



New Zealand
Historic Places Trust *Pouhere Taonga*

**SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT
OF
HISTORIC HERITAGE**

Guide No. 5

**STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT
REPORTING AND
MONITORING**



3 August 2007

Contents

ABBREVIATIONS.....	4
1. STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORTING.....	5
THE SER HISTORIC HERITAGE FRAMEWORK	5
CHAPTER 2. EXPLANATION OF SER HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS.....	9
2.1 HISTORIC HERITAGE STATE	9
2.1.1 ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE.....	9
Indicator: <i>I.1. Number and distribution of identified historic items.....</i>	9
2.1.2 ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE	12
Indicator: <i>I.2. Number and type of historic items assessed using best practice assessment standards.....</i>	12
2.2 HISTORIC HERITAGE THREATS/PRESSURE.....	14
2.2.1 ISSUE: CONDITION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	14
Indicator: <i>I.3. Number of historic items destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished.....</i>	14
2.2.1 ISSUE: CONDITION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	16
Indicator: <i>I.4. The proportion of historic heritage in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity.....</i>	16
2.3 HISTORIC HERITAGE RESPONSES.....	23
2.3.1 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	23
Indicator: <i>I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage.....</i>	23
2.3.2 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.....	26
Indicator: <i>I.6. Number of historic items actively protected by formal statutory instruments or conservation plans.....</i>	26
2.3.3 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.....	27
Indicator: <i>I.7. Assessment of the effectiveness of plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities relating to historic heritage.....</i>	27
2.3.4 ISSUE: RESOURCES FOR CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	30
Indicator: <i>I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage.....</i>	30
APPENDIX 1.....	32
SER HISTORIC HERITAGE REPORTING: BACKGROUND	32
APPENDIX 2	37
STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS PROJECT	37
HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATOR SAMPLING FORM	37
MONITORING THE STATE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	40
EXPLANATORY GUIDELINES.....	40

Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidelines

Guide No.5

State of the Environment Reporting and Monitoring

Author: Robert McClean

This guide was approved by the Board for public distribution on 3 August 2007.

While the NZHPT acknowledges the contribution of other agencies and organisations, the opinions and views expressed in this guide are those of the NZHPT only.

Comments and feedback can be provided to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga about this guideline. Please send comments to:

New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga

PO Box 2629

Wellington

Email: information@historic.org.nz (Attention: Sustainable management guidance)

Phone 04 472 4341

Fax 04 499 0669

Cover photo: Matanaka Buildings, Matanaka, November 2005. Photo, R McClean, NZHPT

ISSN 1178-2919 (Online)

ISSN 1178-2900 (Print)

ISBN 978-0-908577-62-0 (Online)

ISBN 978-0-908577-61-3 (Print)

Copyright © New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga

Abbreviations

ANZECC	Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council
ARC	Auckland Regional Council
CBD	Central Business District
DOC	Department of Conservation
GWRC	Greater Wellington Regional Council
MCH	Ministry for Culture and Heritage
MFE	Ministry for the Environment
NZAA	New Zealand Archaeological Association
NZHPT	New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga
NZLGB	New Zealand Lottery Grants Board
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OTS	Office of Treaty Settlements
PSR	Pressure-State-Response Framework
PUCM	Planning Under a Cooperative Mandate Project
QE II Trust	Queen Elizabeth II National Trust
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
WCC	Wellington City Council
WT	Waitangi Tribunal

1. State of the Environment Reporting

Every local authority has a duty to monitor the state of the whole or any part of the environment of its region or district that is appropriate to enable the local authority to effectively carry out its functions under the RMA.¹ This duty is known as state of the environment reporting or SER. Historic heritage, as a natural and physical resource, forms part of the definition of environment as defined in the RMA.

As with other SER frameworks, research and monitoring of historic heritage requires cooperation between agencies at a district, regional, and national level. This guide emphasises the need to integrate monitoring strategies and information held by local authorities, NZHPT, Department of Conservation (DOC), New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA), iwi and other heritage organisations. By pulling together a range of information from the key agencies, a more robust and comprehensive 'picture' of the state of the historic environment will be realised.

The SER Historic Heritage Framework

New Zealand has adopted the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework as the basis of its state of environmental reporting. This approach, developed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), recognises that managing our environment requires a complicated form of feedback loop: human activities and natural causes exert pressures on the environment; these change the state or condition of the environment; society responds by developing or implementing policies that influence those human activities or modify natural processes, and this in turn changes the kinds of pressures.²

The PSR framework can be adopted to provide information about the state of the historic heritage environment. This has been done in Australia and New Zealand at national, regional and district levels (see Appendix 1 for background information on SER historic heritage reporting in Australia and New Zealand).

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

An indicator is a unit of measure that signals changes in the environment. The change may be an aspect of pressure, state, or response. The development of historic heritage indicators does not attempt to measure the 'total' heritage environment. Attempting to measure the total heritage environment, or the 'universe' of heritage places, is essentially a fruitless exercise since views of what constitutes heritage values change as society changes. In addition, the exercise of listing or registering a particular place inscribes new values.³

Generally, historic heritage indicators should have the ability to:

¹ Sec 35(2)(a) RMA 1991

² WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

³ Prof Dirk Spennemann, 'Your solution, their problem. Their solution, your problem' Paper presented at Planning Institute of Australia Conference, Hobart, 2004

- Produce and simplify the most important information about the historic heritage environment;
- Reduce the number of measurements required to give an 'accurate' representation of historic heritage outcomes;
- Illustrate trends and allow comparisons;
- Ensure responses are triggered when historic heritage thresholds are approached; and
- Make information gathered by specialists more easily understood by the public, the media, resource users, and decision-makers.⁴

The NZHPT proposes that the set of historic heritage indicators used by the Australian National State of the Environment Programme should be adopted in New Zealand with some modifications and additions in light of the 2001 review of the Australian programme. The Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council have endorsed these indicators in 1999.

Further modifications of the Australian set of indicators are also required to reflect New Zealand's historic heritage legislation, policy context and monitoring experience. In particular, the indicators need to be closely aligned to the definition of historic heritage in the RMA.

The proposed draft indicators are organised according to four key resource management issues or information objectives:

- Knowledge of the historic heritage resource.
- Condition of historic heritage.
- Protection of historic heritage by central and local governments.
- Resources for conservation of historic heritage.

⁴ Adapted from WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

In relation to these information objectives, the draft indicators are as follows:

Historic Heritage Indicators

- I.1 Number and distribution of identified historic items.**
- I.2 Number and type of historic items assessed using best practice standards.**
- I.3 Number of historic items destroyed or values severely diminished.**
- I.4 Proportion of historic heritage in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity.**
- I.5 Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage.**
- I.6 Number of historic items actively protected by formal statutory instruments or conservation plans.**
- I.7 Assessment of the effectiveness of plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities relating to historic heritage.**
- I.8 Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage.**

For each indicator, there is a subset of indicators relating to historic places (buildings and sites), historic areas and places and areas of significance to Maori.

