street</td>
<td>Civic Theatre</td>
<td>6079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-303 Queen Street</td>
<td>Tour Hall</td>
<td>41,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187-196 Queen Street</td>
<td>VFRS Wing</td>
<td>51,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118-114 Queen Street</td>
<td>Union Wing</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-148 Queen Street</td>
<td>St Mary's Chambers</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Symonds Street</td>
<td>St Andrews' Church</td>
<td>8.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Symonds Street</td>
<td>St Luke's Church</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-70 Wellesley Street</td>
<td>St Malachy's in the City</td>
<td>78,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total HFS Bonus Granted: $192,792
## SUMMARY OF RECIPIENT SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address Where Bonus Granted</th>
<th>Bonus M² Floorspace Realised or Retained</th>
<th>Bonus M² Floorspace Transferred Onward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79/84 Albert Street</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/96 Albert Street ('91 Queen Street)</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 Commerce Street</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Cook Street</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Customs Street East</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-83 Customs Street West</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25 Dufferin Street West (171 Queen Street)</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-169 Fanahaw Street</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Fort Street</td>
<td>6,147</td>
<td>3,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 High Street</td>
<td>23,271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 Hobson Street</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Hobson Street</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Kitchener Street</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13 Prince Street</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-138 Quay Street</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-104 Quay Street</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Queen Street</td>
<td>687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Queen Street</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Queen Street</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Queen Street</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortland St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>3.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>3.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick St.</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>4.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>199.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>