Historic Heritage Indicators				
Issue	Indicator	Information Sources	State (S), Pressure (P), Response (R)	
Knowledge of the historic heritage resource	I.1	Number and distribution of identified historic items	NZHPT	S R
			Local authorities	
			DOC	
			Iwi	
			NZAA	
	I.2	Number and type of historic items assessed using best practice standards	NZHPT	S R
Local authorities				
DOC				
NZAA				
Condition of historic heritage	I.3	Number of historic items destroyed or values severely diminished	NZHPT	S P
			Local authorities	
			DOC	
	I.4	Proportion of historic heritage in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity	NZHPT	S P
			Local authorities	
			DOC	
Protection of historic heritage by central and local government	I.5	Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage	NZHPT	R
			Local authorities	
			DOC	
			QEII Trust	
			Maori Land Court	
	Office of Treaty Settlements			
	I.6	Number of historic items actively protected by formal statutory instruments	NZHPT	R
			Local authorities	
			DOC	
			Iwi	
I.7	Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents, and authorities relating to historic heritage	NZHPT	R	
		Local authorities		
Resources for conservation of historic heritage	I.8	Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage	NZHPT	R
			Local authorities	
			DOC	

Chapter 2. Explanation of SER Historic Heritage Indicators

2.1 Historic Heritage State

2.1.1 Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: I.1. Number and distribution of identified historic items

Description: Measures the number and distribution of identified historic items in New Zealand.

I.1. Number and distribution of identified historic items		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (Buildings)	NZHPT	No. of registered historic places (buildings)
	Local authorities	No. of listed heritage places (buildings) in district and regional plans
	DOC	No. of actively managed historic places
Places (sites, including archaeological sites)	NZHPT	No. of registered historic places (sites)
	Local authorities	No. of listed heritage places (sites) in district and regional plans
	NZAA	No. of recorded archaeological sites
Areas	NZHPT	No. of registered historic areas
	Local authorities	No. of listed historic areas in district and regional plans
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZHPT	No. of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas
	Local authorities	No. of listed sites of significance to Maori in district and regional plans
	Iwi	No. of sites listed in iwi inventories

Rationale

At the core of New Zealand's cultural management regime is a system of registration or listing of historic heritage. The lists indicate a place that is singled out on account of its heritage value. There are generally three main types of lists: statutory; regulatory; and community. New Zealand's only historic heritage list explicitly provided for in legislation is the Register of historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu, and wahi tapu areas. The Register is a requirement of the Historic Places Act 1993. Local authorities and DOC prepare and manage regulatory lists or schedules that have legal ramifications in terms of rules within district or regional plans prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991 or conservation management strategies prepared under the Conservation Act 1987. In addition, there are a range of community lists which have no statutory basis or regulatory effect. These include lists such as the Rail Heritage Register.

Lists of historic items reflect the values or objectives of the group or organisation which created and maintain them. Counting the numbers of listed places actually provides little information about changes to the historic environment. This is because the large proportion of the historic heritage environment is not listed and the listings themselves

are biased towards particular time, geographic and thematic categories. Numbers of listed items also do not indicate numbers of actual sites or places protected. Protection largely depends on either property status (i.e. reserves) or the quality of rules within regional or district plans.

Changes in the number of listed items do, however, reflect changes in government and/or community commitment to identify and protect historic heritage. The NZHPT's registration process and the RMA plan change process to add new listed items into district or regional plans requires formidable legal, informational, and consultative requirements. The processes also require substantial resources at both a central and local government level.

Other changes to listed items can reflect improved regulatory processes. For example, many surveyors and developers are more aware of the Historic Places Act 1993 with regard to archaeological authority requirements and often engage an archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment if requested by the NZHPT. Thus, most new additions to the NZAA Site Recording Scheme are the result of surveys associated with proposed coastal subdivisions or other developments.

Discussion

Historic Places (buildings)

The majority of historic places are generally buildings or individual properties. They may include residential, commercial, industrial, or public buildings and structures. The NZHPT Register dates back to 1963 when the NZHPT began to establish a national list of historic sites and buildings. The structure of the list was formulated in 1969 with the classification of buildings into five categories A, B, C, D, and O (objects). This was changed to Category I and Category II historic places under the Historic Places Act 1993.

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

All district plans contain a schedule, list, or register of heritage places. These lists are often included in the appendices of the district plan. Some regional plans include lists of regionally significant heritage places.

The Department of Conservation's conservation management strategies identify historic resources of high significance that are actively managed by the Department of Conservation. These sites are the subject of on-going DOC management and attention and are termed 'actively managed historic places.' Nearly all of the places listed are within the conservation estate.

Historic Places (sites)

Many historic places may not include buildings. They may be places where a significant event took place, a battleground, or heritage tree. Archaeological sites are important heritage sites. Archaeological sites, defined by the Historic Places Act 1993, are places in New Zealand that were associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 (including wrecks) and are, or may be able, through investigation by archaeological methods, to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. Many archaeological

sites, however, may be related to human activity post-1900 and these do not enjoy protection under the Historic Places Act 1993.⁵

Archaeological sites have been recorded by the NZAA since 1956. The sites include Maori archaeological sites (pa, midden, pits, etc), and other historic archaeological sites (goldmines, buildings, structures, tracks, etc). Archaeological sites are recorded by archaeological survey or as a result of discovery. There are few areas in New Zealand that have been covered by systematic archaeological survey and there is a need for improved information about the degree and extent of archaeological survey coverage in the country.

The New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme is a national inventory of archaeological sites and currently contains records of over 59,000 sites nation-wide. This list is only those 'recorded' sites. In any given area, there may be undiscovered or unrecorded sites.

A number of recorded archaeological sites are also registered as historic places. Most of these registrations were entered under a 1975 amendment to the Historic Places Act 1954, which provided for a register of archaeological sites. The purpose of the register was for scientific use and for planning purposes at the local government level. Generally, registration of archaeological sites meant the landowner was made aware of the presence of a recorded archaeological site. Recently, the NZHPT has registered a number of archaeological sites as historic places, under the current Act.

Historic Areas

Historic areas registered under the Historic Places Act 1993 contain a number of interrelated historic places. These areas may include a small collection of historic buildings or an entire street. Local authorities have often adopted the term 'conservation areas' or 'character areas' to recognise and list historic areas. For example, the Wellington City District Plan identifies areas such as Thorndon and Mt Victoria as character areas.

Places and areas of significance to Maori

Iwi and hapu have been active in identifying and researching places and areas of significance for both the RMA and claims settlement processes. Some iwi and hapu have prepared iwi management plans or schedules that involve the identification and research of places of significance. These places may include maunga (mountains), awa (rivers), tauranga waka (canoe landing sites), urupa, marae, swamps, and other archaeological and non-archaeological sites.

Any place or area sacred to Maori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual, or mythological sense can be registered under the Historic Places Act 1993 as wahi tapu. Some district and regional plans also include a list of places and areas of significance to Maori or wahi tapu.

⁵ The NZHPT can declare any post-1900 archaeological site as coming within the definition of 'archaeological site' within the meaning of the Historic Places Act 1993 by notice in the *Gazette*. The Napier Prison Wall was gazetted by the NZHPT on 24 June 2005.

2.1.2 Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: I.2. Number and type of historic items assessed using best practice assessment standards

Description: Measures the change and extent of knowledge of the values of historic heritage in the New Zealand by measuring the proportion of identified historic items assessed using best practice assessment standards.

I.2. Number and type of historic items assessed using best practice assessment standards		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings)	NZHPT	No. of historic places (buildings) registered since 1993
		No. of historic places (buildings) registrations reviewed and upgraded
	Local authorities	No. of historic places (buildings), listed in heritage schedules, assessed using best practice assessment standards
Places (sites)	NZHPT	No. of historic places (sites) registered since 1993
		No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic places (sites)
	Local authorities	No. of historic places (sites), listed in heritage schedules, assessed using best practice assessment standards
	NZAA	No. of upgraded archaeological site records
Areas	NZHPT	No. of historic areas registered since 1993
		No. of historic area registrations reviewed and upgraded
	Local authorities	No. of reviewed and upgraded listed historic areas
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZHPT	No. of wahi tapu and wahi tapu area registrations reviewed and upgraded

Rationale

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

Many heritage lists (including the NZHPT register) contain places and sites that were listed without the use of systematic identification or significance assessment standards and methods. A key aspect of improved standards is the establishment of stated criteria or other bases for the assessment of heritage value. Examples of improved standards include section 23 criteria of the Historic Places Act 1993 for registration of historic places and historic areas; guidelines for assessing significance, and criteria for inclusion in heritage inventories and district plan schedules. These standards require new listings or updated listings to contain information that indicates that the place or item does have heritage value. The information often includes photographs/plans, heritage fabric assessment, historical documentation, and an assessment of heritage value. The

standards also outline the process by which heritage value is established, including consultation with building owners and other interested parties.

As stated in the Australian Environmental Indicators report, 'an increasing proportion of identified places with or using best practice heritage assessment criteria or processes reflects an improvement in our understanding of heritage places.'⁶ The indicator also signals an improvement in the quality of the heritage register or list and its usefulness to assist with protective processes and mechanisms.

Discussion

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

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

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

To improve this situation, in 1999 the NZAA embarked upon a national site recording scheme upgrade project. This project, partially funded by the Crown and local authorities, involves assessing all recorded archaeological sites in each district. This project is a collaborative venture between the NZAA, local authorities, iwi, and landowners. Further information about the upgrade project is available from the NZAA website (<http://www.nzarchaeology.org/>).

⁶ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 41

2.2 Historic Heritage Threats/Pressure

2.2.1 Issue: Condition of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.3. Number of historic items destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished

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

I.3. Number of historic items destroyed or values severely diminished		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings)	NZHPT	No. of historic place (buildings) entries removed from the Register
	Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a listed heritage place
		No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed heritage place
Places (sites)	NZHPT	No. of historic place (sites) entries removed from the Register
	Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a listed heritage place (site)
		No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed heritage place (site)
	NZHPT	No. of archaeological sites for which an authority has been granted to allow for modification, damage, or destruction
Areas	NZHPT	No. of historic area entries removed from the Register
	Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a building or structure within a historic area
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZHPT	No. of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas removed from the Register
	Local authorities	No. of resource consents issued to damage or substantially modify a listed place or area of significance to Maori

Rationale

Threats to historic heritage can be generally divided between building redevelopment threats, land development, and lack of maintenance or demolition by neglect.

Building redevelopment involves the development of land and activities such as demolition, relocations, additions and alterations. These activities can harm heritage values as demolition may destroy heritage fabric associated with a site and relocation may harm the heritage context of a site. Also inappropriate additions and alterations may compromise the heritage integrity of a place.

Land development includes both urban expansion and rural development that includes subdivision, new housing, roading, landscaping and associated earthworks. Land development can threaten historic sites and often recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites can be damaged by such development.

Demolition by neglect involves instances where there is little or no economic or social investment in existing buildings and structures. As a result there is little incentive to restore and maintain historic items.

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

Discussion

The link between the actual loss of historic places and listings status can be weak. This is because places may remain on the Register or schedules long after they have actually been highly modified by removal or alterations or destroyed. The NZHPT, as part of the upgrade and review process, is seeking to improve this situation by ensuring places are removed from the Register if they have been destroyed or have been severely modified to the extent that the continued presence of the item on the Register cannot be justified.

Generally, nearly all local authority district plans in New Zealand require resource consent to demolish, relocate, or carry out substantial alterations and additions to listed buildings and sites.

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

In the case of historic places, it appears at present that information relating to building approvals may not identify whether the particular proposal is beneficial or detrimental to heritage values. All the counting of building approvals would indicate would be a change in the rate of activity – more information would be needed to determine if that activity was detrimental to the condition of the historic environment.⁷

Outside the main urban areas, the number of resource consents issued per year involving listed buildings is not large and it may be possible to determine if the consent resulted in substantial severe loss of heritage values. Within the urban centres, a sample approach is probably the most achievable and can be achieved as part of monitoring the outcomes of resource consent decisions (see indicator I.7 below).

The NZHPT's archaeological authority database records authorities issued to damage, destroy, or modify archaeological sites. Not all authorities issued, however, actually involve damage or modifications to archaeological sites. For example, in the case of some section 12 archaeological authorities, the authority is issued because there is 'reasonable cause to suspect' that unrecorded archaeological sites may be uncovered by earthworks in an area – the actual work may avoid the archaeological sites. Many archaeological authorities make provision for the protection of significant archaeological sites while permitting less significant sites to be modified or destroyed.

⁷ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 43

Archaeological authorities may also be issued to enable restorative or mitigation work to take place on archaeological sites and this work would have positive effects on the heritage environment. In addition, there is currently little capacity to actively monitor many archaeological authority conditions. However, reports produced as a result of the conditions of the authorities provide a starting point.

As with numbers of resource consents, further information about the outcomes of archaeological authorities would require a sampling strategy and monitoring of archaeological sites subject to archaeological authorities.

2.2.1 Issue: Condition of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.4. The proportion of historic heritage in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity

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

I.4. The proportion of historic heritage in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (including buildings and sites)	NZHPT	The proportion of registered historic places in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
		The proportion of recorded archaeological sites in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity
	Local authorities	The proportion of listed historic places in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
	DOC	The proportion of actively managed historic places in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
Areas	NZHPT	The proportion of historic places within a selected registered historic area in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
	Local authorities	The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
Places and areas of significance to	NZHPT	The proportion of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity

Maori	Local authorities	The proportion of listed places and areas of significance to Maori in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity
-------	-------------------	--

Rationale

Sample surveys are a critical method of understanding the 'state' of heritage in a particular region or district. Surveys generally involve a brief visit to a place or area and the recording of information about the condition of the place and an assessment of its heritage integrity. These surveys are generally similar to the rapid assessments of condition and integrity adopted in the United Kingdom to understand the state of buildings and at risk. In New Zealand, the survey method must also provide for historic sites, areas, places and areas of significance to Maori.

Planning and conducting surveys can be a time consuming and expensive exercise. For this reason, any survey should cover the range of historic heritage types and be integrated with surveys to assess the effectiveness of plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities (see indicator I.7 below).

For all surveys, Appendix 2 contains a sample survey guide and sampling form.

Discussion

Historic Place (buildings) Surveys

The systematic monitoring of the condition of heritage places by survey has not been carried out at a national or regional level, with the exception of the Auckland region. The Australian SOE indicators programme originally attempted to sample the 'number of heritage places as being in good, average, and poor condition at a national level.' However, after a review of this sampling programme in 2001, the indicators were amended to include factors such as integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity. These factors were included because it was found that while many buildings or structures were assessed to be in good physical condition, substantial alterations had undermined the integrity of the fabric:

An observation, particularly of commercial premises in urban centres and regional towns, is that they had retained good condition externally (except on their ground floor shop fronts in most cases), but their interiors were substantially modified, and while in good condition, had low internal integrity. Their historical associations and functional significance had been severely diminished as a result. There are, for example, few country town emporiums retaining their internal fittings and internal space characteristics.⁸

Other issues raised in the Australian survey included:

- Obtaining permission from owners to visit properties was time and resource consuming.
- Many interiors of buildings were not accessible for survey (only 50% of all buildings were accessible).

⁸ Michael Pearson et al, *Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra, 2001, p 34

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

Despite these limitations, the Australian survey produced valuable documentation about the state of the heritage resource and raised issues relating to the loss of values through changes for new uses, loss of values as result of modernising alterations, threats from urban growth, the state of large former government buildings, the high integrity and good condition of residential buildings, and high maintenance issues with regard to churches.⁹

In New Zealand a survey was undertaken of a sample of registered historic places from each local authority area in the greater Wellington region during the summer of 2005. The survey was based on the Australian survey discussed above, though modifications were made to ensure its relevancy to the Wellington region's heritage environment. The survey guide is attached in Appendix 2.

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

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

1. The condition and integrity of most of the surveyed heritage buildings was generally positive. Many buildings show evidence of recent repair and maintenance and had uses compatible with their heritage value. There did not appear to be any major differences between Category I and Category II with regard to condition and integrity.
2. The integrity of private residential buildings tended to be healthier than commercial and public buildings. However, in some cases public and commercial buildings were in better condition. A number of residential dwellings are cause for alarm, especially those houses that have lost their original usage. In this regard, Taylor-Stace Cottage (Porirua) is a key concern. This building is a Category I

⁹ *ibid*, pp 37-38

Historic Place and the oldest cottage in the Wellington region. The cottage is used as an office and pipe store and is threatened by flooding and general decay.

3. The condition of outbuildings associated with rural buildings is a key concern. With changes in farm practices and management, these buildings often become 'redundant' with a loss of utility value. An example is Sayers Slab Whare (Category I) which was a historic family home and then used farm storage shed. The Whare is at serious risk of collapse and is threatened by a neighbouring tree. The building has been the subject of an NZHPT Heritage Incentive Fund grant and work to remove the tree commenced in April 2005.
4. The integrity of commercial buildings is a key concern, especially in the main towns. While, the condition of many of these buildings is good, most have been modified (especially at the ground-level) for new shop fit outs and renovations. For many commercial premises, the remaining heritage fabric is often limited to the main street façade above the veranda. This finding is supported by the WCC heritage monitoring project. If these trends continue, Wellington Region will have few remaining heritage commercial buildings in the main urban areas that could be described as in an original state. In rural areas, there are a number of original commercial premises that remain and continue to operate. However, many of these buildings require ongoing repair and maintenance.
5. Most heritage buildings in the public domain have high integrity and are in good condition. These buildings are also often open to the public for functions and meetings. Examples include Gear Homestead (Porirua) and Norbury House (Hutt). Both of these dwellings were private residential dwellings that have been acquired by the respective local authorities for public use. Other public buildings of high integrity and good condition include Petone Settlers Museum (Hutt), Carterton Public Library (Carterton), St Mary's Catholic Church (Carterton); St Joseph's Church (Porirua), St Alban's Church (Porirua).
6. In some cases, former buildings associated with the Government, hospital etc remain at risk as a result of restructuring and Government land reorganisation. Both the Mental Health Museum (Porirua) and the Wallaceville Animal Research Centre (Upper Hutt) are in this situation. Both buildings are Category I, are at risk, and are in poor condition. There has been recent progress to manage and repair the Mental Health Museum thanks to the hard work of museum volunteers. The situation of the Wallaceville Animal Research Centre is not so positive and the building has effectively been abandoned.
7. As a general observation, a limited number of heritage buildings have been converted into museums (either general museums or house museums). Examples of museums within heritage buildings in the Wellington Region include Cobblestones (Greytown), Fell Museum (Featherston), Nairn Cottage (Wellington), Katherine Mansfield House (Wellington); Waikanae Museum (Kapiti) and Golder's Cottage (Upper Hutt).¹⁰

Area Surveys

Measuring change within historic areas has been a neglected activity and there are few international examples of monitoring programmes of historic areas.

¹⁰ NZHPT, *Wellington Region SER Historic Heritage Technical Report*, 2005, pp 39-40

Information gathered from resource consents databases can provide some guide to change in conservation areas and landscapes. The Australian and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials commissioned a report to examine issues associated with development proposal in heritage precincts.¹¹ This research reveals that there is a general increase in the rate and magnitude of development proposals within conservation areas in both New Zealand and Australia. Counting numbers of resource consents issued relating to conservation or historic areas however provides little valuable information on the actual outcomes of the consent processes. It is the NZHPT's experience that most consents issued within conservation or historic areas relate to non-heritage related features or structures or involve minor alterations and additions.

The Australian and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials report acknowledges the need for better monitoring of changes within conservation and historic areas. It recommends that:

A more detailed study is undertaken across all jurisdictions to track numbers of development proposals, time taken to process, method(s) used and outcomes achieved in order to more accurately determine how effective the methods currently being used are.¹²

Recently, English Heritage has commissioned research to develop methodologies to guide the survey of England's conservation areas. This project involved three London conservation areas, Maryport in Cumbria and two undesignated 'control areas' – Saxon Drive in Ealing and South Maryport, Cumbria.¹³ The English Heritage research involved a 'door to door' survey and a recording of individual building elements in a detailed system which concentrated on basic elements such as front elevations, chimneys, roof, walls, and windows. From this information, a survival rating was expressed as the percentage of original fabric that remained. In all, the project surveyed over 1000 buildings. The project highlighted the inherent difficulties in surveying conservation areas especially in terms of resources, the need for professional expertise, time requirements and substantial finance. Also the English survey questioned the need for such a detailed survey of each conservation area:

It is reasonable to question whether such a mechanistic approach is necessary in practice. A basic health-check of a conservation area can be performed empirically by a well-informed conservation professional with relative ease.¹⁴

New Zealand's conservation and historic areas tend to contain a diverse range of buildings and structures from different time periods and displaying a variety of architectural styles. NZHPT and local authority research in Napier and Hastings has focused on identifying heritage buildings within the central business districts. This research has revealed changes over time about what exactly constitutes a 'heritage building' as systems are improved and expanded to reflect changing society values.

For example, in Napier the research identified a number of post-World War II buildings associated with modern movement architecture. These buildings had not been identified in previous surveys which focused on pre-World War II Art Deco buildings. In Hastings,

¹¹ National Heritage Managers of Approvals and Advice (NHMAA) Network (A sub-committee of the Australia and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials, *Issues Associated with Development Proposals and Heritage Precincts, A Discussion Paper*, March 2005

¹² *ibid*, p iv.

¹³ Eddie Booth and David Pickles, 'Measuring Change in Conservation Areas', *Context*, Vol 89, May 2005, pp 20-24 (for the full research paper see: www.english-heritage.org.uk/conservinghistoricplaces/conservationadvice/conservationareas)

¹⁴ *ibid*, p 24

a survey of heritage buildings in 1996 identified 85 heritage buildings mostly associated with Art Deco or Spanish Mission movements. A resurvey of the Hastings CBD in 2004 expanded the schedule to 125 heritage buildings.¹⁵

In New Zealand's major urban centres the state of historic townscapes is a growing issue as older parts of cities experience change driven by economic investment, transport, subdivision, and infill housing. Both Auckland and Wellington local authorities have commissioned research to identify changes in the historic townscape environment. Wellington's research has focused on the identification of historic residential townscapes in Thorndon, Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Oriental Bay, Berhampore, and Newtown. In 1998, Wellington City commissioned an Urban Design Evaluation of Mt Cook, Newtown and Berhampore. This research provided statistics of buildings in these areas built before 1919. It was found that in areas such as Mt Cook some 85% of residential houses were built before 1919. The research formed the basis of a consultation project with residents involving both survey and workshops and the Council has proposed a District Plan Change (Plan Change 38) which inserts new character areas into the District Plan with a discretionary rule that applies to the demolition of pre-1930 buildings.¹⁶

The NZHPT suggests that the experience of historic and conservation area and landscape research in New Zealand and overseas can be utilised to provide a framework for conservation area and landscape monitoring. The core elements of this framework would involve:

- The selection of a restricted number of defined historic or conservation areas and landscapes for survey. Due to the resources involved, it may only be possible to survey one area or landscape per region per annum.
- Ideally, a control area that is not recognised as a historic area should be part of the survey project.
- A basic 'desk top' survey should be undertaken of the selected areas involving:
 - Geographical area and boundaries
 - Type and characteristics
 - Location, number, and extent of identified heritage features within area
 - Numbers of resource consents relating to subdivision, alterations and additions, signage, relocation and demolition
- The basic 'desk top' survey should be followed by a physical survey to confirm the location, number and extent of heritage features within an area and provide information on the condition and integrity of the heritage features (as per the general survey described above).
- Ideally, the survey should be repeated on annual basis to provide an indicator of change from the base year data.
- To limit the scope of the survey, it may be necessary to confine the desktop resource consent analysis to number of demolished buildings relating to a period of time. For example, number of resource consents issued to demolish buildings built before 1940.

¹⁵ See: http://www.historic.org.nz/Register/register_HBproject.html

¹⁶ See: <http://www.wellington.govt.nz/plans/district/planchanges/planchange38.html>

- In rural historic areas, the primary change indicator may be the number of resource consents issued to subdivide land within an area per annum.

Places and areas of significance to Maori and historic places (sites) Surveys

With respect to places and areas of significance and historic sites, a similar survey format as used for buildings and areas could be adopted. However a survey of places and areas of significance to Maori and historic sites would focus on condition and integrity without a need to focus on occupation, use and conservation activity. Surveys of places and areas of significance to Maori and historic sites must be conducted with close consultation with the tangata whenua and surveys of archaeological sites should be carried out by a professional archaeologist.

2.3 Historic Heritage Responses

2.3.1 Issue: Protection of historic heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage

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

I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings and sites)	NZHPT	No. of NZHPT properties (buildings and sites) No. of NZHPT covenants (buildings and sites)
	Local authorities	No. of historic place reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act.
	DOC	No. of historic place reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act
Areas	NZHPT	No. of NZHPT properties (historic areas) No. of NZHPT covenants (historic areas)
	Local authorities	No. of historic area reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act
	DOC	No. of historic area reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act
	QEII Trust	No. of QEII covenants established to protect a historic area
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZHPT	No. of NZHPT covenants (wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas)
	Local authorities	No. of reserves managed to protect places and areas of significance to Maori under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act
	Maori Land Court	No. of Maori reservations established to protect places and areas of significance
	Office of Treaty settlements	No. of statutory acknowledgements relating to places and areas of significance in claim settlement legislation

Rationale

This indicator attempts to measure any change in the application of statutory protection for heritage places and areas offered by the active use of heritage legislation and resource management legislation. The long term conservation of historic heritage relies, to some extent, on the implementation of available legislative provisions 'on the ground.' For example, the legislation may provide for a tool to protect historic heritage such as a covenant. However if covenants are never prepared or adopted as provided for in the legislation, there will be not positive heritage outcomes that can be linked to the covenant legislation.

Discussion

NZHPT Properties

The Historic Places Act 1993 empowers the NZHPT to ‘manage, administer, and control all historic places, buildings, and other property owned or controlled by the NZHPT, or vested in it, to ensure the protection, preservation, and conservation of such historic places, buildings, and other property.’¹⁷ As at 2007, the NZHPT manages and controls 60 historic properties nationwide.

NZHPT Heritage Covenants

The NZHPT can negotiate and agree with the owner of any owner (or lessee/licensee) of any historic place, historic area, wahi tapu, or wahi tapu area for the execution of a heritage covenant to provide for the protection, conservation, and maintenance of that place, area, or wahi tapu.¹⁸

Reserves Act 1977

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

Local Government Act 2002: Regional Parks and Reserves

Auckland, Environment Bay of Plenty, Taranaki and Wellington regional councils own and maintain a regional parks network and these parks include a number of heritages and structures. Also local authorities own and manage a large number of reserves that have heritage significance.

Conservation Act 1987

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

Conservation planning includes national general policies, conservation management strategies, and conservation management plans. The strategies include a number of objectives relating to historic resources. The focus of these objectives is the conservation of historic places on land managed by DOC which are of high historic significance.¹⁹

¹⁷ sec 39(e) Historic Places Act 1993

¹⁸ sec 6(1), Historic Places Act 1993

¹⁹ DOC, *Conservation Management Strategy, Vol 1 for Wellington, 1996-2005*, DOC, 1996, p 157

Heritage Orders

The RMA 1991 provides for a system of heritage orders for the purpose of protecting 'any place of special interest, character, intrinsic or amenity value or visual appeal, or of special significance to the tangata whenua for spiritual, cultural, or historical reasons; and such area of land (if any) surrounding that place as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of ensuring the protection and reasonable enjoyment of that place.'²⁰

A heritage order is a provision made in a district plan to give effect to a requirement made by a heritage protection authority. A heritage protection authority includes any Minister of the Crown, local authorities, NZHPT, and a body corporate that is approved as a heritage protection authority.

Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977

The Queen Elizabeth II Trust Act 1977 established the QEII Trust to 'encourage and promote the provision, protection, and enhancement of open space for the benefit and enjoyment of people of New Zealand.'²¹ Open space means any 'area of land or body of water that serves to preserve or to facilitate the preservation of any landscape of aesthetic, cultural, recreational, scenic, scientific, or social interest or value.'²² The Act facilitated a system of open space covenants on private land. The general focus of the covenants has been to protect land with high natural values.

Te Ture Whenua Maori Land Act 1993

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

Claim Settlement Legislation

Any Maori person may make a claim against the Crown under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. As a result of Waitangi Tribunal inquiries and direct negotiations by the Office of Treaty Settlements, legislation has been passed providing for the settlement of Treaty claims. This legislation often provides for a range of statutory acknowledgements which give recognition to sites or areas of significance to iwi within specific rohe.

²⁰ sec 189(1) RMA 1991

²¹ Long Title, QEII National Trust Act 1977

²² sec 2, *ibid*

2.3.2 Issue: Protection of Historic Heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.6. Number of historic items actively protected by formal statutory instruments or conservation plans

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

I.6. Number of historic items actively protected by formal statutory instruments or conservation plans		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings and sites)	NZHPT	No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties and recorded archaeological sites
	Local authorities	No. of conservation plans for listed historic places
		No. of heritage orders issued under the RMA
DOC	No. of conservation plans for actively managed historic places	
Areas	NZHPT	No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic areas)
	Local authorities	No. of conservation plans for listed historic areas
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZHPT	No. of conservation plans for registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas
	Local authorities	No. of conservation plans for listed places and areas of significance to Maori
	Iwi	No. of management plans for listed iwi inventory places and areas of significance

Rationale

While the legislation may provide methods to protect heritage places and a number of places may be listed or reserved for protection, there may be little information available to know if actual protection has been achieved. For example, despite a historic place being protected by a covenant or listing in a district plan, the place may be abandoned and left to decay. While information on this issue can be gathered by sample surveys (see indicators I.4 and I.7), it is also proposed to measure the number of historic heritage subject to a conservation plan.

A conservation plan is a specific plan for an individual place, building, site, or a number of places within an area. The plan normally contains an account of the history and physical attributes of the place, an assessment of significance, a statement of conservation policy and proposals for conservation management and use. Generally, the existence of a conservation plan indicates that the authority responsible is taking an active interest in a site or group of sites to ensure improved management and conservation.

2.3.3 Issue: Protection of Historic Heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.7. Assessment of the effectiveness of plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities relating to historic heritage

Description: Measures any change in the effective implementation of district and regional plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities.

I.7. Assessment of the effectiveness of plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities relating to historic heritage		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings and sites)	Local authorities	The proportion of listed historic places and sites for which resource consents had been granted in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation and use
Archaeological sites	NZHPT	The proportion of archaeological sites for which archaeological authority had been granted in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation and use
Areas	Local authorities	The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area for which resource consents had been granted in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation and use
Places and areas of significance to Maori	Local authorities	The proportion of listed places and areas of significance to Maori for which resource consents had been granted in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity

Rationale

Closely aligned to SER is the monitoring of the efficiency and effectiveness of policy statements or plans and the exercise of resource consents. Guidance on plan monitoring has been published by MFE and available on the Quality Planning website.²³ Further, a substantial amount of research has been conducted by the Planning Under a Cooperative Mandate Project (PUCM) at the universities of Waikato, Auckland and North Carolina. The results from the first phase of this research project has been published as *Planning for Sustainability: New Zealand Under the RMA*.²⁴ With regards to historic heritage, Greg Mason at PUCM is completing a large body of research on the effectiveness of plans in relation to historic heritage. The NZHPT anticipates that when this research is publicly available, this guidance can be revised and updated so as to integrate the findings and recommendations of Greg Mason's research.

Heritage rules within regional and district plans are a key method of implementing statutory protection for historic heritage. To determine if regional and district plans are effective in the implementation of statutory mechanisms, an assessment is required of

²³ MFE, *District Plan Monitoring, A Guide to Getting Started*, June 2000; Policy and Plan Effectiveness Monitoring, Guidance Note, QP Website (www.qualityplanning.org.nz).

²⁴ <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/index.htm>

the quality of the heritage rules. Poorly designed rules will not result in the effective protection of heritage places and the converse is true that robust and comprehensive rules will result in effective protection of heritage places.

To assess the quality of heritage rules within regional and district plans, some key questions that form the assessment criteria are:

Resource Consent Information Requirements

- Does the plan have resource consent information requirements relating to historic heritage (historic places, areas, places and areas of significance to Maori)?

Heritage Schedule

- Does the plan have a heritage schedule?
- Does the heritage schedule provide a comprehensive list of historic places (buildings and sites), areas, and places and areas of significance to Maori?
- Does the plan include a list of criteria for inclusion of items into the schedule?
- Are the criteria for inclusion of items into the schedule comprehensive?

Heritage Objectives, Policies and Methods

- Does the plan have adequate objectives, policies and methods for historic heritage?

Heritage Rules

- Does the plan have any rules relating to historic heritage?
- Does the plan have any definitions relating to key historic heritage concepts and activities?
- Are repair and maintenance, alterations, additions, relocation, demolition, and damage regulated with regard to listed historic places and areas?
- Is subdivision and signage regulated with regard to listed historic places and areas?

The second aspect of monitoring is the effect of the exercise of resource consents and archaeological authorities.

There appear to be few examples of monitoring in New Zealand relating to historic heritage-related consents. With regard to resource consents, one example, is the Wellington City Council monitoring project for the period June 2000 to December 2004 which reviewed the heritage effectiveness of the district plan. The following indicators were selected for the project:

- Number of listed buildings, objects, trees and sites of significance.
- Number of buildings and objects identified as meeting the District Plan criteria for protection but not currently listed.
- Number of buildings (incl. Heritage buildings) that are earthquake strengthened during the year.
- Resource consents granted under Rules 21.2.1, 21.2.2 and 21.1.3 in respect of additions and alterations.
- Professional assessment of the effect of approved resource consents for additions and alterations.

- Resource consent applications under Rules 21.3.1 for total or partial destruction of heritage.
- Resource consent applications for Rule 21.3.2 for tree destruction, removal or partial removal.
- Compatibility of design guides with heritage.²⁵

Generally the monitoring outcomes were not positive for heritage. With regard to a sample of 55 listed buildings that had resource consents granted, the following occurred:

- Heritage values were enhanced in 9% of cases
- Heritage values were not affected in 36% of cases
- Negative impacts to heritage values occurred in 55% of cases.²⁶

Based on the sample data, the report states that 'we can infer that of the 143 listed heritage buildings granted resource consent since June 2000, 48 have had a more than minor loss of heritage values. This represents 10% of the entire list of heritage buildings and a rapid rate of loss for such a short period.'²⁷ The study also found the loss of heritage has been concentrated in the Wellington CBD with some 85% of resource consents issued since June 2000 located within the central area. The findings of this research have now formed part of the justification for changes to the district plan via Plan Change 43.²⁸

This guide proposes a similar survey format as recommended above (indicator I.4). The main modification for this indicator is that places for the survey are not randomly selected from all registered or listed historic heritage, but are randomly selected from those registered, listed or recorded places subject to a resource consent or archaeological authority decision.

²⁵ WCC, Draft District Plan Monitoring Programme, Effectiveness of the Plan relating to Heritage, June 2000 – December 2004

²⁶ *ibid*, p 6

²⁷ *ibid*, p 7

²⁸ WCC, Section 32 Report, Proposed Plan Change 43, Review of Heritage Chapter (www.wcc.govt.nz)

2.3.4 Issue: Resources for Conservation of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage

Description: Measures funds provided and allocated to owners of historic heritage (or community organisations and groups) for heritage conservation from central and local government sources.

I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage		
Historic Heritage	Agency	Information
Places (buildings and sites)	NZLGB	Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic places
	NZHPT	Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of historic places
	Local authorities	Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic places
	DOC	Total amount of project funds granted for conservation of actively managed historic places
Areas	NZLGB	Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic areas
	NZHPT	Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of historic areas
	Local authorities	Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic areas
Places and areas of significance to Maori	NZLGB	Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of places and areas of significance to Maori including wahi tapu
	NZHPT	Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas
	Local authorities	Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of listed places and areas of significance to Maori
	NZHPT	Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of archaeological sites of significance to Maori
	Local authorities	Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of archaeological sites of significance to Maori

Rationale

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

New Zealand Lottery Grants Board

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

New Zealand Historic Places Trust

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

Local Authorities

Many local authorities have formalised a heritage policy or strategy and these strategies often include a grants or funding scheme for historic heritage. The NZHPT has carried out work on developing a guide to heritage incentive funding available from local authorities at district and regional levels.

Appendix 1

SER Historic Heritage Reporting: Background

In 1996, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment reviewed historic and cultural heritage management in New Zealand. The review highlighted heritage at risk and the need for a national coordination and direction, including the need for the provision of 'high quality information and ongoing monitoring'.²⁹

For the purposes of the first national State of the New Zealand's Environment report, the Ministry for the Environment (MFE) measured the condition of historic heritage resources by counting the number of buildings, Maori sites and archaeological sites destroyed with the consent of the heritage agencies.³⁰ Since 1997, the MFE has expanded the National Environmental Performance Indicators Programme and part of this programme includes cultural heritage indicators. These indicators were developed with the assistance of a Maori Environmental Monitoring Group which provided input at a conceptual level. This initiative provided indicators related to Maori interests in the natural environment, but resulted in limited information with regard to Maori interests in the historic environment.³¹

In late 1990s, MFE confirmed a large number of environmental indicators for air, fresh water and land and proposed indicators for terrestrial, freshwater, biodiversity, and the marine environment. This resulted in the identification of some 160 indicators. At this stage, the Government established the goals of the indicator program as 'to develop and use indicators to measure and report how well we are looking after our environment.' In particular to:

- To report regularly on the state of New Zealand's environment.
- To measure the performance of our environmental policies and laws.
- To better prioritise policy and to improve decision-making.³²

MFE have now refocused on New Zealand's priority environmental issues and have identified the following goals:

1. The development of national environmental data which allows MFE to assess trends and emerging issues and that information is used to develop national policies and legislation.
2. The development of measures to monitor the effectiveness of national environmental policies to make sure they work.
3. The measurement of the effectiveness of actions being taken by people and public and private sector organisations to encourage greater awareness and action for the environment.

²⁹ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, *Historic and Cultural Heritage Management in New Zealand*, 1996, p 95

³⁰ MFE, *The State of New Zealand's Environment*, 1997, p 2.21

³¹ MFE, *Environmental Performance Indicators, Maori input into the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme*, Wellington, April 1999; Tuanuku Consultants, *Tohu Waotu Maori Environmental Performance Indicators*, Wellington, report for MFE, 1998; For a review see: McClean, R and Smith, T, *The Crown and Flora and Fauna: Legislation, Policies, and Practices, 1983-1998*, Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, pp 682-684

³² MFE, 'Environmental Performance Indicators Programme – General Information' (www.mfe.govt.nz)

4. The assessment of whether the policies and actions are achieving the environmental results New Zealanders want.³³

The Australian National State of the Environment programme published natural and historic heritage indicators in 1998. The Australian programme aimed to produce a set of key indicators that would 'provide rigorous data describing the major trends in, and impacts on all important elements of Australia's heritage environment.'³⁴ The Australian programme selected indicators for natural and historic heritage that would satisfy a number of selection criteria including:

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

The Australian heritage indicators were first published in 1998 and were refined with the publication of a review report in 2001.³⁵ It is noted the indicators include natural heritage and specific indicators relating to indigenous/aboriginal knowledge, including specific indigenous language indicators.

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

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

³³ MFE, 'The Indicator' August 2004 (<http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/ser/the-indicator/the-indicator-aug-2004.html>)

³⁴ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 9

³⁵ Department of the Environment, *Implementing State of the Environment Indicators for Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2001

10. The number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic places (R).

The Auckland Regional Council has invested a substantial amount of resources in cultural-heritage related policy, cultural heritage database, advice and heritage monitoring. In March 2001, the Council developed a draft cultural heritage monitoring network that included a review of national and international cultural heritage monitoring practices.³⁶ The ARC draft indicators adopted the pressure, state, and response model with a particular emphasis on survey and reserve management.

Draft ARC Cultural Heritage Indicators	
P,S, or R	Indicator
Pressure	Extent of pest and weed impact
	Extent of erosion impact
	Extent of natural hazards impact
	Extent of visitor impact
	Extent of fencing protection
	Extent of development impact
	Land use
	Adjacent landuse
State	Overall condition
	Extent of loss
	Speed of deterioration
	Integrity of place or area
Response	Extent of management impact on condition
	Percentage of recommended management actions carried out since last visit
	Percentage of places and areas formally protected
	Percentage of places and areas destroyed without resource consent approval
	Rate of monitoring resource consent process

Other regional environment reports include statistics and survey information with regard to historic heritage. For example, the Taranaki Regional Council's *State of the Environment Report 2003*, provides information of historic places within Taranaki with a reference to number of places listed in district plans, on the NZHPT Register, recorded archaeological sites, and listed wahi tapu sites.³⁷ The report also provides a review of historic heritage-related protection measures and incentives.

At the district level, some reporting monitoring strategies and reports contain considerable information about historic heritage. For example, Kapiti Coast District Council's monitoring strategy includes a significant section on heritage and tangata whenua. The relevant monitoring objective is 'to monitor the extent to which the district's heritage features are identified and protected.'³⁸ The key indicators are:

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

³⁶ Lucy Mackintosh, *A Draft Cultural Heritage Monitoring Network for the Auckland Region*, ARC, March 2001

³⁷ TRC, *Taranaki- Our Place, Our Future, Report on the State of the Environment of the Taranaki Region*, 2003

³⁸ KCDC, *Capturing Our Environment – KCDC Monitoring Strategy*, August 2002

- No. of archaeological authorities approved for damage or modification of archaeological sites per annum.
- No. and type of complaints received regarding existing or proposed Heritage features.
- Condition of Historic places and occurrence of modification outside resource consent process.
- Condition of 'high risk' heritage features.
- No. and survey of all historic sites threatened by urban development.³⁹

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

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

The Dunedin City Council's *Resource Management Monitoring Programme, Draft Monitoring Strategy*, outlines a number of monitoring requirements that have been prioritised by Council. Within the 'townscape' section, a number of monitoring indicators are relevant to historic heritage including:

- Monitor changes to the schedule of townscape and heritage buildings and sites, together with changes in the state of buildings and facades listed in that schedule.
- Monitor occupancy and type of use of heritage buildings.
- Monitor the costs of renovating a heritage building.⁴⁰

In Christchurch City, the Council has published an environmental trends report for the Long Term Council Community Plan process. This report has selected two indicators as key information:

1. Total number of heritage buildings, sites and objects in the City
2. Number of heritage buildings, sites or objects at risk of loss or heritage value or demolition.⁴¹

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

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

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

- Number of building permits issued to demolish buildings in heritage inventory.
- Number of building permits issued to alter buildings in heritage inventory.

³⁹ *ibid*, p 69

⁴⁰ Dunedin City Council's *Resource Management Monitoring Programme, Draft Monitoring Strategy*, January 2001, p 42

⁴¹ Christchurch City Council, *Christchurch City Environmental Trends Report 2003*, Christchurch, October 2003, p 87

- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to relocate or demolish buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to alter buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of buildings in the heritage schedule of the District Plan that remain authentic’.
- Number of heritage buildings in a neglected state.
- Number of heritage fund applications for restoration of buildings on the heritage schedule of the District Plan.⁴²

⁴² Yvonne Legarth, WCC Internal Report to City Development and Business, 14 February 2000

Appendix 2

State of the Environment Report Historic Heritage Indicators Project Historic Heritage Indicator Sampling Form

NZHPT Register No..... Listed Plan No..... NZAA No.....

Other No.....

Local authority.....

Place Name (or other names the place is known as)

.....

Location description (address)

.....

Chattels/Objects.....

GPS Location Data.....

Site Type (circle those that apply)

Registered Historic Place (building)

Registered Historic Place (site)

Listed Historic Place (building)

Listed Historic Place (site)

DOC Actively Managed Historic Place

Recorded archaeological site
(see note below for archaeological site)

Registered Historic Area

Listed Historic/Conservation Area

Registered Wahi Tapu

Registered Wahi Tapu Area

Listed place or area of Significance to Maori

Historic reserve

Heritage covenant

Heritage order

Other.....

1. Does the place still exist? (circle one answer):

Yes No Not Found/Not Accessible

Add any **aids to relocation** if required (i.e. nearest road, walking distance, access notes):

.....
2. What is the apparent condition of the place (see Note 1)?

Exterior (describe condition)

.....
.....

.....
Interior (describe condition if accessible)

.....
.....

3. What is the apparent integrity of the heritage values of the place (See Note 2)?

.....
.....

4. What is the use of the place? (describe former and current land use)

.....
.....

5. Is the place privately or publicly owned (see Note 3)?

.....

7. Photographs taken during visit?

Yes No

Permission of owner obtained to take photographs?

Yes No

(a permission form should be signed by the owner and attached)

Photographic reference information

.....

8. Brief comments (if necessary, eg: any perceived threats to the place)

.....
.....
.....

Owner's/manager's contact details (not to be made publicly available)

.....
.....

Name of the person completing this form.....

Agency/organisation.....

Site conditions of visit (i.e. weather and visibility)

.....

Date of visit.....

Recommended follow up actions (e.g. provide incentive funding, assistance with maintenance and repairs, listing, registration, heritage covenant, further consultation)

.....
.....

Archaeological sites

The survey of archaeological sites should be undertaken by a professional archaeologist according to best practice archaeological methods and using the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Site Record Forms. Any relevant information about archaeological sites obtained from site visits should be forwarded to the NZAA for inclusion in the NZAA Site Recording Scheme.

Monitoring the State of Historic Heritage Explanatory Guidelines

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

Note 1. Judgements on Condition

Buildings

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

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

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

Places and Areas of Significance to Maori and Historic Sites

Generally places/areas of significance to Maori and historic sites are in poor condition when there are signs of damage from earthworks or erosion and major disturbance of sites. This might include loss of major proportions of the site, the construction of non-heritage related structures on the site. The site may be suffering from uncontrolled vegetation growth or from activities such as dumping and disposal.

A site in fair condition has inadequate maintenance and is need of repairs. There may be some minor damage or disturbance and there may be some uncontrolled vegetation growth. The site retains its important features but these are in need of conservation action and maintenance.

A site in good condition is well maintained and all significant visible features are subject to a program of repair and maintenance. There has been no damage or disturbance to the site.

Note 2. Judgements on Integrity

Buildings

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

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

A building of high integrity has features that contribute to the value of the place are very largely intact and not compromised by significant removals, modification or additions.

Places and Areas of Significance to Maori and Historic Sites

In relation to places/areas of significance to Maori and historic sites without fabric, a judgement must be made on the impact of changes in diminishing the ability of the viewer to understand the associations of the place.

Generally, a place with low integrity has major elements which would contribute substantially to its heritage values removed or extensively altered. Original significant features have been destroyed, partially destroyed or damaged. Activities, such as dumping and disposal are carried out on the site that are fundamentally conflicting with the values of the site. The site is difficult to locate or identify.

A place with medium integrity can normally be located and identified, but there has been some loss of significant features. Despite some damage, the site sufficient original or historically associated features for its value to be understood and interpreted.

A place with high integrity can be located and identified and the original and significant features that contribute to the value of the place are intact and not compromised by significant modifications.

Note 3. Public versus private ownership

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